

TA51, Response 9 (to C8 by Muller)

AN IMMANENTAL APEIRON IS NOT CYPHER OF TRANSCENDENCE by Glenn C.
Wood 25 August 2002, posted 10 September 2002

[1] Mr. Muller's comments are valuable and as one might expect zeroed in on pertinent current items of importance such as: The war on covert terrorism has an overt aspect that is less obvious. Religionists have interpreted biblical prophetic-like perceptiveness as though there is no God, and because Armageddon has been post hoc revealed there's an ad hoc monumental movement toward fulfillment. Religionist's expounding Godless interpretations about what God has revealed are like taunts from a crowd heard by one about to take a suicidal jump: "Jump (and fulfill the prophecy so the select can go on)." We need to be careful how words are interpreted, and the word "cipher" carries an intrinsic reminder of a need to constantly re-cognize a reality beyond our interpretations. "Zero derivation" seems to preclude God, and seems to be a substitution for Jaspers' use of cipher.

[2] Stones as cipher symbols crying to be heard -- "Word use causes transcendence." True, so far as it goes, but it's the ultimate cul de sac in the nice Muller "bubble" we allegedly cannot get out of (TA43 C1<5>). There's more to the word "transcendence" than what the mind's tools can cause. Even if it's a vague subjective word to the wiser philosophical self, Dongier's observation is applicable: "I have a problem" with Glasersfeld's idea that information doesn't travel through space. I have a problem with something there too, for it seems to assume absolute voids where relativity abounds.

[2.1] Glasersfeld is clear and distinct -- though there's ... the rest of the story. There's no clear and distinct doubt where it's most needed. Dongier attempts to transact and says there's something intrinsic in words; they are more than signs, but he is approaching the ineffable (TA43 Commentary 1<2> and <7>). But Dongier cannot come to terms with that ineffable. Perhaps he, as Karl Jaspers, has not forgotten early experiences. "Man lives in ciphers from the day he starts to think, but not until discrimination brightens his world and his knowledge does he feel called upon to purify this realm of language." (Jaspers, Philo. Faith and Revelation, p. 93.) Discrimination is unavoidable in this "bubble" of diversity, and the urge to come to terms with the cipher language is unreachable from within. However, though trying to escape, the "bubble" can only be penetrated from without through the cipher language. But efforts to purify ciphers pervert the cipher. "Ciphers are never the reality of Transcendence." (Ibid.)

[2.2] Limiting the transcendental meaning of stone to empirical meanings can have a minimizing effect; it affects potential. After "Mr. Stone," i.e., the biblical

Peter stated that Jesus was -- the son of the living God -- Jesus said it was revealed to Peter. That's the capital Transcendence revealing something the mind -- individual or collective -- cannot cause by degrees of transcendental levels or cycles of accomplishments, for the bubble has only clear and distinct circle-drives and cul-de-sacs.

[2.3] Above we are talking about petros, meaning a stone, and petra meaning more like a boulder -- if one is to build on it. Here the word stone causes transcendence by comparison for it means what is lesser about a stone compared to something greater in experience and construction, such as Petra, the city carved from boulders (that Josephus knew about, and why not Jesus too?) to which the passage is narrow.

[2.4] If transcendence -- disregarding Transcendence -- is only caused by the mind's words, the church Jesus said would be built upon a rock would be only that posited in experience. It would be temples, churches, and mosques, built in Jerusalem and fought over. It would mean conflict -- overt and covert inquisitions and terrorism in the name of God -- and then a corresponding profane reaction called atheism for there's no cipher to replace the bombardment within immanental transcendence -- there are only the placards "God" and "no God."

[2.5] But Transcendence revealed something to Peter: the prophesied son of God had come. It is upon those symbols, though more than Peter could understand, that the church invisible would be made. But interpreters since have reduced the meaning to an illusion. Jaspers' caveat: "If the reality of Transcendence is thus captured for our own reality [like building a church on a rock, or personage -- my comment], we have lost Transcendence."

[2.6] Is this more spiritual than corporate church independent of mind or minds? Yes, not only as if we can imagine it to be, but it must actually -- unpredictable heroic deeds -- be or the alternative is that mind is dependent on outstanding edifices which control by prohibitions and commands but moreover by mind stifling guilt. Here we step unto a surreal hypnotic primrose lane, for after all if we cause words, and transcendence is limited to that cause, then "all roads lead to Rome." There, then, is a proverbial example of the truth in the statement that words can cause transcendence.

[2.7] If the wholly other is cut off from sacramental thinking, it means only the most vividly and colorfully organized, the oldest, the most subtle, the most given to visual aids for the young and shallow, remains the absolute source of the flow of distraction from the divine.

[2.8] Jaspers' comments about the Augustinian line of church history could be worthwhile reading in *Philosophical Faith and Revelation* pp. 37 through 48

where he refers to the "transformation and falsification of original Christianity into the political Church." (p.47, Collins, London 1967.)

[3] Fixed selves and sources beyond -- Perhaps the word "fixed" self was unclear, and fixated self images should have been used. There's always a beyond or there would be no need for a pilgrimage to an apeiron or the "zero derivation." This is where I'm willing to go with you but not as-if the self images, the icons, are laid aside, not willy-nilly and not dilly-dallying around pointing at Nietzsche as though it had already been done (that's to be read poetically rather than sarcastically). We need to systematically, logically, rid ourselves of fictitious imaginations and fictitious states of emotion, and especially the fictitiousness of the comfortable feeling that accompanies the assumption that "zero derivation" is real but not beyond. Fiction is fiction because constructed only from experience; it can help us get to the moon and beyond, but once reaching somewhere we can still look up to the hills from whence cometh our salvation (Transcendence).

[4] Contacts with various religions and worldviews-- I'd like to think I've no fixated religion and this is hard to see for someone programmed only to recognize an organism. Nor would I participate in an ecumenical -- a union of churches -- movement toward a universal church. But more later on this matter.

[4.1] What does Jaspers say regarding connections with churches? "I do not take my stand against the church and theology as enlightener in order to negate them, but as a servant to that great independent truth [philosophy]." "True, I wanted to be a member of a congregation corresponding to my historical heritage in view of the great regulative forces of the Occident." (Autobiography, p 77 Lib. of Living Philosophers, Tudor, 57)

[5] Are "Protestant" churches making progress toward unity? First, is it being suggested that "the pope" is saying that the "Holy Roman Catholic (universal) Church" is making progress toward protesting the interference of its self? Perhaps there's been a misunderstanding, and someone is taking advantage of the tendency to transcend the real meaning of pontifical utterances. If you're saying there's a conciliatory protestant spirit that is being taken advantage of by an "universally" exclusive church, that there's a harvesting, a collecting of power from naive Protestants; that's probably true. The term Catholicity is still capitalized. The message of Catholicity has not changed: those not in the fold or the sacramental channel are outside the only flow of blessings (but still going to hell). The effort on the part of institutionalism is not reconciliatory as much as it is a way of getting back on top.

[5.1] The word Protestantism implies denomination-alism, the second step to a one-world church or Catholicism (as in universal). The word Protestant is like the word Reformation; there's inherent in it the idea that something can be

protested and then reformed and then there's no longer anything to protest.

[5.2] There's a tradition in the church of my experience that says we are not Protestants but if a name must be used it is biblically this: "They were called christians first in Antioch (Acts 11:26). But once the title was uttered, the subtle process began -- mainly after Constantine -- to misuse and take advantage of the sacrifices that were made.

[5.3] One does not have to know Kierkegaard and Nietzsche to see there's little christian in what is designated "Christian" today. It presents a problem for churches using the Bible as a standard, for how can one continue to respect the biblical word "christian" in view of the misuse. If Christian isn't used it's like throwing out the Bible with the word. (Thirty years ago I playfully considered Existenzen as a substitute for Christian, but everything is subject to abuse. All one need do today is search the Internet to see the misuse of it in the name of Existenz and/or existential counseling and it's not free (except on the KJF).

[5.4] There is no such thing as Protestant or Catholic in the invisible church which is made up of individuals whose membership ideally is not politically and/or economically motivated. Jaspers did not say that there's a greater chance for changing man through Protestantism (which can't exist without admitting the priority of "Catholicism," though biblical christianity is both preeminent and prior). He said he sees greater chance for it on Protestant ... soil. There's less absoluteness in thinking if one does not belong to the only clearly and distinctly right group.

[6] The question of Muslim and Jewish theistics -- They retain at least in transcendental words the faith of Abraham, but also the tensions of Sarah and Hagar and the results of a father's desertions. Jesus saw the need to point to a heavenly father because of the misuse of the lineage bias such as through a convenient regard for the patriarchs which could lead to excuses for misconduct, such as in David: "Look what David did, I can do no better and owe it to lineage to do less" (or, perhaps, look what Muhammad did: "I owe it to him to do no better").

[6.1] Jesus saw the need to restructure what the whole religious system had become. Israel and a new Jerusalem were idealistic symbols and not mundane goals. John in Revelation was shown the result of literal interpretations and unavoidable consequences unless the Transcendence, the non-locality, the Kingdom of Heaven was believed and then manifested to be ... within ... each individual in the here and now.

[6.2] Jesus was a revolutionary reformer of individuals to the point that even the day of the christian get-to-gather was to be the first day of the week rather than the last for the Sabbath was made for man not man for the Sabbath. It

perhaps also afforded the opportunity for the church to gather momentum without too much pressure from the Sabbath-day's establishment. Jaspers places Jesus along side the great philosophers of Socrates, Buda, and Confucius, but in his autobiography he states that at a point he consciously took antiquity and the Bible seriously "as the foundation of our Occidental historical life, not as authorities, but as the task to listen to them and to translate them into the present."

[7] As regard those who have no established religion in whatever sense -- The biblical Paul said it well, that there are those who do by nature the things contained in the law (Romans). Here he is talking about the spirit of the decalogue -- which includes not making an image of God -- and whatever codified form required to deal with improper conduct. But there are advantages to associating with independent ethical movements to cope with the overt and subtle alienating affects of institutionalized religion, such as the infiltration of autocrats -- which happens occasionally in independent local congregations but easier dealt with. If the gospel of faith, repentance, forgiveness, love, and involvement is not shared, the void is quickly filled by criminal organizations sometimes in the form of radical groups using religious language -- atheism in clerical garb and adherents genuflecting in busy public places.

[8] Conversion -- There is no alternative to conversion, for as Jaspers said the hope of mankind is the conversion of each individual. Conversion too often mean proselytizing or converting from -- to make a point -- one gang to another gang. But conversion does not mean thwarting rescue efforts because one has recorded membership as one of the "elect".

[9] 1529 sacramental tension -- Is there a difference today in the role of the church and clergy than during the violent sacramental controversy? There are no priests as sacramental channels of grace today from the vertical dimension; that is: grace doesn't flow -- sacramentally -- through the priests only because the ecclesiastical organization ordained them whether in the western or Eastern Church.

[9.1] In the church of my history there are two practices misnamed as ordinances, i.e., two practices ordained by example by Jesus and used in the early church (to escape the restraining milieu of stifling traditional turf-terms the group's verbiage has not included the word sacrament): baptism and communion. They have symbolic meaning, that is, meaning-on-the-way. Jaspers says: "Neither embodiment nor sacramentalism are essential to that [such as daily reflection and meditation in existential living -- my comment], although philosophical reflection justifies a sacramental trend as long as it does not lure us into those embodying traps. Ritualism and sacramentalism are possible in a life with ciphers." (p.101, Philosophical Faith and Revelation.)

[9.2] Baptism and communion have meaning unless reduced to ecclesiastical facts, or authoritative commands (See: Confirmation of Revealed Reality by Witnesses, p. 109, Philo. Faith and Rev). Such philosophical reflections are treated more fully in what was previously routed to you in a hopefully transactional response to Rifat's comments about nine keys that open nine poly-doors. It's not posted yet. The functional aspect of "sacraments" were put in philosophical language there and presented for comprehension in a five-step biblical plan meant to save human kind and showing the similarity to Jaspers' formula in his "Future of Mankind." My point was to show Jaspers' formula was more biblically than institutionally confirmed, but not because biblical but because corresponding to obvious needs. (See, when posted, my comment to Rifat's TA39, commentary 51(to Wood, C37).)

[10] Nirvana -- Jaspers says: "The ascertainment of the encompassing in which we find ourselves is breached not only by revelation but also by Buddhist and Hindu Nirvana." This quote's context is a demonstration of how the cipher language cannot be embodied, and that it is also not transcended as a result of penetrating the encompassing (for there's always another encompassing anyway).

[10.1] "Breach" is a negative term such as in a breach of promise. "Nirvana turns everything -- ... the relation of Existenz to Transcendence -- into something that is not reality but delusion..." "Revelation ... diverse among Jews, Christians, and Muslims, ... acts upon the world, promising and demanding. It becomes a factor of the utmost vitality and tension in a mundane existence that is not a matter of indifference, not an illusion, but the site of eternal decisions." Jaspers continues to show how both nirvana and revelation [revelation and Godly power flowing through sacraments of an established corporal church] can either cancel or embody, restrain, the affects of cipher. This might be true of nirvana for it is transcendental but within the immanent, so it appears to me. What Jaspers says in this context is not quite like the revelation of my experience, though from another perspective I think Jaspers would agree that the Biblical imageless God allows for Transcendence but not because of transcending efforts reaching toward to the other side of ... an ... encompassing.

[11] I shudder -- poetically -- less now in that Mr. Muller is considering the possible human immunodeficiencies inherent in "zero derivation," or the loss of natural immunity; otherwise, without that critique, how would it differ from a reality independent of the critical mind ? A systematic approach with a checklist may be a good way to avoid acquiring an immune-deficiency and the loss of all that is human. There are inherited preconstitutional and predispositional strengths and weakness that need to be handled too.

[12] After rereading TA45 there still seems to be something absent from a philosophical viewpoint: an as-if-God is no longer hidden. T-Transcendence is no

longer hidden from the imagination; it succumbs to the belief in the criteria of continuous testing, doubt and feedback. The clear and distinct item of the mind that cannot be doubted is that transcendence is caused by our conjured words. The sound Transcendence is no different from the sound transcendence. The latter is clear and distinct to the imagination's cause and effect modes and must be the source of any other less clear meaning. There's little doubt about the clear and distinct effect of words, as follows:

[12.1] Though we need to "... stop giving lip-service to the notion of external reality and truth" -- and it seems this includes religion for Mr. Muller -- there is the predicated and preposition of the next "of" of external truth and reality: "... of which we have to say in the same breath it is unknowable." And though it is more an under-the-breath unknowable, Mr. Muller still seems to be quite clearly saying that the innocent, i.e., naive, assent to the unknowable is non-functional in principle.

[12.2] It seems what we have here in this "principle" is "revelation" for as regards the unknowable, principles like that become revelation or in a sense sacraments; and as Jaspers says in his critique of the possibility of revelation through sacraments: "The faith in revelation is indeed no longer a faith in the hidden God who gives me to myself in biblical and philosophical faith -- immediately, not by some kind of mediation that is claimed to be God himself." (Philo. Faith and Revelation, p. 110)