

λόος

“Mattheehew Markeehew Lukeehew Johnheehheehew.”

To My Daughter

Having 'lost' my daughter to **Unreason** (Fanaticism) (Extremism), I have opted to engage in the following dialectic.

What follows is only my feeble assessment of something that has affected my appraisal of myself as a parent, and as a reasonable and tolerant person. In this I perceive myself as intolerant; I am convinced I have few parenting skills. But while I write this I cannot condemn myself entirely. There seems little doubt in my mind, that if my daughter had approached me as did the daughter of Galileo, there would have been a different outcome. I do not assume to be like Galileo, nor is my daughter like Galileo's daughter. So the resultant outcome might never have had the possibility of becoming different.

I have treated other ramifications of this subject in a different vein under the title of GAWD. In that opus, I practice the invective of an intolerant individual. And I fight back from within my garret. This writing, on the other hand, tries to find a basis for understanding an almost irresolvable difficulty in language; where two individuals using the same language are unable to communicate with one another concerning ***The Logically Unknowable***.

To begin with some preliminaries, more or less thrown at you: **Reason** is the assumed attribute. **Reason** must persuade us of something in order to validate itself. No better test would exist for **Reason** than to elucidate ***Faith***; that is, explain something that cannot be expressed in language. I am reluctant to equate ***Logic*** with **Reason** even though they may involve a similar process of cogitation; the former, while generally imputed to mean 'correct reasoning' does hinge rather upon its close relative, **Logos**, which harbors a variety of meanings that tend to carry over into and affect the root meaning of ***Logic***. Both ***Logic*** and **Logos** are intimately linked and given 'reason-to-be' through The Word and the 'word'. **Logos**, in Greek, signifies 'a word'; in Greek Philosophy, λόος signifies **reason**, or the controlling principle of the universe, being manifested by speech. **Logos**, in Latin, signified a (mere) word. In Christian Theology **Logos** becomes **The Word** invested in the Flesh, or as Jesus.

In our search for the definitive, or for the absolute, in terms of origins or root meanings, we rely heavily upon printed texts, and the thoroughness of scholarship to either determine these facts for us or

interpret the meaning of existent records. It would seem that interpretation is unavoidable, whether or not conclusive evidence exists in the record. In addition, we do tend to view most beginnings as imbued with a kind of innocence, as children, as Adam and Eve; as forgiven, however unenlightening.

The inevitable permutations take their own course.

While still in its innocence, *λόος* was identified with a physical reality: 'The Ordered Whole'. During Hellenic Times, the Idea of *λόος* became transformed to incorporate other meanings involving ethics and theology, and became associated with the '**reasoning**' "power" in man. All the Old Boys, Heraclitus, Plato, and Aristotle, along with the Stoics, and Philo, had a hand in the reshaping of *λόος* and in creating new terms with which it eventually became confused, associated, synonymous, and redefined; finally, in deifying an idea, a principle, a symbol, and a word. Innocence has no safe haven in the harsher world of man; in man's desperate craving for absolutes, in man's will to perversion, driven by his obsessional compulsion to serve his own individual needs.

In the beginning *λόος* expressed an idea of an '**immanent reason**' in the world. In Hellenic times the world was perceived as an ordered whole, regarded as a product of reason (logos), and reason as the ruling principle in the world.

'The **Logos** is the light and the life, at once spiritual, and material, which combats both death and night. It is the antithesis of disorder and chaos, of evil and darkness. It is also cognate with the word and thought'.

Logos: word, speech, discourse, reason.

logos (us) -i m. *λόος*, a word: Pl.; esp. (1) plur., mere words: Pl., Ter. (2) a joke, jest, bon mot: Pl., Cic. L

Scratchings Upon The Sand:

*The Winds touched upon the Land,
The Beaches or Deserts of Sand,
The Grains, down the slope e'er cascading,
Of Tao, vision to discern, fast fading.*

He whose time had passed could not maintain against the zephyrs.
The belchings and fartings of old codgers cast down in the plight
of finitude, corrupting, corrupting, corrupting.

λόος: the bright star of the East, East of Here and East of There, and still farther East than All Together. Too far away, too distant, and too indistinct.

All the more encouragement to venture. One had stood before Helen to proclaim: "**Helen**, thou art immanent upon this land - thou art '**raison d'être**'. He that spake uttered in another tongue; his grunts, his syllables, runes, aspirates, fricatives, consonants diphthongs, glottal stops and vowels; his very aphasia, touched upon perceptions thus awakening in his dim consciousness: **Throat, Sound, Tongue, Speech, Word, Reason, Logos. Truth** captured, enslaved, corrupted and perverted. (Transformed, my love - **Logos** had proven unsatisfactory.)

Laotse, of old, (around 2500 B.D. [before Durchanek] had conveyed, in The Character of Tao:

The Tao that can be told of
Is not the Absolute Tao;
The names that can be given
Are not Absolute names.

The Nameless is the Origin of Heaven and Earth
The Named is the Mother of all things.

Therefore:
Oftentimes, one strips oneself of passion
In order to see the Secret of Life;
Oftentimes, one regards life with passion,
In order to see its manifest forms.

These two (the Secret and its manifestations)
Are (in their nature) the same;
They are given different names
When they become manifest.

They may be both called the Cosmic Mystery:
Reaching from the Mystery into the Deeper Mystery
Is the Gate to the Secret* of All Life.

* Miao or '**Essence**' imputed to mean '**the wonderful**', the '**ultimate**', the '**logically unknowable**', the '**quintessence**' or '**esoteric truth**'.

The perversion of *λόος* evolves as a convoluted story whereupon the **banana** was eventually transformed into the **pear**. In actuality, some eminent gentleman, probably Heraclitus, came upon a deformed fruit resembling nothing he had ever seen before. It appeared somewhat like a gourd, but was soft, and possessed a relatively easily detachable skin, and to the palate, tasted sweet as that of a ripe banana. He named it a '**banare**'. Later, another distinguished gentleman, probably Aristotle, discovered what he believed to be still another kind of deformed fruit, resembling a still shorter gourd, or a rather elongated pear from which the skin was not so easily detached, possessing the sweet flavor of juices resembling that of a pear, to which he applied the name '**paner**'.

Somewhere, in between **banare** and **paner**, and truth, and the fruit, lies the **troot** (erratum).

Reason stems from the French **Raison** which in turn stems from the Latin **Ratio**, the latter signifying a 'reckoning' in a manner similar to our use of '**logic**', although not exactly the same. '**Correctness**' of reasoning, i.e. being **logical**, is not explicitly present in the use of the French **Raison**, whereas in the many applications of the Latin **Ratio**, such meaning becomes affirmed through usage. When we use **Reason**, we do not necessarily employ '**correctness**' of reasoning.

Logic has become synonymous with the '**art of reasoning**' if not wholly so with the **correctness of reasoning**. However **logic** also deals mostly in **inference**, something, e.g., that would not sustain itself in a court of law; that is, it would not be technically permissible to draw conclusions from **inferences**. However, in lieu of the explicit (excepting that which is represented in a written contract), that is, 'eye witnesses' (these existing as a number greater than one, hypothetically [for corroboration]), the 'evident' must be **inferred** by other means. If all things were self-evident there would be no requirement for juries or judges. (But even many contracts are written with an [inner] eye to make them either binding, or non-binding (fine print), as the case may be).

What has been written hereinbefore could obviously be expanded, or perhaps stated in different terms. While it sets the stage for what follows, its whole purpose cannot be relative to the proof or the disproof of what is **inferred** in the following.

The Argument:

Daylight will appear. In the darkness, I assume the light.

Although it is dark I have **Faith** (will rely upon a previous happening) there will be light again (in the morning). Because there

has been light 'observed' before, with a regularity, I (**Reason** [*infer?*]) there will be light again; and, on schedule. I need not Reason, or argue, this fact each time I make the assumption (inference). I simply 'believe' it to be true.

If I was blind, only the visual reality would be altered. If I felt the sunshine (assumption) upon my cheek each day, I would have been able to deduce (infer) a similar set of reassuring realities as if I had the sight to behold them. Such it is we become convinced of the Reality of things.

It goes without saying, the aforementioned depends wholly upon sensation; sight and/or touch, in this case, acting as the source sensation. The ultimate end is a **belief** or **Faith** in the happening, arrived at through **Reason**, the attribute (it has happened before, it has reappeared again etc.), which has ordained the sensation.

There are, of course, other sources, darkneses, and avenues for achieving **Faith**, or arriving at a **Faith**, some of which cannot be verified by either sensation or **Reason**.

Darkness exists in our knowledge, let's say, regarding from whence we came and whither we go. Our sensate life will not detect or reveal any clues to explain, justify or otherwise decipher this quandary. It is as though we were without sensation (or no input from the three-dimensionality that surrounds us in which we are alleged to live and expire).

Hypothetically, being without sensation, we have no direct source of information about the Universe or this environment in which we would exist. Without sensation we would possess no physical awareness. We exist in time, but not in place; or so it might be stated. It might also be stated that a three-dimensional 'existence' is requisite for this whole process of **Reasoning** and/or **Faith** (*belief*) to exist, as well. That is to say both **Reasoning** and **Belief** require a host in which to reside and operate, whether in darkness or in light (or to say it another oft-stated way 'nothing operates in a vacuum').

Am I 'safe' in positing such a statement? A stone exists.

Does this mean it also **Reasons** and **Believes**?

My knowledge (ordained sensations) will not reveal a specific answer. I believe the stone does not reason, and possesses no faith. No matter what I do, or anyone does, or the Universe does to the stone, it remains unaffected, unless we have recourse to the sledgehammer or dynamite in order to alter its physical configuration. If the stone could 'pray', it could not be proven, particularly if it merely disintegrated at the urgency of the blows of the hammer. If the stone appeared to resist disintegration we might suspect the intervention of other forces stronger than our own, or we might suspect some durable quality to Matter. We might guess at its

spirituality should it drop on our toes; we might perceive it as mean-spirited, or just 'grave'.

I might **infer**, because the stone does not move, it is at one with the Universe, and is quite happy to be where it is. Since it enjoys such equanimity, it may not involve either **Reason** or **Belief** to sustain it in its apparent NIRVANA. I know not whether it arrived at this state through **Reason** or **Intuition**, or **Belief** in its *Rightness* (**Correctness**).

It appears I know very little about stones. I may not know very much more about myself. And because I know so very little I may be inclined to venture some **wild guesses** - from out of desperation (what's that ?) or to shout down **Doubt** (who's he?).

One **Wild Guess** may involve a contradiction to what my sensate being will reveal to me. My sensate being, employed in the observation of my look-a-likes, reveals (in a similar fashion to the revelations regarding darkness and light) a finite existence, i.e., a cycle of **Birth, Growth, Attrition, Death, and Decay**. Occasionally I have witnessed the act required to bring about conception, but cannot say which specific act or moment during the act is the contributory one. I have witnessed both whole burials and scattered ashes. From what I may observe, it would be contrary to that experience to assume an Infinite existence; even Dust exists for only a finite time, regardless of the many transformations (conservation of energy and matter) it may undergo. (We are speaking of an entropy which involves eons.)

So it is, I **believe** in Finite Existence. I observe the one or the many, a repetition of events, as I do the comings and goings of lightness and darkness, and assume, **infer**, or deduce the same repetition will continue 'after' as it does now, and assume the same had existed before my awareness came to be a part of the general revelation of My Self.

There are those who claim that Conception does occur, or rather has occurred, in other ways, and that Death has been supervened by Resurrection. Amongst primitive peoples and amongst civilized-enlightened peoples, one finds similar beliefs, although of a different origin, involving different levels of unawareness (ignorance). My concern rests largely with the civilized-enlightened peoples of the West with whose traditions I am more familiar and most generally identify.

A Source of all Knowing, of a certain kind, to be found in the West, exists not in a sensate reality belonging to any person living or dead; it is rather a man-created document that has taken many forms and has undergone many revisions, and has engendered many factional and contestant beliefs. It has found its derivation in the Greek, Ta Biblia, which, through mediaeval Latin, signified - The Books:

Apocrypha, New Testament, Old Testament, Pentateuch, Psalms, Pseudepigrapha, "Q", Septuagint, and Vulgate, the composite also known as the Bible. Upon the pages of this Bible the living (now dead) were purported to have preserved their sensate reality (as I am doing when I observe the light or the stone) through direct observation. Although 'they' ("Mattheehew Markeehew Lukeehew Johnheehheehew"), as participants in the New Testament, did not observe a Deity fornicate with Mary while Joe was chopping wood, they are willing to admit that no ordinary Joe could have engendered what they all were privileged to see, hear, and touch, once it was born and grew into manhood. And since He himself declared himself to be the Son of So And So, The Father, who was able (especially in those days) to challenge such an assertion? In conjunction with this assertion, certain legerdemain, now thought to be Miracles, whether based on deception or fortuitous happenstance, nowadays, also considered to be actions or events which apparently contradict known Scientific observations, and presumably observed by those incorporated within the document as 'eye witnesses', are offered as proof of the existence of So And So, the Father. These actions or events were attributed by the Son to Father So And So. Eventually the Immaculate Conception (Deception) met his demise, at the hands of puny man, appearing to confirm the finiteness of existence, no matter from whence HIS origin.

To round out the symmetry of deception, certain eyes have claimed (not unlike those who have sighted UFO's) they have 'seen' this selfsame finite being, who had been very dead upon a pair of crossed timbers to which he had been secured by nails driven through his hands and feet, having perished in that position, being subsequently removed therefrom and 'buried' in a stone crypt, and finally was said to have arisen from there into the sky and ether beyond. This sounds a bit incredible to us nowadays - and doubtlessly has seemed so, even in the days before Science was recognized as a means (discipline) towards determining certain Truths. It had not happened before, not with Icarus, nor after, with Leonardo, and has not happened since even with a rocket assist. And BOY!!, if it did happen - aint that sumpin'? The Great Pulley in Heaven that enables one to defy gravity. One other possibility exists in the Soul being lighter than air (A Gas).

I want to be taken seriously.

I had begun by attempting to link **Reason** to **Faith**. While previously no other **Homo Sapiens** (even amongst the great shamans) has been able to contravene observable phenomena, before, during or since, it might be said this singular instance recorded in the New Testament would be akin to a day wherein no light had shone, a day of

total darkness as though the earth had not rotated upon its axis. In this day and age, if the earth did not rotate upon its axis, and we all witnessed it, our credulity would be severely tested, because we all accept the earth's repeat performance as a *fait accompli*, even in total ignorance of the Scientific Laws that make it so. Our day to day observations impress a certain factual state of affairs within our area of operational credibility; they become matters of fact we do not question. If, in fact, the earth stood still for one day in darkness (the other portion in a perpetual light, and two others in twilight) we might venture some **wild guesses** as to its cause.

As it would most likely develop, such an event (the earth ceasing to rotate for one day) would so strain our credibility we most likely would not believe it; and just the contemplation of it so tests our credibility we do not even consider it a possibility - no matter how ignorant we might be. We suffer no such unanimity of belief as regards that other event (that which has arisen).

It might be said we 'take it on **faith**', that an action or an event, which contradicts observable phenomena, could not and will not occur; and we may even be able to feebly apply **Reason** (deduction) to support this belief. We can only 'take on **Faith**', (Faith, in this context meaning a reasonless system of opinions, self-conviction; a way of thinking that is essentially opposed to reason and does not involve doubting, or questioning and is perhaps influenced by 'popular' beliefs) and we cannot apply **Reason**, as regards the One Singular Instance recorded in the New Testament, that of the 'arisen'. The said Testament may have recorded some other happenings faithfully, e.g., some of the sayings of its chief protagonist (long after the fact), and in so doing, relied on the narrator (the Gospels) who recorded the sayings, to have faithfully recorded the observations of others, and to truthfully affirm observations as 'eye witness' accounts, which may have been the result of hearsay, invention, coincidence, license, or hallucination. (Perhaps this last is not a fair statement; this does not discount biasing of the record). The self-corroborating nature of the Gospels as **bona fide** eye witnesses (in the plural) is offered as corroborative proof of the existence of Christ and all he is purported to have said, and all that has been attributed to him. Is it really so these are independently recorded testimonies (depositions)? Who were the intermediaries?

An old query 'arises' "If one accepts part, is he obliged to accept the whole?" (what constitutes the 'part?'). (I came into this world provided with a question mark as some dogs are provided with the 'herding instinct'). Questioning the authenticity of something so ancient seems so fruitless in any case.

The protagonist of the New Testament may have been an 'exemplary' figure; he may have empathized with the 'lot' of a

despairing segment of mankind, abandoned to persecutions, want, and poverty by the Roman State; he may have offered them a hope, however illusory, their needs dictating their susceptibility or gullibility (Belief or willingness to follow); not unlike the ignorant masses being taken in by the promises of the pomaded charade, or white collar that passes as their leader (president, dictator, priest, or whomever). Them Romans is bad dudes. They don't know where its at. Jive unto me and I shall lead thee into the Kingdom of Heven.

I'll not conjecture on the phenomenology of actions and events that do not accord observed and 'scientific' data, except to say, the New Testament protagonist may have seized upon the happenstance to enhance his own Beliefs, or mania, or delusions, and perhaps it was simpler even than this; he may not have possessed the curiosity or imagination to conduct a search in order to discover, or invent, or attribute to other causes, events or happenings, things which escaped his own intellectual grasp. There are scientists nowadays who use 'rabbits feet', lucky pens, precious stones, ancient things, certain days, hours, technicians, machines, name brands, etc. to enhance their efforts in the laboratory, even when they know these are of no avail. (I'd assume it is the degree of awareness that makes some kind of difference). Given the state of science 2000 years ago, the New Testament protagonist would not have known and could only venture a **wild guess**, all of his **wild guesses** being ascribed to one source (a prime mover) which he chose to call Father So And So, perhaps as an act of true humility, with which (whom) he may have genuinely believed he had a close personal relationship - delusional perhaps - (but, whatever works). What troubles me is how the Father (assumed to be Omnipotent) could play along with his Son's ignorance. Since he was to allow his Son to be executed anyway, why not allow him access to ALL the facts? Of the hypothetical Omnipotent we assume, and to Him generally ascribe, a complete and absolute knowledge of all things past, present and future. If the Almighty had been withholding something from the Son, the scenario begins to sound a little bit like Fard Mutter Company providing its consumers with an innovation a year, although it has several years worth of innovations on the shelf to meet future needs of competition. However, I cannot believe the Father Fell so far as to engage in the anomalies and vicissitudes of Planned Obsolescence. In any case, the question is a natural one; why should the Father keep the Son in Ignorance?

I am hard-pressed to explain **Faith** that is founded in nothing but assertions. "I am the Son of So And So." Just what are we to deduce (infer) from such a statement? (Just a metaphor, Joe.)

Even if He could, once in a while, seemingly be able to call up-on an act of the Omnipotent Father through the 'snap of his fingers', the singularity of the action and the event rested in his say-so - a non-

duplicable happening. In Scientific endeavors, the non-duplicable is essentially rejected as contrived, false, anomalous, attributable to human error, etc. Truly, the Big Bang may seem non-duplicable, but there are little bangs which offer substance to the same scientific 'speculation'. Can one hypothesize the same for 'Miracles'? Surely there are 'apparent' little ones which cause people to believe, for example, that prayer moves mountains. In my view prayer is a selfish act, one harboring *little Faith* - only the appearance of **Faith**. A causal relationship between prayer and event is wishful thinking, and is delusional. Prayer signifies, at the most, a humble supplication. One asserts this to be true. Also, prayer is a selfish act offered in an attempt to curry favor for oneself (often construed as Narcissism). **Faith**, alternatively, and ideally, in essence, implies 'taking it as it comes' without pulling strings. I suppose one needs to feel his tinniness is able to live in effectuality, and, is somehow protected from all the evils. These last, of course, are assertions, no differently than "I am the Son of So And So".

A true believer is one who, though he prays and prays, is kicked in the ass, harder and harder and harder; perhaps if he lessened his supplications he would be kicked less, although this is unlikely. Prayer is a way of shirking responsibility for oneself (RCWD). Truly, in adversity, character is born. Finiteness is a shocking reality, sometimes a heartbreaking reality (where bereavement may cause one to reach out in desperation for the IMPOSSIBLE [to which some sham jerk in a mortuary, or some pulpited Gantry in a white collar may supply a JASUS]). Enter Deity - "How did He get here?" Whereas before a Deity had not existed, suddenly one exists which we are expected to implore, after the fact. This state of affairs is neither arrived at through an act of Reason, or an act of Faith, but as a sheer Panic Reaction to the reality of one's own ineffectuality, one's inability to influence events. More assertions, to be sure; bordering on Truth.

What may **Reason** support in **Faith**? In general it can be stated that **Reason** is anathema to **Faith**. Perhaps it is so that one may **Reason** one should '**have Faith**'; an instance of **Reason** applied selectively.

Reasoning is able to predict through an assemblage of facts, whereas **Faith** is unable to predict anything. **Reason** is founded in 'knowledge' (sensate ordination) whereas, to **Faith**, both **Reason** and Knowledge are inconsequential. The best that **Faith** can produce for the individual is that he might indulge in futile 'hope' against what he intuitively knows to be false, and that coincidence, like a lottery ticket, will avail him, or that **Belief** will influence the odds ('Providence' will intercede). **Reasoning** will assemble the facts (the Substance) as proof. **Faith** will offer hope and assertion as proof.

I want proof.

"I'm sorry the best we have to offer is underproof" (which won't set fair to a dad-blamed thing.)

There are some things in this life that ought to be self-evident to any sentient being. These 'apparencies' extend beyond mere recognition of light and dark, life and death (this latter duo causing the great schizophrenia, the everlastingness of living in a reality which is constantly denying one the promise within an infinity of more of the same [and better to come]). This condition, of course, is not self-evident) (Perhaps this state of affairs explains the additional requirement for the other ingredient: **Faith.**)

The most ideal arrangement for circumventing the evidential circumstance may be found amongst the missionaries looking for converts amongst the Savages (heathens) in faraway places. By offering health care along with baubles and bibles they were able to persuade rather innocent (perhaps trusting) and curious (?) minds to accept something of which they had no knowledge, and no information to offer as challenge, or any substantiality, to present in support of any Doubts (who are they?). One may doubt an assertion made while a 'sanctified' presence thumps a Bible, offered as 'evidence', but an assertion is an assertion - and to the weak mind It is perhaps just as evident to a stronger mind that the Bible-puncher is a stark raving lunatic. That the naïf should yield any part of his simple intelligence and integration to these proselytizers, Missionaries, albeit, Bible Thumpers, doth confound me, notwithstanding Albert Schweitzer.

Sigmund Freud, in *The Future of an Illusion*, felt that the Religious involvement stemmed from an obsessional neurosis (involving anxieties attributable to a general 'ignorance' [misknowing]), but was of a Universal nature, affecting all mankind. Whereas the individual neurosis generally develops into certain neurotic illnesses, the group neurosis (a shared anxiety neurosis) tends to mitigate the effect of the individual neurosis).

He also speculated that as time went on the '**intellect**' of man would better serve him, and certain neurotic behavior would subsequently abate.

Ah, Yes, this hand that grips this stylus, scratching upon the surface of some tactile reality, "Bears Witness!". These scant morphemes ensue, etching some dim autobiographical stirrings - as always. What emerges is some kind of unstoried still-life, solitary as the old dismasted tree in the forest, a few stout truncated limbs still

showing, in which the vestiges of life remain as an aged clinging presence.

The VISION, that once burned in the mind's eye, has ceased to ignite the spirit that is contained within the corpus from which that claw extends. I have gone to the WELL too many times. It is because I possess no TRUE VISION; I cannot see through the DARKNESS that lies ahead, nor am I any longer able to impose upon this VAST OUTERNESS with my MERE INNERNESS.

If this MERENESS could only grasp the TRUTH. IF. PAX.

In recognizing 'mereness', one may also assess one's state of Ignorance. Ignorance does not necessarily imply 'lack of knowledge'. One is ignorant, regardless; acceptance is the key. Saying "I Do Not Know.", is a necessary first step toward understanding Ignorance.

I have no proof of the existence of FLUMDUM* (GUD).

I have no proof of the existence of something universally 'higher' in the animal known as *Homo Sapiens*.

I may INFER FLUMDUM* exists as a SOURCE of all this complex Reality - only because it is beyond the capability of MERE MAN to have created any part thereof. But it is beyond my Intellect to perceive or know FLUMDUM'S Reality.

I may proclaim that *Homo Sapiens* has consistently demonstrated he is an animal (primarily a selfish, instinctual entity), and to ENVISION this animal as Existing in another State, and, although my Intellect may enVISION such an entity, I have not known the Reality, therefore can offer no proof of the 'Higher' State, and cannot INFER the EXISTENCE of the 'Higher' Animal.

While it may be so that a FLUMDUM exists in some form, it is my CONVICTION, for which I may offer demonstrative proof stemming from my own personal experience, that FLUMDUM is a TOTALLY

* While enlisted in the USN, and stationed at Oceana, Virginia, I had occasion to attend evening classes in Philosophy at William and Mary College wherein the Professor (McDonald, I believe) made constant reference to a certain FLUMDUM with whom I had no familiarity, but whose hypothetical significance I could not ignore. It is a reference I have elected not to forget, and in its innocuous inoffensiveness, has served not to stir images of a raging, all-powerful, indifferent Deity, but more to serve plainly to identify with some kind of MARK, a coordinating presence, reference point, within the Mind, if not 'without' the Universe. The use of Flumdum pretends to acknowledge 'others' references to some 'two-legged' prime mover.

INDIFFERENT entity, IMMUNE to Supplications of any kind. (I have prayed and prayed, as a generalized form of wishful thinking, that my daughter would get off this 'JASUS IS WORD' kick, to no avail). It is not a situation involving abandonment as much as FLUMDUM cannot be personalized to MY benefit, or detriment (for example, my daughter praying to have me converted or smote by THE WORD.)

This repetition, albeit, emphasizes its own purpose, like gripping a bat as one stands in the batter's box. (Why not just grab the damned bat and swing for all you are worth. Well, suppose that isn't the most efficient and beneficial way to connect with the ball; perhaps it just does not FEEL right.) Let's say I do reiterate for EMPHASIS. The Emphasis involves all speculations regarding MY Life, and MAN, that Oh! So 'Higher' animal, as the SOURCE of the 'betterment' (used prospectively) of his own condition (sometimes referred as the HUMAN CONDITION). Such is my CONVICTION; no outside AGENT will supervene.

The Existential dilemma: that of a purposeless existence.

Surely I cannot ENVISION many forms of LIFE for myself beyond this very one in which I presently (once in a while) discover myself. I may or may not Envision some kind of 'perpetualness' through the act of FORNICATION, the result of which produces a co-mingling towards another look-a-like. The part I would play is small, almost insignificant, compared to my mother's or her mother's, *ad infinitum* (only it is not towards infinity since certain revealed 'Scientific Laws' (observations) have indicated only finiteness for any form of the physical world (matter). Even if 'Human' EVOLUTION would continue towards infinity, the planet will not. Its all a ways off, so lets consider it a moot point. Incidentally we appear to be at work discovering ways to shorten or circumvent the whole process). (One more lick: Lets all 144,000 (12,000 a month) of us go to another younger planet, in another galaxy - YEAH! YEAH! Lets!). Another farfetchedness, a number, which, since this writing, has been modified (not enough satisfied customers).

To return to the gambling, for the sake of more argument. The Purposeless Existence surely takes the wind out of one's VISIONARY sails, not necessarily becalming him, but demoralizing him. The demoralization occurs because it forces one to accept the fact we are all thrown together in a heap, serving our own individual interests (this is mostly hypothetical and mostly true, inferring a mostly true hypothesis). It means we have got what we have got without HOPE; and 'rest' assured, we have got what we have got. (wondrously immutable).

Yes!, one of the things 'we have got' is this anxious Belief that our SINS upon this EARTH are punishable in the AFTERLIFE. Even if we

subvert Man's Laws, or find venial loopholes in our dealings with the ALMIGHTY, this belief entails an exaction of PUNISHMENT for such clever nuances or deceptions (can't fool Flumdum). (If I wuz the Almighty, I'd sure get 'em for every infraction. They'd wish they wuz SAVED in some other way, I'll tell yuh!.)

Well, Sigmund Freud, for whom I have mostly respect, claims its been a 'good' thing for civilization to have had these foci to curb our natures, since, in his judgment, he could not discover in the human psyche what he identified as an "Instinct to Morality", something which the Existential Individual would require in order to keep from running amuck (anarchy) in a shared situation, and perhaps to SAVE his posterior in others.

Since the 'Instinct towards Morality' does not appear to exist, man is abandoned to spurious altruistic impulses, or a rather nebulous 'species' conscience; he also might avail himself of an olden, ancient, 'antiquated' construct known as the Golden Rule, or its obverse 'an eye for an eye' (mutually assured destruction) to guide him and possibly assure for continued respiration in the presence of his look-a-likes, instead of a random mayhem.

Why attempt to take away the FOCI of FLUMDUMS when they have proven to be so effective in calming the Beast that lives within?

I think one may argue at length regarding the effectiveness. FEAR of ETERNAL DAMNATION in the AFTERLIFE has perhaps moderated the more retributive and vengeful amongst us. FEAR is the NAME OF THE GAME (e.g. mutually assured destruction) Some will argue this is LOVE. (Call it what you like, but what is it underneath?)

A duality then - of FEAR/LOVE arising from one's imaginary interaction with FLUMDUM in the AFTERLIFE.

Whatever works!! Its not so simple, as you must be aware; while many may ENVISION FLUMDUM as a personality, all employing the term "GUD" (Alahlahlah) to refer to this personality, the varying perspectives of the flocks (of men) result in differing (focal lengths), which again result in differing interpretations of the SAME ENTITY whether Jasus or Mohohohoh). While the spirit of ecumenicalism periodically arises amongst certain sects (sometimes through the VISION of one individual [like John 23], and sometimes in their mutual self-interest [better Christian than Red or whatever]) it does not flourish in the human environment (I'll permit you to tell me why [some Christians just smell bad]). What we eventually obtain is an agglomeration of GUD-lovers insisting on their own perspectives creating a condition of conflict and intolerance amongst the brothers. They attempt to POSSESS GUD unto themselves (that is my assessment).

Anyway it is not really clear what benefits have been derived from the focusing on a FLUMDUMhead contrasted to that which might

have evolved in yet another way, a way, or the very way we will NEED (necessity being the mother of.....) to evolve as we pass through the Curtain of Darkness (something to go along with Camus' Fornication). "Sigmund, it may be argued that this insistence upon rectifying an anxiety (obsessional) neurosis has impeded man's natural curiosity, has stultified his intellect, has resulted in the persecution of those who have sought the TRUTHS that we all recognize now as TRUTHS, and for which, now, we would not think of persecuting anyone (unless we were a fanatic or a bigot)". Of course, we do not know how many would have perished at the hands of a pagan society, do we?). Burn the heretics, or burn the Christians.

Everything in due time, in its proper place; and in sequence. We must not have anything out of sequence. EVOLUTION IS (apparently). "The evolution of the Intellect IS; so you will argue Sigmund; and perhaps rightly so - if it can be freed to operate within a realm of **'correct reasoning'**."

In this regard, we will require Patience during the EVOLUTIONARY process. In other words, it most likely will not occur during my lifetime. However, just because it is dependent upon an EVOLUTIONARY exegesis, does not imply that what one finds at any particular stage along the way is "The Best Of All Possible Worlds." We might perceive our gains as merely a Holding Action until Revelation or Truth arrives. Waystations or Halfway Houses.

We need to make an effort to help the Process along, if we expect the Process to succeed.

Being AWARE of a PROCESS might inspire confidence in the GAME. EVOLUTION may not necessarily eventuate into the 'higher' animal per se; what may eventuate will be that the already 'evolved' intelligence of the animal will receive more recognition and utility towards the assistance of his adaptation and his need for putting anxieties (mutually assured destruction) to rest, and instead assure some securities (not strategic defense initiatives) for ALL MANKIND - BROADLY speaking, (that is, outside the realm of bullshit). It's as much as saying MAN must assume some responsibility for himself if he expects to succeed in these evolutionary efforts, and not to be forever 'laying it' at the feet of FLUMDUM or the Big Punch.

So, my gamble to preclude the purely EXISTENTIAL view of a purposeless existence is a bit flimsy, but it purports ONLY to argue, in full realization, that in my lifetime I shall not be witness to any quantum (or recognizable) evolutionary leap - and/or utilization of the already evolved intellect towards the TRUE betterment of the HUMAN CONDITION (long sentence which I'll make even longer by declaring that building a strong defense is like using underarm deodorant - it does not last).

Thus I return to being this mereness provided with a prehensile claw that holds a stick to that tangible reality, leaving a MARK - Outside. This mark reveals a doubtfulness - a lack of belief. While it recognizes and expresses MAN as capable of change (labile) it also knows that EFFORT is required to alter the STATUS QUO. This effort must incorporate a VISION; they are interdependent. Complacency ('This is the best of all possible worlds') assures a prolongation of certain nagging realities without guaranteeing any mitigation of their effects or betterment thereof. So there you have it!

While one might PROCLAIM what happens to and in the Human Condition as FLUMDUM'S WILL, it is beyond me how ANYone can know that WILL - even if FLUMDUM EXISTS. FLUMDUM talked to someone (Jasus, purportedly) but revealed nothing to HIM; such is the message I receive. (Jasus took liberties with his imaginary connections.)

A VISION, coupled with an EFFORT (The WILL of Man), COULD effect some 'betterment' of the Human Condition, or, if you like, COULD better utilize the full capacities of the animal *Homo Sapiens*. (there are a lot of swelled heads who believe they are already doing this by advocating a strategic defense initiative, or offering the kindly ministrations of prayer). The object is not to persuade everyone to listen to and appreciate BEETHOVEN and BACH; some of those who appreciate BEETHOVEN and BACH are SNOBS; rather large azzoles. There are some PRIMITIVE types (noble savages) who understand the necessary requirements of HUMAN society (group interaction), whether or not they appreciate B and B, SDI or prayer.

I don't mean to leave you HIGH and DRY.

There wasn't much to be said to begin with; there's even less to say now. It's all a brain tease, and will remain so, even after we have created life in a test tube (HOMO FLUMDUM).

While perhaps I have strayed here and there, it has not been my intention to leave the main theme; Thus to return to the beginning and to recapitulate:

I had been disturbed by the ready acceptance, by my daughter, of one of those Christian creeds founded upon the American Standard Revision of the New Testament, not unlike some 'savage' in the wilderness, whose awe and wonder at being 'saved' by some motivated indulgence, stemmed as much from a weak mind as from any real or imagined need to be 'saved'.

We live in a 'loveless' place - this earth - amongst and amidst those (our look-a-likes) who are mostly 'loveless' and self-serving. We look elsewhere for our comforts. We even yearn perhaps for a permanent embrace. One reaches out, to be touched by those eagerly seeking

one's reachings - not as an act of 'saving' but as an act of self-affirmation and self-inflation. A self-acclaimed, inspired intermediary (a stark raving lunatic who maligns all the other sects) whacks away at the soft-covered black book, vouchsafing THE WORD. The weakminded, timid creatures, redound to this WORD, sparing both **Reason** and **Logic**, and denouncing all the other sects, though based in the same Gospels. Billy Graham revealed his secret during a PBS interview; to respond to and harp on people's fear of death, a lonely death, perhaps even lonelier than the loneliness of life.

Reason has been considered our most distinctive attribute, not without a little self-congratulatory feeling, since we have deemed it separates us from the 'lower animals'. However, many of the brethren, before they may be able to 'think', or to employ or apply this 'miraculous' cognitive part to a burgeoning life, willingly submit their bony crypt to a 'lobotomizing', as though to spite this 'gift' of life imbued with such a splendid intelligence.

Surely a quandary exists, one which our intelligence might perceive as a challenge, as much as something to be sequestered. That one should become anxious because he cannot go beyond (arrive at the absolute) through the use of his **Reason** or **Logic** seems a natural enough occurrence, but to allow the anxieties to impel one into 'irrational' **beliefs** seems to resolve one quandary while creating yet another. While the first quandary "From when ye came and wither thou goest?" may not be explicitly answered through the offices of '**correct reasoning**' or '**logic**', it is my conviction that one may provide more varied and imaginative 'scenarios' through this means than by frying his brain through endless repetitions of an antiquated nonsense - 'Gud said unto them; Jasus said unto them; HE spake a whole pile; an' if'n ye listen up, an' take heed, ye'll be sighved, ye'll enter the hallowed honeyed havenly halls of Hehven'.

The second quandary that resolves the first: How the hell are we gonna relieve the boredom?"

I can only approach the relief of boredom in a facetious manner.

While 'waiting' in line to get into Heaven, one imagines Jasus as a Country Western Folk Hero. One then further projects this image through the donning of other spiritual accouterments, such as cowboy hats, cowboy boots, and sundry pertinent paraphernalia that conforms to and confirms our more modern 'sexy' mores. Then one utters "Git along little Goddy!"

Beware of the Gud.

Forthwith, an ADDENDUM follows, pursuant to the imperative of purging the text of levity:

ADDENDUM to Meditation Upon The Loss:

I do not wish to imply, absolutely, that **Reason** or **Logic** (objectively seeking 'correct reasoning'), if consistently applied, will yield consistently the same kind of truth or perfection of logical construction. For the lack of absolute persuasion to be found in any methods we may have devised, it may be indicated there should be some allowance made for a kind of intuition, or sixth sense, albeit common sense, that will stand outside of the realms of **Reason** or **Logic**. We may characterize this other sense as an 'understanding' of the Universe in terms that do not find expression in the mere 'word', yet contain a meaning or significance that does not represent a departure from what is implied in the Latin Ratio, a something or other that appears as 'concrete', which becomes affirmed through 'usage'. One supposes, as an instance of fairness, it would be understood that the faithful will affirm their faith through usage. However, I will quarrel with any attempt to confuse Reasoning with Faith. (**Belief** - the 'quantum' leap from **Rationality** to **Irrationality**.)

To illustrate that to which I am referring, I cite how we use our 'common sense' or 'inner **ratio**' (which may be essentially wordless) to assess or judge what it is our fellow man (leader, governor, favorite bureaucrat, let's say) is 'up to' when he or she, or they, all together, say things they do not mean, or when they say something in which they are concealing their 'true motives'. Of course I am speaking of Rhetoric [**rhêtōric, ae, L: through a technique of oratory or eloquence one attempts to elicit all manner of persuasion regardless of import**] to which we may apply our own, but also which we may adduce as faulty, being unable to ascertain how exactly without extracting a confession from the lousy bastard or bitch (which we are not allowed to do in the coercive manner necessary to bring it about). The facile tongue requires a detection device which stands outside of 'the word'. One simply raises his level of apprehension, and, in fact, without reason, claims a faithlessness in what he hears (A simple distrust in the projected word).

We generate our own (rationale) based upon our suspicions, and a general body of knowledge (a litany of betrayals) that certain types and certain individuals are not to be trusted in their words.

To amplify this notion even more I include what we would adduce as 'hunches', to be defined as a condition wherein we assess the appropriateness or proportionality, or rightness or wrongness, of things, most likely arising from our imperfect systemization of logical processes, and our general lack of absolute knowledge, with which most of us are affected, even the experts. Experts are perhaps the most vulnerable because they are called upon frequently, for

their 'expert' opinion, thus feel the compulsion to render informed or 'educated' guesses rather than saying what they know to be true, i.e. "I don't know". To further elaborate upon this example, I would suggest we might benefit from a statistical basis in generating hunches. Whereas one levitation was sufficient for the Resurrection to generate widespread belief in certain miraculous happenings, ostensibly corroborated by other miraculous happenings, the element of statistics never played a role in the Evolution of **The Word. (Logos** becoming invested in the Flesh - by **FIAT**.)

As one becomes aware of certain happenings, as a function of certain repetitive exposure or behavior, as comprising some additive property in one's memory, as an accumulation of remembrances of experiences which become oddly pigeon-holed or coordinated or associated and assimilated; these, with or without precedent or documentation, are brought to bear upon some happening, as if in judgment, or in an attempt to bring them to light. While I lengthen this example without producing what it is I wish to say specifically, I am obliged to elucidate with yet a further extension of the example.

What we know about chemistry may be said to fill volumes upon volumes - yet, the statistical information available for corroborating falsity or bias, in proving or disproving the effects of substances upon biological entities (hominids, more specifically), challenges both our knowledge and our way of presenting facts, in a way sufficient to arrive at definitive conclusions. Even a judge who happens to be both an expert chemist, as well as expert in the law, will need to resort to an intuition or his 'feel for the chemistry' of biological systems, in order to render a judgment, lacking all other criteria for making a judgment (through certain correlations not obvious in causal relations). He will necessarily revert to a rhetoric, mostly the rhetoric of law to do so. He cannot say "I do not know". Judges are not permitted to say they do not know, and they are precluded from giving specific **reasons** for their judgments, if they elect to do so, as a matter of legal tradition, **Judices Non Tenetur Exprimere Causam Sententiae Suae**. This smacks somewhat of the Omnipotent which, or who, by simply being despotic, does preclude any access to rationality. In most cases of this kind, it may be said the judge appears to go with hunches. We are at the mercy of that judgment, also, as a matter of tradition. Why is not fair for us to be exposed to the reasons behind the judgments, simply because that is the very thing we are most desperately in need of; something which validates the process, and as something that enlists our belief in human rationality?

What kind of relevant evidence may we introduce to further the interests of '**correct reasoning**'; such that we are not so much at the

mercy of our hunches? **Rationality** ought be employed to preclude the whimsicality of it all.

Those who would have us become mindless automatons in the service of some unknowable deity might as well not be made of their uniquely recognizable hominid components, but rather, of any other hopelessly innocuous, and assimilable configuration or approximation of matter. The stone serves as well as Medusa.

J.C. (Joseph Campbell) opines the Virgin Birth (why Virgin?) represents the Birth of Compassion.

Carl Jung opines Religion is a defense against the religious experience.

Sigmund Freud perceived Religion as a universal obsessional neurosis; acting as a generalized balm to certain anxieties experienced within the individual (implied as a shared experience).

More succinctly, Karl Marx perceived Religion as the Opiate Of The People (The Masses).

The foregoing was not intended as a philosophical treatise; but an observation regarding the inadequacies of language. While there may be a lack of clear distinctions to be made by argument, there is a possibility that through usage a language may present a clearer picture of where we come from, why we are here, and where we are going.