

TA51, Response 3 (to Moore, C1)

JOHN NASH, MY EARLY MEMORY, DEPERSONAL APEIRON by Glenn C Wood 4  
Jul 2002, posted 16 July 2002

( I'm attaching TAC44 Wood to McCarthy (C31): EARLY MEMORY 15/30 April  
2002 - for re-posting the original remains inaccessible. )

[NOTE - I tried C44 to TA45 just now, and had no problem getting it from the  
KJF web site; no need for re-posting. In any case, sometimes files are not  
accessible from the McGill computer: in such a situation I can always send them  
to those who want them - just ask me. - HFJM] Notation: I still could not get it!

[1] In preparation for my response to your response to Mr. Moore's posting I  
find this early memory significantly helpful at least to me. I had some time back  
examined John Nash's web site and found it interesting that he mentioned his  
early memories, which was not too unlike my own regarding the early age. He,  
quite fairly, stated that memories are memories of memories, or words to that  
affect, which I say similarly, and that some error-tolerances are undeniable, but  
the same can be said of any idea. Because it seems one must support by outside  
or historical book-written authority one's talk about basic and fundamental  
experiences; I cite Mr. Nash's reference due to his quality of discernment  
between reality and embellishments.

[2] You have probably detected a degree of suspicion regarding editors in some  
of my earlier comments. You should know such wild cynicism is due to ...  
immanentistic ... experience with Newspaper editors, but not limited to these.  
The City of Truth or Consequences has three competitive newspapers and I've  
submitted material to all three plus others. I quickly learned to comply with  
published deadlines for submissions as close to the deadline as possible;  
otherwise the editor would have time to arrange for other submissions to  
counteract mine and maintain the publisher's political/subscriber slant.

[3] Typo and other mistakes, omissions, were often made too by the editor  
which made me appear like a fool -- more than I preferred -- but it also provided  
me opportunity to then write and correct the mistake without blaming the editor  
or publishers. It actually drew more attention to the subject matter. I must  
confess to having made one or two of these mistakes for which to later apologize  
and add emphasis; but it was done in reaction.

[4] That having been said to explain my untamed cynicism; I've -- sincerely --  
found none of this stuff in your editorial conduct, and want you to know your  
intellectual honesty is appreciated. This honesty I attribute not so much to your  
self-image or imaging, but to the ... transcendental ... source of some standard  
of truth. This transcendental source then is ultimately more appreciated and has

tamed my cynicism. What that does is leave judgment of your motives up to -- if...you...will pardon the expression -- God, while leaving me free to keep both eyes toward seeking understanding and communication.

[5] You'll note the italicized terms above, and probably see the meaningfulness for future dialogue, especially relative to your response to Mr. Moore's posting as a C to TA51. I intend to take some issue with your use of transcendence as noise from n-o-w-h-e-r-e [my vivid interpretation] whereas immanence, though nothing intelligible -- like aggravating bass noise [my depiction] -- is more now and here and therefore ... comprehensible. One objective will be to avoid any KJF contributor from occupying a position of superiority regarding originating truth-enhancing structures (or drugs for that matter). Ultimate credit must be reserved distinct and distant enough away from us -- our subject-object dichotomous unsought but unavoidable split -- to avoid even the appearances of that evil enemy, megalomania.

[6] For this reason my early memory is here attached for re-posting with an additional request justified in part on the John Nash precedent mentioned above. In this early experience with a sewing machine, where would you place transcendence -- not so much as one of the forms of Jaspers' Encompassing -- but as a general transcendence belonging to each mode one might give to the Encompassing. For example, I would use the term to point toward what personal affections and understanding was parentally manifested including the untold -- to the child -- histories and standards involved.

[7] Let's begin with lower case "t" transcending, meaning going beyond in thought, to "a specific objectivity to become aware of its Encompassing." (Jaspers, from Von Der Wahrheit.) We will not use "T" Transcendence yet as Jaspers also used it as one of the modes of the Being that surrounds us, for it seems a little early a memory of experience to expect immersion -- baptism -- in that mode to be understood by a child; though Transcendence can be felt and trusted no less through others though not comprehended.

[8] Obviously, this is a tolling of the bell for you and Mr. Moore to come back to the cultivatable field, back to a more current reality than Anaximander's few lines (a little more than alleged and less than an affidavit). I understand this is expecting much for my personal education, and I feel some guilt for requesting condescension. If it would help your empathy, please visualize me as one confused or disorientated along the side of the road to Jericho having been beaten senseless from behind by unknown assailants wielding not harmless transcendental weapons but an immanent weapon thus robbing me of an authentic self-hood based on the immanence with which you can identify.

[9] Finally, a precedent from Karl Jaspers from a statement to Rudolph Bultmann under the caption Personal Recollection and Motivation: "In the field of

the undemonstrable, every kind of thinking has a personal character. This is not a disadvantage; rather, it characterizes truth whenever it does not reflect individual caprice, and when subjectivity has been sufficiently moved to assume the form of a universal idea." (Myth and Christianity, p. 108 Noonday paper back 4th printing.) My position is that, that: taking the personal out of being and/or Being -- or as you for some reason prefer impersonal apeiron -- reflects individual caprice by indirection or turning one's back to subjectivity rather than as a person going beyond. <file:///Users/glenn/Desktop/WoodJaspersForum/51-R4MUL.webarchive>