

(Excerpt from The New, True Infinity c 2008 Peter Francis Dziuban)

### **Infinity is a synonym for *being***

A new definition for infinity as *absolutely measureless* may be semantically or technically correct—but is it really important? Science, for example, deals entirely in numbers and measurement—of matter, time and space.

So of what value is a new infinity that has nothing to do with measurable matter, time or space? The new infinity's value is that it is all that is truly *present*.

More importantly, *only infinity is present*.

The world of finity, of measurable matter, time and space, *never is present*.

Recall the point made earlier—that infinity not only has no physical size or length—infinity has no length in time. The implications of this are fascinating, the more one sees what it means.

Again, infinity does not mean forever in time, or unaffected by time—but is the utter absence of time. Infinity is the *preclusion* of time, and any time-processes, because any amount of time would be measurable. The fact that infinity is the absence of time, or is *time-less*, makes infinity synonymous with *being*, or *the present*.

You can conduct your own thought-experiment of sorts as you think this through. Infinity is identical to *being* because just as infinity has no time measurement, neither does being.

Being means *having existence*, or *present*. Being means *is*.

In the definition of *being*, or *the present*, or *is*, there is absolutely no provision for any passage of time. None. Being, which is a state of pure *is*, doesn't involve so much as a microsecond of *was* or *will be*. The word *was* means no-longer-being, and *will be* means not-yet-being—neither of which even remotely resembles being.

*Being* is strictly present tense only—wherein time doesn't occur.

Being is the *absence* of time, exactly as infinity is the absence of time.

One also notices that, just as being never is time—time never is being.

On the level of the observing human mind, it seems as if time never quits passing, flowing, moving on. Physics tells us that time functions relative to the one that is observing time. More recent developments indicate that time may not even *flow* (at that point, it might be better to use the term *being* than “time”). Regardless, in the everyday world, that which the human mind experiences as “time,” by its very definition, is not the present. Time never seems to stop moving or passing to *be*, to *be what is*, to *be present*. Time is inseparable from a past, what-is-not-present-anymore—and a future, what-is-not-present-yet. Time, and everything that appears to occur in its flow, is literally *what-is-not-present*.

The point is this: as time itself never is present, all phenomena that supposedly occur and are observed in time, equally *never are present*.

It would appear that every last particle of the observable stellar universe, even at its smallest quantum level, seems to function and have its basis in never-present time. Even at the level of energy, every bit of the universe appears to be vibrating, moving; it never stops passing on in time, or *not-being*, to genuinely be. It means the entire universe never is *present*. What's more, it takes time to observe the universe. The entire functioning of the very human thinking, sensing mind that claims to observe that universe equally has its basis only in never-present time. The entire activity of the mind equally

*never is present.*

Only *being* is present.

A doubting thought may come, “Don’t tell me the things that my mind senses in the universe aren’t present or aren’t being. I sense this page right now. I sense the planet earth right now. I see it now, and I even could reach down and touch it now—so don’t tell me the page, the earth, and all those sensations aren’t genuinely *present*.”

Look closer. For *anything* in your entire universe, the moment you sense it by way of a visual image, a tactile feeling, or any other sensation—what’s really happening? Those particular sensations are constantly shifting, changing and *passing on*, never to return again. It seems each sensation is instantly replaced by another new visual or tactile sensation, and another, and another, non-stop.

They’re like the moving frames of film in a movie projector. The specific image and sense of touch that you had of this page a few seconds ago are gone, already having been replaced by the fleeting image and touch being experienced at *this* moment in passing time, and on and on. This applies to everything that is sensed in the universe—including the entire universe itself. None of it ever stops moving on, or not-being, to *be*. In its essence, it all would be a state of vibration, always moving or passing on in time. All of it always is fleeting, passing away, and *not being*—or being “not.” Shocking as it may sound, the entirety of the “universe” would be just so much *non-presence*!

Again, only being is truly present.

## **Being does not co-exist with time**

Interestingly, if one starts out with the typical human presumption that there is time, one assumes there are *both* time and being. In contrast, when one starts from the premise of *being*, one can see that *there are not both being and time*!

From the standpoint of being, being does *not* co-exist with time, non-being.

There is *only* being. Why?

There is absolutely no point at which being can be said to stop being, and where another state, one of time or not-being starts. Think it through—how could not-being *start*? It’s a contradiction in terms. Not-being *can’t* start or get its foot in the door because it’s *not being*. It literally doesn’t exist; it can’t occur. Only being can be—and it is *alone* in its presence.

This is clear only when starting from the premise of being, and not time—something that time-based human thinking never does. And shouldn’t one start from the premise of being and not time—*since only being is being, is present, to be a valid premise?*

The Newtonian view of time, which was accepted for centuries, was that time moved at a fixed, absolute rate. This later was refuted by Einstein, who demonstrated that time doesn’t move at a fixed rate, but seems to move at a speed that is relative to the speed of the one who is observing time.

From the premise of being, one now can see that time is *not* relative. Time takes on an “absolute,” status again, but in a new way. From the standpoint of being, time is absolute in that it *absolutely never is present*. From the premise of being, (and, again, only being is present to be a valid premise) time isn’t relative to anything because in being, time never occurs! Being’s changeless presence precludes “the arrow of time.”

Another inevitable conclusion this leads to is that, just as infinity has no

measurable size, *being has no size*. Just as infinity has no spatial measurement, neither does being.

There is absolutely no space or dimension in being, in the present. Being, the present, is *not* present at all points in physical space. Being does not “fill” or occupy space. Why?

If there *were* space in being, it would be possible to move from point A here, to point B, over there. But movement would involve time—of which there is none in being. The instant one has movement in time, one has left *being*. To speak of movement in space, thus time, is to speak of what-is-not-being, instead of what-is-being.

Being, the present, is the absence of time, which also is the absence of measurable space or dimension. In other words, being is present as infinity.

This new, true infinity forces us to redefine what is called “the present”—which is typically assumed to mean “everywhere present” or being present at all points in space, all points of dimension. The *infinity* that the present, pure being, is, involves no space, no dimension. Most emphatically, this infinite-present, pure being, is not the same as “presentism.” Presentism is described by some philosophers as meaning a sliver of time, a momentary or fleeting “now-instant,” in time’s flow from past to future. The infinite-present is not sandwiched between past and future time. As only the infinite-present, pure being, is what is being, and is the absence of time, then it does not permit or co-exist with any time. Thus the infinite-present is not between past and future, but is the utter *preclusion* of past and future, all time.

*That which is truly present*—being, infinity—involves no time, no space, no matter. As being is timeless, spaceless, quantity-less—then being, like infinity, is irreducible. So, *being* makes clear that the last, truly irreducible “something” we’ve been seeking isn’t a quantum particle, string, or other form, but is being, itself.

The fact that infinity, being, is measureless and timeless, of course means it is unobservable and un-test-able—and therefore unacceptable in scientific experimentation. But infinity undeniably indicates an *ever-present* state, vastly different from *never-present* time and finity. The infinity of being is clean and simple—an eternal absolute standing present outside of time, cause and effect. Infinite being never wavers or varies, never is random—rather than a finite state of incessant change and variability in which everything is relative to everything else.

### **Infinity and being are synonyms for *reality***

The infinity of being also puts new light on what could be called *reality*.

The un-finite nature of being cannot be dismissed or ignored when it comes to discerning reality. Ever-elusive as *being* seems, science should not leave it completely out of consideration just because being isn’t observable or measurable, and has no form. Where is it written that reality must have a finite form?

If one ignores being—in fact, if *that which truly is being* is not one’s starting point or premise—it can only mean one is dealing with *that which is not being*. To deal with that which is not being (that which is time-based), would be dealing with that which never is truly present.

If something never is present (all time-based, finite phenomena) and has no real, changeless being—how could it honestly have any connection to reality? That which has *no true presence, no present-ness*, could not be reality.

To *be* reality, reality at least has to *be*.

Not to belabor the point, but if something isn't specifically present, if it isn't *really being*, then it certainly isn't *being real*. Whatever the "ultimate reality" of life or existence is, does it not have to truly exist and *be present*?

There's a definite reason why *being* up until now has had no significance to the human mind in its conduct of science. It is because science is all about proving, and there is nothing observable, measurable, or provable about being's measureless infinity. *Being has no provable finite form*. Meanwhile, the thinking, sensing human mind is entirely finite, and deals *only* in finite form. So to the sensing mind, in which everything has a form, being's absence of form makes being "invisible" to the mind. To the sensing mind, it seems formless being is "nothing" or non-existent—thus scientifically useless.

Now put the shoe on the other foot. Exactly what is the credibility of the very thinking, sensing mind itself that declares being to be useless? That very mind itself senses, thinks, and functions only in time, only in *non-being*—thus it would be the mind's entire activity that *never is present*. How can a thinking, sensing mind whose activity *never really is*, legitimately set itself up as the judge of *what really is*?

As all mind activity *never is present*, where does that leave *you*? It would seem there is more to you than just finite sensing and thinking that occur in time. Apparently, *being* must have something to do with you—as evidenced by the fact that this truth of *being* can ring true to you right here, now, as you read these pages. The only one *present* to whom being can ring true is being itself—so being must in some way be you.

Time certainly can't know there is being. If you were nothing but the constant movement of a sensing, thinking mind in time's never-present flow—nothing but a time stream—you would have no awareness, no reference point for *being*, and this would be unintelligible to you. It is only against the backdrop of being, or an unchanging presence, that all time-phenomena can be seen as *non-presence*.

It is thanks entirely to *being* that one is not limited to the level of time and form that appear to the sensing human mind. The fact that being is infinite, present outside of time and form, doesn't "wipe you out." It indicates there is something about you that is truly eternal, immortal. Suddenly, the thinking, sensing mind isn't the only game in town.

It is not possible to take up the discussion in this brief article—but the difference between being and the mind is the same as the difference between infinity and the mind. All mind-activity and mental phenomena of thinking, sensations, emotions, would be finite. All time-activity of the mind would be a constantly *changing process*. The infinity of being is a *changeless presence*.

Every experience of the sensing mind—all of its sensations, all its measurements, even all its thoughts and conclusions—all occur in time and are *finite*. As all mind activity is finite, it is in some way potentially quantifiable; thus all mind activity is potentially reducible to *data*. If you were limited to only the level of the mind, *then you, too, would be part of the data itself!* How can data discern anything about other data? Data doesn't know anything.

To say pure infinite being is timeless and *preclusive of all finity*—seems especially paradoxical. After all, it requires finite time and finite words to even say there is no time, no finity. It takes time even to come to a realization that there is no time. So how is all this Absoluteness of infinity, being, "being known" if there is no time, no

finitude? The answer lies in where one identifies—with the thoughts and sensations of the would-be time-mind, or infinite being, sometimes also referred to as pure Awareness. Does one identify merely with the would-be thoughts, sensations and other forms one seems to be *aware of*; or does one identify as pure Awareness Itself, which is formless? From the standpoint of pure Awareness as It is *being*, it doesn't take any time for Awareness to be Self-aware.

One might also ask: "How is it possible to say with certainty that being is reality? An 'ultimate reality' is one of the things science and philosophy are still seeking. We won't know what reality is until we've found it."

To say we have not yet found, or do not yet know what reality is, actually is saying something else. It's saying we haven't been able to give reality a *form*.

We have not been able to observe, measure, or otherwise point to reality as if reality were something finite, a last irreducible particle, or even a mathematical theory. We have not been able to say, "Aha, *there* reality is." Whether one expects "ultimate reality" should have an incredibly small subatomic form, a mathematical form, or even a mental, theoretical form—to say reality has not yet been found, is saying no form has been found.

Is it too radical to ask, "What if reality has no form?"

That certainly would explain why reality hasn't yet been found in some form.

There is no such form to be found!

The more you pursue that seemingly strange thought, the less strange it sounds. While some may claim we are not yet able to say *what* reality is, it can be said with certainty *that* reality is.

Again, by definition, in order to be reality, reality has to really be. So it can be said with certainty that reality must be that which is being. It simply is not consistent or intelligent to say that what-isn't-being, or what is not truly present, is reality.

The fact that reality must be *being*—means being itself is literally what reality is. Only being itself can be that which is being. That means the nature of being is equally the nature of reality, for they are the same. So, to discern what is true of being, is to discern what is true of reality, since they are the same.

The fact that being has no measurable form, means reality has no form. Being, thus reality, is the absence of time—and this shows in another way why reality has no form. In timeless reality, no time passes in which anything could be formed! No time passes in which any form could be discovered—or have been considered un-discovered!

The fact that being, reality, is formless means just that—*completely* without form—so being cannot be given even a mental form; one cannot form an idea or concept about it. Do not feel frustrated because you cannot mentally grasp or conceptualize being. You're not supposed to. Yet being remains changelessly present.

One implication of Godel's famous incompleteness theorem is that it is possible for something to be un-provable, yet true—and that points directly at the new, true infinity. Infinity, being, can't be proven mathematically or by data, for true infinity exists outside of numbers, formulas and data. Infinity also exists outside of time. Yet un-provable infinity, being, is *what truly is*, or what is true. If being were not true, it would not truly be—there would be no such thing as being—but there is. One simply cannot get around this, for if one attempts to say there is no being, one first has to *be* in order to even say that.