

TA51, Response 15 (to C28 by Archambeault)

BIBLICAL PRELUDE TO JASPERS ON CREATION 30 April 2003, posted 6 May 2003 by Glenn C. Wood

Appreciated Armand Archambeault's drawing attention to C24 for I do want to respond eventually to that Comment. Here's a brief and loose response to AA:

AA's view of the place of creation as more eternal than not is not new in the historical scheme of experience. The Bible -- and I'm speaking as an occidental -- begins with the encompassing eternal. "In the beginning God" provides a real twist of thought and tosses one not only against but also through the walls of thinking. That's good psychology and recognizes not only the piece-meal way we think but shows us the eternal as well. Hebrews 11:3 provide similar twists for thought. Included is the essence of AA's "it" but AA seems to have an at least unintentional aversion to the Bible. So, I would ask AA to give credit where due by remembering -- lest it be forgotten, to be remembered no more -- that the aversion is a reaction to a peculiar religious tradition, and a concomitant desire for the priesthood.

If it were not for the mind encompassing and transcending the peripheral bonds of thinking, like concepts of beginnings and ends, there would be no science and no communication. It's the predicament of polarization or that dichotomous necessity for comparing and differentiating, but we must not succumb to either pole's ground -- cosmology's or eschatology's ontology. If it were not for the predicament of thinking in terms of beginnings and ends there would be no reason for appearances except to lead out of the predicament. AA's experience with established religion must be discombobulating. If "Michael" appears between the poles of this predicament, hopefully it's to point toward the imageless God of the Bible. AA could believe the Bible and still have reason to write his books; I mean AA does not have to discredit the Bible for his books' values to be determined.