

## ***Creating Relevance***

### **S h o o t**

sub silentio

The separate realities.

A Rotten Apple.

To be consistent within my own musings, that border on philosophical speculations, which are intended to assign meaning and order to this life, my finite life, I must be careful how I argue my case.

I have been a fault finder of the milieu in which I live, which ascribes itself a "Human Society" (A Societal Arrangement). My particular notions emanate from the belief that Human Society is still very much formative; this means to me that what we are now experiencing is a transience (for good or ill).

The idea of a 'perfect' Human Society should not be an obstacle to its realization; Ideas abound. One should not fear Utopia.

What may be lacking is the Will towards the realization of the Idea of The (better) Human Society.

Elsewhere, in abundance, I have registered my complaints regarding the true obstacles to the formation and realization of the 'better' Human Society. Now I insist upon a hypothetical proposition.

What confronts me now are the queries I put to myself, e.g. what part can I play; what part do I want to play, given my outlook? Is one able to induce a better society simply by bitching all the time? Is my outlook a consequence or is it a contingency; am I just a rotten apple? Since this life is the ONLY life I will ever live (no afterlife for a second chance) ought I not join the fray? What inhibits me from 'joining'? Is it fair to say that the 'better' Human Society is an impossibility given the 'facts', and the conclusions one may be inclined to draw from those facts. And do I have a right to declare that impossibility in absentia, i.e., do I not cede to and assure the impossibility? What can one invest in Transience? Many questions. A most important question - Is It Worth It? How can one insist upon something one moment and wish to bow out the next? (Only an intellectual exercise?)

One might be desirous of becoming effectual in his participation (short of having Quixotic delusions of grandeur [could be a lot of fun]); construed as an Ideal which each might wish to claim for himself. Most of us feel unequal to the task (we cede to the public figure or the celebrity). The best for which one could hope would exist in a consensus of the moment, which may be contradicted in the very next moment. Not a very satisfactory situation, however.

One might claim or argue that his concern consists of seeking a more lasting condition; and that absorption in the moment does not constitute a sufficiently worthy endeavor to enlist one's time or attention. I, for one, might so argue.

## ***Creating Relevance***

Examples of consensus of the moment involve issues such as capital punishment, abortion, gun control, drug control, practicing religion in public school, rights to privacy, equal rights for all (including the 'fairer' sex), to suggest a few. These issues are decided in the moment by a consensus; that is the intention; one moment 'righteously' dictating what will happen in the next, from out some reactionary spuriousness (or spurious reaction).

The righteous redound to the moment, and abound when the society becomes 'uptight' or is challenged from the outside, or is foundering in its 'moral' depravity. These represent a conservative element, protective of what it has got, sensing some danger of losing it, not wanting to put at risk any part of itself, wanting to assure permanence of fixed values based on its narrow interest, what I have been identifying as the Ossification of society. (Banks, Churches, and 'City Halls', Bureaucracies, while marginally useful, are symbolic of the Ossification.).

There are those who advocate another way, the Fair Play contingent, who are accused of 'moral' depravity if they advocate the generally expansive humanistic causes such as the abolition of capital punishment and support for abortion, whereas the 'right wing' augurs to establish capital punishment as a deterrent to abortion. Those in the 'fair play' contingent would advocate gun control, whereas the 'right wing' insists upon being armed to contain the 'radical element'; they also never fail to invoke the b · e noire over the horizon as justification for their 'refined paranoia'. 'Fair play' would have everyone become equal explicitly, whereas the 'right wing' lives in dread of equality. 'Fair play' would say, since the Constitution of the United States of America sets forth strictures with regard to the separation of Church and State, and that the First Amendment to that Constitution also specifically issues disclaimers against any particular religion becoming the religion for all, they would not advocate for the Government, via its judiciary (presumably), to institute any religious practice that would contravene those basic precepts. Whereas the 'right wing' would seek out a majority consensus (faction) as a basis for establishing its will, which would enforce its religious precepts upon the young mind in the captive situation of the classroom (just in case you can't get 'em in the church where they might, of their own free will, never attend [too many holes in their Sunday Best]). The 'fair play' contingent believe that the will of humanity, per se, towards the inclusion of all, is the purpose of Human[E] Society, and that the Ossification of a particular human society, sect, or faction, thereby becoming an exclusive society, sect, or faction, is anathema to Human[E] Society, and does, by its very nature, invite its own destruction from within (through revolt).

The realities that concern me at this juncture, having little faith in the possibility (even with my fullest participation) in The Human[E]

## ***Creating Relevance***

Society becoming anything more than an IDEA, have to do with living a solitary existence. I must consider such existence as a valid construct, if not more so than that in which I am expected to now perform; and to which I am expected to conform; and in which I have become deformed.

If it is the truest and noblest thing that life should devolve into a proposition of making a contribution (or 'quality' contribution) to a Human[E] Society, perhaps living the solitary existence favors the best chance of producing such a contribution. In the least, such an existence favors the chance of becoming its own reality, rather than a reflected (mirrored) one - not to be judged in the moment. Living in the moment, mirroring the status quo, may only enhance, augment or validate a dangerous situation. It would seem that to yea-say what one is because it is all he is, is lacking in foresight. Allowing the transient to become the measure and repository of possibilities does reflect the more untranscendable flow of the Universe. However, a Lasting Human[E] Society requires more than what the moment will contribute to it. Human society must exist as the Sun, a constant transcendental Idea. From this ambience Humanity could hope to extract an awareness and recognition of our continual need of reformation, towards the creation of that Sun.

So it is that I argue against 'playing it by ear'. Despite the appearance of pessimism, I believe there can be no substitute for the Verities (those conditions necessary to the formation of a Human [HUMANE - I must repeat] Society. But just paying a lip service to the Verities emerges as the most crass form of yea-saying (playing it by ass's ears). Besides the being opposite of a falsehood or the bane of a misconception or error, a Verity is 'what is required'; a lastingness. The Intensity of the Transient persuades many of the veracity of itself; a seeming lastingness. However, even a dim awareness of the course of our own life will soon reveal the true nature of transience.

My reality will be less of a reflection, and will most likely be no better than a transient construction, however I am desirous of projecting a far-reaching and all encompassing temple of universalities (bridgings of the moment that provide a constant reference - which in the end may invoke no other verity beyond the GOLDEN RULE, which, again in my view, we would not be at a loss to implement seriously).

Horribly, in addition, I have become dependent upon my look-a-likes (as a matter of conditioning and habit [call it the Supermarket Complex [a marvel to be sure] [[FOR SOME ONLY]] [[[TOUGH SHIT!! ]]]). If it was not for my spouse whose love and tolerance of me has made it possible for me to conspire with myself in producing these images, which in the end may only be made from the chards of the mirrors I have broken, we would be deprived of this much.

These conditions being what they are, I am sufficiently doubtful of my insular possibilities, perhaps to become humbled - and stand very near

## ***Creating Relevance***

being accused and guilty of some kind of hypocrisy or mealy-mouthedness. (Damned if you do, and damned always.)

As a consumer, I am a reluctant participant, and as a laborer I am a reluctant participant. If one consumes, or labors to further the erection of the Tower of Babel, it must be said he participates in Nothing.

It would seem impossible to avoid becoming a walking contradiction. Siamesed Antipodes.

Then, what is it I am, or is it we are, that in the end may be said to comprise a contribution? Will it be only another VISION; another Possibility only? It is my belief that the Vision and/or Possibility may exist as a validity, only when it coincides with the whole (collective? - in Transience?). Some will put forth this argument to enhance or further the interests of a Jesus Christ, whose purported Exemplary nature still waits in the wings to be fully validated (exploited?) by the whole. (As it is his Advent has evolved into factionalism, each faction attempting to retain exclusive [possessory] rights to his bod and message [One projection of the extremity of this utilization of JASUS is only too well delineated by The Grand Inquisitor to be found in Dostoievski's Brothers Karamazov]). (Soren Kierkegaard projects another view in his Attack Upon "Christendom" where he points out that the New Testament admonished one to live a life of poverty and self-sacrifice which the Protestant Theologists have managed to convert into more (mere) worldly indulgences.) (It does say that little of what 'was' 'back in those days' applies to today). What do we purposefully extract from the past? Perhaps Jesus was premature. Is he now equally an anachronism? Or is he still a valid symbol? A lamb to sacrifice as expiation? The persuasion of blood.

Some will argue that I cannot even validate my own response to being alive; that I am a sourpuss - Where is my 'Rapture'? I am supposing the answer is self-evident - discounting my personal quirks. I love my spouse, which may demonstrate a narrow performance, but it does argue against total misanthropy, and certain other glandular aberrations or deformities.

Surely one may never be 'raptured', but will promulgate a Vision and a Possibility, not founded 'in the air', but in a finite reality, the finite reality confined to this earth, this planet, this solar system; even THIS Universe - and unfortunately, within this society -without hocus pocus.

Taking the pantheistic view, it may be said GUD exists everywhere, GUD being synonymous with many things, but not imbued with a personality; synonymous with Love (that Great generality), with Justice (which implies an Equalitarianism as the Pure objective), and the Quest for Truth (TAO). The part an individual may play in this pantheistic phantasmagoria (Rapture) is obviously quite minimal (did I say nil?); but he may surely rejoice in the Vision, if not the Reality - the Vision being composed of a clay (terra firma) in which a sensate, tangible

## ***Creating Relevance***

dimension appeals to what we know deep inside to be true ("In your heart you know I'm right") despite all the high fallutin falderall (religiosity that compromises towards eternal life) (It's time to do this one again: "We demand eternity for a lifetime: when our mortal half-hours too often prove tedious". Herman Melville in Mardi). Now is relevant to itself. Solitaire in Transience. Solitary Intransigence.

This pantheistic GUD is part of the embodiment of the Vision, as we attempt to impose an order upon our perceptions of 'chaos' and cope with the indifference of the Universe (In as much as GUD the Father was central to JASUS, without whom or what HE was NOTHING - just an arm-waver).

However GUD, per se, is only a construction, a totality of forces, something central to a VISION, something with a little more personality than an Equation, which in itself comprises a Vision, or an imposition of an Order upon a seeming disparate earthbound world and a separate and indifferent Universe.

In truth, I ascribe to an Equation without a comprehension of its particulars, only because I realize it is representative, to the best of man's knowledge, of all 'physical forces conspiring (working together) to hold OUR Universe in balance. These exist also in their reason to be; one might say that in the Universe there is a cooperative effort, a joint venture, rather than a conspiracy; all of which we have attempted to reduce to FORMULAE. But I respond to these Formulae as I do a chill wind, as perhaps I respond to the COLD Truth (they take some getting used to). The control we have over these Universal forces is nil, although our creators of formulae feel, by giving mathematical expression to them, that they control them (I have feeling they don't even disturb them). Perhaps the creation of JASUS, in all his ramifications, was a necessary gambit for humanity, in that he became the link, a way of accessing GUD. He has become a 'Familiar' whom, we wish to believe, acts on our behalf through our supplications (HE told us it was so). We also appeal to Him to remove Pain of the absolute and oppressive knowledge of, and the stigma of, Universal Indifference from our very Beings.

In essence, whether by intent, or inadvertently, the formula makers do affirm our Universe, as more than an incidental order; our Universe is given more persistence than the happenings upon Earth tend to cause one to believe; and the EARTH, like its inhabitants, comprises the tiniest portion of the whole.

I feel my separateness as a natural extension of my peculiar awareness. One might characterize what he feels as estrangement; however this ought to be noted as more appositeness in yearning, than oppositeness from sheer contrariness.

Solitaire seems a glum and grim inattentiveness; like biting one's fingernails.