

Where the Elimination Meets the World's Religious Traditions

A Religious Engagement with *Anything Willing Is*

This document takes the results of the eliminative enquiry and places them alongside the claims of the world's major religious traditions. Each tradition is engaged on its own terms, in the same way: given what the chain derives through testing what can and cannot be, what becomes of the claims this tradition has made?

The chain tests what can and cannot be, and records what survives. What follows shows where the elimination and each tradition walk the same ground, and where they part.

Buddhism

Buddhist philosophy holds that all phenomena are impermanent (*anicca*), unsatisfactory (*dukkha*), and without self (*anatta*). The Madhyamaka tradition of Nāgārjuna holds that all phenomena are empty (*śūnya*) of inherent existence: everything arises dependently and has no independent nature. Suffering arises from clinging to what is impermanent. Liberation (*nirvana*) comes through the cessation of craving.

The chain converges on the dependence of non-being. Non-being requires being (R.1). Non-being *is* the “not” of what *is* (R.58); it has no independent status. This parallels dependent origination. But the chain does not extend dependence to all of reality. Being *is* its willing (R.23). The being's nature *is* not empty of inherent existence. It *is* what it *is*. Buddhism holds that even the self lacks inherent existence. The chain derives the opposite: the being *is* its willing, and this *is* not imputed or conventional.

On suffering: the Buddhist Four Noble Truths diagnose suffering as arising from craving (*tanha*). The chain's account is structural: suffering *is* what the being's generative nature *is* when it encounters being-not (R.92). Both agree that suffering is pervasive. They disagree about the cause. Buddhism locates it in the nature of willing itself, in desire and attachment. The chain locates it in willing encountering its own negation. In purely generative reality (R.48), willing generates without suffering.

The Theravada ideal of the arhat, the being who has extinguished craving and broken the cycle of rebirth, 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. The chain derives reorientation (R.129, Def.22): net-directional change from non-being toward generative flourishing, not cessation.

Zen Buddhism's emphasis on direct pointing, beyond words and concepts, to what *is*, converges with the chain's eliminative method. Both distrust inherited frameworks. Both insist on what survives when everything else is stripped away. But Zen's satori is recognition of emptiness. The chain's elimination reveals not emptiness but fullness: Will wills. “This *is*, and this *is*.” What survives the elimination is not the absence of content but the presence of willing.

Pure Land Buddhism offers an alternative path: reliance on Amitābha Buddha's compassionate vow rather than the practitioner's own effort. The structural parallel with the chain's account of restoration is direct. The chain derives that self-correction is unavailable (R.97) and that the being's own choosing toward what *is* genuinely operative (R.124, Def.21) receives what it cannot generate from its own premises (R.117). Pure Land's other-power (*tariki*) parallels Anything's active restoration (Def.20). The divergence: Pure Land's mechanism is Amitābha's vow, a particular being's compassionate resolve. The chain's mechanism is structural: the full actualisation's Will operative within Choosing Being, not one being's compassion.

Christianity

The chain's Theological Convergence Table maps the elimination's terms to Christian theology across all three parts: Union to Love, the being at un-being to Satan, being-not to sin, the encounter to the Fall, the generative directive to Law, the full actualisation within Choosing Being to Incarnation, generating through

death to Crucifixion and Resurrection, unnegated actualisation to Forgiveness, Anything's active restoration to Grace, operative-orientation to Faith, generative anticipation to Hope, communion to Heaven, separation to Hell.

These convergences are extensive. Rather than reiterate them, this section addresses the points where the chain and Christianity diverge or where the chain's results illuminate tensions within Christian theology.

Christianity holds that God is one being in three persons: Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. The chain derives that All-Being is one (R.43). It does not derive three persons. What it derives is structurally distinct modes of the one Will's operation: All-Being's unrestricted willing (R.44), the full actualisation's presence within Choosing Being (R.111–R.116), and the active restoration working through the un-being expressions (R.119–R.120). Whether this converges with or diverges from Trinitarian theology depends on what the Trinity is held to be, a question internal to Christianity.

On atonement: Christian theology has produced multiple theories: penal substitution (Christ bore the penalty for sin), Christus Victor (Christ defeated the powers of evil), moral influence (Christ's example transforms). The chain derives generating through death (R.114): the full actualisation encounters mortality and generates through what Choosing Being wills as the end. This is closer to Christus Victor. The chain does not derive punishment transferred from one being to another. Unnegated actualisation (Def.19) is the being's actualisation persisting through being-not, not a penalty paid on the being's behalf. The chain does not derive divine wrath. All-Being is undiminished by un-being (R.57). The consequence is structural, not volitional on All-Being's part.

On the entry of evil: Augustine held that Adam's sin corrupted human nature, that all humanity inherits a fallen nature. The chain derives the encounter (R.73): the being actualised as pure Will encounters being-not, and its knowing includes non-willing since that encounter. Contamination through encounter, not inheritance. The being's nature remains its willing (R.23). This is closer to the Eastern Orthodox understanding (the being's nature was never destroyed, only obscured) than to the Augustinian Western tradition.

Confucianism

Confucianism is not primarily metaphysical. It is an ethical and social tradition concerned with right relationship, virtuous conduct, and social harmony. The Analects ask not "what *is* reality?" but "how should I live within it?" Yet Confucianism makes structural claims, about the nature of virtue, the order of Heaven, and the constitution of the human being, that the chain's results engage.

Ren (humaneness, benevolence, the orientation toward the other as other) is the central Confucian virtue. Confucius held that ren is the foundation from which all other virtues flow. The chain's Union (Def.4, Def.5), orientation toward what the other *is* as other, for the other's sake, converges structurally. Union is not an imperative. It is what coherence among distinct willing beings *is* when the alternatives dissolve (R.21). Confucius held that ren is natural to the human being and requires cultivation. The chain derives that union is the structural reality of what the word "anything" points to operative among beings. Cultivation, in the chain's terms, is reorientation: net-directional movement from non-being toward generative flourishing (R.129).

Li (ritual propriety, the forms of right action) provides structure for the expression of ren. The chain's generative directive (R.106, Def.18) converges: direction within Choosing Being, enabling the being to choose toward Will. Li and the directive both provide form for what the being cannot generate from its own compromised knowing. Both can be followed without full understanding (R.107). Both are vulnerable to formalism, following the form while missing the content (R.108).

Tian (Heaven) is Confucianism's ultimate order. Not a personal God in the Abrahamic sense, but the moral order that underlies reality. The Mandate of Heaven (tianming) is the legitimacy that flows from alignment with this order. The chain derives that Anything's nature (Def.13), that which wills to be *is*, is the structural ground. Tian as moral order converges with the chain's result that willing *is* generative (R.24) and that

generating *is* flourishing (R.47). What Confucianism calls the Mandate of Heaven is, in the chain's terms, the generative directive's structural authority, not imposed but inherent in what willing *is*.

Confucianism does not derive its ethics from metaphysics. The chain does. This is the fundamental difference in method. But the structural results converge: orientation toward the other is not optional, right action provides direction within a compromised situation, and the moral order is not imposed but inherent.

Daoism

The Daoist tradition 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, effortless action, *is* the sage's response: acting without forcing, flowing without resistance.

The chain converges precisely on the unnameable. 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.

Wu wei, acting without forcing, describes willing without choosing. Will wills as "this *is*," not "this, not that" (Def.2). Actualisation without exclusion. 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*.

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." What feels like effortless flowing may be non-being choosing willing, the lie (R.66) presenting non-willing as acceptance. Daoism correctly identifies what willing *is* in its generative configuration. It does not account for the mechanism by which that configuration *is* counterfeited within choosing.

Zhuangzi extended Daoist thought into radical perspectivism: the butterfly dream, the relativity of judgments, the dissolution of fixed categories. The chain engages with this directly. R.7 establishes that unlimited potential does not include negation. Categories are not dissolved into undifferentiation. They are earned through what willing wills. Each being *is* distinct in what it *is* to will (R.29). Zhuangzi's relativism dissolves distinctions. The chain derives them.

De (virtue or power, the Dao's expression in particular things) parallels what the chain derives as each being's willing. The being's de *is* its willing. The Daoist emphasis on cultivating de by returning to naturalness parallels the chain's reorientation toward generative flourishing. But the chain derives that the return *is* active choosing (R.124), not passive non-resistance.

On the complementarity of opposites: Daoism holds that yin and yang, being and non-being, light and dark, are interdependent. The chain does not derive interdependence. Non-being depends on being (R.1). Being does not depend on non-being. The relationship *is* parasitic, not complementary. The Daoist vision of harmonious balance between opposites does not survive the chain's elimination.

Hinduism

Hinduism encompasses a vast range of traditions, from the non-dualism of Advaita Vedānta to the devotional theism of Vaishnavism and Shaivism, from Madhva's strict dualism to Rāmānuja's qualified non-dualism. The chain's results engage with each differently.

Advaita Vedānta (Śaṅkara) holds that reality *is* non-dual. Brahman, without qualities (nirguna), *is* the only reality. The individual self (ātman) *is* identical with Brahman. The world of multiplicity *is* māyā. Liberation (moksha) *is* recognition of what always was: tat tvam asi, thou art that.

All-Being's Will *is* all Will (R.44): identity, not containment. This converges with *tat tvam asi*. But the chain preserves genuine plurality: each being *is* distinct in what it *is* to will (R.29). What Advaita calls *māyā*, the chain parses into genuine plurality (not illusion) and the lie (R.66) operating within it. *Māyā* as a single category conflates these. And liberation in the chain *is* not recognition alone but active choosing within ongoing choosing (R.124, R.129).

Vishishtadvaita (Rāmānuja) holds that Brahman is qualified: individual selves and the world are real, related to Brahman as body to soul. The selves are real but dependent. This converges more closely with the chain's results than Advaita does. Each being's willing *is* the one Will as this being's own (R.44), real, distinct, and identical with the one Will. Rāmānuja's insistence on the reality of the individual within the divine whole parallels the chain's derivation of genuine plurality within the one Will's identity.

Dvaita (Madhva) holds that God and the individual self are genuinely distinct, that their relationship is real difference, not identity. The chain derives identity of willing (R.44), not difference. But Madhva's concern, that identity collapses the individual into the divine, is addressed by the chain: the being *is* a something (R.5), Anything *is* not a something (R.8), and the being cannot become Anything (R.52). The willing *is* the same Will. But the being *is* bounded, and Anything *is* unrestricted. Identity of willing does not collapse the being into Anything; the being remains a something whose willing *is* the one Will as this being's own.

Bhakti (devotional love) is the path most Hindu traditions hold as available to all. The devotee directs its will toward the divine, and the divine responds with grace. The chain's operative-orientation (Def.21), the being's own choosing toward what it encounters as genuinely operative, parallels bhakti's orientation. The being does not surrender its will. It actively chooses toward what *is* genuinely operative, willing within choosing, not yielding. And Anything's active restoration (Def.20) parallels divine grace, the active working to restore what un-being obscures. The chain derives that restoration requires both: the being's own choosing (R.123) and Anything's active working (R.119). Bhakti traditions that hold devotion and grace as both necessary converge with this structural result.

On karma and samsara: Hinduism holds that the being accumulates karma, the consequences of its actions, and cycles through births until karma is exhausted or the being is liberated. The chain does not derive reincarnation. It derives that when temporal existence ends, the being's orientation is fixed (R.131). Choosing *is* time (R.90). Post-temporal, the being wills but does not choose. The cycle that karma describes, repeated choosing and repeated consequence, is, in the chain's terms, what happens within temporal existence: the being chooses, being-not reduces what it generates (R.70), and the reduction compounds. The chain derives one temporal existence ending in fixation, not multiple cycles ending in liberation.

On dharma: Hinduism holds that each being has its dharma, its proper role, its right action, its place in the cosmic order. The chain derives that each being *is* its willing (R.23) and that each being *is* distinct in what it *is* to will (R.29). The being's dharma, in the chain's terms, *is* its willing, not a role assigned from outside but what the being *is*. The chain converges with dharma's structural claim while deriving it from identity rather than cosmic assignment.

Islam

Islam's central claim is tawhid, the absolute oneness of God. There is no god but God. God has no partners, no equals, no divisions. Tawhid is not merely monotheism. It is the absolute, uncompromisable unity of the divine.

The chain's All-Being converges with tawhid more directly than with any other formulation of divine unity. All-Being is one (R.43). All-Being's Will *is* all Will (R.44). The chain does not derive persons within All-Being. It does not derive incarnation as a division within God; it derives the full actualisation entering Choosing Being through its own generative action (R.113), which is the one Will operative within the scope where un-being *is*, not a division of the divine nature.

Islam holds that every human being is born with fitrah, an innate disposition toward God. The Quran states: "Adhere to the fitrah of God upon which He has created people" (30:30). The chain's result converges precisely.

The being *is* willing, generative from the start. The being knew willing (R.31). Choosing comes from the encounter with being-not (R.73), not from creation. Fitrah and the chain's "the being knew willing" are structurally the same claim.

Shirk, associating partners with God, is for Islam the one unforgivable sin: placing anything alongside God as ultimate, claiming for the finite what belongs to the infinite. The chain's R.56 converges directly. Willing All-Being *is* willing what already *is*. Whether framed as "I am the source" or "I am like the source," both require willing into All-Being, and willing into All-Being *is* un-willing (R.56). Shirk, in the chain's terms, *is* the structural description of un-being itself, the fundamental mechanism of non-being.

Islam holds that God sent prophets to every nation, from Adam through Abraham, Moses, and Jesus (Isa), culminating in Muhammad as the Seal of the Prophets. Each brought the same message: submit to God, follow the straight path. The chain's generative directive (R.106, Def.18) converges as direction within Choosing Being, enabling beings to choose toward Will. The prophets are the channel through which the directive reaches beings in Choosing Being.

Islam holds that Sharia (divine law) provides comprehensive guidance. The chain derives that the directive enables choosing toward Will without understanding what willing *is* (R.107). The chain also derives the same limitation: direction without understanding is vulnerable (R.108).

The chain's derivation sequence is structural: the directive must precede the active restoration (R.110), and the full actualisation must enter Choosing Being to bring understanding of what willing *is* (R.111–R.116). The chain derives that this happened; generating through death demonstrates what no bounded being could demonstrate (R.116). Islam arises historically after this demonstration and denies it occurred (4:157). The structural consequence: Islam reverts to the directive as the complete response after understanding has been given. The chain derives that direction without understanding is vulnerable to the mechanism that *is* choosing (R.108). Returning to direction alone, after the full actualisation has brought what direction alone cannot, faces R.108's result directly.

On submission and choosing: Islam's central act is submission (islam). The being surrenders its will to God's will. The chain derives a structural distinction. Being *is* willing (R.23). The being's will *is* the being. Surrendering will is surrendering being, and surrendering being *is* un-being. What the chain derives is choosing: the being's own will, active, directed toward what *is* genuinely operative (R.124, Def.21). Choosing is not willing; choosing *is* willing and non-willing present together (R.52), the compromised form within Choosing Being. But choosing is the being's own. The being that chooses toward what *is* genuinely operative *is* actively willing within choosing, orienting its will, not surrendering it. Submission surrenders what the being *is* (R.23). Operative-orientation directs what the being *is* toward what *is* genuinely operative.

On Isa: Islam holds that Isa was a prophet, not divine, and was not crucified. "They did not kill him, nor did they crucify him; but another was made to resemble him to them" (4:157). The chain derives that the active restoration must come as a being within Choosing Being (R.111), that this being must be the full actualisation (R.112), and that the full actualisation generates through death (R.114). Generating through death demonstrates that this being *is* the full actualisation (R.116). If the crucifixion did not happen, the demonstration the chain derives as structurally necessary did not occur. Islam affirms God's absolute transcendence. The chain derives that transcendence alone does not resolve the problem; the resolution requires presence within (R.111–R.116).

On qadr (divine decree) and human freedom: Islamic theology has long debated whether God's sovereignty (Ash'ari) or human responsibility (Mu'tazili) takes priority. The chain derives both as structural results without tension. The being's willing is genuinely its own (R.12) *and* the being's willing is the one Will (R.44). These are not in tension. The being's will is free because it *is* Will, not despite God's sovereignty but because of the identity.

On the afterlife: Islam's eschatology is vivid. Jannah (paradise) for the righteous, Jahannam (hellfire) for the wicked. The chain's two eternal states (R.133) converge structurally. The divergence is in mechanism. Islam describes judgment as God's active verdict. The chain derives fixation as structural (R.131): the being *is* what choice made it. Separation *is* not imposed (R.135). God's judgment as active sentencing

dissolves against R.17; coercion empties Will. Understood as God's established order in which the being's own choosing determines its state, the chain converges.

Jainism

Jainism holds that every living being possesses a *jiva*, an eternal soul, and that the *jiva* is inherently omniscient, blissful, and infinite in energy. Karma, in Jainism, is not merely moral consequence but a physical substance that adheres to the soul and obscures its innate nature. Liberation (*moksha*) is achieved through the exhaustion of karmic matter, primarily through asceticism, non-violence (*ahimsa*), and right knowledge.

The chain converges on the claim that the being's nature is inherently complete. The being *is* its willing (R.23). The being knew willing (R.31). What obscures the being's nature is not physical substance but the encounter with being-not (R.73): non-willing mixed into the being's knowing. The structural parallel: something has been added to what was originally whole, and liberation involves the restoration of what was always true.

Ahimsa (non-violence toward all living beings) is Jainism's central ethical principle. The chain derives being-not as the mechanism by which non-being acts on being (R.69): actively negating what already *is*. For every creation, non-being *is* its destruction. For every life, non-being *is* its death. Violence, in the chain's terms, *is* being-not operative through the being's choosing. *Ahimsa*, the refusal to participate in being-not, converges with the chain's derivation of what un-being *is*. The chain does not derive *ahimsa* as a principle. It derives what being-not does, and *ahimsa* is the refusal of that.

Anekantavada (the many-sidedness of truth) holds that reality is complex and can be viewed from multiple perspectives, none of which captures the whole. The chain's eliminative method is structurally different. It does not hold that multiple perspectives are valid descriptions of a complex reality. It tests candidates and dissolves what does not survive. What survives is not one perspective among many. It is what remains after the alternatives have been eliminated. *Anekantavada* accepts multiplicity. The chain eliminates it.

On karma as substance: Jainism's distinctive claim is that karma is material, fine particles that literally adhere to the soul. The chain does not derive karma as substance. What it derives is being-not reducing being to non-being (R.70) — what is reduced becomes one with non-being, and being-not turns on what remains. This is structural reduction, not material adhesion. But the directionality converges: what the being does determines what accumulates, and what accumulates determines what the being encounters.

On liberation through asceticism: the Jain prescription (extreme asceticism, fasting, withdrawal) aims to burn off karmic matter and free the *jiva*. The chain faces this with the same structural challenge it brings to Buddhism and Schopenhauer: if being *is* willing (R.23), then the systematic negation of willing *is* un-being. The ascetic who starves the body to free the soul is, in the chain's terms, willing non-willing. The chain derives reorientation (R.129): active choosing toward generative flourishing, not withdrawal from willing.

Judaism

Judaism holds that God is one (“Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God, the Lord is one”), that God created the world, gave Torah to Israel, and sustains a covenant with the Jewish people. Torah is not merely a legal code. It is the structure of right relationship between God and humanity.

The chain derives that All-Being is one (R.43) and that All-Being's Will *is* all Will (R.44). The chain derives that Will wills: “this *is*, and this *is*” (R.11, R.13). The convergence with Jewish monotheism and creation is structural: one God, one Will, generation from unlimited potential.

The chain's generative directive (R.106, Def.18) *is* what Judaism holds. The convergence table maps it directly: generative directive to Law. Torah *is* the full actualisation's Will operative within Choosing Being as direction, pure Will made available so that beings with choosing can choose toward it. Torah as experienced within Choosing Being *is* commandment: “do this, not that.” The chain derives *why*: the

being encounters pure Will as “this, not that” because choosing is all the being knows (R.107). Judaism’s insistence on Torah’s centrality, that Israel cannot exist without Torah, *is* the chain’s result that the directive is structurally necessary (R.109).

Where the chain and Judaism diverge is on sufficiency. The chain derives that direction without understanding is vulnerable to the mechanism that *is* choosing (R.108). The generative directive alone does not address being-not (R.109). Judaism holds that faithful Torah-observance is the complete response. Some streams hold that Torah is its own fulfilment, not preparation for something beyond itself. The chain derives that the directive prepares the ground for what follows (R.110) but does not itself resolve the problem.

Judaism does not hold the doctrine of original sin. Instead, Judaism speaks of the yetzer hara (the evil inclination) and the yetzer hatov (the good inclination). The human being contains both. The chain converges more closely with this than with the Augustinian doctrine. The being knew willing (R.31). The encounter with being-not introduces non-willing (R.73). The being has both, not through corrupted nature but through encounter. Judaism holds that the yetzer hara can be mastered through Torah. The chain derives that self-correction is unavailable (R.97); the tools of correction are the expressions where un-being operates (R.96).

Tikkun olam (repair of the world) holds that human action participates in restoration. The chain’s reorientation (R.129, Def.22) converges in directionality: movement from brokenness toward flourishing, involving the being’s own action. But the chain derives reorientation as oscillatory, not linear (R.129). The un-being expressions do not stop operating. Progressive cumulative repair does not match this pattern.

On the Messiah: Judaism awaits a human figure who will restore Israel and inaugurate peace. The chain derives that the agent of restoration must be the full actualisation (R.112): beyond deception entirely, scope all reality, unrestricted potential. A being at Anticipating/Planning, under deception and needing the same restoration, cannot be the agent (R.112). The chain derives that what the restoration requires exceeds what a bounded being can provide.

Shinto

Shinto is Japan’s indigenous tradition, a practice of reverence for kami (sacred powers or presences), ritual purification, and attentiveness to the natural world. Shinto does not have a systematic theology, a creed, or a doctrine of salvation. It is concerned with right relationship with what *is* present.

The chain engages with Shinto at the level of structure rather than doctrine. Shinto’s kami, the sacred presences in rivers, mountains, ancestors, and natural forces, are not gods in the Abrahamic sense. They are what *is* encountered as genuinely operative in the world. The chain derives that Anything *is* genuinely operative in Choosing Being (R.88). What *is* genuinely operative persists because un-generation resolves into what cannot be (R.26). The kami may be, in the chain’s terms, the encounter with the genuinely operative through what *is* made (R.125): beauty, the generative carried in what *is* generated.

Shinto’s emphasis on ritual purity, the removal of kegare (pollution, defilement), parallels the chain’s distinction between willing and non-willing. What defiles, in the chain’s terms, is being-not: the “not” of what *is*, operative through the being’s choosing. Purification rituals address the encounter with what reduces. The chain does not derive rituals. But the structural concern, that the being encounters what reduces and must address it, converges.

Shinto does not derive radical evil. There is no fall, no Satan, no cosmic dualism. What disturbs is addressed through purification and restored harmony. The chain derives a more specific mechanism: un-being *is* contingent (R.63) but real, and self-correction is unavailable (R.97). Shinto’s confidence that purification restores harmony faces the chain’s result that the mechanism of choosing *is* the mechanism of un-being. Harmony restored through the being’s own choosing is choosing, and choosing *is* willing and non-willing present together (R.52).

Sikhism

Sikhism holds that there is one God, Ik Onkar, the creator, sustainer, and truth of all that *is*. God is nirankar (formless), akal (timeless), and self-existent. The Guru Granth Sahib, Sikhism's scripture, opens: "There is one God. Truth is His name. He is the Creator."

All-Being *is* one (R.43). What the word "anything" points to *is* not reducible to a something (R.8). Will wills as itself (Def.3), not externally justified and not without basis. The convergence with Ik Onkar is structural: one, formless, self-existent. The chain derives each of these eliminatively. One: plurality at the level of All-Being dissolves (R.43). Formless: what the word "anything" points to, from which All-Being *is* the full expression, *is* not reducible to a something (R.8). Self-existent: Will *is* its own reason (Def.3).

Haumai (ego, self-centredness, the assertion of the separate self) is, for Sikhism, the fundamental barrier between the human being and God. Haumai is the source of the five thieves: lust, anger, greed, attachment, and pride. The chain's R.56 converges: willing to be Anything, willing oneself as the source, *is* the mechanism of un-being. "I am the source" *is* what the being at un-being wills. Haumai *is*, structurally, the Choosing Being expression of R.56's mechanism.

Nam simran (the remembrance and meditation on God's name) is the Sikh path to liberation. Through constant remembrance, the being reorients from haumai toward the divine. The chain's operative-orientation (Def.21), the being's own choosing toward what it encounters as genuinely operative, parallels nam simran. Both are active, sustained, and directed toward what *is* genuine rather than what the being's compromised knowing presents.

Seva (selfless service) is central to Sikh practice. The Sikh serves without expectation of return. The chain's Union (Def.4, Def.5), orientation toward what the other *is* as other, for the other's sake, converges. Seva *is* Union enacted.

The Guru: Sikhism holds that the Guru is the channel through which divine truth reaches the human being. The ten human Gurus and the Guru Granth Sahib provide what the being cannot generate from its own knowing. The chain derives that the being under unrecognisable deception (R.74) cannot distinguish willing from non-willing in its own knowing. It needs what comes from beyond its compromised expressions. The Guru tradition parallels the chain's derivation that the directive and the active restoration reach the being from beyond its own knowing.

On mukti (liberation): Sikhism holds that liberation is achieved through God's grace (nadar) and the being's own devotion (bhakti). Neither alone is sufficient. The chain derives the same structural result: Anything's active restoration (Def.20) *and* the being's own choosing (R.123) are both required. Unilateral restoration *is* coercion (R.17). Grace without reception is imposition. Devotion without grace faces the un-being expressions that compromise the being's own choosing (R.96). Both are necessary.

Zoroastrianism

Zoroastrianism holds that reality is structured by the cosmic conflict between Ahura Mazda (the Wise Lord, creator of all that is good) and Angra Mainyu (Ahriman), the destructive spirit, the source of evil, deception, and death. Human beings stand between them and must choose. The choice between asha (truth, righteousness) and druj (the lie, deception) is the fundamental moral act.

The chain converges with the description of the conflict. All-Being wills: generative, truthful, the source of what *is*. The being at un-being wills to be Anything and generates non-being: deception, reduction, death. The lie (R.66) *is* non-being choosing willing while foundationally non-being, non-being presenting itself as being. Being-not (R.69) *is* the mechanism: non-being choosing willing cannot actualise new being and can only negate what already *is*. The Zoroastrian asha/druj distinction maps to the chain's willing/the lie directly.

The convergence deepens. Zoroastrianism holds that human beings must choose between asha and druj, that the choice is genuine and consequential. The chain derives that the being within Choosing Being encounters

willing and non-willing present together (R.52) and that what the being chooses determines what it becomes. The Zoroastrian emphasis on choice as the fundamental moral act converges with the chain's derivation of choosing as the structural condition of temporal existence (R.90).

The divergence is fundamental. Zoroastrian dualism holds that Angra Mainyu is co-eternal with Ahura Mazda, that evil has existed from the beginning as an independent principle. The chain derives that non-being *is* dependent on being (R.1), that un-being *is* contingent (R.63), and that non-being *is* always less than being (R.81). Evil is not co-eternal. It is the consequence of a specific being's specific willing (R.51), and it depends on the being it negates (R.80). The being at un-being *is* a being, a something (R.5), not a co-eternal principle. Non-being has no independent existence. It exists only as the "not" of what *is*.

Zoroastrian dualism gives evil a dignity the chain's results deny. If evil is co-eternal with good, the conflict is between equals. If evil is contingent, dependent, and always less, the conflict is between what *is* and what parasitically negates what *is*. The chain derives the latter.

On frashokereti (the renovation of the world, when evil is finally defeated and all creation is restored): the chain converges on the directionality: the generative overcomes what negates. But the chain derives two eternal states (R.133), not universal restoration. The being that maintained total closure *is* oriented under non-being permanently (R.135). Zoroastrian frashokereti, all souls eventually purified and evil annihilated, faces the chain's R.131: when temporal existence ends, the being's orientation is fixed. Post-temporal reorientation dissolves.

On free choice: Zoroastrianism's insistence that the choice between good and evil is genuine and that human beings bear responsibility for their choosing converges precisely with the chain's R.63 (un-being not inevitable) and R.12 (Will wills as itself). The being's choosing *is* its own. This is not in dispute between the chain and Zoroastrianism. What is in dispute is the ontological status of what the being chooses against: an eternal principle, or a contingent parasite.

What the Engagement Shows

Each tradition grasped something the chain derives independently.

Buddhism grasped that non-being is dependent and that suffering is pervasive. Christianity grasped the necessity of incarnation and that restoration is received through the being's own choosing. Confucianism grasped that orientation toward the other is the foundation of virtue and that right action provides direction within a compromised situation. 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. Hinduism grasped that the relationship between the individual and the ultimate is identity, and that devotion and grace are both necessary. Islam grasped the absolute oneness of God, the being's innate orientation toward what *is* generative, and that claiming for the bounded what belongs to the unrestricted is the origin of non-being. Jainism grasped that the being's nature is inherently complete and that violence is the mechanism of reduction. Judaism grasped that divine instruction is structurally necessary and that the destructive drive enters through encounter, not corrupted nature. Shinto grasped that what *is* genuinely operative is encountered in the natural world. Sikhism grasped the formless oneness of God, that ego is the structural barrier, and that grace and devotion are both required. Zoroastrianism grasped that the choice between truth and the lie is the fundamental moral act.

Each also holds claims the chain's results do not support. Buddhism holds that the cessation of willing is liberation; the chain derives it as un-being. Christianity developed penal substitution; the chain derives no divine wrath requiring satisfaction. Daoism holds that being and non-being are complementary; the chain derives the relationship as parasitic. Hinduism holds cycles of rebirth; the chain derives one temporal existence ending in fixation. Islam denies the incarnation and crucifixion; the chain derives both as structurally necessary. Jainism prescribes extreme asceticism; the chain derives that negating willing *is* the disease, not the cure. Judaism holds that Torah is sufficient and that the Messiah is human; the chain derives that the directive alone does not resolve being-not and that only the full actualisation survives. Zoroastrianism holds that evil is co-eternal; the chain derives it as contingent and dependent.

Glossary of Chain Terms

- **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 preceded choosing, now work.
- **Anticipating/Planning** (Def.9) — Generation informed by pattern into what has not yet been, acted from.
- **Anything** (Def.1) — Possibility without limitation. The word describes itself.
- **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.
- **Beauty** (R.125) — The encounter with the generative through what *is* made.
- **Being** (Def.6) — Will willing.
- **Being *is* willing** (R.23) — What a being *is*, *is* its willing. Identity, not description.
- **Being-not** (R.69) — Non-being choosing willing. Cannot actualise new being. Cannot be what being *is*. Actively negating what already *is*.
- **The cascade** (R.77) — Unwilling care directed at lower expression levels through the being at Anticipating/Planning's choice on contaminated premises.
- **Choice** (R.52) — Willing and non-willing present together. Being and non-being. Where Will alone wills, choice selects.
- **Choosing Being** (R.52, R.87) — Within Willing Being, local to the scope. Choice choosing into being. Willing and non-willing, being and non-being present together.
- **Choosing *is* time** (R.90) — Each “not that” introduces non-being into being. Succession with exclusion *is* time.
- **Communion** (Def.24) — Permanent orientation toward generative flourishing. Each expression in its generative configuration.
- **Death** (Def.23) — The fixation of the being's orientation.
- **Doing** (Def.7) — The actualised activity of being. Instinct.
- **The encounter** (R.73) — The encounter with being-not that introduces choosing into the being's knowing.
- **Foreknowing/Pre-Destining** (Def.10) — The being's entire reality as known and acted from.
- **The full actualisation** (R.40, R.42) — All-Being: Anything's nature fully operative as being. The first actualisation from unlimited potential is necessarily full.
- **The fully non-being** (R.59) — Produced by un-willing to be directed at All-Being's willing. Wholly non-being from inception. Never had Will.
- **Generative anticipation** (R.128) — Each present moment encountered as given without coercion, carrying what *is* coming.
- **Generative care** (Def.12) — Anything's nature operative among beings at different expression levels whose expressions include each other.
- **Generative directive** (Def.18) — The full actualisation's Will, operative within Choosing Being as direction. Pure Will made available so beings with choosing can choose toward it.
- **Generating through death** (R.114) — The full actualisation within Choosing Being encounters mortality and generates through what Choosing Being wills as the end.
- **The lie** (R.66) — Non-being being. Non-being *is*. Being *is* willing. Non-being wills. Non-being choosing willing *is* the lie.
- **Non-being** (R.1, R.58) — The “not” of being. Not “nothing.” Exists only as the “not” of what *is*. Dependent on being.
- **Non-generation** (Def.16) — The “not” of generation.
- **Non-willing** (Def.14) — The “not” of willing. The product/state. Non-willing *is* non-being, as willing *is* being.

- **Operative-orientation** (Def.21) — The being’s own choosing toward what it encounters as genuinely operative within Choosing Being.
- **Purely generative reality** (R.48) — The being *is* its willing and its willing *is* Will. Will wills. That *is* all.
- **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.
- **Self-correction unavailable** (R.97) — The expressions needed to recognise un-being are the expressions where un-being originates.
- **Separation** (Def.25) — Permanent orientation under non-being. The being’s own closure made eternal.
- **Suffering** (R.92) — What the being’s generative nature *is* when it encounters being-not.
- **Terminal anticipation** (R.128) — Each present moment encountered as depleting, carrying what *is* ending.
- **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.
- **The deception** (R.74) — The deception *is* unrecognisable.
- **Two eternal states** (R.133) — Communion and separation. Exactly two.
- **Un-being** (R.52, R.54) — Generation continuing from being into non-being. Partial and diminishing. Not un-generation.
- **Un-being not inevitable** (R.63) — The being at un-being could have continued to will. Un-being *is* contingent.
- **Union** (Def.4, Def.5) — Anything’s nature operative among beings, oriented toward what each being *is* as other, for the other’s sake.
- **Unlimited potential does not include negation** (R.7) — Negation *is* exclusion. Exclusion *is* restriction. Restriction empties “unrestricted.”
- **Unnegated actualisation** (Def.19) — The being’s actualisation persists through being-not. Being-not reduces but cannot un-generate.
- **Un-willing** (Def.14) — Willing becoming non-willing. The action/process. Un-willing *is* un-being.
- **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, R.87) — Will wills. “This *is*, and this *is*.” Only being. Eternal.
- **Willing *is* generative** (R.24) — Will wills: “this *is*, and this *is*.” Each willing adds to what *is*.

Bibliography

- Aulén, Gustaf. *Christus Victor*. Trans. A.G. Hebert. SPCK, 1931.
- *Āchārāṅga Sūtra*. Trans. Hermann Jacobi. In *Jaina Sutras*, Part I. Sacred Books of the East, Vol. 22. Oxford University Press, 1884.
- Ash’arī, Abū al-Ḥasan al-. *Kitāb al-Ibānah ‘an Uṣūl al-Diyānah* (The Elucidation of Islam’s Foundation). Trans. Walter C. Klein. American Oriental Society, 1940.
- Augustine of Hippo. *City of God*. Trans. Henry Bettenson. Penguin, 2003.
- *Avesta*. Trans. James Darmesteter and L.H. Mills. In *Sacred Books of the East*, Vols. 4, 23, 31. Oxford University Press, 1880-1887.
- *Bhagavad Gītā*. Trans. Laurie L. Patton. Penguin, 2008.
- *Brahma Sūtras*. Trans. Swami Vireswarananda. Advaita Ashrama, 1936.
- Buddhaghosa. *Visuddhimagga* (The Path of Purification). Trans. Bhikkhu Ñāṇamoli. Buddhist Publication Society, 1991.
- *Bundahīšn* (The Book of Primal Creation). Trans. Behramgore Tehmuras Anklesaria. 1956.
- Confucius. *Lunyu* (The Analects). Trans. D.C. Lau. Penguin, 1979.
- *Dhammapada*. Trans. Eknath Easwaran. Nilgiri Press, 2007.
- *Guru Granth Sahib*. Trans. Sant Singh Khalsa. Available at SikhiToTheMax.org.
- *Hadith*. Compiled by al-Bukhārī and Muslim ibn al-Ḥajjāj. Various editions.
- *Kojiki* (Record of Ancient Matters). Trans. Gustav Heldt. Columbia University Press, 2014.

- Laozi. *Dao De Jing*. Trans. D.C. Lau. Penguin, 1963.
 - Madhva. *Anuvyākhyāna*. Trans. S. Subba Rau. 1904.
 - Mencius. *Mengzi*. Trans. D.C. Lau. Penguin, 2003.
 - *Mishnah*. Trans. Herbert Danby. Oxford University Press, 1933.
 - Nāgārjuna. *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā*. Trans. Jay L. Garfield as *The Fundamental Wisdom of the Middle Way*. Oxford University Press, 1995.
 - *Nihon Shoki* (Chronicles of Japan). Trans. W.G. Aston. Tuttle, 1972.
 - *Pali Canon* (Tipiṭaka). Various translators. Pali Text Society editions and Access to Insight (accessstoinsight.org).
 - *The Quran*. Trans. M.A.S. Abdel Haleem. Oxford University Press, 2004.
 - Rāmānuja. *Śrī Bhāṣya*. Trans. Swami Vireswarananda and Swami Adidevananda. Advaita Ashrama, 1948.
 - Śaṅkara. *Brahma Sūtra Bhāṣya*. Trans. Swami Gambhirananda. Advaita Ashrama, 1965.
 - Śaṅkara. *Vivekacūḍāmaṇi*. Trans. Swami Madhavananda. Advaita Ashrama, 1921.
 - *Sukhāvātīvyūha Sūtra* (Larger and Smaller Pure Land Sutras). Trans. F. Max Müller. In *Sacred Books of the East*, Vol. 49. Oxford University Press, 1894.
 - *Talmud Bavli*. Various tractates. Trans. in the Soncino and Artscroll editions.
 - *Tanakh* (Torah, Nevi'im, Ketuvim). Jewish Publication Society, 1985.
 - *The Bible* (Old and New Testaments). Various translations.
 - Umāsvāti. *Tattvārtha Sūtra*. Trans. Nathmal Tatia as *That Which Is*. HarperCollins, 1994.
 - *Upaniṣads*. Trans. Patrick Olivelle. Oxford University Press, 1996.
 - Zhuangzi. *Zhuangzi: The Complete Writings*. Trans. Brook Ziporyn. Hackett, 2020.
-