

## TA51, Response 5 (to Moore and others)

DON'T DEMYTH THE REALITY OF CRUCIFIED by Glenn C Wood 7 July 2002,  
posted 6 August 2002

Notation: David Herman indicated willingness to Comment on TA 51 but stated a need for research. To date I've not seen a Comment and I had indicated to him that I understood if he could not Comment

[1] I was a little disappointed not to have a more direct contribution to TA51 by Mr. Muller -- but I do appreciate his extensive research and references particularly his influence in getting the Moore posting. I'm looking forward to David Herman's comments and to making adjustments, corrections, and additions to TA51.

[2] Though relevant and a bit far afield, Mr. Muller (M) finds in Moore's (M's) article something interesting and something that counters something in TA51. I pointed towards God (Transcendence too) and religion in the current field of experience and through Jaspers, Nietzsche, myself, with some personal histories; something not unexpected in an approach not excluding philosophy and psychology. The mention of Jaspers calling for a religious revival and his comments about small sects, independent, and locally controlled churches, offers concrete testing in a laboratory of history ripened for harvesting with living ... theological ramifications. Here, now, we have the occasion to see the results of a few millenniums of experiences with the body of Jesus mistakenly referred to as the corporate church by institutional or church officials at large.

[3]

TA51 deals with the practical application of the psychology of what M at least finds in M's work, i.e., "some fundamental theological question..." or for M, a formula which is a fixation far enough away from dynamic personalistic realities to launch a nebulous-to-ground attack on a "theistic centerpiece" "Jesus"--about whom M seems to have an, at least an as-if, absolute hang-up on a misunderstanding of the Biblical words resulting in a later concept of an "incarnation." The misused word "incarnation" is obviously the preferred centerpiece rather than the field of current experience. It's easier to review remote -- but not the remotest accounts like the Biblical imageless God -- discussions about the "incarnation" in Church history, while simultaneously finding refuge in alleged conceptual conflicts and self-contradictions that are more real errors than the contradictions inherent in life in general, like birth and death, or image and imageless, or the inadequate visualization of cosmology or sub atomic physics, and the contradictory affects of observers on the observed -- natural contradictions that become errors if denied as unavoidable.

[4] It does seem a bit strange that disputants know more about the life of God or Jesus than they do about themselves. There is mystery and myth regarding not only one's own origin, current status, and destiny. About this uncertainty they can be of good cheer anyway, but with regard to Jesus certainty is demanded with all seriousness though there are no individual forms for handling Jesus more adequately than what they use for knowing themselves.

[5] We could conveniently get hung-up in the history of the "incarnation." This has been demonstrated by M and M's, and like M proposes to get loose of such by decrees about "zero derivation." There's not much to talk about in referents in the depersonalized silence of here-and-now's ground zero (like the silent barren atom bomb ground-zero site here a few miles north at the north end of White Sands, New Mexico), but plenty incarnation-talk about agnostic ramblings, including some ease with which to apply a mind-independent reality standard for there can be no response from voices of the past except by living defenders of ethical memorial personages of history.

[6] Very early after Jesus Justin Martyr had talked about the "divine Word, or logos, as incarnate in Christ." (see TA 51 bibliography, pp.80-81, Fisher.) Subsequent discussions seem to follow the normal course, like in the discussions on the KJF regarding the: is reality mind-independent? The same basic forms of thinking were being used then as now with some seeing the contradictions as unavoidable and others not capable of living with contradiction without talking incessantly as though much simple or sophisticated chatter would shatter or broach the contradictions and make contradictory terrain level enough for a consensus on the question of contradictions.

[7] In 1525 Casper Schwenckfeld, reported to be pious, saw some possible value in such discussions, forensic value, about the "incarnation," and saw them, like in terms of the Lord's Supper, useless unless it had a conversion affect on the core of man and an understanding of the symbolic nature which must result in internal change. Here, the "incarnation," localized somewhat in the Lord's Supper, was expected to have results in the conduct of man.

[8] It seems this form of "incarnation" thinking is relevant to TA 51 in that the legal discussion surrounding the Bill of Rights' freedom of religion and separation of Church and State is comparable to forensic medicine's relation to legalities. Relevant too is the "incarnation" as the continuation of the body of Jesus in the body of established churches -- misunderstood in part as something really present rather than the symbolic representations of the body and blood.

[9] If the "incarnation" is thought to be a fertile impregnating (fecundate) sperm-like-word carnally cast like seed into an immanent matrix for rooting and growing like a flowing vine, it can become corporate -- with head and body -- or "corporeal" rather than symbolic, with enough divine-descendant corporate

power to be a real threat to religious freedom for a law might be required to control the misuse of divine power. That's one reason the Biblical Paul emphasized faith over law.

[10]

Though there were no corporate power dangers in his psychology of an incarnation, Schwenckfeld and his followers were persecuted in Germany and many immigrated to Pennsylvania in 1734. That persecution over meaningful symbols is perhaps more to the point than discussions about the M and M's dialogue about ramifications of the misunderstood "incarnation." Schwenckfeld was restoring Paul's meaning.

[11] (In the Church of my history, each Sunday the congregation -- including visitors -- are invited to participate in the Lord's Supper. Elected elders of and by the group would preside and say that the bread and juice reminds us ... symbolically ... of the death of Jesus on the cross -- accompanied by quotes from the Bible. It is part of the centerpiece of the weekly meeting. So much, there, for the "incarnation." So much for forensics regarding the US Constitution, for there's no potential threat unless somehow the people are abused through brainwashing and freedom of thought is enslaved by an institutionally enforced faith in a miraculous transfer of the real body and blood of Jesus which would have spoiled by now and become poisonous [that's not as much a natural contradiction as it is premeditated error]. That's a bit comparable to the Jonestown massacre, and forensics would then be involved because of the violation of civil rights, such as child and adult emotional and physical abuse.)

[12] Forensics continued, forensics because of the legalities growing out of the Church-State legislative and executive powers and the threats of judicial inquisitions. During the 19th century a fellow named Julius Muller held to a theory of "the Kenosis" or that Jesus laid aside his potentials temporarily and that is all really that need be said about the incarnation if such talk only intends to avoid the work of thrashing, like some take more breaks from work than others because they have an addiction to smoking.

[13] (By the way; I wonder how one should interpreted Mr. H. Muller's capitalized phrases and words: Are they inspirational shouts of emotion or are they emphatic decreeing? Are they ciphers in Jaspers' sense wherein Transcendence descends objectively and moves subjectively? Perhaps they are cries of distress like Nietzsche's Zarathustra heard -- see below. Perhaps it's my vivid paranoid imagination! Yes, that's it. My apologies.)

[14] What does an incarnation idea mean today and in language that does not plead for justification without referents? It should mean what the Biblical Paul meant when he was speaking about Jesus being the head of a body, the church.

That the people influenced by and seen as followers of Jesus should watch their conduct, but not to be too harsh on those who are misbehaving -- not living up to the standard set by the head. All a reasonable person needs do is read all of Paul's writings to the Corinthians. Paul was dealing with problems in the churches like the problems in today's churches. Personal immoral conduct was a problem. Intentional use of unknown words, vying for power, babbling, and/or speaking in tongues--a problem that he dealt with masterfully by simply saying let there be interpreters (with two interpreters, who would dare babble and claim it's inspiration or a structured bit of grammar from the encompassing of being as such). The Lord's Supper too was being misused which he resolved by showing the symbolical nature of it, and the forensics involved was: some were overeating and getting drunk really and verbally, and that compromised the group in the community and placed it in a liable position (they had lawyers then too).

[15] One can find something correct in Muller's zero derivation, besides what I've referred to elsewhere, but he is hoping for what has already been attempted in the Biblical "beginning" and in the movement of at least one small sect; i.e., the effort to pass over all this well known church history and restore the earliest meanings regarding these theological questions by using a standard that has been preserved but greatly ignored within that church history. With regard to the "incarnation," which M and M's affirm is an essential part of Christian or Christian Church history, the Bible should be given consideration as the standard. But here I sit, if I agree to the M as-if rule, as-if with no standard, except "old battered law-tables around me and also new, half written law-tables. ... No one tells me anything new; so I tell myself to myself." (Thus Spoke Zarathustra, Of Old and New Law-Tables)

[16] (By the way ... again -- Nietzsche's genealogy of morals will have to be considered further from his life's history perspective, as must be the misunderstanding about his alleged vital position relative to the death of God. The two are connected, as the two matters are inseparable in the current field of investigation relative to morals and disease and the possible consequences of zero derivation and no referents. I prefer moving on without that discussion for it can be endless, but Nietzsche is one prop used by proud, straight standing, staring fellows with gang-like courage standing by a fellow bigger than most -- they think.)

[17] What is alarming about "zero derivation" is that it leaves the young and impulsive without a moral standard and the elderly -- who are removed from the need for self control -- forgetting the need for standards, and it cuts off a wealth of learned lessons not only in religion but also in science. First, there is no such thing as zero derivation or there would be no shouting about its need. Secondly, the real danger is operating for a moment as-if there's such. The decree for it as a fiction and/or as a fact is contradictory and without any personification.

Though I have no problem with contradiction, this zero derivation seems like a contradiction reversed upon itself; it is like a cow ruminating between the two stomachs listening between cuds at another's chewing in a field where there's nothing to eat and refusing to eat the overgrowth of accessible vegetation from adjacent fields. Or as Abe Lincoln once said of an opponent's argument, that, it's as thin as soup made from a pigeon that starved to death.

[18] Hard put to find, there must be something to falsify in "zero derivation" and it's that phenomena which has existence, a pure arbitrary existence without a referent. In search of it M has hiked back-trails almost as though -- albeit unintentionally -- searching for some ground which has no moral precepts, a search for a ground for license and the only test is whether it functions, as in trial and error. Supposedly this includes behavior. He recognizes the unifying value of mores but is concerned about the failure of some religious ideas not keeping pace with alleged fragmentation resulting from science.

[19] Does this mean there should be an amendment to constitutions to legislate for zero derivation? Does it mean adding statutes leaning favorably toward immoral behavior or a repression of moral conduct so that there's public funding available for treating the diseases resulting from trial and error in scientific and humanitarian constructions built from the stock of zero derivation ?

[20] That's a real problem, as C. Everett Koop has made clear in his introductory remarks to Aids and the Health Care System (editor, Lawrence O. Gostin) "We must not isolate our efforts in AIDS from the mainstream of public health and medicine, despite the many temptations to do so. This has occurred in the past in the area of mental health and substance abuse." Denying that reality or thinking of it as-if is really being independent of one's mind and is unrealistic in that there's always been a world of other minds even if each admits being dependent upon the mind more than the brain or reality; diseases have been communicated from mind to mind, brain to brain, body to body especially during times of the denial of reality or behaving as-if reality is independent.

[21] But back to the falsification of the formula of as-if God, zero derivation, or ideas without referents, and back to the search for the results of the death of God. Here poetry is resorted to fairly, for the same was done with Anaximander. The M search for zero derivation reminds me of Nietzsche's Zarathustra's (Z) wholesome search. Z ran through the forests looking for the source of some cries of distress. Momentarily oblivious to the suffering, Z rejoiced in his heart and was thankful for discussions he had during the early part of the day's search. The joy of togetherness in dialogue made him forget the suffering cries.

[22] "... [A]ll at once the scenery changed, and Z ... stepped into a kingdom of death. Here...no grass, no tree, no cry of birds..."--except a green serpent when it grew old went to die there. But there was Z as a person because of the cries.

"Then he saw something sitting on the pathway, shaped like a man and hardly like a man, something unutterable. And all at once Z was overcome by the great shame of having beheld such a thing: blushing ... he turned ... to leave this evil spot. But then the dead wilderness resounded: for from the ground issued a gurgling, rasping sound such as water makes in stopped-up water-pipes at night, and at last a human voice and human speech emerged from it ..." Held in position like a felled oak, Z regains strength and says "I know you well ... you are the murderer of God ! Let me go. You could not endure him who saw you -- who saw you unblinking and through and through, you ugliest man! You took revenge upon this witness..." the ugliest man said: "But he -- had to die: he looked with eyes that saw everything -- he saw...all man's hidden disgrace and ugliness." (From the Ugliest man section of Thus Spoke Z). Here, even Nietzsche, immanentism personified, did not dare venture into the "source and sink" and leave personalistic essentials behind. Even when he tried, his personal shadow would run after him.

[23] So the personalistic shadows if not the whole person follow the church throughout its history, and sometimes the shadow of the "theological" discussions overshadow the simplicity of the referents of religious symbols, the personages. But the field is still ripe for harvesting those seeds, those husks, those exemplary examples independent of my mind, and independent of every individual mind since one person noticed self and another self.

[24] I now what to respond more specifically to Muller's C2 (to C1 by Moore). The phrase {1} "... the 'modern' split between natural sciences and the humanities and the resulting fragmentation of experience ... still produce conceptual difficulties" sounds close to a fulfilled hope if not pure faith in the absolute elimination of conceptual difficulties. How much closer to a fixating ontology can one get? It sounds like an ontology disguised as a functional as-if ontology, but embellished by a resounding melody to hide the sink's gurgling. We should come to terms with contradictions but not to the point that the terms deny them as ultimate and unavoidable situations in life.

[25] In {2} M proceeds to talk about the abolition of absolute truths and realities and absolute truths regarding God and Jesus. There are no such absolute truths about God or Jesus in the Bible. There are absolutes but they are not definitive in the normal sense. The deconstruction and restructuring hoped for is based on extra-Biblical conjured absolutes like in institutional creeds enforced in definitive ways upon the membership to make them feel exclusive for the ongoing support of the institution. But these creeds M seems to want to work with for they can be made to fit a formula.

[26] M seems to bend over to find Moore's <10> "... not a call for thinking, nor ... step toward thinking" clear enough to demand an either/or answer on the question of whether reality is or is not mind-independent. Thinking and being,

they are both separated and together, and M seems to capriciously omit structure and calls on a ... given ... nebulous unstructured reality when overwhelmed by structure. This call for Moore's confession is comparable to "have you quit beating your spouse?"

[27] Why he does this is seen in {5} some interpretation of apparent static hopes within untidy physics that is then -- less real than actual -- seen in "onto-theology" equated with God. Here M is making progress though, for he is recognizing God as distinct from a static entity. Here the Biblical view of God is gaining a spiritual foothold in Muller's saddle. That's good. It was good, for then he feels the spirited foot, bolts away and God is reduced to a working hypothesis without personification, a product of pure rationalization about experience.

[28] In {6} Plato is blamed for codifying the subject-object split. Plato was not that much of an establish institution. If a codification occurred it came with what is known as the Apostasy when faith is reduced to creeds in church history. The codifications are associated with the ugliest man -- and I'll leave that as a riddle, for Nietzsche gives the title of the ugly man later in the Z story.

[29] In {7} I'll leave M with his understanding of monotheistic religion seen from his obvious personal distance from it. I'll allow great tolerance here because of his use of "theistic" rather than "theism." However, at the end here, even Jesus is accused of MIR-logos, and therefore his example, life's history is in question and we are on our own -- which means we can be like a god taking credit for such codes of conduct as the golden rule.

[30] Mystery and myth are demeaned by association with the Catholic official characterization of "incarnation" {9}. The misuse of mystery can only be eliminated by such an example. Now M knows all mystery, I mean it is finally revealed to him, for the ground of being is known to be an unstructured mother nature, and the life of Jesus was more meaningless than meaningful. He knows this regardless of his own structures and the only experience he's had is with a structured world of others. Personally, once again, let me say, not knowing, I'd rather hate to say with such absolute certitude what other world-power structures and principalities there might be in this infinite universe. Perhaps M should capitalize the words for there's nothing much else to lend credentials to it.

[31] Transcendence is shouted or inspired in {10}. Here is a M classical statement easily challengeable. It is a word he says per se, not grammar, not based on religious experience. To enforce this unclear view, TA45 is referred to, and concludes that transcendence is a view from nowhere and drops another name, Nagel. I and Karl Jaspers do not agree, but one has to be more or less than formula orientated, must be wholly human and have either philosophical or religious experience within a like history, familial, or community experience to yield to what cannot be uttered without embarrassment. But we will try: "Let us

bring these modes of encompassing to mind: on the subject side lie consciousness at large, existence, the mind, Existenz; on the object side lie the world and Transcendence" (p. 62 Phil. Faith...) and in a section entitled the Step From Immanence to Transcendence: "... [W]e become free for ourselves in relation to Transcendence. When we hang in suspense, so to speak, in all mundane being, we touch ground in Transcendence. Here is our refuge. Returning from there to the world, we take up the tasks that fall to us in the situations of our way through the world."

[32] In {11} M has a predeterministic understanding of language, that it is like we get carried away and start talking in tongues and then assume some entity as object. Although that happens, I would agree more with Moore that the scientific understanding of the word logos has theistic ramifications, but to me not that's not theism. It does not become absolute unless reduced to a creed with a system as a test of memberships, a pledge of allegiance to the authority of the institution as distinct from others. Words participate in the unknown and known simultaneously when proceeding from ethical or transcending thoughts. And there is a word into which comes meaning from a vertical dimension -- it can be cipher -- that is humbling, though unquestionable to the individual, and brings discomfort when placed in communicable form to others.

[33] Thoughts expressed in {12} by M regarding the ground of being are correct according to my experience in that access can be obstructed by assumptions, but primary structures are always there by the fact we come into a world where other's structures already influence the mind's development. There is no remembrance by mortal man of immortality that can be expected to be sharable with the community of others -- (with a singular exception). There might be a vague recollection of retrospective awareness prior to objectification and while prospectively anticipating the need for structure to avoid discomfort in the future for both self and others if wholly human, that is, e.g., not diseased by alcoholism's affect on the fetus.

[34] Remembering early life experiences cannot give us definitive truth or boost standards to live by except by the empathetic care, affection, and understanding by the handed down structures of others, such as balanced parents. But there is a vague feeling of ... being ... prior to more vivid recollections and in that sense reality is independent of vividness. Heidegger's mistakes, or one's less than absolute accuracy and varying degrees of remembering and resultant personal biases should not prevent admitting such data.

[35] Theism, that is, the ism, sneaks back in {13}. Theism is an absolute word and exclusive, unlike theistic thinking and the monotheistic imageless Biblical idea. Non-theistic religions may be like a theistic silence but could be a theism in effect. The word "mono-theistic" is again tossed back in and interpreted as something visible compared to something more vague like in nirvana and the



Encompassing of the encompassing. The outside authority of monotheistic feeling and thinking is more the recognition that authority lies beyond the predicament of thought and its piece-meal determinations. Being an istic rather than an ism avoids egocentricity.

[36] "If one accepts that the source and sink of our thinking is not structured ... self contradiction disappears." {14} Unfortunately, creative tension disappears as well along with the hope for something permanent, immutable, in an overwhelming changing flux-like phenomena of experience -- even Heraclites' river has structure, that is: "one cannot step twice into the same river" especially if it's a river of others' structures. This is not to suggest productivity is entirely lost in "zero derivation" or when no external referent is admitted, but it is a productivity out of balance with the rest of the world, reaching its most extreme dysfunction in catatonic withdrawal, a sinking (immanental) into or beyond (transcendental, small "t") potential and personal selfhood within the world of others.

[37] In the second paragraph of {14} M implies monotheistic thinking turns people into gods whereas in non-theistic creeds it is less likely but tempting. These comments and those about the incarnation shows a misunderstanding of the Biblical message about the life of Jesus. The word of God, the Old Testament that Jesus knew well, has always been present in the sense of Karl Jaspers' ciphers. In this sense too a comprehensive understanding of an incarnation process has come to terms in Jaspers' view that "what ever is historical is corporeal." "The ciphers too are historic, but their only embodiment is in their language, in this ambiguous, historically animated language that is not spoken and is only metaphorically called a language." (Philosophical Faith and Revelation p. 107, 1967, Collins, London.) Limiting the cipher language to definitions of "incarnation" such as done by M and M's is an easy escape from understanding the cipher language of Being. There are no multiple manifestations of such a historical incarnation except in the mind of those withdrawn from an indivisible reality.

[38] {15} Sarcasm: It appears the wrong fellow was crucified. Or, it ought also have been Parmenides for his "MIR-belief." That rascal! He obviously also caused some individuals to go along with a misunderstanding about the life of Jesus. But without Parmenides and the life of Jesus what would MIRs have to discuss? M could retreat to a monastery of his preference, take an easy vow of silence; but there might be a field there for testing formulas -- assuming he's not already a monastic.

[39] Paragraph {16} makes me shudder. Transcendence shall always occur but not because of technical maneuvers and rationalism's scheme of redemptions this side of potentiality. It seems a shame to get good ideas and then refuse to feel obligated to sources outside the fixated self. Perhaps the problem here is

that Transcendence is seen by M as having only a vertical like rational ascending, whereas to me Transcendence has a coming in from beyond comprehension and understanding to potentiality while reason's ascending and descending is either crushed in immanental depths or explodes in speculation or contemplation.

[40] In {17} paper tigers are constructed and knocked down by an awareness that nothing can be taken from the encompassing but what by experience can be placed into it. It's assumed here that the encompassing unknown and unknowable is known to be filled with non-structured stuff and that there is no potential there which is the source of personalistic imagining. One cannot even enter there with anything personal. The potential appears substituted for by an Encompassing of the encompassing experience having its sole purpose the preventing of reasoning exploding with a big bang at least without provisions for bringing about the shrinking again. The ground of being limits expansion beyond the tests of ease or disease. It's depersonalized to the point of the exclusion of ethical corporeal historical examples.

[41] Now {18} contains some clear truth such as there remains no longer any human sacrifices for erroneous judgments and we have to look foreword with fear and trembling while forgiving one another as Jesus forgave us, and as God is love. If one needs a priest as intermediary, Jesus deserves the position. Absolutes do remain but nothing that can be verified by as-if formulas, but more by a standard for conduct that can be thought of as not dependent on the capriciousness of one individual nor a gang-like consensus. The history of the well behaved and committed is not temporary. It seems that in Mr. Muller's tone there's manifested some disrespect for the crucified one, and we know already what truths are already considered obsolete. What we seem to know is the values of the commitment to plans, formulas, wholly resounding from Z's valley of death. We must start the whole process of learning over again to get feedback experience and adjustments. As anti-institutional as I am, I'm familiar enough with reality outside myself to understand and predict the suffering cries of those propped up by meaningless non-applicable religious views if they should be removed. But in fairness, M is not advocating an immediate deconstruction and restructuring.

[42] {19} Structures have been seen as needed for stabilization since moral laws have been verbally stated or recorded such as the Code of Hammurabi and the decalogue, and the golden rule. The problem here seems to be an abnormal aversion to or unwillingness to consider the Bible's standard of conduct and religious structure, and to see there something of enough value to protect with no less commitment.

[43] An unstructured ground {20} of experience is more myth than the myth included in inescapable structures in the vast sea of humanity. The assumed nothing of encompassing being's ground is more mysterious and foggier as it is

given credit only for impersonal causes and the receptacle of impersonal experience.

[44] Here {20} also contradiction, though bemoaned elsewhere, is uneasily allowed in the balancing scales of reason. Myth, mystery, fogginess, is on one hand excludable, but on the other hand allowable if a fellow with a standard from nowhere feels another is trying to be more original than one forming the words "zero derivation." Sarcasm: My immanent God is better than your transcendental God for I have greater command of details rather than generalizations. My immanent details create more fog than the nebulosity of transcendentalistic thoughts.

[45] {21} We do live in a time of uncertainty but the uncertainty is enhanced by the structures of minds independent of the reality of the humanities. Man's inhumanity to man through structures is now such as it threatens the extinction of humanity. But the modification of the gospel message is not part of the solution; it, the modification, has been part of the problem.

[46] Conclusion: Mr. Muller's intentions seem admirable. His hopes for finding a unifying ground for a world-unity like religion is commendable though not very realistic. But it does offer an appeasing temporary alternative to the embarrassing opportunity this discussion on religion has offered the type of church that Karl Jaspers has seen as potentially worthwhile in the process of converting humankind.

[47] As a concluding remark it's doubtful there will be much expected from Christian Churches now that the editor has pretty much eliminated Jesus from the discussion though over my objections. It's doubtful that this elimination or screening is what the editor intended. The World Council of Churches began around 1937 and has as its goal to encourage its membership to see one holy, catholic, and apostolic church and that the Lord Jesus Christ is God and savior according to the Scriptures. (The greater such an organization becomes, the greater the need for balance by local autonomous churches.) That WCC organization takes some pride in stating that the Catholic Church has representatives within its organization. It should be noted that the CC is not an official member because it is "the" only exclusive catholic church. A comprehensive sort of understanding without a union of churches stands a better chance of materializing through the KJF once we get M straightened out -- said with a cheerful smile.