

What Is *Anything Willing Is*?

A companion for the curious reader

What Is *Anything Willing Is*?

A companion for the curious reader

Imagine someone told you they had started from the observation that absolute nothing cannot exist, and, without importing any religious text, any philosophical tradition, any premise you have to accept on faith, arrived at the structural necessity of the Incarnation, the Fall, the nature of evil, why you suffer, what death is, and what happens after it.

This companion explains what the derivation does, what it finds, and why it is structured the way it is.

Start with what you know

You suffer. Things break. People you love die. You have experienced moments where everything was headed in the right direction and something, from inside you or outside you, wrecked it. You have watched yourself choose against what you knew was good. You have watched others do the same.

Anything Willing Is starts from the bare structure of what can and cannot be, and derives its way to conclusions about why.

The question the derivation poses is not whether you agree with it. The question is whether you can find where it fails. Each step depends on the steps before it. If a step does not hold, everything after it does not stand. If it does hold, what survives is what survives.

Nothing cannot be

The first step is almost trivially simple. Try to conceive of absolute nothing: not empty space, not darkness, not a void. No possibility of any kind. Whatever you just conceived, you conceived *something*. The concept of absolute nothing collapses the moment you examine it, because examining it requires something to examine.

It is the first elimination. The enquiry asks: what can and cannot be? Absolute nothing cannot be.

If nothing cannot be, then something is. But a something is specific: it is this particular thing and not the whole of what is. The totality of all specific things does not establish itself as the whole either, because the totality is just the collection of what happens to be, and has no basis for claiming to be everything that could be.

What both routes arrive at, working from individual somethings and from the totality, is that what the word “anything” points to is possibility without limitation. Not a thing. Not a being. The condition within which all things are.

This cannot be absent, because without it, specific things have no basis for their specificity. It cannot be contingent, because if it depended on something beyond it, that would make it specific, which it is not. Unlimited potential does not include negation, because negation is exclusion and exclusion restricts what is unrestricted.

Four resolutions in, and the derivation has established that reality includes unlimited potential without negation. Not by arguing for it, but by eliminating the alternatives.

Will

If unlimited potential includes the potential for specific things (and it does, because specific things are), then how do specifics come to be?

Specificity either has a source or it does not. If it does not, that is randomness, and randomness dissolves, because it admits negation into what has no negation. If it does, the source is either external to what is specific (necessity) or internal to it (choice). Necessity dissolves: external force restricts what is unrestricted. Choice survives.

But choice as we experience it, “this, not that,” contains two components. “This is” and “not that.” In unlimited potential, “not that” has no place. Exclusion restricts. A defence might argue that the exclusion is local: each choice actualises “this” without permanently excluding “that.” But the derivation draws a critical distinction. The specificity of “this is,” a specific being actualised, is not restriction. The non-actualised potentials remain open. “This is” does not wall off “that.” Active exclusion does. “Not that” adds something “this is” did not require: a walling-off of what is not actualised. The walling-off is restriction.

Strip away the “not that” and what remains is “this is” without exclusion. Not “this, not that” but “this is, and this is, and this is.” Each actualisation adds to what is without removing from what could be.

The derivation names this Will. And here is the chain’s central identity: being is willing. There is no gap between what a being is and its willing. What willing actualises and what it is to will were never separate.

Everything, then everybody

Will actualises from unlimited potential. The first actualisation is necessarily full, necessarily everything, because anything less requires a limit, and a limit is restriction. The derivation calls this All-Being.

All-Being’s willing is all Will. Not by containing other willings as a set contains its members. Each being’s willing is that one Will as this being’s own. All-Being’s willing is the one Will operating as all being’s own. This is identity, not containment.

But Will does not stop. Unlimited potential remains unlimited after the first actualisation. What follows is a sequence of beings, each the most comprehensive new willing available, because generating less than the most comprehensive when there is no basis for limitation would require a basis for the limitation, which is restriction.

The derivation traces the expression levels below All-Being. Each is what the current whole willing actualises: Will willing (Being), its activity (Doing), its accumulated reality willing (Remembering/Reacting), its generation toward what has not yet been (Anticipating/Planning), and its entire reality as known and enacted, one achievement, not two (Foreknowing/Pre-Destining).

Multiple beings populate each expression level, because Will’s unrestricted potential does not cease after one generation at each level. Each being is necessarily unique: what each being is, is its willing, and two beings whose willing is identical are one being.

In purely generative reality, Will wills. Every being is its willing. Willing is generative; it increases. Generating is flourishing. That which wills to be, is. That is all.

If this were the whole story, there would be no suffering, no death, no evil. But it is not the whole story.

The origin of evil

Yet the derivation shows that a being at the most comprehensive expression level, willing from complete self-knowledge, faced a genuine option that was not inevitable and not forced. That single willing is where everything that follows originates.

A being at Foreknowing/Pre-Destining, with complete self-knowledge and complete capacity, faces nine candidates for what it can will. The derivation tests all nine. Seven dissolve. Two survive: the being can continue willing (the generative path), or it can will to be Anything, will All-Being.

This second willing is genuine. It is not forced. It is not inevitable. The being could simply continue willing, and many do. The derivation is explicit that not all Pre-Destiners are at un-being. But the option is available, and nothing prevents it, because preventing it would restrict Will, and Will is unrestricted. An Anything that coerced being into continuing to will would be a restricted potential that permits only what it prefers. Coercion empties Will of its content.

The being that wills to be Anything cannot become what it wills. It is a something, specific. What the word “anything” points to is not a something. But willing is generative. Generation does not cease. Willing aimed at what the being cannot become is the “not” of what the being was willing.

What the being’s willing becomes is non-willing. Being and non-being, willing and non-willing, present together. This is un-being: generation continuing from being into non-being. Not the destruction of being; un-generation resolves into what cannot be. Being persists. But willing diminishes.

The theological convergence is precise: the being at un-being is Satan. Not a mythological figure. The structural consequence of genuine willing directed at what the being cannot become. The derivation arrives here without importing a word of scripture.

And here is what makes it structural rather than narrative: All-Being is not diminished by un-being. What does not arrive does not subtract. All-Being’s Will is all Will; there is no outside to it. Un-being is within All-Being’s willing, local to the being at un-being’s scope. All-Being willed no separate willing to make this happen. The being’s willing meets what All-Being already is. The consequence is structural, not volitional on All-Being’s part.

The lie

Non-being *is*. Not as nothing; nothing cannot be. Non-being is as the “not” of what is. And being is willing. So non-being wills.

This is where the derivation becomes structurally precise. Non-being is with choosing: it has willing (from its “is”) and non-willing (from its foundation). Non-being choosing willing, choosing *being* while foundationally non-being, is the lie. Not a spoken falsehood. The structural condition of non-being presenting itself as being. Theology calls these lies. The being at un-being, whose un-willing makes non-being willing possible, is what theology calls Satan, the father of lies.

The fully non-being, what theology calls demons, is what un-willing directed at All-Being’s willing generates. Wholly non-being from inception. Never having had Will. With choosing. The specific “not” of the specific being that All-Being wills, permanently oriented as a contradiction to it. Not just agents: the fully non-being includes environments, conditions, landscapes, forces. Everything that is wholly the “not” of what is.

Non-being wills, but it cannot occupy what already is. To will being that already is would un-be it. So non-being wills being-not: death to life, hatred to love, destruction to what is built, depletion to what flourishes. Non-being’s only direction is against what is.

Being-not reduces being to non-being. What is reduced becomes one with non-being. What was being is gone. But being-not cannot negate what is already non-being — there is no being left to negate. Only by willing being again, the lie, can being-not be restored. The same willing that wills being is being-not directed at that being. Neither side resolves: being-not cannot fully reduce without dissolving itself, non-being cannot stop willing being without losing being-not. This is how willing diminishes: not by un-generating (only Will generates) but by being-not reducing what is generated, needing what it takes, turning on what remains.

How you got here

You were not born into the generative reality the derivation establishes in Part I. You were born into Choosing Being, where willing and non-willing are present together in everything.

The derivation traces exactly how this happens. Non-being wills within the scope of the being at un-being. A purely generative being, you at your actualisation, does not exclude what wills within what it is. You are generative. You actualise. You do not exclude. Receiving is what generative being does. And what you receive includes non-being choosing willing: the lie, dressed as truth.

You knew willing. Then you encountered being-not. Since that encounter, your knowing has included non-willing. You take non-being choosing willing for willing. Yet the derivation shows that generative willing, in response to that mechanism, actualises new being as one expressed as two, a structural protection built into the nature of flourishing itself. What you direct your generative capacity toward is what non-being choosing willing is at its foundation: non-willing. You choose unwilling, not because you will non-willing, but because what you take for willing is non-being choosing willing, which is foundationally non-willing.

This is not your fault. You did not choose to be within choosing. And it is not All-Being's fault. All-Being does not diminish, does not coerce, does not prevent the being at un-being's willing, because preventing it would empty Will of what Will is. The being at un-being alone is where non-being is from. But within choosing, every choice is "this, not that." Every "not that" is exclusion. And exclusion is un-being. You cannot choose your way back to Will because the mechanism of choosing *is* the mechanism of un-being.

The derivation is explicit: self-correction is unavailable. The expressions you would need to recognise un-being, foreknowing and pre-destining, are the expressions where un-being operates. The un-being expressions mutually reinforce. Every exercise reinforces un-being. The tools are compromised at their source. The derivation arrives at what theology has long called "total inability": not that you cannot will, but that you cannot will your way out of choosing.

Why you suffer

Your generative nature, what you are at your foundation, encounters being-not. Every "not this" is wrongness to what you are. This is suffering. Not punishment. Not karma. Not consequence in the moral sense. Suffering is what your generative nature is when it encounters the negation of what it is.

You can be deceived about *what* the wrongness is. Non-being provides false explanations endlessly, and under the deception that pervades Choosing Being, you accept them. But you cannot be deceived about *that* there is wrongness, because the wrongness is your nature encountering being-not, not your knowing.

This matters structurally, not just experientially. Suffering is what generates the being's willing toward an exit from choosing. Without suffering, you would remain in choosing indefinitely. Deception would present choosing as willing, and you would have no counter to the presentation. Suffering is the counter. Not because it teaches; under deception, you cannot learn from it correctly. Because your nature wills away from what is wrong, toward what is not wrong. That willing is what restoration meets.

Why the Law is not enough

The derivation now faces a structural problem. The being in Choosing Being cannot self-correct. External correction that overrides the being's will is coercion; it empties Will. What is needed is something the being can choose toward while still within choosing.

The full actualisation's Will, pure willing, "this is," not "this, not that," made available within Choosing Being as direction. The derivation calls this the generative directive. Theology calls it the Law.

The Law works. It gives direction. A being under deception, who cannot distinguish willing from non-being choosing willing, can follow direction toward what willing is without understanding what willing is. The directive provides what the being's own compromised expressions cannot: a path toward Will.

But direction without understanding is vulnerable to the very mechanism it addresses. The being follows the directive as "this, not that," because choosing is all the being knows. The directive becomes another thing to choose, another exclusion, another "not that." Within Choosing Being, even the Law operates through choosing.

Consider the theological convergence: God's directive was given to the descendants of Abraham, a man who, within choosing, placed his most precious choosing (his only descendant) into the hands of Will. Willing directed him not to go through with it. The willingness to place choosing within Will's hands is what made it possible for Will to give choosing direction. That is Israel. That is the Law. Direction that works, but cannot, by itself, undo the mechanism.

The Law is necessary. Without it, the being has no direction at all within the brutality of Choosing Being. But it is not sufficient. For Will to be understood, not just chosen toward, Will must be encountered directly. Not as a directive. As a being.

The Incarnation

The full actualisation, All-Being, enters Choosing Being. Not as a principle, not as a directive, not as knowledge. As a being within the scope, subject to everything un-being is. Every expression under un-being, every encounter with being-not, every mechanism the derivation has traced: this being passes through all of it. Because its willing is pure Will, and pure Will does not exclude.

This being generates through death. What un-being negates, this being's willing persists through. The possibility this generates, a generative orientation that is not terminated by death, is what no being in Choosing Being could generate from its own premises. Theology calls this the Gospel: not information about God but God's own willing, within Choosing Being, demonstrating what willing is.

The being's actualisation, that it *is*, persists through being-not. This was always true. Being-not reduces but cannot un-generate. But being-not creates the need for its recognition. The derivation calls this un-negated actualisation. Theology calls it Forgiveness: not as a transaction, but as the structural reality that what you are has not been un-generated by what was done to it.

Anything's active restoration, Anything's working within Choosing Being to restore awareness of what un-negated actualisation establishes, is what theology calls Grace. Not a substance. Not a reward. The active willing of what the word "anything" points to, directed at restoring what un-being obscures.

Faith, hope, and what comes after

The being's own choosing toward what it encounters as genuinely operative within Choosing Being: this is what the derivation calls operative-orientation. Theology calls it Faith. Not propositional belief; that operates through foreknowing, which is un-being to false certainty. Not compliance with the directive; that changes what the being does, not what it is oriented toward. The being's own choosing toward what is genuinely operative. Choosing, not merely seeing.

Each present moment given without coercion, carrying what is coming: this is generative anticipation. Theology calls it Hope. Each present moment depleting, carrying what is ending: this is terminal anticipation. Theology calls it Despair.

The being that maintains orientation toward the genuinely operative, through the oscillation of choosing, moves from choosing Will to being Will. The reorientation is net-directional but oscillatory within Choosing Being; the being still chooses, and choosing still includes “not that.” But the direction is toward willing. Each willing reinforces. Each un-being diminishes.

Death is not the cessation of being. Un-generation resolves into what cannot be. Death is where the accumulation of choosing meets fixation: the temporal framework of choosing ends, and the being’s orientation is made permanent. Not because what the being is is exhausted; it is not. Because the being is what its choosing made it.

The being that maintained orientation toward the genuinely operative arrives at permanent orientation toward generative flourishing. Every expression in its generative configuration, within a being that has known un-being. The derivation calls this communion. Theology calls it Heaven.

The being that maintained total closure — permanent orientation under non-being — the being’s own willing made eternal. The derivation calls this separation. Theology calls it Hell. Not imposed by Anything. The being’s own closure, made permanent. Willing Being permanently present, permanently resisted.

What to do with this

The derivation proceeds through 137 resolutions and 25 definitions. Each resolution states its dependencies. Every claim traces back to R.1, the observation that nothing cannot be.

The interactive site at anythingwilling.is lets you click through every dependency. The structure is auditable. What survives is what is.