

# Separation, Desire and Time of waiting

Vincenzo Peluso

Via Don Bosco, 11, Genzano di Roma, 00045, Rome, Italy.

[fmsv.peluso@gmail.com](mailto:fmsv.peluso@gmail.com);

(Dated: January 6, 2026)

## Abstract

In his *Parmenides*, Plato subjects two kinds of One to dialectical examination: the absolute One, without parts, which is neither in space nor in time, nor does it have being, and the One that is being, and therefore is the whole that has parts. These are two totally different Ones, two mutually transcendent worlds. Each of the two, considered independently of the other, ultimately proves to be aporetic within the narrow horizon of the act, within whose limits the thought of the Platonic dialogue is exhausted. However, by extending the ontological horizon to the sphere of potentiality, both, united, constitute the structure of Intention, which binds an “I” to its other. In Intention, the “I” does not exist without being, thanks to which it has a soul and a consciousness, and being makes no sense without the “I”. The purpose of this article is to clarify this relationship between the absolute one, the “I”, and the one of being, the whole, whose synthesis is the person, and to show that Intention, a true theory of everything, integrates both physical reality and aspects inherent to consciousness and the constitution of the I within a single explanatory framework. The distance of separation is reflected in the time of waiting in the mirror that is the three-dimensional space of Intention, and thus of the universe, as well as of every whole that is part of it. A mirror whose substance is desire and in which the Other is revealed.

**Keywords:** Intention, Self, consciousness, soul



## 1 Introduction

This work investigates the inner, existential aspect of the intentional relationship, dual to the physical one mainly exposed in [68] as well as in [61] [62] [63].

## 2 The One

The One is the individual. But there are two kinds of One, absolutely transcendent to each other: the One of being and the “I”.

The “I” does not exist without being, and in fact in existing appears as the One of being, and vice versa, being makes no sense without the “I”. Both, in fact, are part of the structure of Intention that binds two I’s. The I is the subject, while being is the relationship, the representation of Intention by each of the two individuals involved.

More in detail, being is the nothingness that opens in the intention of the Special I with the I. A Nothingness that splits into the space that gradually separates them while, in equal measure but with opposite sign, the desire that attracts them grows, in the waiting for the decision that, with the gift of oneself, of one’s own energy, will end the time of separation, annulling the distance and the desire.

Distance that is separation, time of waiting, desire.

## 3 The One of Being

Within the realm of being, there is nothing primitive, nothing absolute, but everything emerges at the relational level and is functional to an end.

From a gnoseological perspective, identity too is emergent, as it can be reduced to a node of relations immanent to being, just like difference, and like chronological time and metric space. What emerges from potentiality and appears in act is information functional to an end.

From an ontological perspective, everything made of matter falls within the realm of being, where matter is pure potentiality, which appears in act as body (i.e., whole composed of parts, organized space), whose element is not the atom of the Greeks

(the ultimate, indivisible, and fundamental element of reality) but, as will be clarified later, the quantum of potentiality.

Being is the whole<sup>1</sup> that emerges from nothing<sup>2</sup> by separating the positive from the negative, with a single measure, finite, constant<sup>3</sup>, whose modulus,  $R_\omega$ , is determined by the end known as the “anthropic principle.” The One of being is thus a whole composed of parts, and is itself part, member, of a higher universal, and so on in the hierarchical scale whose two extremes are the universe  $R_\omega$ , and the quantum of the universe  $R_\alpha$ , one the reciprocal of the other:  $R_\alpha = 1/R_\omega$ . Where the universal of an entity is not an abstract idea, but the concrete space of possibilities of the whole, that is, of the concrete organism, of which it is part.

From another perspective, everything that is perceivable and knowable falls within the realm of being, in short, the whole world of an individual, since the living body is the direct cause not only of personal character, memories, but also of thoughts, desires, consciousness, mood.

The One of being, as well as everything that belongs to being, is therefore emergent from the structure of Intention, since even the quantum of the universe, at the foundation of all entities, emerges from potentiality in the image of Intention, just as logic-mathematics and the laws of nature are emergent from the structure of Intention. Being is the potentiality that converts into energy, which, in the interpretative framework of the structure of intention, is the vector of information. In this sense, being is language and meaning, form and content, code and message.

## 4 The Absolute One

The absolute One, the end, beyond being, is the transcendent I, different from the immanent I which is simply its projection, the relational node at the center of its own world.

The absolute One, the transcendent I, is not a concept, but one of the poles of the transcendent relationship. The unknowable that manifests and relates through being. Not being, not substance, it is neither generated nor created but called into existence. This One enters existence by accepting the being that is given to it as the end of an intention, and thus assumes a body. It is possible to know an image, the image is the representation of the One as being. But the One without being has no form, is not in space, is not in time, is not knowable, is not a possibility, is not subject to chance or necessity. The identity of an I, unlike that of the One of being, is not reducible to being, and therefore cannot be found by a third party. Only the I, called into existence through being, can say *«I perceive, therefore I exist, and with me my world and my present time»*.

The I is the unfounded foundation that nonetheless needs the founded, that is, being, to exist. And since the I that does not exist cannot have power over being, its

---

<sup>1</sup>Our universe is the whole and if, absurdly, we hypothesized other universes beyond ours, all these would necessarily be part of a larger whole or would be mere illusions.

<sup>2</sup>The total matter is in fact null both gravitationally, since the positive energy given by the mass  $R_\omega$  is balanced by the negative energy of the gravitational field, and electrically, since the positive electric charge, corresponding to the matter that appears in the present act coming from the past, is balanced by the negative one, in the opposite direction.

<sup>3</sup>The constant  $R_\omega$  is the measure of the extension of the triad of the universe’s dimensions: mass, age, and spatial extension.

coming depends on someone else, on a Special I, who by intending it calls it into existence giving it being and power over being. The Special I is not the set of I's, because the set of parts is the whole of being, but the I is not being. Similarly, knowledge, consciousness, do not belong to the I as such. They are in fact part of existence, belong to the I that exists. The I is the individual individuated by the intention of the Special I. In my particular existence, I am the called one, I and no one else. The I in intention is free, and through being has a soul and a consciousness, perceives, understands and decides being. It understands being because it represents its end, because being is the word addressed to it, which calls it, and decides by inhabiting, from time to time, the particular potentiality of being it chooses among those present at hand. The I, the deep mystery, otherwise unknowable, reveals itself in existence through its free decisions.

#### **4.1 The Structure of Intention**

Intention is the entanglement of two individuals.

The structure of intention, the same and unique from the element to the whole, is a metaphysical relationship between a giving "I" and a receiving "I". It is metaphysical, because it is a relationship that is not contained within the sphere of being. On the contrary, being is only the relationship that unites two I's placed beyond being.

At the base of Intention is freedom: the gift and the reception are the result of a free decision by the two I's involved. In a first rough approximation, intention could be compared to Aristotle's four causes, where the Agent and Final causes are the two "I" involved, outside of being, who are nevertheless present in the sphere of being through a body, while the formal and material causes are respectively the act and the potentiality of a body, in particular of the given-received object, which passes from being part of the giver's body to being part of the receiver's body.

Intention, which structures being, is a relationship, known in physics as entanglement, three times two-faced:

1. because it consists of the alternation of potentiality and act which, in the holistic relationship of the whole with the multiplicity of parts, give rise respectively to the mirroring of the soul that surfaces in the light of consciousness as reflection;
2. because, in potentiality, it is the relationship of the whole with the parts which is, at the same time, the relationship of each part with the totality of the remaining parts;
3. because, in act, it is an asymmetric giving-receiving relationship between the two entangled entities with alternation of roles in the space of their common universal.

The relationship of being, which is the Intention of the whole with the parts, since a part is in turn a whole, is at the basis of all the hierarchical structuring of being. At the physical level, that is, limited to the sphere of being in act, the structure of being is concretized in the "part of" relationship that underlies the entire hierarchical scale of entities. Thus, proceeding from the bottom up, the quantum of the universe, by aggregating, constitutes wholes/universals of ever higher level such as fermions, hadrons, atoms, dust, rocks, planets, stars, galaxies and so on, up to the whole that is the entire universe. The One of being, that is, the whole, the universal that emerges

from the set of parts, is such if it behaves as a whole, as the potentiality of a One, and this happens when the entanglement of the whole with all its parts exists, that is, when everything mirrors everything. In the absence of this, the set of parts is only an aggregate which, as such, has no potentiality of its own, is not free but is bound by physical laws.

Every entity is thus resolved into its elements and this recursively down to the quantum of the universe, elementary lump of potentiality, which is the sole and only substance of the whole. The whole is therefore, in itself, organized quantity that becomes quality. Within it, the universal is a space consisting of a specific form of energy, as its elements are specific, and so analogously each of its elements recursively. The structure of intention, at the base of the soul and consciousness, is an alternation of two phases, that of potentiality and that of act in which the potentiality of the element is converted into energy, complementary to each other:

- the period of potentiality, of desire and separation, the time of waiting, the true time of the soul. True time in itself is not measurable, it is part of the structure of intention and is a preparatory time, characterized by desire (the energy possessed), in view of the decision. In the period of potentiality every individual, that is, every space, mirrors every other individual present in the space of its universal or, which is the same, the universal mirrors itself in each of its member individuals and vice versa. The potentiality period is not measurable in itself, nevertheless, it assumes a measure determined a posteriori, in the act, as the time of memory in the reflexive historical reconstruction;
- the instant of act, of union, in which the decision takes place that involves the gift-reception of a part of one's own energy to another, present in one's own space at hand<sup>4</sup>. The set of acts within a universal, the result of a holistic decision, constitutes the phenomenon.

The decision, which lies in the live true time, is the only jump from a state to a new state, the only newness that changes the world. Potentiality and Act, that is, mirroring and exchange of energy, that is, wave function and collapse, that is, soul and consciousness, that is, being and entity, constitute the structure of being.

Now, since all that exists, it exists in the intention, and the nesting of intentions gives place to new reflective universals of higher level, the sole principle of intention is not limited to primitive intentions involving elementary individuals, but it extends to whichever universal to whichever reflective level it could emerge. Indeed, no one only process of our everyday life is not governed by it.

In primitive intentions, such as the existential one between the Special I and the transcendent I, in which the period of potentiality extends from the act of birth to the act of death, the I lives in the darkness of the soul, outside the phenomenon. The primitive intention, which involves the whole in its totality, ends with the collapse of the totality of the parts.

---

<sup>4</sup>By space of influence at hand of an individual [68] is meant not the synchronous space of relativity, but the space that the individual has at the instant, based on the energy being exchanged and on the direction of giving or receiving. If the exchanged energy is electromagnetic radiation, the space at hand of the individual is, in receiving, the past light cone and, in giving, the future light cone.

On the contrary, the countless reflective intentions, which during their life concern individuals as endowed with a body, and which concern from time to time modular subparts of the whole, take place in the light of the phenomenon that illuminates the intentions in the context of the world. In reflective intentions, the holistic collapse of the potentiality of a specific part of the whole produces, from time to time, a holographic pattern of energy that is external phenomenon and internal consciousness. The phenomenon and consciousness, in fact, correspond as the external and internal of the same process, which is phenomenon of the external world for the parts, own consciousness for the whole.

There is no One of being in absolute, independently of the intention in which it figures. Just as there is no absolute time or absolute space. But time, space, and being find their place in the intention between two I's. The constitutive space of intention is therefore subjective and anything but isotropic and homogeneous, in it each of the three dimensions has its own character and specific meaning. There could be no separation without desire for union, fusion with the other. Time is the dimension of identity, while space is that of diversity, of separation from the other. Desire is mirrored in the space of each of the two individuals involved: in the spatial plane constituted by its two mutually orthogonal dimensions, where, on the same axis, the gravitational energy of one is mirrored as the electric energy of the other, and finally on the time axis, orthogonal to the spatial plane, as relative momentum.

The superposition and integration of the multiplicity of intentions, each component of the holistic intention of the whole with all its parts, each in its own primitive space, with its own orientation dictated by desire and separation, gives rise to and shapes the Euclidean phenomenal space, isotropic and homogeneous. The three-dimensional Euclidean space is therefore the space of the image, of the idea, of thought, of consciousness. Information, in fact, is present in the image, and the image is reflective, emerging holistically from the multitude of intentions involving the parts of a whole.

A whole emerges from the darkness in which it would otherwise be relegated, that is, it becomes a phenomenal object capable of consciousness<sup>5</sup>, and is called classical, if, and to the extent that, it is composed of a sufficient number of elements to constitute, with its own body, a Euclidean space that serves both as a reflecting mirror and as a bearer of its own image, bearer of its own information.

Just as the act is the element from which the reflection that illuminates consciousness emerges, so potentiality is the element from which the mirroring that forms the soul emerges. The soul is the open in the timeless now where, in the darkness of potentiality, the presence and separation of the other members of the same universal are felt. Its mirroring is the imaginative capacity, formative of ideas, the foundation of logic-mathematics and of categories and laws in general and, in particular, is the plastic matter, shaped by the unfolding of contingent events, which preserves its trace as historical memory.

The holistic decision that determines the collapse in act of the potentiality of all the intentions of the parts is designed to realize behavior in Euclidean space. The

---

<sup>5</sup>it is assumed that an aggregate, like a clock or a mirror, not having a soul—not having freedom—is consequently devoid of consciousness although capable of consciousness

structure of Intention is, at the same time, both the stage on which phenomena take shape and are represented, and the lens, the interpretative framework with which they are perceived and understood. Even in this emerging structure, the engine is desire and the goal is union with the desired.

From a geometric point of view, the elementary space, the constitutive structure of the intention of the individual as individual, is very different from the phenomenal space, which serves as the background, emerging from the multiplicity of the remaining intentions concerning the parts of the individual's body and of the universal. The One is the elementary space of the individual in intention, existential, fundamental, where desire is mirrored on the spatial axis of separation which in turn is reflected in the time of waiting. The other is the emerging Euclidean space, or the manifold more generally, in which the phenomenon object of perception takes place. If, on the one hand, the geometry of the manifold represents the image that emerges from the multiplicity of interactions, i.e., the image provided by classical objects, the geometry of nature, on the other, embodies the interaction. One focuses on the image on the screen, the other on the interaction that lights up each pixel.

In fact, the element of perception is the image, and the image is the proper element of Euclidean space.

The space of the representation of knowledge, neither phenomenal nor existential but artificial, has as its object the intention between two classical wholes, observed from the outside, represented by their respective wristwatches, where the recursive reflection of their image, between the mirrors of their respective bodies, marks the emergence of chronological time and its reflection which is metric distance, and thus of memory and knowledge. The representation of this knowledge, which is always historical reconstruction of memory, although it can be placed in Euclidean space with the addition of a fourth temporal dimension, or more generally in the manifold, as physics has artificially done since Descartes, instead finds its most natural place in the primitive three-dimensional space of intention <sup>6</sup>.

---

<sup>6</sup>While Euclidean geometry and its derivations imagine the unfolding of nature in a manifold all in action, without interruption, which is why the metric is quadratic, the geometry of nature arises from the historical reconstruction, starting from the image received in a here and now. The geometry of nature is therefore a system of knowledge representation of the information present in a timeless image. From this image it is possible to extract the unfolding of nature along the linear path of energy in a space of power, where the same path is made up of points (in act) interspersed with periods of the power. Which is why the metric is linear and the nature quantum. It is the very same path that, in the representation of knowledge, necessitates both difference and identity, reflecting itself in (proposing itself as) space and time, respectively. If the substance of geometry of nature is the matter-energy (potency-energy), its subject is the give-take relationship: first of all, the hosting relation between the whole and its parts, and therefore, the peer-to-peer relation between the parts with each other. These two relationship always coexist.

Conversely, in this new scenario of space at hand, light, as it is now that defines synchronous space, is considered instantaneous. More precisely, the new paradigm, since it is focused on interaction, which is why it considers not an abstract space but only the real space at hand of an individual, the one forged by the paths of light, involves the loss of the substantial difference between the spatial dimension and the temporal dimension. The spatial dimension and the temporal dimension are only different connotations of the one-dimensional path of light between an emitter and a receiver. The geometry that has the path of light as its element is therefore one-dimensional, linear. Instant light, therefore, does not mean infinite speed, but without speed. For each of the two individuals in relation: time and space, the whole and its parts, the moment of identity and the moment of difference.

But there is something even more radical. The time interval that opens between the round trip of the signal, for each of the two individuals involved in a reflexive interaction (where reception is immediately followed by reflected sending), since it can no longer represent the continuous time taken by light to travel from one end to the other, must represent the period of power between one instant in act and another. And this path of light, which interconnects pairs of events in action separated by power, is reflected both on the spatial and temporal dimensions. If the path is not a continuous journey in action, but a space in potential between two events in action, then the absolute is not the path (which is only in potential) but the pair of events in action.

If there were no act, the soul would remain closed in on itself, in a timeless now. The decision, which translates potentiality into act, leads the I to go out of itself to meet the other and unite with it. It is the decision that changes the world, modifying potentiality, and marking the difference between before and after and giving rise to time and phenomenon. The decision, which arises to overcome the separation, the abyss that stretches between the individual and its other, is thus the foundation of change and therefore of chronological time and the corresponding metric distance: two aspects of the path of energy in the representation of consciousness.

## 4.2 The Quantum

The One that is being is the whole that has parts. The whole in act and the parts in potentiality, and vice versa. In representation, if the One in act were not composed of potentiality, this One would end up proving aporetic since the parts, being also wholes, should in turn be decomposable into parts and so on recursively to infinity. The process of decomposition must therefore concern potentiality and must, nevertheless, have a limit in act. This limit is the quantum<sup>7</sup> of the whole, extension of potentiality delimited by the act.

The quantum, extension delimited by two points, is neither in act nor in potentiality. It is the unity that crosses true time. In act only the point exists, in potentiality only the extension exists. The point does not belong to the extension and vice versa, but one presupposes the other. The point is other than the extension, of a different nature, even if it is positioned along the extension. The point always presupposes an extension and the extension is an interval delimited by the point and another point. Similarly, a point has two faces: on one side it is the end of a segment, on the other it is the beginning of the next segment, on one side it is the receiver, on the other it is the giver. There is no point without extension and without the other point with which it is in relation and with respect to which the extension finds space and direction. The quantum is the synthesis of point and extension which, as such, is neither in act nor in potentiality, but the bridge between one act and the next, bridge between a giving I and the other receiving in intention.

The quantum emerges only in the historical reconstruction based on the image received in the act, where the image preserves and reveals the memory of the past that develops in a succession of acts, each represented as a point, between which the period of potentiality extends. In the historical reconstruction, the quantum reveals itself as the element of representation.

Physics describes the laws of the representation of natural phenomena in the framework of Intention. Being is only the language of the dialogue between two "I" which is Intention. Everything that is being has the structure of intention and is therefore quantum.

---

The proposed paradigm shift therefore entails this further change:

*«constancy of the speed of light» → «invariance of the length of the paths of light between two events»*

That is, the linear space of interaction is zero curl and conservative, since simply connected.

<sup>7</sup>This limit cannot be arbitrary, it must therefore be determined by its other, by its whole. Between the real whole and its quantum there must necessarily be a relationship, a circle that closes on itself, and this can only be the relationship given by reciprocal mirroring: the whole mirrors the quantum and vice versa. The whole is the mirror image of the quantum and vice versa. Numerically they must correspond as  $x$  and  $1/x$ , one the reciprocal of the other.

### 4.3 The Soul

A whole is classified according to its level of freedom, which corresponds to the extension of its soul, which in turn depends on the type of entanglement from which it derives. A simple aggregate, such as a meteorite, or a house, or a shoe, has a very superficial and totally fragmented entanglement, constituted by the gravitational and electric forces that hold it together, it has no soul because it is not free. Similarly, a mechanism, characterized by a superficial entanglement that rigidly determines its functioning, has no soul. The soul of a living being, on the other hand, arises from the entanglement of all its parts, its soul is its potentiality.

The universe has its own soul that produces and mirrors the physical universe and its history. Within the Universe, some special compounds, the so-called living beings, are characterized by constituting their own internal space, a new autarchic universal which, although its matter continues to be part of it, separates itself from the universe and stands before it as its other, as a new living and autonomous individual. The body is alive as long as it behaves as a whole, that is, as long as the entanglement of the whole with the parts exists. This whole is the soul, the potentiality of the living body as a whole. When this entanglement is interrupted, the body, now without a soul, loses its unity and becomes an aggregate which, as such, falls apart into its components according to physical laws.

The soul is a property of physical matter, different from moment to moment, just as the living body is different from moment to moment, because new cells are born and others die. The living body and the soul are constantly transforming, they are one, two sides of the same coin. The soul is a mirror that mirrors its members. It is a global potentiality that encompasses and coordinates the potentiality of all its entangled parts and that transforms and evolves maintaining itself in the present. The death of the body is equivalent to the vanishing of the soul, that is, the breaking of the entanglement and the disappearance of that global potentiality that coordinated all the parts evolving and preserving itself since birth.

Emerging from being, the soul is a constituent of the structure of intention. The structure of the soul is that of the quantum, it is the potentiality that finds space between two acts. It lasts the interval of potentiality: it begins with the act of receiving and ends with the subsequent act of giving. The soul, like the quantum, has no identity of its own, it is individual and relational. The soul is structured, there is a fundamental intention, corresponding to the personal soul, which during its life coordinates all the vital components of the whole, in turn recursively structured, all resolving into a multiplicity of souls that succeed one another cyclically, with more or less frenetic rhythms, beginning and ending with an act, all included in the fundamental soul.

The I inhabits the personal soul and can decide to inhabit this or that component, this or that possible variant, based on the limited energy it has and based on the importance it attributes to it. The decision marks the completion of the particular intention, the end of the module of the soul concerned and the beginning of a new intention, of a new component of the personal soul. However, it cannot decide either the beginning or the end of its fundamental soul, because this is not its intention, it is an intention of the Special I. The soul, in fact, is being, it is the gift by which the Special I calls the I into existence.

#### 4.4 The principium individuationis

To be in intention means to mirror during the period of potentiality and to reflect in the instant of the act. Thus, every whole has a potentiality that mirrors the entire universe, that is, mirrors the Special I who mirrors in it and gives it an identity, an I, calling it by name. And so, the potentiality of the whole becomes the soul inhabited by its I, mirror of the Special I by whom it is intended, and during life reflects the Special I in its consciousness.

The principium individuationis is, in one direction, the intention of a “Special I” who relates to an intended “I”, calling it by name and keeping it in the world in which it has been placed. In the opposite direction, it is the intention by which an “I” recognizes the identity, that is, the presence and persistence of the entities of the world, under whose form the Special I appears.

In both cases, the One of being is the means, the object, while the I is the subject and the end.

#### 4.5 Qualia and the consciousness of the I

Quanta, qualia, and image in consciousness: what is the relationship between these three elements of being?

In the first chapter of his posthumous work “The World or Treatise on Light”, Descartes makes a very intuitive analogy between the particles that cause sensation and the sound of spoken words that provoke in us the image of meaning, arguing that the meaning of words is something quite different from the material medium through which it is transmitted, that is, the sound of words, just as sensation is quite different from the material means through which it is transmitted.

These perplexities are well rendered by the German philosopher Gottfried Leibniz (1641–1716) who, in his masterpiece *Monadology* (1714), writes: “Moreover, it must be confessed that perception and that which depends upon it are inexplicable on mechanical grounds, that is to say, by means of figures and motions. ... Thus it is in a simple substance, and not in a compound or in a machine, that perception must be sought for.”[15]

Descartes therefore found himself unable to deny the existence of sensations or, even less, of the physical processes underlying them. For this reason, he postulates the existence of two distinct realities: *res cogitans* and *res extensa*. These two substances have practically opposite qualities: *res cogitans* is free, sensitive, immaterial, indeterminate, indivisible; *res extensa* is material, insensitive, determined, divisible, and is bound by the laws of physics. Descartes’ interactionist dualism, however, left open a question of fundamental importance: how is interaction possible between a material substance and an immaterial one?

It is a matter of explaining the correspondence between the phenomenon, emerging from quanta, and consciousness, emerging from qualia. Physics, in fact, represents phenomena, in the form of physical and geometric quantities, starting from quanta, whereas consciousness perceives the phenomenon, in the form of images and sounds, etc., starting from qualia. Energy is quantity plus quality, number plus qualia.

Quantity is the rhythm of a temporal sequence or configuration of a spatial coexistence. Its measurement, by a mechanical instrument, is the number; its perception, as rhythm or configuration, is the qualia. What is observed and measured and represented as composed of quanta is perceived as composed of qualia. The immediate datum is perception composed of qualia: are quanta then the other side of the coin of qualia? The image emerges in the consciousness of the living being from the holistic collapse of the intentions of the whole with the parts, parts shared by the whole that is the universe and by the whole that is the soul of the living being. The holistic collapse of the multiplicity of intentions that constitute the whole that is the module dedicated to perception gives rise to the emerging pattern that is measurable from the outside as a configuration composed of quanta while it appears in consciousness as an image composed of qualia. The same emerging pattern holistically can be the idea, the intention, that commands the muscles of the body.

Energy is thus information through qualia, that is, image, sound, which is inserted and framed in the context of memory and finds meaning there. Memory finds its seat in the mirroring potentiality of the soul where the present finds meaning and consciousness emerges. Every whole is a universe. The act fixes in memory what potentiality has determined from time to time, it is the bookmark of potentiality. This means that all the past, from the previous instant still vivid but fading towards the beginning of time, forms the context in which the act of the present is framed. Our ideas, our achievements, the images and discoveries of our mind, as well as perception, are the result of a holistic collapse of modules of our brain. The brain being part of a living body whose matter is shared with the living whole that is the universe. Our thoughts are the evolution of that whole world which is the memory of our soul; they, as well as the interpretation of perceptions, are placed and find meaning in the light of this world. The mirroring potentiality of our soul, with its past and its expectations, is the incubator of our consciousness.

The question is: *does consciousness also fall within being or in something else? In other words, does the phenomenon-consciousness correspondence reveal a bridge between two fundamentally different realities, an interface between being and the transcendent I, between the phenomenon in being and consciousness in something other than being, or is it the revelation of two concomitant aspects of the same substance?*

Qualia are the way in which being appears to the I. There is no consciousness without I because there is no consciousness without soul and no soul without freedom, and no freedom without I. The I is the ultimate subject of experience.

But *Who is the I? Is it the whole as one, that is, the soul, or the principle of the soul, its effigy, which mirrors in all its members, or neither, but an I beyond being, transcendent?*

If the principle were unique, if at the beginning there were nothing but Being or, conversely, but the I, then there would be only the unique substance of the seventeenth-century rationalists, objective, from which the derived I would emerge, or conversely the absolute I of German idealism that places being outside itself. If, instead, beyond being, there is something else, then this other is the absolute I who through being enters into existence, and the I that exists is structural and relational.

For Heidegger, Dasein, which is nevertheless an entity, is not an isolated subject, does not stand “before” the world as an observer, it is being-in-the-world that implies openness and possibility.

In Intention, being is the relationship that binds a Special I with an I, where the I is the ultimate subject behind Heidegger’s being-in-the-world, just as the Special I is the ultimate subject behind Being. In the framework of Intention, the physical quantum of being manifests itself to the I as qualia, while from their totality, from the holistic collapse of potentiality, consciousness emerges. But consciousness is prior to the representation of the physical phenomenon, qualia are prior to quanta. The physical phenomenon is representation whereas qualia and consciousness are the immediate datum. The physical, material, objective world, representation of perceived images, represents the mirroring of a soul of the universe in the souls of living individuals. Potentiality and act, mirroring and reflection, thinking thought and thought thought. The I is not being but exists through being, exists through the body, which is the soul and consciousness.

Consciousness has a double face: on the one hand, in itself, it is Descartes’ “*cogito ergo sum*”, the awareness of thinking that is at the same time the awareness of existing of the transcendent I; on the other hand, in itself, it is the representation of the informational content object of knowledge and science, it is the datum, the object, among which also figures the immanent I. As a whole, it is the immediacy of the awareness of existing by the transcendent I: *I perceive*  $\equiv$  *I exist, as a whole world*; as a set of parts, it is representation, it is the mediation that makes knowledge possible, and where the same I objectifies itself by taking part as the immanent I, part of the whole: *I perceive my perceiving*  $\implies$  *I exist, in the world and as part of the world*.

Consciousness is all new at every instant. Consciousness is thus fragmentary, but the soul, in which the transcendent I dwells, remains uninterrupted from the instant of birth to that of death.

## 4.6 The Person

The One of being has two coexisting moments: the moment of the One as whole; the moment of multiplicity as composed of parts. Both moments are fundamental for intention. The moment of the One of being is the primitive, subjective moment of intention, of the soul inhabited by the I, of the existential, of freedom in view of an end; the moment of multiplicity, on the other hand, is the reflective phenomenon that emerges from the continuous succession and crowding of the intentions of the parts, it is the emergent objective of logic, mechanism, information, and consciousness.

More in detail, the whole-I, as one and individual, is free in the intention that binds it to its other: as it mirrors it is soul, as it decides it is the energy that crosses it in the encounter with its other. At the same time, the whole-I, as composed, as the totality of the intentions involving its parts, both with the other peripheral parts belonging to its own body and with those belonging to the external space of its universal, in their entirety and in their continuous whirling, is the ever-present background given respectively by the consciousness of its own body and by the consciousness of the phenomenon of the external world.

More in detail, consciousness is the unveiling of the phenomenon, the image in the present instant that carries within itself the entire historical unfolding of memory according to chronological time, in the open and in the light of the timeless now of the soul. Only in the open, in the now of the soul, does the image fixed in its historical depth light up and come to life at every instant. In the soul is the form of the possible and the capacity for imagination, in consciousness the image. In the soul are present the automatism of the mind as atemporal potentiality, encoded in the configuration of its elements, which manifest in consciousness, each time, as phenomenon in act.

The soul is the set of relationships with all the other members of the same universal against the background of the world, where each intention is characterized by the degree of separation, given by the distance from the other, and by the degree of desire, given by one's own energy possessed and the energy possessed by the other. It is the degree of separation that, in the phenomenon, translates into chronological time of the I and metric spatial distance of the other<sup>8</sup>, equivalent to each other, while it is the degree of desire that is the attractive or repulsive force that moves the relationship.

If, using Heidegger's words, in being-thrown (Geworfenheit) man does not choose his starting point (language, time, body, society), but is "thrown" into an already given situation, with Care (Sorge) and Project (Entwurf) he builds his soul and his world.

#### 4.7 The Time and Space of the Individual in Intention

Primitive space is not absolute; it is the entangled space of an individual, their space at hand in intention with other individuals of the same universal. Even more so, the space emerging from the reflective intention of the whole with its parts is derived. The universe, as well as the space of every whole, emerges from the mirroring potentiality, the foundation of logic-mathematics and the guardian of memory and physical laws (or of memory), all new at every instant.

*"How is it possible that this unity of knowledge, feeling, and choice which you call your own could have sprung into being from nothingness at a given moment not so long ago?" [29]*

The question expresses the astonishing coincidence that we exist at this particular moment in the infinite expanse of time. This question would make sense if time were an absolute, above everything, and containing everything. The I is outside of time and time is only an aspect of the existence of the I. Time accompanies the existence of the I, not the I. The I, in fact, is not being nor, consequently, is in the realm of time. The I does not fall within time, as I, while it falls within time, as called into existence through a body and within a world and a history already given. The time of the I is an integral and substantial part of the universe and its history, part of the fabric of the universe.

Our existence does not depend on us, it does not begin nor end with our decision, but with the decision of an intention that surpasses us, with the intention of a Special I. The call to existence, however, is not a random and contingent fact, which can

---

<sup>8</sup>although the distance is placed along the axis of the act of intention, the intentions that make up a universal can be oriented along any combination of its three axes, corresponding to act, potentiality, and time, and from their superposition arises the three-dimensional Euclidean space of the universe.

happen at any random moment sooner or later, but, on the contrary, is the central fact, the fundamental event, to which the finite history of one's world, of the universe from one's point of view, which serves as a frame and background, is subordinated. Its duration is not finite, it is outside chronological time.

Potentiality, which is the substance of the soul, is informed by past decisions that leave their trace there; it is therefore the seat of memory, but not as historical memory in act, as can be, for example, the presence in the now of a document or a ruin of the past, but as a trace in the potentiality that extends to the present and as such is the cause of the continuous re-actualization and evolution of the ruin.

In the soul there is no chronological time, it is the dwelling of the I in the eternal now and is marked by the desire of the I for the other. If the soul is desire, feeling, attraction or repulsion, consciousness is instead representation. Chronological time, time as a unit of measure, belongs to representation.

The period of potentiality, in which the I dwells, is the duration of a primitive time, in itself not measurable, which is the time of waiting. The time of waiting, which began with the primitive and fundamental decision of accepting the call, taken at the instant of conception, and which will end with the final decision at the instant of death. It is the true time of life, in itself not measurable, in itself infinite. All the decisions and actions we take during life, on the other hand, are not primitive but reflective, phenomenal, emergent. They are mirrored in the soul as memory of the past from which the present emerges and in which it is placed. Duration is thus measurable not in itself, but in something else, photographed in the phenomenon that emerges reflectively from time to time in the instant in act.

If "space = time" then "past and future = spatial distance in receiving and in giving". In the now of the soul, the phenomenon, the story, is all present at every instant and all new at every instant.

## **4.8 The End and the Underlying Orientation**

In the structure of being there are no laws. The freedom of intention, however, does not generate chaos, but order, thus revealing an underlying orientation and a finalism.

The laws of physics, mathematics, thought, are not absolute, they are emergent phenomena from an underlying orientation, present in the freedom of intentions, which manifest in the open of the space of a universal when the density of intentions involving its members exceeds the threshold of reflection, beyond which information and classical physics take shape.

This underlying orientation is at the base of universal logic which in turn is the foundation on which the universal, in view of its end, designs and acts.

The end is primitive, it belongs to the single intention, to the universal as one, it is an expression of the freedom of the individual; the underlying orientation, instead, is what emerges from the multiplicity of intentions, from the multiplicity of ends. It is the cause of the logical structure of the reflective image (consciousness, phenomenon) that emerges from the totality of intentions, each with its own end, involving the totality of the members of the universal and that serves as the background to the intention that the universal is living to pursue its particular end.

The underlying orientation and the end are respectively the ground and the goal of the imaginative power of the universal.

The underlying orientation derives from the maximization of charity, for whose realization it is necessary that, in the physical sphere, energy is finite so that those who have abundance give to those who lack, as provided by the laws of thermodynamics, and that, in the biological sphere, natural selection prevails as provided by Darwin's laws.

## 4.9 Mirroring

Separation, desire, and time are the three mirror dimensions of a whole in intention, the mirrors in which the other is revealed. Mirroring is the distribution of potentiality in the entangled space of a whole, which constitutes the memory from which the imaginative power of a mind springs before being realized in the phenomenon in act. Phenomenon, in turn, that forges its memory and that is mirrored in the space of potentiality of the wholes that are part of it.

Mirroring, which in the soul anticipates consciousness, is the taking shape of the image of the desired in the substance of desire.

The intention relationship is embodied in the geometry of nature whose figure is:

- the mirroring in the period of potentiality: everything mirrors everything;
- the exchange of energy in the instant of act, which is the reflective thread that forms the path of light reflected on the axes of space and time.

The give-take relationship requires that the two subjects, placed in front of each other, correspond to each other like two mirrors. That is, the nature of the give-receive relation is the mirroring. The mirroring of the individual therefore pre-exists and is the presupposition of the act, in which the collapse of the wave function of the two individuals involved takes place and in which the relationship manifests itself, and which is the basis of the reflection that emerges from the multiplicity of acts. Reflection would not guarantee information if it were not for the emergence of regularities inherent in mirroring. Between two mirrors, in fact, a recursive mirroring is established which gives rise to a geometric progression where the scale factor is the quantum and the common ratio is the energy  $dt/d\tau$ .

Everything arises from mirroring<sup>9</sup> in potentiality. "Power" and "Mirroring", two aspects of a single reality, are therefore the key to understanding nature. Indeed, there can be no one without quantum, no quantum without the power that is its content, and without mirroring which is the nature (the behaviour and form) of power.

The same participation of Plato's ideas is implemented, in being, through mirroring, and it is the same mirroring, which takes place in the depths of the soul and which precedes the reflection of the act proper to consciousness, that makes real that "remembrance" of ideas that the maieutic intends to awaken in the mind of the knower.

---

<sup>9</sup>From a physical point of view, mirroring, of gravitational nature as mediated by the quantum of the universe, is the indispensable ground that prepares the act, of electric nature, mediated by bosons. The quantum of the universe  $R_\alpha = 1/R_\omega$  is about  $2.24 \times 10^{40}$  times smaller than the mass of an electron, it is the mediator responsible for gravitation, and is the smallest lump of potentiality, which constitutes the dark matter of the universe.

Mirroring is the outside of an inside, of a state of mind. From the internal point of view, the equation holds

$$\text{Mirroring} = \text{Loving}$$

More precisely, mirroring is universal, everything mirrors everything. It is the I who, among the many who mirror in it, chooses, by inhabiting it, its other, and thus chooses its universal. Mirroring is loving, the mirrored is someone, or something as a means in view of someone, who presents itself in the guise of a universal.

Consciousness, loving, refer to a reality placed beyond being, and of which being, which embodies and represents the words of a language, is only a means. Concepts and words of which we, loving, already come to know in the soul even before they surface in consciousness.

#### 4.10 Mirroring and Imaginative Capacity

The I is unknowable, but manifests in history through being.

Potentiality, which starts from the previous act, contemplates all the different forms made possible before one of them translates into the new act. Potentiality is desire that mirrors the desired, acquiring its image. In the soul of a whole, that is, in its potentiality, the following holds:

$$\text{Loving} = \text{Mirroring} = \text{Imagining}$$

Imagining is representing, and representing is giving form to potentiality. Thinking is navigating in the form of potentiality.

The structure of the universe, that is, the formation of fermions, atoms, molecules, dust, planets, stars, galaxies, and the tectonics of planets, the formation of conditions for life, the birth of life, etc., are all logical consequences deriving not from an impersonal underlying orientation, but from an intention, an imaginative capacity of a Special I, active, free, which has operated, based on logic, in view of an end.

It is necessary to distinguish between the imaginative capacity of the Special I, which realizes the imagined in the universe, and the imaginative capacity of the living creature, which mirrors and makes its own the images of nature and in turn realizes the imagined in its mind, composing and dividing in various ways concepts, words, and images already perceived. In Berkeley's words: «*For my self I find indeed I have a Faculty of imagining, or representing to myself the Ideas of those particular things I have perceived and of variously compounding and dividing them. I can imagine a Man with Two Heads or the upper parts of a Man joined to the Body of a Horse. ...*» The imaginative faculty of man, being made of the same substance as that of the universe, is subject to the same emergent laws. Thus, images of abstract ideas, such as color or movement abstracted from a body, are impossible: «*Not that it is possible for Colour or Motion to exist without Extension: ... But then whatever Hand or Eye I imagine, it must have some particular Shape and Colour. Likewise the Idea of Man that I frame to my self, must be either of a White, or a Black, or a Tawny, a Straight, or a Crooked, a Tall, or a Low, or a Middle-sized Man. I cannot by any effort of*

*Thought conceive the abstract Idea above described. And it is equally impossible for me to form the abstract Idea of Motion distinct from the Body moving, ...».* Similarly, only by error or by fiction can I contradict logic.

Abstraction, fundamental for science, is, in the framework of Intention, not the negation but the suspension of the useless for the sake of a purpose.

Imaginative capacity is a result of the ability to inhabit potentiality, which prepares and makes possible the decision. Potentiality opens up in a finite number of alternatives. Imaginative capacity is the realization of a path in view of an end. The capacity for imagination is thus the light that the I casts into potentiality and with which it makes a path in act that sculpts potentiality.

#### 4.11 Decision

Freedom implies a conscious I, capable of understanding the world, and the existence of possible alternative decisions, and, finally, an end toward which to tend.

The decision of the I occurs by inhabiting potentiality, choosing the place, among the many that open up, where desire pushes it. If our attention focuses on an activity, we inhabit its potentiality because it is there that it is important to make decisions; we are not conscious of breathing, we breathe mechanically, we are not conscious of stepping, we walk mechanically.

Representation is a leap between mirroring of potentiality and reflection of the act. Mirroring is understanding while the act is what, taking note of decisions, informs potentiality, constituting the memory of the past that grounds the present and the future. There could be no knowledge without understanding and no understanding without representation, and no representation without mirroring, and there could be no mirroring without love toward the mirrored, in one of the forms in which it manifests, which must already be loved, which is already loved because it is the one who loved us first and placed us. We love the Other whom we do not see and do not know, except in the forms in which it appears to us from time to time. And by virtue of this love we exist and understand.

But the problem is how the decision can occur. Before every decision, a finite number of possibilities open up to the I.

Being makes no sense and does not exist without an I to inhabit it. Among the multiplicity of spaces of being that mirroring, proper to potentiality, opens to the I, only the one in which the I has decided to inhabit becomes reality. We inhabit our thoughts just as we inhabit the world.

In other words, the soul is one's inner world, the space of one's possible actions and perceptions, set in the external world that is the universe. If we apply to the soul the "many-worlds theory" of Everett, one could say that deciding is choosing to inhabit a particular soul among the many possible alternatives that open up from time to time.

#### 4.12 The Structure of Souls and the Personal Soul

Mirroring, which first occurs between the universe as whole and its element, gives form to potentiality and thus gives rise to the entire concatenation of universals that

structure being and recursively form fermions, the atom, galaxy filaments, and then, on the other hand, cells, living beings, and their organizations.

An aggregate, even if it is a mechanism, does not arise from the entanglement of its components and therefore has neither a soul nor an I. A whole, on the other hand, has a soul and, in its kind, constitutes a level of a hierarchical “Part Of” structure. The universal of a whole is in turn a whole, whose body is the union of the bodies of its members, and whose soul is the union of the souls of its members. Every hierarchical structure of wholes has a dominant level, the only one endowed with an I, which can therefore make decisions and whose decisions are reflected on the decisions of the remaining levels. We call the elements of this level the personal souls of the hierarchical structure. The personal soul, being the only free and independent one, is the only one to have an I and a consciousness and an end. Only the intention of a Special I can indeed give a soul to an I; otherwise, the soul remains a space inhabitable by the I of the personal soul.

Thus, in nature, that is, in the hierarchical structure that goes from the quantum of the universe to the universe, where the soul is that of the Special I, the end is the anthropic principle. Similarly, a family, a people, any organization arises from the organization of a group of members, to the extent that the members mirror a common universal. The individual, as possessing a body, has its own soul but, to the extent that it mirrors the universal, inhabits the soul of the universal. It is said, in fact, of a pair of lovers, that they form one body and one soul, or that their souls are entangled. The personal soul almost disappears in the crowd of a concert, a stadium, a gathered square, where the common feeling, the soul of the universal, takes its place.

Thus a people, a company, if not intended by a Special I, are only means for an end, born for the defense and prosperity of the members, have a body and a soul and generate a phenomenon, but do not have an I. They act by inspiring and through their members but are not persons. Similarly, electrons, atoms, dust, planets, galaxies, and all inanimate entities do not have an I but are, together, the body of the universe inhabited by the Special I.

The I is what is abysally separated from the other I. If the I does not arise from matter, if the I is not a possibility, then it can enter existence only by accepting the invitation of a Special I who has called it personally, by name, through being on which it gives it power. And this intention, this relationship that binds them, is the matter that forms the soul and consciousness of the I in the universe that addresses it.

### **4.13 Intention and Knowledge**

Knowledge is the dialogue between the mirroring that emerges in the soul and the image of the phenomenon that appears in consciousness. They are complementary: one understands, the other sees.

If it is true that the human soul is of the same substance as the soul of the universe, it is nevertheless incomparably more limited. Above all, the relationship between the two is asymmetric: it is that of the whole to the part.

In other words, knowledge is the dialogue between reason, which is nourished by the soul’s mirroring—boundless, holistic—and the intellect, which is nourished by the experience proper to consciousness—finite. The attribution of epistemological

primacy to one or the other was what opposed the rationalists (favoring reason and universals) to the empiricists (favoring sensory experience and particulars) between the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

Every whole is a world, in turn within the universe.

The primitive intention of a whole, that is, the period of potentiality that begins with the receiving act of birth and ends with the giving act of death, takes place, moved by desire and supported by faith, in the depths of the soul, in the darkness of potentiality. It is blind, existential. It takes place in a primitive, three-dimensional space, constituted by the distance that separates from the other, equal to the time of waiting for the encounter and in turn equal to the measure of the desire for the encounter.

From the frenetic intertwining of intentions that, throughout life, involve the multiplicity of parts, arises the imaginative capacity and the pre-understanding of the soul, which anticipate the perception and knowledge of consciousness. The desired of the fundamental intention surfaces in the light of consciousness in the form of the many contingent desires in which, from time to time, it mirrors in the soul. Primitive space gives way to the emergence of chronological time, Euclidean metric space (more generally the manifold), and energy, which constitute the a priori structure of the representation of knowledge, which is the same structure as reflective intention. Similarly, the holistic potentiality of the multiplicity of intentions, guided by the anthropic principle, assumes a supporting structure constituted by categories and logic-mathematics and the physical laws that govern the representation of nature and thought, on which memory rests, a dynamic form, shaped by experiences. Nature itself moves the universe as well as thought.

The structure of intention, as it incorporates the core of the relationship between being and Dasein of Heidegger, although attributing a completely different meaning to it, is the foundation of existential and ethical and aesthetic concepts. The soul is the seat of true time and true distance, of attractive/repulsive force and emotions and states of mind. The very nature of intention, constituted by an individual who gives a part of their being to the other, whom they do not see and by whom they are not seen, belonging to their own universal, requires ethical-aesthetic-normative judgments. Hence, faith, hope, courage, generosity, justice, beauty, on one hand, and their opposites on the other. All concepts that pertain to the structure of intention. Thus, to the gift is opposed theft, to love hatred, to one order the opposite order.

Every entity is only a means in view of an end in an intention. There is no image of beauty, justice, good, without intention. In the Symposium (especially in Diotima's speech) beauty is not possessed by the object but manifests through it, dragging the soul toward the Beautiful itself. In other words, beauty happens in the relationship between object and subject as "rapture" (eros). If it is true that beauty is not in the object nor in the subject, but happens in the interval that unites them: it is the phenomenon of the giving of the object and the receiving of the subject, where what appears becomes shared meaning, it is equally true that the object, in speaking to us of something, is mirroring someone, awakening in us the feeling of someone who is unknown and unknowable.

The potentiality of the world mirrors in the potentiality of our brain, for this reason we imagine and in the phenomenon we recognize: we discover what was already present in potentiality in our mind. The imaginative power of the universe generates, in the succession of epochs, the structure of entities, each realization of a concept that changes and transforms with the epochs. Being, as entity, is totally structured by the “Part Of” relationship that determines the hierarchical scale of universals corresponding to empirical concepts. The concrete universal (of nature) is the organism. The organism is composed of functional organs in harmony with each other, therefore in relationship, and each organ is composed of functional subparts and so on down to the elements. Every universal has, in its potentiality, behavioral schemes, models, programs, characteristic of its species. These behavioral schemes present in the soul as its form give rise, in the phenomenon, to stereotyped behaviors extended in time and cyclical. On these reflective behaviors, the living individual, to the extent that it is free, grafts its free actions.

The One as whole is not only quantity, it is always also quality, functionality. There is no number without a purpose. All knowledge is abstraction: there is no identity and difference without a purpose. Identity and difference are at the base of categorization and therefore of knowledge. But we recognize as difference only what serves a purpose. The useless falls into indifference, gradually giving way to the concept. The concept arises from abstraction which, in the light of a purpose, neglects in the image all that it considers irrelevant. Abstraction consists NOT in negating, but in bracketing the useless in view of a purpose.

Experience, observation, is a perceiving and therefore understanding and therefore representing in the framework (desire, space, time, categories) of intention. Observation becomes objective, with physics, through the use of mechanical, deterministic measuring instruments. Physics is therefore objective representation of a phenomenon, through mechanical measurement methods and instruments.

#### **4.14 Proofs of the Transcendent I: Freedom and the Vertiginous Problem**

Reviving a body after death, after the dissolution of the soul, would mean giving it not another soul, because the soul has no identity different from that of the changing body, but again a soul, even if with the same memories and the same character. The question is: *What happens to its I? Can its I ever return?*

If the I and the soul were of the same substance, if the I emerged from the soul or represented an aspect of it, or if the soul were an emanation of the I, then it would make little sense to ask whether its I will be the same as before (the soul would carry its I without identity); conversely, if the I is independent of the soul it inhabits, then the I is primitive and has its own identity, and since the I that does not exist cannot have power over being, its possible return, as well as its first coming, will depend on someone else, on a Special I. The question therefore is reduced to the following: *Are the I and the soul of the same substance? That is, does the I emerge from the soul or represent an aspect of it, or does it have its own identity irreducible to being? That is, besides the I object of consciousness, is there also a transcendent I?*

Only freedom can explain consciousness by making it necessary. The ontological dualism potentiality-act, which is rather complementarity, opens the door to consciousness, interiority, freedom, making it possible to see nature as a living being, ordered with its own ends as an organism. In fact, potentiality is the opposite of determinism just as life is the opposite of death.

Which, among the many possibilities, will constitute the new act? Who/what will determine the choice?

Since potentiality excludes necessity, only two solutions remain: blind chance or the free will of an individual who freely chooses in view of an end. Of the two, the first is unnatural and incomprehensible since it contradicts the Principle of Reason. The second implies intentionality.

We are most conscious in critical situations, where it is necessary to be ready to make decisions; we are least conscious, conversely, in situations of secondary importance, where we act mechanically or distractedly. Mirroring and acting require energy, that is, desire, and this is finite and must be managed according to needs. Consciousness therefore reveals an economy of energy, which is an economy of desire. The I is conscious of its world not indiscriminately, in the same way in every aspect, but in the aspects and to the extent that it is important to make decisions to achieve its desired. Mirroring, which is love, desire, is the ground in which the decision matures that translates potentiality into energy, which is consciousness. Desire, attention, energy, qualia, consciousness, constitute a concatenation.

Freedom, which takes place in being, cannot be explained by remaining confined within the narrow space of this single substance, that is, by limiting oneself to the sphere of being alone. To decide is to govern being. If this governance were internal to being, if the I derived from being, were an attribute of being or emerged from being, it could not be free. What depends cannot govern what it depends on. What depends can mechanically react on what it depends on, but cannot free itself, cannot be free.

Freedom means deciding about being, and to do so requires a subject external to being to whom being is given. It takes an I external to being to whom being opens as soul and then as consciousness. An I who has lordship over being since this being is only a means whose end is the I and does not exist without the I.

An autonomous guidance mechanism can very well perform all the necessary functions to navigate traffic and reach a destination. A drone equipped with artificial intelligence can autonomously perform all the actions necessary to achieve a goal. Yet none of these mechanisms has consciousness, or at least it is neither necessary nor foreseen that they have it. The reason is that a mechanism is only an aggregate, its behavior is deterministic, it therefore has neither its own space of potentiality nor its own autonomy. A mechanism therefore has no soul, and there is no consciousness without soul. It is indeed the holistic decision of an I that transforms the potentiality of the soul into the act of consciousness. A consciousness without soul would be pure passivity without imagination or understanding. A soul without I would be potentiality without possibility of realization, eternally impotent.

A measuring instrument, to be objective, must not have a soul and an I, it must be an aggregate, a mechanism, that translates an aspect of a reflective phenomenon

into its objective measure, just as a mathematical operator translates its input into the corresponding output. A whole, instead, as endowed with a soul and an I, always interprets the phenomenon subjectively. In a whole, perception is mediated by sense organs and finally by neural maps, whose malfunction, as with any mechanism, can compromise the result. The functioning of the mechanism is in turn a phenomenon that mirrors in the soul where it is interpreted subjectively, in the framework of reflective intention, before emerging into consciousness.

Thus, while a measuring instrument has no soul, and consequently measures mechanically, without awareness, a whole, as endowed with a soul, is the author of its own free interpretation and representation of the phenomenon and is therefore conscious, aware of its existence.

In reality, there is no objective phenomenon, except as a particular aspect of a reflective physical phenomenon, forced to manifest mechanically to a deterministic, mechanical measuring instrument. The structure of Intention, instead, always involves two subjects, a mirroring and a mirrored, one who shows itself and the other who perceives.

The difference between showing and perceiving corresponds to a difference between action and passion, between the giver and the receiver, between the "other" and the "I". To the other, to its showing, corresponds my perceiving, my consciousness. The other mirrors/is-mirrored in my soul and appears/is-perceived in my consciousness. The phenomenon represents the other in me.

Mirroring in the soul, which allows one to be the author of the free interpretation and representation of the phenomenon, is at the origin of self-perception which, as the empiricist philosopher John Locke argued, makes us an I: "*Thinking consists in being aware that one is thinking (...). It is impossible for someone to perceive without perceiving that one is perceiving (...). In this way everyone is for himself what he calls I (self)*".

This model has raised, in philosophy, the problem of how there can be knowledge, of anything, without there being a distinction between the knower and the known, since in the cognitive relationship with oneself, which makes an individual an I, the I is both the subject and the object of knowledge. The explanation of the apparent paradox lies precisely in the difference between the sentient I of the soul and the conceptual I of consciousness. There is an immanent I, and this is the one object of knowledge and consciousness, and a true I, transcendent, and this is the one who inhabits the depths of the soul. The true I, the transcendent I, forms its soul by mirroring, inhabiting the places of potentiality it loves, and forms its consciousness by representing, imagining, and in this consciousness also projects itself, which then becomes a false I, an immanent I reduced to a node of relations.

The identity of an object is reduced to a node of relations. The I, instead, is the ultimate subject, the end of the universe that addresses it.

The transcendent I of the resurrected body can always be aware of its existence, can say «I perceive therefore I exist», but exists only in the present, can never say whether it is the same transcendent I as before. It can confirm that its immanent I, given by the set of relations that constitute its world, has remained the same as before, comparing the present with memories of the past, but the transcendent I is not a

datum, is not a content of memory or perception, but its subject. If perceiving, living, were impersonal, as is the physical body, then the confinement of living would not require an explanation, it would be random, or would have an answer in the history of the body, but living is subjective and requires a real I, with its own identity irreducible to being. The identity of a transcendent I, irreducible to being, cannot be attributed to chance.

The perception of an identity of the I irreducible to being, the “first-personal argument” against physicalism[60], is the foundation on which the question is posed, better known as the vertiginous or abysmal problem [56] [57] [59]:

1. “why I am me and not someone else”.

Identity makes sense only in relation to others. In the absence of another, the I would be an absolute. The question can admit only two solutions: either there is a single I, or each transcendent I has its own identity because called into existence personally, by name, by a Special I.

But what sense would intention, whose ground is charity, have if the other did not exist? Charity, which has no laws, is the only way, the true way, to escape the prison of the ego to meet the other. Without freedom and the other, charity is not possible. The structure of intention is charity, which is an invention, always new, which is meeting the other in its particular context, putting oneself in its shoes, meeting and merging with the other, or one of its thousand impairments and mystifications.

The transcendent I is not being but, called into existence, its essence is existence itself. Its identity is transcendent, unknown to the I itself, it derives from being called by name by the Special I.

#### **4.15 The Special I: A Comparison with German Idealism**

German idealism of Fichte, Schelling, and Hegel, which is rooted in and continues the Neoplatonic tradition (Plato, ... Plotinus) and the subsequent rationalist tradition (Spinoza, Leibniz, Vico, Berkeley, ...), was born to overcome the aporias of Kant’s noumenon, eliminating the dualism between phenomenon and noumenon through the original and immediate unity of both subject and object with the position of the absolute I, an active and creative principle that posits itself and, in its action, also posits the non-I (the external world) as a limit to be overcome. The I of the idealists is being. The other, therefore, is in any case an emanation of the I, the absolute I cannot leave itself.

Intention, on the contrary, imposes the abyss between the I and the other. It is the relationship between two I’s irreducible to unity, and this because the I is not being. If the I is not being, the Special I is not a whole, is not made of parts, cannot contain the other within itself, cannot emanate it from itself, can only call it, connect it through being thanks to intention. The existential condition of the I is that of being in relation with the Special I and therefore with all other I’s.

Every I exists through a body in its world which is part of the whole world. The whole made of parts is a relationship of being, not of the I who transcends being. God is not the whole of I’s, but the Other. The unknowable.

#### 4.16 The Dominant I: A Comparison with Leibniz's Monadology

Intention can be compared, in some respects, to Leibniz's monadology. The fundamental difference is that Leibniz's universe is all in act, having confined potentiality to the mind of God alone. Without potentiality, quantum is not possible, and consequently, to avoid falling into the antinomies of infinite divisibility in act, only the monad remains in act, without parts, extension, figure, or divisibility, yet endowed with quality and identity (i.e., qualia, consciousness, I). It follows that monadology takes place in a metaphysical space, where all bodies, divine machines, natural automata, are composed solely of monads, headed by a dominant monad that represents the soul and which, unlike the simple monad, which only has perceptions (mirrors) «*Creatures as living mirrors of the universe*» (§§ 56-65)[15], is also endowed with perceptions and appetitions and consciousness but, since it lacks potentiality, is not free, but subject to the pre-established Universal Harmony that realizes «*Thus the actual existence of the best [of possible worlds] that wisdom makes known to God is due to this, that His goodness makes Him choose it, and His power makes Him produce it.*» (§§ 47-55)[15].

Potentiality, which in Monadology is relegated entirely to the mind of God, in intention is the substance of the soul of each individual who is thus free.

Even in intention there is a personal soul with a role analogous to that of the dominant soul of Monadology, but of a completely different nature. The personal soul, in fact, is not a special monad among the monads of the body, but the holistic potentiality of the entire body, potentiality inhabited by an I beyond being who is therefore free and before God.

#### 4.17 Metaphysical Desire and Ethics

The I is the metaphysical desire that inhabits the potentiality of being. I desire the Other, but I do not know it nor will I ever know it. This Other, unknowable, is God.

Consciousness is the act, the soul is the potentiality of intention with the Special I. The I shares consciousness and soul with God, unknowable, whom it metaphysically desires.

The beautiful, the just, the good, courage, magnanimity, etc., arise from emotions or states of mind and therefore reside in being, are localizable in the body. These emotions, as well as those vital for the survival of the individual and the species, have a neurobiological basis, arise from cerebral processes and evolutionary, cognitive, and social mechanisms aimed at increasing social cohesion and the probability of survival of the group that various historical and sociocultural contexts have expanded and shaped.

This is true for the consciousness of the species to which the individual belongs, and for the consciousness of the individual itself as a body belonging to the species, but not for the I.

There is a fundamental ethics, an ethics of the I, which is not founded on being, on nature, but on intention toward the other I. For Lévinas, rightly, ethics is the first philosophy, comes before ontology, knowledge, everything. Ethics is not a cultural construction or a social convention, but a fundamental reality: it is given in the

encounter with the Other, it manifests in the face of the Other: the face “speaks” and says “do not kill”. This obligation does not depend on laws, societies, or religions: it is objective and absolute, rooted in the interpersonal relationship.

This ethics has no laws, just as charity has no laws.

The I exists in the metaphysical desire that inhabits the potentiality of being.

Ethics and aesthetics, in themselves, reveal the I beyond being in the freedom of intention.

## 5 Fundamental Intention

The fundamental intention of the I, the one that involves the I as such, is that of life. It begins and ends with a decision and takes place entirely in the darkness of the soul, where the I dwells. It begins by responding to the call of the Special I, with the acceptance of being and therefore the gift of life. The Special I calls the I, whom it does not know, with hope. The I accepts life from the Special I, whom it does not see and does not know, with faith. The fundamental intention, as such, is blind, the I desires but does not see the Other and vice versa, but since the received body is reflective, phenomenal, its life takes place in the light of consciousness, in the phenomenal world. It can meet and recognize it in the phenomenon, in the guise of an entity, of a physical body. Life is the moment of choice, of waiting, of preparing the response given by the I to the act that ends the night. The response is another yes, the union without more time with the Special I, or a no, the return to the abyss of the I without existence.

## References

- [1] *Parmenides, On Nature (V century BD)*
- [2] *Plato, Parmenides (IV century BD)*
- [3] *Plato, Symposium (IV century BD)*
- [4] *Aristotle, Metaphysics (IV century BD)*
- [5] *Aristotle, Physics (IV century BD)*
- [6] *Aristotle, On the Soul (IV century BD)*
- [7] *Euclid, Elements, (IV century BD)*
- [8] *Plotinus: Enneads (250 AD)*
- [9] *Proclus: Elements of Theology (V century AD)*
- [10] *Giordano Bruno: La Cena de le Ceneri, 1584*
- [11] *Giordano Bruno: De la causa, principio et uno, 1584*
- [12] *Giordano Bruno: De l'infinito, universo e mondi, 1584*
- [13] *Isaac Newton, Philosophiae Naturalis Principia Mathematica, 1687*
- [14] *John Locke, An Essay Concerning Human Understanding, 1689*
- [15] *Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz, Monadology, 1714*

- [16] George Berkeley, *A Treatise Concerning the principles of human Knowledge*, 1710
- [17] David Hume, *A Treatise of Human Nature*, 1739
- [18] Kant, I. (2009). *Critique of Pure Reason*. Indianapolis/Cambridge: Hackett Publishing Company, Inc.
- [19] *G.W.F. Hegel, Logic (1830)*
- [20] *Sören Kierkegaard: The Sickness Unto Death (1848)*
- [21] Martin Heidegger: *The Principle of Reason*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1991.
- [22] Martin Heidegger, *Essere e tempo*, Longanesi & C., Milano, 1976
- [23] *Martin Heidegger: Conference of the Academy of Sciences at Heidelberg, July 26, 1958*
- [24] Martin Heidegger, *Kant e il problema della metafisica*, Laterza, Roma-Bari, 2015
- [25] Heidegger, M. (1965). *Kant and the Problem of Metaphysics*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- [26] Heidegger, M. (1957, 6a ed. 1978). *Identity and Difference*. Pfullingen: Verlag Günther Neske.
- [27] *Jean-Paul Sartre: Existentialism Is a Humanism, Lecture given in 1946*
- [28] *Husserl: L'idea della fenomenologia, Mondatori 1995*
- [29] Schrodinger, E. (1984). "The Mystic Vision" as translated in *Quantum Questions: Mystical Writings of the World's Great Physicists*. Ken Wilber.
- [30] Emmanuel Levinas: *Dall'esistenza all'esistente (1947)*, a cura di F.SOSSI, con una premessa di P.A.ROVATTI, Marietti, Genova 1986.
- [31] Emmanuel Levinas: *Le Temps et l'Autre(1947)*, Quadrige/Presses Universitaires de France, Paris 1985.
- [32] Emmanuel Levinas: *La traccia dell'altro*. Scorciatoie [traduzione italiana degli ultimi quattro saggi di *En découvrant l'existence avec Husserl et Heidegger (1949)*], a cura di F.CIARAMELLI, con una presentazione di H.KÜNKLER, Libreria Pironti, Napoli 1985.
- [33] Levinas, E. (1967). *En decouvrant l'existence avec Hussert et Heidegger*. Paris: Vrin.
- [34] Levinas, E. (1969). *Totality and Infinity*. Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press.
- [35] Emmanuel Levinas: *Totalità e infinito*. Saggio sull'esteriorità(1961), a cura di A.DELL'ASTA, con introduzione di S.PETROSINO, Jaca Book, Milano 1980.
- [36] Emmanuel Levinas: *Difficile libertà*. Saggi sul giudaismo. Saggi scelti(1963), a cura di G.PENATI, La Scuola, Brescia 1986.
- [37] Emmanuel Levinas: *Quattro letture talmudiche(1968)*, a cura di A.MOSCATO, Il Melangolo, Genova 1982.
- [38] Emmanuel Levinas: *Altrimenti che essere o al di là dell'essenza(1974)*, a cura di S.PETROSINO e M.T.AIELLO, con introduzione di S.PETROSINO, Jaca Book, Milano 1983.
- [39] Emmanuel Levinas: *Nomi propri(1976)*, a cura di F.P.CIGLIA, Marietti, Casale Monferrato 1984.

- [40] Emmanuel Levinas: *Di Dio che viene all'idea*(1982), a cura di S.PETROSINO, Jaca Book, Milano 1983.
- [41] Emmanuel Levinas: *Etica e Infinito. Dialoghi con Philippe Nemo*(1982), a cura di F.RIVA, Città Aperta, Troina 2008.
- [42] Emmanuel Levinas: *Fuori dal soggetto. Buber, de Waelhens, Jankélévitch, Liris, Marcel, Merleau-Ponty, Rosenzweig, Wahl*(1987), a cura di F.P.CIGLIA, Marietti, Genova 1992.
- [43] Emmanuel Levinas: *Tra noi. Saggi sul pensare all'altro*(1991), a cura di E.BACCARINI, Jaca Book, Milano 1998.
- [44] Emmanuel Levinas: *Alterità e trascendenza* (1995), a cura di P.HAYAT, Il Melangolo, Genova 2006.
- [45] Emmanuel Levinas: *Quaderni di prigionia e altri inediti* (2009), a cura di S.FACIONI, con prefazione di J.MARION, Bompiani, Milano 2011.
- [46] E. Levinas, *Libertà e comandamento*, Schibboleth, Roma 2014
- [47] H. Arendt, *Socrate*, Raffaello Cortina, Milano 2015.
- [48] Martin Buber: *Il problema dell'uomo*(1947), a cura di I.KAJON, traduzione di F.S.PIGNAGNOLI, Marietti, Genova 2004.
- [49] Martin Buber: *L'eclissi di Dio. Considerazioni sul rapporto tra religione e filosofia*(1953), traduzione di U.SCHNABEL, Comunità, Milano 1961.
- [50] Martin Buber: *Il principio dialogico e altri saggi*(1962), a cura di A.POMA, traduzione di A.M.PASTORE, San Paolo, Cinisello Balsamo 1993.
- [51] Martin Buber: *Incontro. Frammenti autobiografici*(1986), a cura di D.BIDUSSA, traduzione di A.FRANCESCHINI, Città Nuova, Roma 1998.
- [52] Vincenzo De Risi: *Geometry and Monadology. Leibniz's Analysis Situs and Philosophy of Space*, Basel/Boston, Birkhäuser 2007.
- [53] Vincenzo De Risi: *Plotino e la Rivoluzione Scientifica. La presenza delle Enneadi nell'epistemologia leibniziana dello spazio fenomenico*, in *Il Platonismo e le Scienze*, eds. R. Chiaradonna and M. De Caro, Roma, Carocci, 2012, pp. 143- 163.
- [54] Daniel Dennett, "The Self as a Center of Narrative Gravity" (1986)
- [55] Hellie, Benj (2013). "Against egalitarianism". *Analysis*. 73 (2): 304–320. doi:10.1093/analys/ans101.
- [56] Hellie, Benj (2013). "[AgainstEgalitarianism](#)". *Analysis*. 73 (2): 304–320. doi:10.1093/analys/ans101.
- [57] Roberts, Tim S. (September 2007). "[TheEvenHarderProblemofConsciousnessbyRoberts.TimS.](#)" *NeuroQuantology*. 5 (2): 214–221. doi:10.14704/nq.2007.5.2.129.
- [58] Watanabe, Tsuneo (1 June 2009), "[FromSpiegelberg's'I-am-me'experiencetothetotalisticexperience](#)", IHSRC 2009 (The 28th International Human Science Research Conference), Molde, Norway, retrieved 2 February 2025

- [59] Watanabe, Tsuneo, "Enigmaoftheprivateselfandstudiesofthe"I-am-meexperience": Towardsaphenomenologicalapproachtothedevlopmentofthesubjectiveself", ISTP (International Society for Theoretical Psychology) 2017 Conference (Tokyo, Japan)
- [60] List, Christian (2023). "[Thefirst-personalargumentagainstphysicalism](#)". Retrieved 3 September 2024.
- [61] *Peluso V. 13 jan 2019 Intention Physics* [viXra:1811.0391](#)
- [62] *Peluso V. 2021-02-12 Intention not Theory: the Vertigo of Love* [viXra:2003.0606](#)
- [63] *Peluso V. 2021-04-16 The Geometry of the Discrete Act* [viXra:2104.0097](#)
- [64] *Peluso V. 2022-04-30 The Cosmology of the Instant Reconstruction of the Path of Light* [viXra:2204.0175](#)
- [65] *Peluso V. (2022) The Promised Science* [viXra:2208.0071](#)
- [66] *Peluso V. (2022) Individual, Time and Space* [viXra:2209.0042](#)
- [67] *Peluso V. 08 Mar, 2023 Cosmology in the Linear PseudoPlane of the Act* [rs-2657670/v1](#)
- [68] *Peluso V. 10 Aug, 2025 The IRPL model of Nature: a Theory of Everything* [viXra:2507.0201](#)