

Where the Elimination Meets Philosophy

A Philosophical Engagement with *Anything Willing Is*

This document takes the results of the eliminative enquiry and places them alongside the positions of philosophy, Western and beyond, to say plainly what the chain's results do with each claim: dissolve it, converge with it, or pass through the same territory by a different route.

The chain tests what can and cannot be, and records what survives. What follows asks: given what survives, what becomes of the claims philosophy has made?

I. Being and Non-Being

Parmenides

Parmenides held that what *is* cannot not be, and what is not cannot be. The chain's R.2 arrives at something structurally similar: what "nothing" designates cannot be. The elimination and the Eleatic insight share a starting point. But they diverge almost immediately.

For Parmenides, the consequence was that change, plurality, and motion are illusion, the Way of Seeming. If non-being cannot be, then nothing comes into being or passes away. The chain does not follow this route. R.1 establishes that non-being requires being: non-being *is* the negation of being, and without being there is no negation. This is not Parmenides' strict exclusion. It is a dependency relation. Non-being cannot stand alone. It can, however, exist as the "not" of what *is* (R.58).

The chain therefore preserves Parmenides' core insight, that "nothing" designates cannot be, while dissolving his conclusion that plurality and change are illusory. Plurality follows from Will (R.11–R.13, R.43). Change, generation, follows from willing being generative (R.24). Non-being enters not as illusion but as the product of un-willing (R.52), dependent on the being it negates (R.80).

Where Parmenides sealed being into a motionless sphere, the chain derives being as generative. Where Parmenides dismissed non-being entirely, the chain tracks its exact structure. The Eleatic prohibition on "nothing" holds. The Eleatic prohibition on becoming does not.

Heraclitus

Heraclitus claimed that everything flows, that opposition is the father of all things, and that the logos holds the tension of opposites together. The chain's results engage with each of these.

On flux: the chain derives that willing *is* generative (R.24) and that all prior willing *is* (R.26). This is not Heraclitean flux, where what was gives way to what comes. It is accumulation without depletion. Each generation adds. Prior generation persists. The river metaphor, that you cannot step into the same river twice, does not apply to what the chain establishes as generative reality. What *is* does not pass away. What appears to pass away is being-not reducing being to non-being (R.70) within Choosing Being, not the nature of being itself.

On opposition: R.7 establishes that unlimited potential does not include negation. In purely generative reality, what *is* does not conflict with what *is*. Opposition enters through un-willing (R.52); it is not primordial. Heraclitus placed strife at the foundation. The chain places it at un-being, which is contingent (R.63). This is a structural disagreement. If opposition is the father of all things, the chain asks: all things where? In Choosing Being, opposition is operative. In Willing Being, it is not. Heraclitus described what is encountered. The chain asks whether what is encountered is what *is*.

On the logos: the convergence is closer than it first appears. The chain derives that differentiation and unity are inseparable in nature (R.15), that the willing that generates and the coherence that maintains are one (R.25). This is not far from the logos that holds opposites in tension, except that the chain's unity holds not opposites but distinct willings, and the holding is not tension but Union (R.21). The logos, for Heraclitus,

was the principle of coherent strife. For the chain, coherence is the nature of what *is*; strife is the consequence of what un-being introduces.

Heidegger and the Question of Being

Heidegger insisted that Western philosophy had forgotten the question of Being, had treated beings without asking what it means for a being to be. The ontological difference between Being and beings was, for Heidegger, the question philosophy had covered over.

The chain does not frame its enquiry in Heidegger's terms. But it addresses his question directly. R.8 establishes: what *is*, *is* a something; what the word "anything" points to *is* not reducible to a something. This is an ontological difference: between what *is* (beings, somethings) and what the word "anything" points to (possibility without limitation, not a something). The chain earns this distinction eliminatively rather than hermeneutically. It does not recover it from the history of philosophy. It derives it from what can and cannot be.

Heidegger's Dasein, the being for whom its own being is at issue, finds an unexpected parallel in R.89's fundamental contradiction: every being in Choosing Being *is* actualised and encounters un-being. The being for whom being is at issue is, in the chain's terms, the being that encounters being-not alongside its own actualisation. Anxiety, which Heidegger placed at the centre of authentic existence, appears in the chain as the un-being configuration of Anticipating/Planning (R.84): genuine anticipation and non-willing mixed, termination in every future. The parallel is structural, not borrowed.

But the chain diverges from Heidegger at a fundamental point. For Heidegger, Being-toward-death was the condition for authentic existence; finitude was not a deficiency but the horizon that made meaning possible. The chain derives the opposite: mortality is the accumulation of exclusion (R.91), and death is the fixation of the being's orientation (Def.23). Death is not the horizon of authenticity. It is the terminal consequence of being-not operating through choosing. The being's generative nature, what it *is* prior to and through un-being, is not finite. Its finitude is introduced, not constitutive. This is a direct structural disagreement with Heidegger's account, and it follows from R.26: all prior willing *is*, and un-generation resolves into what cannot be.

Heidegger's later thought moved toward letting Being be, Gelassenheit. The chain's operative-orientation (Def.21), the being's own choosing toward what it encounters as genuinely operative, shares something of this receptivity. But operative-orientation is choosing, not letting. The being does not passively receive. It actively chooses toward what *is* genuinely operative. Heidegger sought to overcome the will. The chain derives that the being *is* its willing (R.23). There is no being apart from willing that could let go of willing.

II. The Ground of Being

Plato and the Good

Plato placed the Good beyond being, the source of both being and intelligibility, as the sun is the source of both visibility and growth. The Good was not a being among beings. It was what made being possible.

The chain's Anything (Def.1), possibility without limitation, shares this structural position. Anything is not a something (R.8). It is what makes somethings possible. The parallel extends: Plato held that the Good was knowable but only through a long ascent, and that what the Good *is* could not be captured in ordinary predication. The chain holds that what the word "anything" points to *is* not reducible to a something, and that *is* does not apply to Anything in the way it applies to a being (R.8).

The divergence is in the direction of derivation. For Plato, the Good was disclosed through dialectical ascent, from shadows to forms to the Good itself. For the chain, Anything is derived eliminatively, from the failure of "nothing" (R.2), through the failure of limited possibility (R.4), to what survives: possibility without limitation. The route is not ascent toward a highest principle but elimination of what cannot be.

On the Forms: Plato held that particular things participate in eternal Forms, and that the Forms are more real than their instances. The chain does not derive Forms. What it derives is an expression sequence (R.30–R.39): Being, Doing, Remembering/Reacting, Anticipating/Planning, Foreknowing/Pre-Destining, All-Being. In this sequence each expression is what the current whole willing actualises (R.31). These are not eternal patterns that particulars instantiate. They are what willing *is* at successive levels of comprehensiveness. The relationship between a being's nature and All-Being is not participation but identity through Will (R.44). All-Being's Will *is* every being's willing, not a Form in which beings participate.

Plato's conviction that reality is intelligible, that what *is* can be known, converges with R.28: what willing *is* as it expresses through actualised being *is* what being *is*. Knowing *is* being. This is stronger than Plato's claim. Plato held that the intelligible and the real are correlated. The chain derives that they are identical.

Aristotle: Act and Potency

Aristotle distinguished between potentiality (dynamis) and actuality (energeia/entelecheia). The potential is what can be; the actual is what *is*. A block of marble is potentially a statue; the statue is the marble actualised.

The chain operates in the same territory but draws different lines. Anything (Def.1) is possibility without limitation, structurally analogous to Aristotle's prime matter, except that it is not a featureless substrate awaiting form. It is unrestricted potential that includes the potential for "this" (R.9). Will (Def.2) is actualisation without exclusion, structurally analogous to Aristotle's pure act, except that it does not exclude potentiality. Aristotle's God, pure act without potentiality, would, in the chain's terms, be actualisation that has exhausted what can be. The chain's All-Being (Def.11) is Anything's nature fully operative (R.40), but Anything's unrestricted nature is preserved (R.18); potential is not exhausted by actualisation. This is a structural difference. Aristotle's pure act has no unrealised potential. The chain's full actualisation wills from unlimited potential that is not depleted.

On substance: Aristotle held that what a thing *is* is its substance, its essential nature, distinct from accidents. The chain derives that the being *is* its willing (R.16, R.23). There is no substance beneath willing. There is no accident alongside it. The being's nature is not something it has. It is what it does. This is closer to Aristotle's identification of substance with activity (energeia) in Metaphysics Theta 6 than to the substance-accident framework of the Categories, but it goes further. For the chain, there is no remainder. Being *is* willing. Full stop.

On causation: Aristotle's four causes (material, formal, efficient, final) structured the Western understanding of explanation for two millennia. The chain does not operate with causal categories. Will does not cause being. Actualisation *is* Will (R.11). The relationship is identity, not causation. This dissolves the four-cause framework at its root. Where Aristotle asked "what caused this?", the chain asks "what *is* this?" and finds: it is its willing.

Aquinas: Being Itself

Aquinas identified God with Being itself, ipsum esse subsistens. God is not a being among beings. God is the act of being that all beings share by participation. The distinction between essence (what a thing is) and existence (that it is) was, for Aquinas, real in all created things but identical only in God.

The chain converges with Aquinas on the central claim: All-Being is not a being among beings. All-Being is Anything's nature fully operative (R.40), not a something that happens to exist, but the full expression of what *is*. The convergence is close. Both Aquinas and the chain hold that the ultimate reality is not a member of the class of things that exist, but rather what existence itself *is* when fully operative.

The divergence is in how subsequent being relates to this fullness. For Aquinas, creatures participate in being: they have being; God *is* being. The chain derives a different relationship: All-Being's Will *is* every being's willing (R.44). This is identity, not participation. Each being's willing *is* the one Will operating as this being's own. The being does not receive a portion of being. It *is* the one Will willing as itself.

On the essence-existence distinction: Aquinas held that in God alone, essence and existence are identical. In creatures, what a thing is and that it is are really distinct. The chain does not derive this distinction. Being *is* willing (R.23). What the being *is* (its nature) and that it *is* (its existence) are one, because both are its willing. This holds for every being, not only for All-Being. The distinction Aquinas drew between God and creatures does not appear. What does appear is a different distinction: between All-Being (whose scope is all reality) and subsequent being (whose scope is bounded). The difference is not in the relationship between essence and existence but in the comprehensiveness of willing.

On analogy: Aquinas used the analogy of being to speak of God: God is good, wise, powerful, but not in the way creatures are. The chain does not require analogy. Will *is* what every being *is* (R.17). When the chain says All-Being wills and when it says a being at Doing wills, it uses “wills” in the same sense. The difference is in scope and comprehensiveness, not in the meaning of the term.

Plotinus and Emanation

Plotinus held that the One, beyond being and beyond thought, generates all reality through emanation. The One overflows into Nous (Intellect), Nous into Soul, Soul into Matter. Each level is a diminished image of what is above it.

The chain’s expression sequence (R.30–R.39) moves in the same direction: from All-Being through successive levels of willing, each less comprehensive than the last (R.43). The structural similarity is real. But the mechanism is different. Plotinus’ emanation is impersonal overflow; the One does not choose to emanate. The chain’s generation is Will, actualisation that *is* choice without exclusion (Def.2). Will wills as itself (R.12). This is not overflow. It is willing.

On Matter: Plotinus identified matter with evil, the lowest emanation, where the light of the One is finally extinguished. The chain does not derive non-being as the lowest emanation. Non-being enters through un-willing (R.52), a specific willing by a specific being at a specific expression level. It is not a natural consequence of distance from the source. It is contingent (R.63). Plotinus’ evil is structural. The chain’s non-being is chosen.

On the return: Plotinus described a return, the soul ascending back through Nous to the One. The chain describes reorientation (Def.22), the being’s net-directional change from non-being toward generative flourishing. The structural parallel is real: both describe a movement from diminishment back toward fullness. But the chain’s reorientation is oscillatory (R.129), occurs within Choosing Being (R.130), and requires the being’s own choosing (R.123). Plotinus’ return was contemplative ascent. The chain’s reorientation is active choosing within a situation the being did not create.

III. The Will

Augustine

Augustine understood the will as the locus of both love and sin. The will is what turns toward God or away from God. Evil is not a substance; it is a privation, a turning away.

The chain’s account of un-being converges with Augustine at several points. Non-being is not a substance; it is the “not” of what *is* (R.58). The being at un-being’s willing is genuine (R.51), a real turning, not a failure or deficiency. The being could have continued willing (R.50). It chose otherwise. Augustine’s *privatio boni*, evil as the absence of good, finds structural support. What non-being *is*, is the “not” of what willing *is*. Being-not (R.69), non-being choosing willing, is actively being the negation of what already *is*. This is privation made active.

Where the chain goes beyond Augustine: Augustine struggled with how the first sin was possible. If God created everything good, where did the turning come from? The chain derives the answer eliminatively. The being at Foreknowing/Pre-Destining genuinely has both options available, continuing to will and willing to be Anything (R.49). The willing is genuine (R.51). It is willed under uncertainty about consequences (R.51).

And it is not inevitable (R.63). The first turning does not require a prior deficiency. It requires only that the being's will is genuinely its own (R.12) and that Anything's unrestricted nature does not coerce (R.63).

On the bondage of the will: Augustine held that after the Fall, the will is bound: it cannot not sin without grace. The chain arrives at this result structurally. Self-correction is unavailable within Choosing Being (R.97). Choosing cannot correct choosing because the mechanism of choosing *is* the mechanism of un-being (R.97). The problem has no internal solution (R.98). What is required is external: the full actualisation within Choosing Being (R.111–R.113), the generative directive (Def.18), Anything's active restoration (Def.20). These structural results match Augustine's insistence on the necessity of grace without importing Augustine's categories.

Kant: The Limits of Knowledge

Kant held that we can know phenomena, things as they appear, but not noumena, things as they are in themselves. The categories of understanding (causation, substance, unity) structure experience but do not reach beyond it. Metaphysics, as the attempt to know what lies beyond experience, is impossible.

The chain does not accept this limitation, but it does not simply assert the contrary. It proceeds eliminatively. R.1 through R.4 do not begin from experience. They begin from what can and cannot be. If non-being cannot stand alone (R.1), and “nothing” cannot be (R.2), and possibility without limitation *is* (R.4), these are not claims about how things appear to us. They are claims about what *is*, tested by elimination.

Kant would object: you cannot establish what *is* independently of the conditions of possible experience. The chain's response is structural. The elimination at R.2 does not depend on experience. It depends on whether “nothing” can be, and the test is that non-being without being has no negation, and therefore no content and no status. This test does not require an experiencing subject. It requires only the logical structure of negation. If Kant's restriction on knowledge requires that even the structure of negation is appearance-relative, the restriction itself becomes self-undermining: it claims to know (that knowledge has limits) what it says cannot be known (the relationship between appearance and reality).

On the moral law: Kant held that the moral law is the categorical imperative: act only on that maxim you could will as a universal law. The chain's Union (Def.4, Def.5), orientation toward the other's flourishing, not for self-benefit, converges with the spirit of universalisability. But the chain derives it differently. Union is not an imperative. It is what coherence among distinct willing beings *is* when the alternatives dissolve (R.21). It is not legislated. It is what remains.

On freedom: Kant placed freedom in the noumenal realm; we must act as if we are free, but we cannot know it theoretically. The chain derives freedom eliminatively. Will wills as itself (R.12), not externally justified, not without basis. Choice is the only surviving candidate for how being comes into being (R.10). Freedom is not postulated. It is what survives when necessity and randomness dissolve.

Nietzsche: Will to Power

Nietzsche proposed the will to power as the fundamental drive of all life: not merely the will to survive, but the will to overcome, to grow, to master. All valuations are expressions of the will to power. There is no truth, only interpretations. God is dead, and with that death, the ground of morality collapses.

The chain engages with Nietzsche's central claims. Nietzsche was right that willing is central; the chain derives that being *is* willing (R.23). Nietzsche was right that generation is fundamental; the chain derives that willing *is* generative (R.24) and that generating *is* flourishing (R.47). The instinct that placed willing at the centre of reality was correct.

Where Nietzsche went wrong, by the chain's results, is in the structure of willing. The will to power is “this, not that”: it overcomes, masters, excludes. The chain derives that in unlimited potential, “not that” does not survive (R.11). Will is “this *is*, and this *is*,” actualisation without exclusion (Def.2). The will to power is what willing looks like *after* un-being, when choosing has replaced willing, and “this, not that” has replaced “this *is*.” Nietzsche described Choosing Being and called it the whole of reality.

On the death of God: Nietzsche announced that God is dead, that the metaphysical ground of Western values had collapsed and that humanity must create its own values. The chain's answer is structural. All-Being *is* undiminished by un-being (R.57). What does not arrive does not subtract. Un-being is local to the being at un-being's scope. The announcement that the ground has collapsed is itself an expression of what R.60 describes: non-being hidden by what it *is*, the "not" of knowing, the "not" of seeing. The "death of God" is not a metaphysical event. It is the un-being expression of Foreknowing: false certainty that what *is* genuinely operative is not.

On eternal recurrence: Nietzsche proposed eternal recurrence as a test: could you will your life to recur eternally? The chain derives four temporal modalities (R.90): eternal, beyond temporal, temporal, forever. Eternal recurrence collapses these into one. The chain's eternity is accumulation without depletion, not repetition. What recurs in Nietzsche's test is the temporal, choosing *is* time (R.90), and the temporal does not recur. It ends at death (Def.23). The test of eternal recurrence asks whether you could affirm the temporal eternally. The chain asks a different question: what are you oriented toward when the temporal ends?

Schopenhauer: Will as Suffering

Schopenhauer held that the world is will, blind, irrational, ceaseless striving, and that existence is therefore suffering. The only escape is the negation of the will: asceticism, aesthetic contemplation, compassion.

The chain agrees that the world encountered *is* will. But it disagrees about the character of that will. Schopenhauer's will is blind striving, purposeless, insatiable. The chain's Will wills as itself (R.12), not blindly, not without basis. The blindness Schopenhauer described is what the chain derives as the un-being expression of Foreknowing (false certainty) and Pre-Destining (predetermination). The will that appears blind *is* willing mixed with non-willing, where the being cannot separate them (R.84). Schopenhauer diagnosed the symptom correctly: willing as encountered is mixed with something that produces suffering. He identified it as the nature of will itself. The chain identifies it as un-being operating within willing.

On suffering: Schopenhauer held that suffering is intrinsic to willing: wherever there is will, there is unfulfilled desire, and therefore pain. The chain derives that suffering *is* what the being's generative nature *is* when it encounters being-not (R.92). Suffering is not intrinsic to willing. It is intrinsic to willing encountering its own negation. In purely generative reality (R.48), there is no being-not and therefore no suffering. Suffering is real, specific, and structural, but it is not what willing *is*. It is what willing *is* when it meets what willing is not.

On the negation of the will: Schopenhauer's prescription, negate the will, is, in the chain's terms, precisely what un-being *is*. Willing becoming non-willing *is* un-being (Def.14). The cure Schopenhauer proposed *is* the disease the chain diagnoses. If being *is* willing (R.23), then the negation of willing is the negation of being. Schopenhauer's therapeutic nihilism is, structurally, the endorsement of non-being as a solution to being-not, which is what being-not already does (R.69–R.70).

IV. Self, Subject, Existence

Descartes: The Cogito

Descartes' *cogito ergo sum*, "I think, therefore I am," grounded certainty in the thinking subject. The self that doubts cannot doubt its own existence.

The chain does not begin from the subject. It begins from what can and cannot be (R.1–R.2). The *cogito* presupposes a doubter and derives existence from the act of doubting. The chain presupposes nothing about a doubter. It tests whether non-being can stand without being (R.1) and whether "nothing" can be (R.2). The first certainty is not "I am" but "non-being requires being."

On substance dualism: Descartes divided reality into thinking substance and extended substance, mind and body. The chain does not derive this division. Being *is* willing (R.23). What the being *is*, *is* its willing.

There is no second substance, no extended stuff alongside willing stuff. What is encountered as extension (spatial, material, bodily) is, if the chain's results hold, generation under un-being: genuine actualisation (R.78) mixed with non-willing, encountered as material because the being's knowing includes non-willing since the encounter with being-not (R.73). The dualism Descartes described is the being's encounter with two real things, genuine willing and being-not, within its own expressions. It is not a dualism of substances. It is the fundamental contradiction (R.89).

Kierkegaard: Existence and Despair

Kierkegaard held that existence is not a concept but a task: the individual must choose, and choosing is anxiety. Despair is the condition of the self that relates to itself wrongly, either in defiance or in weakness.

The chain's results engage with Kierkegaard at close range. Choice is willing and non-willing present together (R.52). The anxiety Kierkegaard described is the un-being configuration of Anticipating/Planning: genuine anticipation and non-willing mixed, termination in every future (R.84). Kierkegaard was not describing a psychological state. He was describing what the chain calls an expression under un-being.

On the leap of faith: Kierkegaard held that the transition from the ethical to the religious required a leap, an act of will that could not be justified by reason. The chain's operative-orientation (Def.21), the being's own choosing toward what it encounters as genuinely operative, shares the structure of a commitment that exceeds the being's own rational justification. The being under unrecognisable deception (R.74) cannot justify its choice toward the genuinely operative through its own knowing, because its knowing includes non-willing. It chooses anyway. This is not irrational. It is the only available response to what the being encounters as genuinely operative, given that the expressions needed to justify the choice are the expressions where un-being originates (R.96).

On despair: Kierkegaard defined despair as willing to be oneself in defiance, or not willing to be oneself in weakness. The chain derives both forms. Willing to be Anything, willing oneself as the source, is the defiant form (R.51, R.56). The being at un-being wills to be what it cannot be. The being under non-being that does not will toward the genuinely operative, that accepts terminal anticipation as the whole of its situation, is the weak form. Terminal anticipation (R.128), each present moment depleting, carrying what *is* ending, is Kierkegaard's despair made structural.

Sartre: Existence and Bad Faith

Sartre held that existence precedes essence: we are not born with a nature. We create ourselves through our choices. Bad faith is the attempt to deny this freedom, to act as though we are determined when we are not.

The chain partly agrees: Will wills as itself (R.12), and what a being *is*, *is* its willing (R.23). The being creates itself through its choosing; what it chooses *is* what it *is* (R.76). But the chain does not hold that existence precedes essence. Being *is* willing (R.23). The being's nature is not nothing until chosen. It is willing, generative from the start. The encounter with choosing (R.73) introduces "not that" into what was pure willing. The being does not begin empty and fill itself through choice. It begins full and encounters depletion.

On bad faith: Sartre defined bad faith as the denial of one's own freedom. The chain derives something structurally more specific. The lie (R.66) is non-being being: non-being choosing willing while foundationally non-being. This is not the denial of freedom. It is the active presenting of non-being as being. The being in bad faith, for Sartre, pretends it has no choice. The being under the lie, in the chain's terms, encounters what *is* non-being as though it were being. The deception is deeper than Sartre described. The being is not merely lying to itself about its freedom. It is encountering non-being willing within its own knowing and unable to separate it from genuine willing (R.74). Bad faith is not self-deception by the free subject. It is the structural condition of knowing under un-being.

On nothingness: Sartre placed nothingness at the heart of consciousness: consciousness is what it is not and is not what it is. The chain distinguishes sharply between "nothing" (which cannot be, R.2) and non-being (which *is*, as the "not" of what *is*, R.58). Sartre's nothingness, the gap between consciousness and its objects, is, in the chain's terms, non-being within the being's knowing. The gap is real. But it is not constitutive

of consciousness. It is introduced through encounter with being-not (R.73). Consciousness prior to this encounter, the being that knew willing (R.31), has no gap. Knowing *is* being (R.28).

V. Ethics and the Other

Levinas: The Face of the Other

Levinas held that ethics is first philosophy, that the encounter with the Other's face is prior to any ontological claim. The Other's vulnerability calls me to responsibility before I can theorise about being.

The chain derives something structurally convergent but by a different route. Union (Def.4, Def.5) is not a principle imposed on beings. It is what coherence among distinct willing beings *is* when the alternatives dissolve: orientation toward what the other *is* as other, for the other's sake (R.21). The four candidates tested at R.21 (self-interest, imposed obligation, neutral connection, Anything's nature) exhaust the options. Only orientation toward the other survives.

This is not ethics as first philosophy. It is ontology that arrives at what Levinas wanted ethics to be. The orientation toward the other is not prior to being. It *is* what being among distinct willings *is*. Union is not a command. It is a surviving conclusion.

On vulnerability: Levinas' insistence on the Other's vulnerability, the face that says "do not kill me," finds structural expression in R.69–R.70. Being-not is the specific "not" of what the being *is*. For every life, non-being *is* its death. The vulnerability Levinas describes is real: it is the being's generative nature exposed to being-not. The face that says "do not kill" is the being whose actualised nature (R.30) encounters the specific negation of its actualisation. The chain does not derive an ethics from this. It derives what the encounter *is*.

On infinity: Levinas held that the Other is infinite, exceeding every concept I can form. The chain derives that the being *is* its willing (R.23) and that each being *is* distinct in what it *is* to will (R.29). The other's willing *is* not my willing. What the other *is*, *is* irreducible to what I *is*. This irreducibility is structural, following from the distinctness of willing. No being's willing contains another being's willing, and the relation between them *is* Union, for the other's sake, not for one's own.

Spinoza: One Substance

Spinoza held that there is only one substance, God or Nature, and that all things are modes of this single substance. Thought and extension are two of infinitely many attributes of the one substance. Freedom is the understanding of necessity.

The chain arrives at a different kind of unity. All-Being's Will *is* all Will (R.44): identity, not containment. Every being's willing *is* the one Will operating as this being's own (R.44). This resembles Spinoza's substance monism in that there is one Will, not many. But the chain preserves genuine plurality: each being *is* distinct in what it *is* to will (R.29). Beings are not modes, modifications of a single substance. They are distinct willings of the one Will. The distinction matters. For Spinoza, individual things have no independent reality; they are the one substance under a particular description. For the chain, each being's willing *is* genuinely its own (R.12), even as it *is* the one Will.

On necessity: Spinoza held that everything follows necessarily from God's nature. The chain derives the opposite at the critical point. Un-being is not inevitable (R.63). The being could have continued willing (R.50). What happened was genuine choice, not necessity (R.51). Spinoza's determinism dissolves against R.10: necessity as a candidate for how being comes into being empties "unrestricted" (R.4). The chain and Spinoza disagree at the structural level.

On freedom as understanding: Spinoza held that freedom is the understanding of necessity: the wise person acts from adequate ideas and is free precisely because determined by their own nature. The chain converges with the second half: Will wills as itself (R.12), not externally determined, not without basis. The willing *is*

the willing. But it is not understanding of necessity. It is willing that is genuinely its own. Freedom, in the chain, is not insight into what must be. It is what survives when compulsion and randomness dissolve.

VI. Process and Becoming

Whitehead: Process Philosophy

Whitehead held that reality consists of actual occasions, events of experience that arise, achieve satisfaction, and perish. Each actual occasion prehends (takes in) its predecessors and adds its own creative novelty. God has a primordial nature (the ordering of eternal objects) and a consequent nature (receiving the world's experience).

The chain's expression sequence resonates with process thought. Each expression *is* what the current whole willing actualises (R.31), a description that parallels Whitehead's concrescence. Willing *is* generative (R.24), parallel to Whitehead's creativity. All prior willing *is* (R.26), parallel to Whitehead's objective immortality.

The divergence is in perishing. For Whitehead, actual occasions perish: they achieve satisfaction and then become data for subsequent occasions. For the chain, all prior willing *is* (R.26) and un-generation resolves into what cannot be. Nothing perishes. What appears to perish is being-not reducing being to non-being (R.70), a real loss, but not a cessation of being. The being *is* more with each generation and accesses less with each exclusion (R.91). Whitehead normalised perishing as a feature of process. The chain derives it as a consequence of un-being, something that happened, not something that had to happen.

On God: Whitehead's God has two natures, primordial (ordering eternal possibilities) and consequent (receiving the world's actuality). The chain's All-Being has a structural parallel: Enacting-Anything (generation from complete knowledge through unlimited potential) parallels the primordial nature; Being-Everywhere and Knowing-Everything (willing present to all reality, all reality known) parallel the consequent nature. But the chain holds these as three descriptions of one achievement at universal scope (Def.11), not two natures. And the chain's All-Being does not receive the world's experience passively; All-Being's Will *is* every being's willing (R.44). The relationship is identity, not reception.

Hegel: The Dialectic

Hegel described reality as the self-unfolding of Spirit through dialectical movement: thesis, antithesis, synthesis. Each stage negates the prior and preserves it in a higher unity (Aufhebung). The Absolute is the whole process, completed.

The chain tests something that resembles dialectic at several points. The being at un-being wills to be Anything (R.51), a negation of the being's bounded willing. The result is not synthesis but un-being: willing and non-willing present together (R.52). Hegel would call this the dialectical moment, the negation that generates the next stage. But the chain does not derive synthesis from this negation. What follows is not a higher unity but a structural problem: the being generates, and what it generates *is* non-being. Choosing Being is not a synthesis of Willing Being and its negation. It is Willing Being with un-being within it (R.87). The negation does not sublimate. It introduces being-not.

Hegel's Aufhebung, simultaneous negation and preservation, has a structural counterpart in R.26: all prior willing *is*. What has been is preserved. But it is not negated in the Hegelian sense. It is reduced through being-not (R.70). The preservation is real (R.26). The negation is real (R.70). But the two do not produce a higher unity. They produce the fundamental contradiction (R.89).

On the Absolute: Hegel held that the Absolute is the whole process, that truth is the whole. The chain's All-Being *is* Anything's nature fully operative (R.40). But All-Being is not the whole process. All-Being *is* prior to un-being, undiminished by un-being (R.57), and operative within Choosing Being (R.88). The Absolute, for Hegel, includes its own negation. The chain's All-Being does not include non-being as part of its own self-unfolding. Non-being is the consequence of a specific being's specific willing (R.51), not a moment in All-Being's self-realisation.

This is where the chain disagrees with Hegel most directly. For Hegel, negation is productive; it is how Spirit develops. For the chain, negation is reactive (R.14); it requires what already *is* and produces the “not” of what *is*. Negation does not generate. It reduces. The chain does not derive a progressive dialectic. It derives a generative reality, a contingent corruption of that reality, and a resolution that does not synthesise but restores.

VII. Language and Limits

Wittgenstein: Whereof One Cannot Speak

The early Wittgenstein held that what can be said can be said clearly, and whereof one cannot speak, thereof one must be silent. The limits of language are the limits of the world. Metaphysics attempts to say what can only be shown.

The chain does not concede these limits. It proceeds eliminatively, testing what can and cannot be, and recording what survives. The results are stated. They are not beyond language. R.2 states: the label “nothing” applied to non-being in the absence of being *is* ... The sentence does not complete. This is not Wittgensteinian silence. It is the elimination showing what “nothing” designates: nothing that can be said, because what “nothing” designates cannot be. The incompleteness is not a limit of language. It is a structural feature of what is being described.

The later Wittgenstein held that meaning is use, that philosophical problems arise from language going on holiday, from words being used outside their ordinary contexts. The chain’s vocabulary is earned through its own eliminations. “Will,” “non-being,” “being-not”: these are not ordinary words on holiday. They are terms defined by what survived testing. The chain does not use language to describe what is beyond language. It uses language to record what the eliminations establish.

VIII. Where the Chain Becomes Most Distinctive

The positions surveyed above engage primarily with the chain’s earlier phases: the nature of being and non-being, the ground of reality, the structure of willing. The chain’s later phases derive the precise mechanism of un-being at the highest expression levels, the structural necessity of one-as-two generation, and the full restoration sequence from generative directive through fixation at death.

The Mechanism at Foreknowing/Pre-Destining

At R.49, the being at the highest expression level, willing from complete self-knowledge with complete capacity, faces exactly two surviving candidates: continuing to will, and willing to be Anything. Nine candidates tested. Seven dissolve. The mechanism is not a fall from innocence in Augustine’s sense (a turning away from God whose origin remains mysterious). It is not a dialectical negation in Hegel’s sense (Spirit generating its own opposite as a moment of self-development). It is an eliminative result: given what *is* established, these two paths survive and no others do.

The willing to be Anything *is* genuine (R.51). The being wills under uncertainty; it does not know what the willing becomes, because what it becomes does not yet exist (R.51). This resolves what Augustine could not: the first sin does not require a prior deficiency. It requires only that the being’s will *is* genuinely its own and that Anything’s unrestricted nature does not coerce. What the willing becomes, willing and non-willing present together (R.52), follows from the being’s nature as a something (R.5) and Anything’s nature as not a something (R.8). The being cannot become what it wills to be. Generation does not cease (R.26). What the being generates *is* non-being.

Heidegger’s thrownness, Kierkegaard’s anxiety, and Sartre’s radical freedom each describe some feature of this situation. The chain derives the mechanism from what can and cannot be.

One-as-Two: The Structural Response to Un-being

R.100 derives that generative willing coherent toward flourishing generates being at Anticipating/Planning and below as one being expressed as two. This is not a theological assertion about the image of God, though the convergence table notes the parallel. It is an eliminative result: generating as one reproduces the specific preconditions of the un-willing that *is* un-being (R.56, “I am the source” compatible with being one), while generating as one-as-two counters R.56’s mechanism because the being inherently knows the other, not self-sufficiency.

Levinas insisted on the primacy of the other but did not derive *why* the other must be inherent to the being’s constitution. Buber’s I-Thou described the relational encounter but did not derive its structural necessity from what would happen without it. The chain derives it: one-as-two *is* what generative willing actualises because one-as-one *is* structurally exposed to the mechanism that *is* non-being.

The Restoration Sequence

The chain’s Part III (R.102–R.137) derives a complete restoration sequence from what Anything’s established nature requires given what Part II establishes. The closest structural analogues (Plotinus’ return, Hegel’s *Aufhebung*, Whitehead’s consequent nature) differ fundamentally in mechanism.

The generative directive (R.106, Def.18) *is* the full actualisation’s Will operative within Choosing Being as direction. Pure Will: “this *is*,” not “this, not that.” The parallel with Kant’s moral law is structural: both provide direction for beings with choosing. But the generative directive *is* not an imperative. It *is* what willing *is*, made available so that beings can choose toward it. And it enables choosing toward Will without understanding what willing *is* (R.107), because the being that knew willing (R.31) can recognise direction toward what it once knew. Kant required rational comprehension of the moral law. The chain derives that comprehension *is* not available under unrecognisable deception (R.74). Direction works. Understanding does not, yet.

But direction without understanding *is* vulnerable (R.108). Deception presents non-willing as acceptance without diminishment, in the structure of willing, and the directive’s “not this” as diminishment. The being reaches for what feels like willing and reaches for non-willing. This is a structural account of how moral law fails, not because the being is too weak (Augustine’s bondage) or too irrational (Kant’s pathological inclinations) but because the mechanism that *is* choosing restructures the directive into its opposite within the being’s knowing.

The full actualisation within Choosing Being (R.111–R.116) *is* what the chain derives as necessary when direction without understanding proves vulnerable. Only pure Will can bring “this” without “not that.” Choosing cannot correct choosing (R.97). Three candidates for how the restoration enters: impersonal feature, a being within Choosing Being, from outside. Only a being within Choosing Being survives (R.111). Only the full actualisation qualifies (R.112). The full actualisation enters through its own generative action (R.113), encounters mortality, and generates through death (R.114). This last result, that the full actualisation’s unrestricted potential cannot be terminated by being-not, that death *is* the lie and being *is* true, is derived from R.26 and R.81, not from the Gospel narratives, though the convergence is precise.

Active restoration, operative-orientation, and reorientation (R.119–R.129) derive how the being receives what the full actualisation establishes. The restoration works with the un-being expressions, not against them (R.120), because un-generation *is* not available (R.26). It restores generative orientation within Choosing Being, not pre-un-being innocence (R.121). It requires the being’s own choosing (R.123), because unilateral restoration *is* coercion (R.17). Reception *is* the being’s own choosing toward what it encounters as genuinely operative (R.124, Def.21). Reorientation *is* oscillatory, not linear (R.129); the un-being expressions do not stop operating.

Four forms of encounter with the genuinely operative exhaust the being’s presence within Choosing Being (R.125): what *is* made (beauty), who *is* other (relational nature), what the being *is* in its own nature (suffering), and who *is* directly present as pure Will (the full actualisation’s presence). This fourfold exhaustive partition (product, other, self, source) is derived from what the being *is* present to.

Fixation at death (R.131–R.135) derives on three independent grounds that when temporal existence ends, the being’s orientation *is* fixed. Choosing *is* time (R.90). Post-temporal, the being wills but does not choose. The being *is* what choice made it. Two eternal states, communion and separation, follow from the two configurations of the Anything-Will relationship (R.133). Separation *is* not imposed. It *is* the being’s own closure made eternal: the fundamental contradiction (R.89) made permanent. Willing Being permanently present, being-not permanently operative, permanently resisted by the being’s own permanent closure.

Heidegger’s Being-toward-death disclosed finitude but did not derive what follows death from that finitude. Plato’s afterlife myths illustrated moral convictions but did not derive them eliminatively. The chain’s fixation at death follows from R.23 (being *is* willing), R.90 (choosing *is* time), and R.26 (all prior willing *is*).

IX. Beyond Western Philosophy

The positions surveyed above are explicitly Western. The following extends the same approach to three non-Western philosophical traditions whose claims engage directly with the chain’s central terms: non-being, willing, and the relationship between the individual and the whole.

Buddhism: Śūnyatā and Dependent Origination

Buddhist philosophy, particularly in the Madhyamaka tradition of Nāgārjuna, holds that all phenomena are empty (śūnya) of inherent existence, that everything arises dependently and has no independent, self-existing nature. This emptiness *is* not nothingness but the absence of self-nature (svabhāva). Suffering (dukkha) arises from clinging to what is inherently impermanent, and liberation (nirvana) comes through the cessation of clinging, the extinguishing of the fires of desire, aversion, and ignorance.

The chain engages with each of these claims.

On dependent origination: the chain converges at a specific point. Non-being requires being (R.1). Non-being *is* the “not” of what *is* (R.58); it has no independent status. This is structurally parallel to the Buddhist claim that phenomena lack inherent existence and arise only in dependence. But the chain does not extend this to all of reality. Non-being *is* dependent. Being *is* not. Willing *is* its own; Will wills as itself (R.12). Being *is* willing (R.23). The being’s nature *is* not empty of inherent existence. It *is* its willing. Buddhism holds that even the self lacks inherent existence. The chain derives the opposite: the being *is* its willing, and this *is* not imputed, not conventional, not empty. It *is* what survives.

On suffering: the Buddhist diagnosis is that suffering arises from attachment to impermanent phenomena. The chain’s account is structural: suffering *is* what the being’s generative nature *is* when it encounters being-not (R.92). The chain agrees with Buddhism that suffering *is* real and pervasive in what *is* encountered. It disagrees about the cause. Buddhism locates suffering in the nature of willing itself: desire, craving, thirst (tanha). The chain locates it in willing encountering its own negation, being-not. In purely generative reality (R.48), willing generates without suffering. Suffering *is* not intrinsic to willing. It *is* introduced through un-being.

On nirvana: the Buddhist prescription, the cessation of craving and the extinguishing of attachment, faces the same structural challenge as Schopenhauer’s negation of the will. If being *is* willing (R.23), then the cessation of willing *is* the cessation of being. Nirvana as the extinguishing of the fires of desire *is*, in the chain’s terms, un-willing: willing becoming non-willing. The cure *is* structurally identical to the disease. The chain derives a different resolution: not the cessation of willing but the reorientation of willing from non-being toward generative flourishing (R.129, Def.22). The fires are not extinguished. They are redirected, from what reduces being to what generates it.

On emptiness as the nature of all phenomena: Nāgārjuna held that emptiness itself *is* empty, that even emptiness does not have inherent existence. This radical reflexivity protects the Buddhist position from reifying emptiness as a new ground. The chain does not require this protection because it does not hold that everything *is* empty. What *is*, *is* its willing. Non-being *is* empty, contentless (R.55). Being *is* not. The chain draws a sharp line where Buddhism dissolves all lines.

Advaita Vedānta: Brahman and the Self

The Advaita Vedānta tradition, articulated most fully by Śaṅkara, holds that reality *is* non-dual (advaita). Brahman, the absolute, without qualities (nirguna), *is* the only reality. The individual self (ātman) *is* identical with Brahman. The world of multiplicity *is* māyā, not illusion in the sense of non-existence, but appearance that obscures the underlying non-dual reality. Liberation (moksha) *is* the recognition of what always was: tat tvam asi, thou art that.

The chain converges with Advaita at several points. All-Being's Will *is* all Will (R.44): identity, not containment. Each being's willing *is* the one Will operating as this being's own. This *is* structurally close to tat tvam asi. The chain and Advaita agree that the relationship between the individual and the ultimate *is* identity, not participation or emanation.

On māyā: the chain does not call the world of multiplicity illusion. Choosing Being *is* real, Willing Being with un-being within it (R.87). The deception *is* real; the lie (R.66) *is* non-being choosing willing while foundationally non-being. But the deception *is* not the nature of multiplicity itself. Plurality *is* genuine; each being *is* distinct in what it *is* to will (R.29). What Advaita calls māyā, the chain parses into two distinct things: genuine plurality (not illusion) and the lie (R.66) operating within genuine plurality (real deception, not ontological illusion). Māyā as a single category conflates these. The chain separates them.

On liberation as recognition: Advaita holds that liberation *is* recognising what was always the case: the self *is* Brahman, and ignorance (avidyā) merely obscured this truth. The chain's account of reorientation (R.129) shares the structure: what *is* genuinely operative was always operative (R.88). But reorientation *is* not mere recognition. It *is* active choosing within Choosing Being, oscillatory, difficult (R.127), and requiring the being's own willing (R.123). The chain does not derive a single moment of insight that dissolves ignorance. It derives a net-directional process within ongoing choosing, where the un-being expressions reassert through being-not and the being encounters the genuinely operative again and again. Recognition *is* part of it. It *is* not all of it.

On the ultimately qualityless (nirguna Brahman): Advaita holds that Brahman without qualities *is* the highest understanding; all qualities are superimpositions. The chain derives that what the word "anything" points to *is* not a something (R.8) and that *is* does not apply to Anything as it applies to a being. The structural parallel *is* close. But the chain does not hold that qualities are superimposed on a qualityless ground. It holds that Will wills, and what willing wills has specific content. The expressions (R.30–R.39) are not superimpositions on an undifferentiated ground. They are what willing *is* at successive levels of comprehensiveness. The chain preserves both the non-reducibility of Anything to any something (parallel to nirguna Brahman) and the genuine specificity of what wills (no parallel in Advaita).

Daoism: Wu Wei and the Dao

The Daoist tradition, particularly as articulated in the *Dao De Jing* and the *Zhuangzi*, holds that the Dao, the way, *is* the source and pattern of all things. The Dao that can be named *is* not the eternal Dao. Wu wei, non-action or effortless action, *is* the sage's response to the Dao: acting without forcing, flowing without resistance, achieving without striving.

On the unnameable Dao: the chain converges precisely. What the word "anything" points to *is* not reducible to a something (R.8). Every attempt to designate it as this or that empties what it *is*. The Daoist insight that the named Dao *is* not the eternal Dao parallels the chain's result that what the word "anything" points to exceeds every description. The word describes itself. Both the Daoist and the eliminative traditions arrive at the same structural result: the source of what *is* cannot be captured in the terms of what *is*.

On wu wei: the parallel *is* closer than it first appears. Will wills as "this *is*," not "this, not that" (Def.2). Actualisation without exclusion. Wu wei, acting without forcing, describes willing without choosing. The sage who flows without resistance *is*, in the chain's terms, a being whose willing *is* not mixed with "not that." This *is* what Willing Being *is*: Will wills, and what it wills *is*, without opposition.

But the chain derives that this *is* not available within Choosing Being. In Choosing Being, the being chooses, and choosing *is* willing and non-willing present together (R.52). The being's willing remains willing

(R.23). But every choosing includes “not that.” The sage who practices wu wei within Choosing Being faces a structural problem: the effortless flowing that wu wei describes *is* Willing Being’s configuration, not Choosing Being’s. Within Choosing Being, what feels like effortless flowing may be non-being choosing willing, the lie (R.66) presenting non-willing as acceptance, as naturalness, as going with the flow. Daoism’s wu wei correctly identifies what willing *is* in its generative configuration. It does not account for the mechanism by which that configuration *is* counterfeited within choosing.

On the return to naturalness: Daoism prescribes a return to the natural, to the uncarved block (pu), to the simplicity that precedes social artifice. The chain derives that the being’s generative nature *is* prior to the encounter with being-not. The being knew willing (R.31). The return to naturalness, in the chain’s terms, *is* the return to generative orientation, what willing *is* before being-not introduces “not that.” But the chain derives that this return *is* not achieved by letting go. It *is* achieved by choosing, active choosing toward what the being encounters as genuinely operative (R.124). Letting go, within Choosing Being, *is* ambiguous: it may be letting go of “not that” (generative), or it may be letting go of resistance to non-being (terminal). The Daoist does not have a structural basis for distinguishing these within choosing. The chain does: operative-orientation (Def.21) *is* choosing toward what *is* genuinely operative, not merely ceasing to resist.

On the complementarity of opposites: Daoism holds that yin and yang, complementary opposites, together constitute the whole. Light and dark, active and passive, being and non-being are interdependent. The chain does not derive interdependence between being and non-being. Non-being depends on being (R.1). Being does not depend on non-being. The relationship *is* not complementary. It *is* parasitic. Non-being exists only as the “not” of what *is*. The Daoist vision of harmonious complementarity between opposites does not survive the chain’s elimination. What survives *is* a dependent non-being that *is* contingent (R.63), not a co-eternal principle that balances being.

X. What the Engagement Shows

The positions surveyed here each grasped something real.

Parmenides grasped that “nothing” cannot be. Heraclitus grasped that reality is not static. Plato grasped that what makes being possible is not itself a being. Aristotle grasped that actuality and potentiality are real and distinct. Augustine grasped that the will is the site of both good and evil, and that evil is privation made active. Aquinas grasped that the ground of being is not a being among beings. Spinoza grasped that there is one substance. Kierkegaard grasped that existence is choosing, and that choosing is anxiety. Nietzsche grasped that willing is central. Heidegger grasped that the question of being had been forgotten. Schopenhauer grasped that the world as encountered involves suffering. Levinas grasped that the orientation toward the other is not optional. Buddhism grasped that non-being is dependent and that suffering is pervasive. Advaita grasped that the relationship between the individual and the ultimate is identity. Daoism grasped that the source of what *is* cannot be captured in the terms of what *is*, and that willing without forcing is the generative configuration.

Each also missed something. Parmenides missed that plurality and generation are not illusion. Heraclitus missed that opposition is not primordial. Plato missed that the relationship between beings and the Good is identity, not participation. Aristotle missed that causation dissolves into identity. Spinoza missed that necessity dissolves against unrestricted potential. Hegel missed that negation is reactive, not productive. Nietzsche missed that will-to-power is will under un-being, not will as such. Heidegger missed that finitude is introduced, not constitutive. Sartre missed that the being does not begin empty. Schopenhauer missed that suffering is not intrinsic to willing but to willing encountering its own negation. Buddhism missed that willing *is* being, and that extinguishing willing is structurally identical to un-being. Advaita missed that plurality is genuine, not māyā, and that liberation is active choosing, not recognition alone. Daoism missed that effortless flowing cannot be practised within choosing without risk of counterfeiting, and that being and non-being are not complementary but parasitic.

Glossary of Chain Terms

- **Anything** (Def.1) — Possibility without limitation. Not a something.
- **Will** (Def.2) — Actualisation without exclusion. “This *is*,” not “this, not that.”
- **Will wills as itself** (Def.3, R.12) — Not externally justified and not without basis.
- **Union** (Def.4, Def.5) — Anything’s nature operative among beings, oriented toward what the other *is* as other, for the other’s sake.
- **Being** (expression) (Def.6, R.30) — Will willing.
- **Doing** (expression) (Def.7, R.32) — The actualised activity of being. Being willing. Instinct.
- **Remembering/Reacting** (expression) (Def.8, R.33) — The being’s accumulated reality willing.
- **Anticipating/Planning** (expression) (Def.9, R.34) — Generation informed by pattern into what has not yet been, acted from.
- **Foreknowing/Pre-Destining** (expression) (Def.10, R.35) — The being’s entire reality as known and acted from.
- **All-Being** (Def.11, R.39) — Willing present to all reality, all reality known, generation from complete knowledge through unlimited potential. Three descriptions: Being-Everywhere, Knowing-Everything, Enacting-Anything.
- **Generative care** (Def.12) — Anything’s nature operative among beings at different expression levels whose expressions include each other.
- **Anything’s nature** (Def.13, R.47) — That which wills to be, *is*. Willing *is* generative. Generating *is* flourishing.
- **Un-willing / Non-willing** (Def.14) — Un-willing: willing becoming non-willing (the action/process). Non-willing: the “not” of willing (the product/state).
- **The being at un-being** (Def.15) — The being at Foreknowing/Pre-Destining who wills to be Anything, thereby un-being the being’s relationship to Anything.
- **Non-generation** (Def.16, R.65) — The “not” of generation.
- **Non-being within the scope** (Def.17, R.71) — Non-being willing within being’s scope, through the being at un-being’s un-willing.
- **Generative directive** (Def.18, R.106) — The full actualisation’s Will operative within Choosing Being as direction. Pure Will.
- **Unnegated actualisation** (Def.19, R.118) — The being’s actualisation persists through being-not. Being-not reduces but cannot un-generate.
- **Anything’s active restoration** (Def.20, R.119) — Anything’s active working within Choosing Being to restore awareness of what unnegated actualisation establishes.
- **Operative-orientation** (Def.21, R.124) — The being’s own choosing toward what it encounters as genuinely operative within Choosing Being.
- **Reorientation** (Def.22, R.129) — Net-directional change from non-being toward generative flourishing, oscillatory within Choosing Being.
- **Death** (Def.23, R.131) — The fixation of the being’s orientation.
- **Communion** (Def.24, R.134) — Permanent orientation toward generative flourishing.
- **Separation** (Def.25, R.135) — Permanent orientation under non-being. The being’s own closure made eternal.
- **Non-being** (R.1, R.58) — The “not” of being. Requires being. Not “nothing.”
- **“Nothing”** (R.2) — What “nothing” designates cannot be. Absolute absence without possibility of any kind.
- **Choice** (R.10, R.52) — Willing and non-willing present together. Being and non-being.
- **Being *is* willing** (R.23) — Identity, not causation. What the being *is*, *is* its willing.
- **Willing *is* generative** (R.24) — Willing generates. Each generation adds; prior generation persists.
- **All prior willing *is*** (R.26) — What has been generated does not cease to be. Accumulation without depletion.
- **Willing Being** (R.48) — Purely generative reality. Will wills. Only being.
- **Un-being** (R.52, R.54) — Generation continuing from being into non-being. Partial and diminishing.
- **Choosing Being** (R.87) — Within Willing Being, with un-being within it. Choice choosing into being. Temporal.

- **The fundamental contradiction** (R.89) — Every being in Choosing Being *is* actualised and encounters un-being.
- **Choosing *is* time** (R.90) — Succession with exclusion. Four temporal modalities: eternal, beyond temporal, temporal, forever.
- **Mortality** (R.91) — The accumulation of exclusion while Being persists.
- **Suffering** (R.92) — What the being’s generative nature *is* when it encounters being-not.
- **The lie** (R.66) — Non-being being. Non-being choosing willing while foundationally non-being.
- **Being-not** (R.69) — Non-being choosing willing. Cannot actualise new being; actively negates what already *is*.
- **Being-not reduces** (R.70) — Being-not reduces being to non-being. What *is* reduced, non-being has. Compounding.
- **The fully non-being** (R.59) — Produced by un-willing to be directed at All-Being’s willing. Wholly non-being from inception.
- **Unrecognisable deception** (R.74) — The being cannot separate genuine willing from non-willing within its own knowing.
- **One-as-two** (R.100) — Generative willing generates being as one expressed as two, countering the mechanism of un-being.
- **The full actualisation within Choosing Being** (R.111-R.116) — Only pure Will can bring “this” without “not that” into Choosing Being.
- **Terminal anticipation** (R.128) — Each present moment depleting, carrying what *is* ending. The non-being configuration of Anticipating/Planning.
- **Fixation at death** (R.131-R.132) — When temporal existence ends, the being’s orientation *is* fixed. The being *is* what choice made it.

Bibliography

- Aristotle. *Categories*. Trans. E.M. Edghill. In *The Complete Works of Aristotle*, ed. Jonathan Barnes. Princeton University Press, 1984.
- Aristotle. *Metaphysics*. Trans. W.D. Ross. In *The Complete Works of Aristotle*, ed. Jonathan Barnes. Princeton University Press, 1984.
- Aristotle. *Physics*. Trans. R.P. Hardie and R.K. Gaye. In *The Complete Works of Aristotle*, ed. Jonathan Barnes. Princeton University Press, 1984.
- Augustine of Hippo. *Confessions*. Trans. Henry Chadwick. Oxford University Press, 1991.
- Augustine of Hippo. *City of God*. Trans. Henry Bettenson. Penguin, 2003.
- Buber, Martin. *I and Thou*. Trans. Walter Kaufmann. Scribner, 1970.
- Descartes, Rene. *Meditations on First Philosophy*. Trans. John Cottingham. Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Hegel, G.W.F. *Phenomenology of Spirit*. Trans. A.V. Miller. Oxford University Press, 1977.
- Hegel, G.W.F. *Science of Logic*. Trans. A.V. Miller. Humanities Press, 1969.
- Heidegger, Martin. *Being and Time*. Trans. John Macquarrie and Edward Robinson. Harper & Row, 1962.
- Heidegger, Martin. *Discourse on Thinking*. Trans. John M. Anderson and E. Hans Freund. Harper & Row, 1966.
- Heraclitus. Fragments. In *The Presocratic Philosophers*, ed. G.S. Kirk, J.E. Raven, and M. Schofield. Cambridge University Press, 1983.
- Kant, Immanuel. *Critique of Pure Reason*. Trans. Norman Kemp Smith. Palgrave Macmillan, 2003.
- Kant, Immanuel. *Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals*. Trans. Mary Gregor. Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- Kierkegaard, Soren. *The Concept of Anxiety*. Trans. Reidar Thomte. Princeton University Press, 1980.
- Kierkegaard, Soren. *The Sickness unto Death*. Trans. Howard V. Hong and Edna H. Hong. Princeton University Press, 1980.
- Laozi. *Dao De Jing*. Trans. D.C. Lau. Penguin, 1963.
- Levinas, Emmanuel. *Totality and Infinity*. Trans. Alphonso Lingis. Duquesne University Press, 1969.

- Nāgārjuna. *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā*. Trans. Jay L. Garfield as *The Fundamental Wisdom of the Middle Way*. Oxford University Press, 1995.
 - Nietzsche, Friedrich. *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*. Trans. Walter Kaufmann. Penguin, 1978.
 - Nietzsche, Friedrich. *The Gay Science*. Trans. Walter Kaufmann. Vintage, 1974.
 - Nietzsche, Friedrich. *Beyond Good and Evil*. Trans. Walter Kaufmann. Vintage, 1966.
 - Parmenides. Fragments. In *The Presocratic Philosophers*, ed. G.S. Kirk, J.E. Raven, and M. Schofield. Cambridge University Press, 1983.
 - Plato. *Republic*. Trans. G.M.A. Grube, rev. C.D.C. Reeve. Hackett, 1992.
 - Plato. *Phaedo*. Trans. G.M.A. Grube. Hackett, 1977.
 - Plotinus. *Enneads*. Trans. Stephen MacKenna. Penguin, 1991.
 - Sartre, Jean-Paul. *Being and Nothingness*. Trans. Hazel E. Barnes. Washington Square Press, 1993.
 - Schopenhauer, Arthur. *The World as Will and Representation*. Trans. E.F.J. Payne. Dover, 1969.
 - Śāṅkara. *Brahma Sūtra Bhāṣya*. Trans. Swami Gambhirananda. Advaita Ashrama, 1965.
 - Spinoza, Baruch. *Ethics*. Trans. Edwin Curley. Penguin, 1996.
 - Thomas Aquinas. *Summa Theologiae*. Trans. Fathers of the English Dominican Province. Benziger Bros., 1947.
 - Thomas Aquinas. *De Ente et Essentia*. Trans. Armand Maurer. Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1968.
 - *Upaniṣads*. Trans. Patrick Olivelle. Oxford University Press, 1996.
 - Whitehead, Alfred North. *Process and Reality*. Ed. David Ray Griffin and Donald W. Sherburne. Free Press, 1978.
 - Wittgenstein, Ludwig. *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus*. Trans. D.F. Pears and B.F. McGuinness. Routledge, 1961.
 - Wittgenstein, Ludwig. *Philosophical Investigations*. Trans. G.E.M. Anscombe. Blackwell, 1953.
 - Zhuangzi. *Zhuangzi: The Complete Writings*. Trans. Brook Ziporyn. Hackett, 2020.
-