

And I think that's what many people fear. And to be fair, weird hormonal imbalances in ones brain can lead to all sorts of odd desires one doesn't necessarily have under control. Like, can we control our desires in the first place ... ?

When it comes to hell - well - I only know of some vision I once had. And ... I'm not sure if I want to call them visions because I've always had a very vivid fantasy and from smoking a lot of weed it seems some aspects of it have gone somewhat independent. Perhaps to a point uncomfortably close to schizophrenia – or what I think to be schizophrenia. I certainly had episodes in my life ... of questionable mental health. Including probable brain damage from malnourishment. But that's a different story.

But here's the thing ... and it took me a while to connect the dots, but: In **Doctrine and Covenants 76** we read that it's a horrible place with torments beyond our comprehension. Now, I wouldn't take all we find in this book at face value - but then there's verse **47**, where we read that God will give some people a vision. And I think I had it. And from it I find that "What Dreams may Come" shares a similar ... well ... let's call it "vision".

And that, I guess, might strike some people as some modern "hot take" on the concept of divine punishment. It is certainly a more palatable take. And based on it, we can make further space for the concept of self-inflicted harm – in the grander scheme of things. That part in the Bible where we read: **"Where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched" (Mark 9:44)**. But it also defies what we read in that D&C section. If I now had a comprehensive vision that revealed what it entails, it's not so unknowable anymore. But well. In my vision I had some clarity of what was going on. So, I was a person and I was stood in a paradisaically beautiful place - and there was a kid playing with his dad I assume ... flying a kite. But then that kite broke and fell to the ground. I by some point had picked up an item from the ground. As I then met those two and we interacted - it became clear to me that the thing I had found would help them fix their kite. I had no use for it - but still decided to keep it. The sky became darker, a storm started rolling, and I woke up in an empty shack made of ... whatever it is. "Ancient Concrete". Nothing to cover the windows, I was curling on the floor wallowing in my own misery. At least there was a roof and a door I suppose. Then eventually some missionaries arrived at the door. I opened it - but whatever they tried to say, I didn't understand. It was ... as if they spoke through water. There however was a strange light surrounding them - and glimpses at an alternate reality of some sort visibly fluctuating in and out of my vision through that light. And then they left. [Lightning Crackling, heavy rainfall]

It ... does align pretty well with the Mormon concept. Similar to Dante I suppose – where we have several Tiers of hell or paradise – but with the addition of Missionaries that visit the lower planes to eventually help them out. Although not all Mormons agree with that interpretation. I've talked with Mormons and from what I could tell they don't really share the idea that you can eventually make it out of hell. That you so might learn the lessons and ascend to a higher, less bad tier of it. Or at some point perhaps even out of it, and onward. And I guess I can see why people

don't like the idea. It kinda tells people that going to hell is OK because eventually you might get out of there anyway. So - no need to really ... try not ending up there while giving into your doubt and faithlessness. Which basically takes us back to "What Dreams May Come". And that's maybe why we shouldn't really talk about hell either.

Like so, on the one page we'll read of "the spirit being poured out upon all flesh" but on the other page we'll read that some people will go to hell still.

People sure can get upset over the mere concept of Hell - because between the deterministic and the chaotic we don't even know if that's fair. Like, what if you're gay and all Christians you know keep telling you that you're going to hell for it? Not that it's right, but it's that we perhaps never really get to solve this problem by becoming more nuanced about it. Sure, "do the right thing" - but what about those that ... would at least have us believe that they couldn't? Assigned Asshole at Birth ... now what? Trans Rights are Human Rights! (this is a trans allegory. Although it's dissimilar)

When it comes to the kingdoms (plural) of heaven (Mormon concept) - I can see indicators and reasons to believe that the main factor to all of it, is our free will. So, what the Doctrine and Covenants might call "(personal) glory", could be a measure of the personal freedom the individual has. So, the better of a person I am, the more free I can be. In that vision of Hell I had, I felt like all of my freedom only existed in that one moment where I decided whether to give that kid that thing it needed to fix their kite. (Although technically, I assume, I wasn't free still (which is a separate thing).) Yes, sure it's "God's fault" that this kite broke down in the first place - give or take - but would that venerate you from being an asshole?

And is it difficult? I mean, I'm catching vibes that there are people who would see this as a particularly mean challenge. So yea, I guess they now know where they belong! Maybe.

Maybe.

## Death

In physical terms, death is simple. But what about ... our soul? I mean, energy can neither be created nor destroyed - sotospeak. So, what about our thoughts? Can we just erase experiences we've had? (Deeper down there's the issue of the subconscious, or something even lower than that.) It would seem they can only slip from our awareness ... but eventually we might recall. So are they ever really gone? It would seem to me, that the only way God could KILL us, is by making us utterly unfree. Effectively turning us into puppets. Or statues. *Ugh, creepy.* ... Marbles. And yea, I don't like it - to be honest. It seems too easy of an out. It's like encouraging someone's depression. It's like ... giving up. - Is that the death the Revelation speaks of? Is it torment? Does hell exist to tell us that this is not an option?

resembles consciousness. I mean, a neuron fires ... and the system thereby does something. Why am I conscious of it? It's more of a Myself of the Gaps.

But yes. Esoteric thought, to a natural sciences perspective, is usually just about alternative perspectives grounded on concepts generally inaccessible to the natural science; And thus it couldn't be taken all that serious quite easily. It is in some way independent, though generally dependent on the sciences that can confirm or deny. And as that, esotericism, so far, amounts to ... just ... theory of the beyond.

When it comes to "resonant minerals/mineral vibrations" we can play a "different" game. Say, you go somewhere and you feel something is off. We could argue that there would be enough stuff around, to find one thing to blame it on. There after all is this whole placebo thing; To imply that we don't need much in terms of external stuff, in as far as our mind is pretty much capable of them on its own. When talking of Tai Chi, we also eventually talk about the Parasympathetic Nervous System. So, perhaps the mind has ways to trigger it somehow. Or release some hormones - while we're maintaining a somewhat internal optimism that would encourage healing somehow. Yea ... not sure if you'll find a properly rational explanation of what's going on there. But I guess the hormone interpretation is easily debunked.

But on the other hand, maybe there are "vibes" inherent to materials. They wouldn't affect us physically - or if there's an effect, we don't know of it yet - but on some more esoteric Level. Like, say ... pills are bad because they're not happy stuff. They're not happy because they're artificial. What if we now took happy stuff ... say, hemp ... all natural and good vibey and stuff ... and esoterically canoodled it into those pills. Like, by homeopathy - as to perhaps maintain the vibes and bring them into the not-happy-pills?

It would suggest that happy factory workers would also make more happy stuff. Like ... food we eventually ingest.

But yea. That's got to be enough nonsense for the day.

My understanding there takes me to Ki. And it would seem that some fabrics can insulate Ki flow as concerning some environmental exchange. But well. I understand, that there is a layer of sorts between my mind and my body. I developed that understanding by practicing Tai Chi. I suppose there's something to the constant repetition of the same form that allows the mind to experience its own motion in contrast to the body and what experiences are associated with it. One can experiment with controlling ones breath or not. What my Tai Chi instructor would point out in his book<sup>3,4</sup>, is that at a certain point in the form one may recognize a warm feeling in ones hands once done things properly. But I suspect that this warmth wouldn't be detected by a thermometer. And I wonder how large the consensus on the existence of "esoteric warmth" would be.

Expanded therefrom, along the matter of Ki, there's the concept of Ki flow. And that would eventually be an ancient Chinese way to recognize stress and potential negatives thereof.<sup>3,5</sup> Psychology on the other hand might come to talk of self-efficacy where the esotero-doctor would speak of positive energy. And although the two concepts couldn't seem to be further apart, they are still somewhat linked. Self-efficacy is a term used, so I understand it, for positive experiences from breaking ones own negative patterns, basically. Say, you go out of your way to get yourself some ice cold ice tea on a hot summer day, sit down and just chill for a moment; With the 'going out of your way' part being the important aspect; As this whole thing is about learning healthy living/patterns/options in contrast to ones own self-destructive habits. Give or take. I'm not an expert and this is effectively laypersons level of insight. Same with what esotericians(?) believe. But I assume positive energy here would largely deal with things that are statically present. Stones, Furniture arrangement, candles. Which, yes, eventually is just "positive vibes", including personal ones. But it's still about procuring this ... "positive stuff" for some transformative purpose. And that, alongside seeking out corresponding environments, is in a way about self-efficacy also. Tai Chi would be somewhere in the middle, along with tree-hugging.

When it comes to positive vibes, I also theorize of something I called 'Astair'. I thereby recognize some sort of shared emotional plane we feed with our experiences. This would be how Hype manifests, for instance. But perhaps also how we transmit vibes in a more immediate way. One however, so it seems, usually needs to first establish a connection with the field. I mean, if you're really depressed – you'd, so the theory, be not as easily swayed by a hype field – even if it happened around you, fueled by thousands.

I also call it ETP (Emotionally Telepathic Phenomenon) and juxtapose it with NTA (Non Telepathic Astair) – for one because all the "it might also just be ..." explanations aren't entirely unreasonable. And I think those are valid, as the two would go like smell and taste.

And I mean to advise against tinkering with it. I believe there's hostile activity – perhaps responsible for the occasional psychotic break.

If so this "bad ki flow" is really just stress - Tai Chi would help against it because it is a form of meditation. But ... yea, what is stress? Well, there are stress hormones. And to do a God of the Gaps, sortof, what I wonder about, is how all these things make anything happen that

There are a lot of things we do not know. And – if I then am to believe that we don't have free will, not even a little, I wonder what any of it amounts to.

## Free Will

The thing is, that in deed, **rationality does in essence oppose freedom of will**. And eventually it makes perfect sense, that there is no neurological evidence for it either. Neurology is to be deterministic – at least within the confines of how deterministic physical reality is. And acknowledging free will would be as an acknowledgment of the supernatural or divine. And maybe that's why so many gravitate towards Yoga (a.k.a. Torture) rather than Tai Chi. Sorry. My hatred for Yoga is a personal issue. So, to be fair, in a sense ... does Yoga also deal with the matter of ones will. That however, as for my case, in a way that's pretty much in line with every day challenges. Hence: Torture. But sorry, I know not enough to be taken serious about this.

And I don't know.

### **An Exercise in Free Will:**

*All I need to do, to prove to myself that I have free will is to move my body. And by that I don't mean some random freak-out. But that I guess ... needs to be said in as far as it is a thing to be learned. Free Will that is. But yea. **Rationality naturally inhibits what this Freedom amounts to** → within reason. And therein also rests the trick. To so not seek for a demonstration counter to the rule of rationality. For if Freedom of Will can only be regarded in contrast to rationality, it must therefore be confined within irrationality – at which point it also isn't really free anymore. Depending on how deep or extensive of an irrationality we're talking about.*

*And yes. So. Like, we can describe irrationality as an absence of rationality – not merely the opposite of it. To so imagine a box, perhaps, within which you can be free without bursting out into crazy. Perhaps start by holding your hand flat before you – to then raise and lower it as though it floated on a surface of water. You can try to want to raise or lower it – and just not do so. And eventually you may experience a difference between when you act – and hand control over to some more rationalistic pattern. But even those you can then go on to play with.*

So – you can for instance wait for an impulse to research some of these topics or to take any proposed measure seriously. Or you can want yourself to do so. And this wanting is eventually also capable of overriding our subconscious modalities of belief. Belief structures are only rigid in as far as items we mean to change, depend on or support other structures we believe in. And so the impulse basically means, that we're "ready" for a particular thing in our queue. In that regard it is usually easier to start anew. To so plant a seed somewhere in the void, feed it with what it craves – and eventually that structure of belief can outgrow others. Or consume them. Maybe this sounds easier than it is. But at some point this is the

process – or the inner struggle. Being in the ninedom eventually trivializes it – but one does not get around dealing with these things.

The problem thereby, so I see it, is the matter of uncertainty. At least so in the hypothetical, there's the problem that as soon as one acts against one's rationality, it is uncertain where one might end up. Which is also why the Blessing of Wisdom is important – in my opinion. And through it, one's understanding eventually is expanded to a point that doesn't offer a simple reliance on *rationality*. As when it comes to that in terms of luck, impulse is only superior in that the consequences correspond to your mindset. So is rationality in the grand sense not as much a road as it is a plane. And we become the river ... sotospeak. "*Be water my friend*" XD.

And the carrot on the stick eventually loses its flair once you spot an entire field of carrots.

### The bucket

One could now go to assume, that the way our brains develop is to supplement our rationality. From perspective of the divine (one gained in the ninedom), the reality is that God can very easily act through us without us noticing. We might even believe it to be ourselves (there is no part of us, that isn't also a part of Him). So, in as far as God uses this power to solidify very basic concepts within our otherwise darkened understanding – we are likely to eventually get a hang of things and then move on ... as one would. There's even an argument to be had about dreaming, where the waking mind is a state in which the biology takes over – and like so we lose a lot of the memory that would so have existed merely spiritually.

It does however come to a dark twist, once we acknowledge that this then also entails all the sicknesses and bad conditions one could be born with. It would almost appear as a sick joke. Just one more reason, one more stone into **the bucket**, to rebel against God.

There's an opinion I have formed pretty early during my journey. During that time I ... well, was mentally oppressed by the concept of anti-Christianity. Not the edgy satanist type. The professional "from roman emperor to prime religious authority pipeline", son of perdition type. And I never had a reason to change that opinion. It states, that the anti-christian strategy is to shit all over you – [extend nasty imagery as desired] - so you'll join them to spite God because He would allow that to happen. And this is certainly an angle that can make them appear as the good guys. Because they are "so concerned". And as religion or ideology does – soon people would feel justified wrecking everything good, because "it'll help you see". "*Unfortunately nobody can be told what the Matrix is*".

To me there is no denying that this world can be a dark place. The one moment you're happy and carefree – and the next you'll stumble down the cellar stairs in search for the light-switch – and as you look up some scary clown-face stares at you from a darkened corner of the already pitch black room.

As then for a third degree of the esoteric, we take away the **guiding rails** – and we're left with in about any idea that we could ascribe to an 'inner realm' of sorts. Homeopathy, Crystal Healing, such and such. Further however - this would merely be '**casually**' esoteric thought. For the previous two degrees fall apart when approached too casually. The first more so than the second. So, if all you can do is throw about some buzzwords and create something along the lines of an esoteric thought ... it would first of all be third degree nonsense, as far as I'm concerned.

But yet. When we talk about body-magnetism in the sense of resonating stones and minerals, or just and simply ki, we do speak of **possible** esoteric components to the physical reality. As I'd say: Things that are, that we can't measure because the way in which they affect the physical world isn't to the extent our measuring devices can capture. Or: To affect us, they don't need to be entirely physical in nature. From a Gnostic angle this is intrinsically given. The human mind/spirit being the most fundamental *physically esoteric* component. And sure: on the other hand it's inevitable to realize that there is at least some physical/biological footprint to our cognitive processes. That would be how drugs work. Or what happens once we black out. And yea. When it comes to drugs; Some people might find this funny; We can try to argue that there's an esoteric component to them. Yet people know to not be appreciative of "homeopathic beverages" (homeopathy: repetitive diluting of substances with water). The thing being that whatever actual esoteric components there might be – would generally elude what we could physically "comprehend" (→as by measurements). And being drunk is some kind of measurement ... or "(physical) comprehension".

The Bible kicks it off, perhaps, in Leviticus 11, where the concept of impurity by touch is introduced. Touching unclean animals, though mostly related to their carcass, and dead flies touching food – that sort of thing. And sure – from a modern perspective we can understand that. But rather than just telling folks to wash their hands, one is considered 'unclean until the evening'. And funny enough did Jesus have some altercation with some Pharisees over the washing of hands. But that probably just because the Torah doesn't tell anyone to wash their hands – and the Pharisees yet would insist that to be the right interpretation. Which then probably is just a statement against the concept of turning bodily hygiene into religion. As hygiene is this paradoxical thing. So is an esoteric understanding of cleanliness better than no understanding of cleanliness. Over time we eventually developed a sufficient degree of hygiene so we are even rather to be mindful of not being too obsessed over cleanliness (some degree of dirt is good for us to develop our immune system).

But yea. There probably is more to the world around us than merely the physical. What however; And to which degree it matters – is at first a problem that needs to be solved, starting with how to even approach it. I for my part have come to throw away my microfiber bed-sheets because one night I had a terrible toothache and I felt like something needed to breathe. So I'm a big fan of natural fibers nowadays. But what's the science behind it?

And yet both sides come with implications. And eventually they manifest themselves. And maybe there's no strict, let's say, agreement where one side could give up one thing to accommodate for the other – unless one can be found. And such ... may also be ... Esoteric in kind.

### Not what you expected?

Well – there's barely anything really developed in here. My work on the Logos got interrupted, then I had difficulties getting back into it, then I somehow lost my records and nowadays I dread trying to find my way back into it. And so I'm stuck just giving you some kind of summary. Overall, the Savior and Salvation topic isn't really my strong suit either. I kind of get the whole deal about it, read a few words here and there, but I'm sure some people might get a lot more intricate and in depth and what not with it, so – I'm semi competent to write a bit about it. Mythology ... also not really my field of expertise.

This whole topic might just be the source of my headache; Thereby being a representation of a hole in my understanding I desperately try to wrap my head around but ... can't.

I can tell, at occasion, that I'm lacking, because something triggers me to – for instance: That one error with assumed expertise comes from personal degrees of proficiency, noobishly extended beyond where it applies. Proficiency so has a foundation. It is knowledge of a subject, familiarity with its concepts. Things that have been passed down from generation to generation – learned and honed over the years. Or centuries. There are going to be certain truths that would apply to other things. But unless you learn those things first – to know where those truths apply – you're just projecting your expertise onto a totally different reality. One that would have its own legacy of proficiency.

So yea, I guess it's not all that easy to write this kind of stuff ... .:/ - So do I sometimes struggle more to put my thoughts into words than other times. And that I for the most part don't have input, outside of my own, concerning these topics, would be one part to it. → Mutual illumination.

## C - The other other side of the esoteric

So, maybe it's time to do some summary and classification. We have the **first kind or degree of the esoteric**. That is **esoteric knowledge**, or transcendental empiricism. This is all about frozen realities. So, here 'the inner realm' is presented axiomatically and expanded upon logically with *empiricism*. **Then** we have the 'inner realm' in accordance to **the individuals perception and experience**. Of this we can construct an esoteric worldview - or so an interpretation of the world that is aligned to the human experience as *opposed* to the natural sciences. Politics or ideology would fall into that category, although those generally would be too world-adjacent to be properly esoteric. Not saying that world-adjacency is undesirable, but not necessarily on point.

Atheism might help you maintain some sobriety about those things. And similarly we can also just move on to ignore them. To me this issue has always come down to the part that humans play in this. All that God does, is maintain a physical reality with pretty universal rules. If He ever were to make exceptions, they would be exceptions. Otherwise we could recognize them as rules. I think myself to be exceptionally well comforted by God – to the point where it's rule extends beyond my reach. I sometimes am under the impression that I'm even a rule on my own in that sense. But that doesn't mean I'm living "the good life". I mean, I do – in as far as I can; And what good I get from it, mostly extends from my attitude about it all. But, in as far as the common desire is to remove negative consequences from the picture ... yea, the desire is certainly unto a world without all this bullshit. Which is to say that ... I think it's an earthbound view where the unenlightened one wants to imply that if there were a God, we should live in a perfect world; And everything to the contrary produces a stone into the bucket. Or a stack of buckets. It's the stone-2-bucket mine. And so we would try to take things into our own hands. We see for instance that even if we cannot completely remove all suffering – we can greatly diminish it, versus trying to pray it away. (As if God needed us to suffer enough before He would do something [shaking my head]). But then there's the issue with ... people that care "so much" about us – they can't let it happen. At least the 'making the world a better place part'. Because, you know, "we have to **see**".

I understand that ignorance doesn't seem like it's a meaningful solution to the problem - but ask yourself perhaps: What problem? If not a problem of our comprehension? I might so try to empty that bucket - trying to explore each and every nook and cranny of this world in the hopes I might find even the last stone to put in there so all can be satisfied. And that eventually just to get started.

I'm not going to do that. In part because there is nothing to be gained here. The world is as it is – which means that a lot of drama might very well just and simply be the result of a degree of randomness built into this world. We can look for deeper meaning, but we don't have to. ... . And I honestly don't know what I'd be on about by continuing.

### Stress

There is however one aspect to this that may be worth getting into. The thing with Mental Stress. In that regard there is a craving for Knowledge here. "Why me? Why this? Why now?". The atheist might not have it – but the believer would be stressed to supplement their crumbling foundation with substance. On the other hand is it a Mystery – and both can find meaning in investigating it. We could call it 'world-theory (concerning the ethical implications of its design)'. Atheists draw value from it to supplement their idea of God not existing – and Christians draw value from maybe finding that golden nugget. And Gnostics simply fly over the slippery slope and the abyss behind it because it is as it is and why should we care for more than we can carry? I mean, there are answers. Like "the bridge over there". But a lot of it is implicated within the atheistic worldview. It's the question of what we do with what we have – for other

options don't exist. Other than perhaps, if you so will, some random superstition that promises some solution to some problem.

The problem here is with Knowledge. Imperfect Knowledge perhaps. Knowledge can be a relief. But knowledge also can be a source of stress. Cognitive Dissonance for instance. Eventually it's not really the fault of the knowledge, but of incredibly complex conditions the knowledge interacts with. And Knowledge in this case doesn't even need to be empirical, factual knowledge. For all I care, the "knowledge" that every year Santa comes down your chimney to leave a present is sufficient. Which certainly can be a problem – although Santa would be a pretty silly example in that regard.

But if you have a flawed understanding of the world, the world itself will merely by virtue of its existence introduce challenges to your understanding of the world. And you per chance may feel compelled to challenge back. And yes – that's a "wonderful" setup for Chaos. Chaos leads to confusion and confusion leads to the dark side of the Know. But that's not what Chaos wants. Like, it doesn't 'want'. Chaos ... benefits from quantity. And given enough quantity – Chaos turns into mostly just noise. Infinity ought to be full of that. Endless vistas of monotony, vast deserts of unknowledge, held together by nothing but the theory of existence. And somewhere in all of it ... a dark tower building a nexus connecting all the falsehoods about reality. Woven into its structure are truths, seen in all the wrong places, twisted and bent into distorted imagery, decorating gates and hallways that lead deeper and deeper into its gaping maw.

Say, the new Testament is a roman catholic codex. Because it is. The Bible, including the new Testament, condemn the roman catholic church, but then at some point you can also read that the Devil is the King of this world. And so you're just one step away from believing that God is dead because the Bible ... doesn't give you the answers you need, let's say. And so, a movie titled "God is NOT dead" ... does strike me as a consequence of coping with this kind of stuff.

So, what do we do? We seek what does work for us. What is good for us. We seek community - and try to fill our minds with good thoughts. That's certainly the therapeutic angle in as far as I'm concerned. Or one of them. Like, if you were to find that you had issues with *the community of yours*, that angle wouldn't work so well for you. And so, eventually, sometimes, what we need more than just knowledge is balance.

### Satisfaction

And so, the chasing for satisfaction is a double edged sword. I don't really want to preach, but if I had to, based on my concerns from looking around, this is definitely high up on my list of things worth preaching about. As with hope, it can be good, but it can also be bad. There is a kind of yearning for satisfaction that has a certain finiteness to it. Whether we see it or not. And that kind of satisfaction would leave you empty and subsequently chasing for more; Because once you have it – it only takes a moment for it to slip into the past. And even if you had the opportunity of infinite satisfaction – you then might fall victim to its saturation. And what

react to the different ways in which God took action. Which further exists between condemnation and forgiveness.

So are there are tales such as that of Jonah. Although most likely not historically accurate in the slightest; So that we perhaps don't even know, why we should treat it as a part of the book. Here it's easier to read them as social commentary. Similar to the story of Job. So, things happened before an observers eye – and the author thereby assumed a general throughline. Who knows? But well. I'm not actually too familiar with these parts of the Bible. At best I can think of how the story of David is really just more of a story – with its implications – but not necessarily a moralistic tale. Even if the implications can be huge.

And so there is the challenge. In as far as there's an expressed meaning – it comes with implications. And those aren't always clear. That, since they would be understood relative to what is weighted how. Imaginary Numbers make for an interesting case in that regard. They aren't necessarily implied within the logic of mathematics, but a single 'maybe' that technically could be implied, opens a whole new field of mathematics that in turn enables things previously not possible. The overall rules of mathematics technically imply all of it, though what we – us humans – implied wouldn't at first reveal that to us. Similarly concepts such as zero and negative numbers. They aren't implied within the "practical numbers" - like: Negative one apple doesn't exist. Unless you see it as an arithmetic operator.

And God knows what all of this amounts to. And that's that. It's like ... well. Whatever. However. If we want a thing to break all philosophy – and science – try

### The infinite paradox:

Concerns the existence of time and location – just in general. How can anything exist without infinity? How can anything exist 'in' infinity? If something came out of nothing, how did it come to be? If there is an infinite past, how did it ever arrive in the now? If there was never a 'first' thing, how are there things at all? If there is a 'first' thing, where did it come from?

Here's something I found in my sketchbook: >>> At the beginning is the end, And at the end the beginning – for had eternity neither beginning nor end, [could the now even exist?] But wherein persist the beginning and the end of eternity – for yet it is eternal? <<<

The thing is, you can go two ways with it. You can acknowledge that reality continues whether you understand it or not; Or you stop believing in anything that claims that reality is a thing. Give or take.

Be it the big bang or the first insight – there is no time or place for either to exist. Give or take. And what the most of us believed, would be the most reasonable by communities standards. And either way, we believe in something that is invisible. Unfathomable. It is ... inevitable. And eventually, perhaps just as inevitably, we find a corresponding savior.

Mythology, in a sense, is esoteric. There are symbols and other metaphorical devices – while usually their meaning, to us outsiders at least, unfolds through the stories that are told.

What matters to us here is “the Mythos of the Logos” – which is also the truth to the reason why Gnosis isn’t just Science. That at least is what I arrived at. Which, so far, is a story of Enlightenment, here and there described as “salvation from (the (destructive) forces of) Chaos”.

The primary actors therein are ‘the Father’ - His ‘Son’, a.k.a. the Logos – and the Holy Ghost, a.k.a.: ‘the Savior’ within us.

To me, it is a very crisply clear Mythology. It sets itself apart from the more conventional mythologies – in that its esoteric concepts, to me at least, are self-evidently irrefutable. There sure is additional detail beyond “the important stuff” - but those don’t really matter per se. To imply: There are certain thresholds, like an event horizon or ‘planes of effect’.

A common theme within Mythologies would be, that they speak to us of required commitments; And eventually the back and forth between compliance and dissent. And in a lot of ways that translates into ordinary worldviews. Wokeness, Conservatism, Capitalism, Socialism ... you name it. There are heroes and villains – and everyone is with a perhaps ever so slightly slanted plane of effect compared to someone else.

That eventually is a problem of the weight of information to the one telling the story. In other terms a problem that authors of detective stories face. On the one side you get the revelation at the start and you exactly know what’s going on, on the other you get the revelation at the end – whether there have been any clues for you to have figured it out or not.

In Mythology – we kinda don’t have these resolutions; And thus, quite possibly, no real ‘expert vision’. And beyond that – things might just mean whatever we want them to. And so, for wanting the truth, it’s ever so often not quite possible to say certain things with certainty. Or, uncertain things with certainty, rather. Perhaps.

The Bible might give us plenty of examples. There are a lot of stories in the Bible for instance that only exist – by their own record – because God chose someone for a particular reason – or two, or more – while people then would look at the events of those stories as containers for a moralistic message. And an atheist will read the story of Abraham and Isaac differently than a Jew or Christian would – who, last time I checked, aren’t big time into Child sacrifice. Well, depending on how spicy you wanna get. And once we get to the question of what one would interpret as a command from God ... we’re not necessarily talking about explicit doctrine. Or things like that.

Besides what one would find at face value, there are general themes such as **God doing what He wants** (and that’s usually it) while dealing with folks that, to varying degrees, are willing to do His bidding. So often enough the story can be seen as one of how different individuals

then? Does it matter? I mean, the issue of distant goals that are of questionable quality and require questionable actions to arrive at are a base problem on their own. So, stuff like ethical cleansing, perpetual warfare, robbing a bank to fuel your addiction, that sort of thing. And yea, one trick there is to seek the solutions in the now. Starting with Yourself.

So, rather than seeking satisfaction, it is better to just be satisfied. One term that aims at that is ‘self-sufficiency’. It may seem weird – but it eventually makes sense once you think about the nature of the satisfaction you crave. Provided you have a mind settled enough to do so. (Or the good things to occupy your time with.) Sometimes it’s attention or acknowledgment. Other times it’s distraction. Eventually it’s some sense of fulfillment. And none of them are bad things to want. Like ... food. Or sex even. And you’d sure laugh at me if I suggested to just be fed – if you have problems finding food to eat. But the natural need to eat is certainly not the same as an unhealthy eating disorder.

Not finding acknowledgment or attention opens the gates to depression, a lack of distraction opens the gates to insanity and a lack of fulfillment ... well, whatever. But so the problem eventually is that we seek acknowledgment from the wrong people, distraction from the wrong things and fulfillment of the wrong desires. And usually one’s self is a good place to start. Acknowledge/respect yourself. Don’t get distracted from yourself. Follow desires and passions that make you feel whole. Eventually there’s more than enough to find for you to be able to pursue all of it. Maybe I’m getting this wrong though.<sup>3.1</sup> Maybe I just got things sorted out due to being in the ninedom. [shrugs] I mean – this isn’t religion or spirituality, it’s rather therapy or psychology. And yet in all of it, be it religion or psychology, the will to live is an important asset.

Often however, the will to live is tied to conditions. “If I can (or cannot) have this and/or that, then ...”. And not wanting to downplay the vast difference in starting conditions, jealousy still has this thing going for it, that envy doesn’t care about the conditions and circumstances that produce the thing that is being envied. So, if you were to envy my cools for instance, you’d probably “ignore” all the hardships it took for me to get as hard boiled about shit as I’ve gotten. Plus my own part to it. Including what outlets and strategies I have (developed) concerning my stress. And at any rate can you at best ever only be yourself truly.

In other words then, there’s an issue with being (perceived as) pathetic. And so people eventually strive for greatness, perhaps developing a need to punch down, developing modes of self-aggrandizement, such and such. To pick on the negatives. Things I would, in the Darwinian sense, not deem conducive to the purpose of improvement. People can aspire these things in more constructive manners, but how often does the aspiration for greatness really yield the desired result? To me, in the end, it’s just a projection of strength that obscures a certain weakness. It’s pathetic in its own silly way. And you don’t have to be a part in that. You might feel compelled to jump in and elbow your way up the food chain – but eventually there’s nothing to be accomplished but the maintenance of a struggle that is only perpetuated through these mannerisms.

Think perhaps of greed. Or the justification of keeping up with concurrence. Corporations get to push each other to the limits, and now we're at the limits where every corporate entity, including nations, extracts the living shit out of the planet while there's no actual benefit to us at large. And no one dares to tell anyone to "chill out" because it'd fuck over "the economy". So yea, if resources were infinite we'd have exponentially more bullshit to drown in. But ... what's the point, really? It might even make things worse.

In this cycle of rise and fall – as silly as it may sound – we might just choose to remain grounded and move somewhere else. Metaphorically speaking. But how easy is it, really, to escape the deluge of our wasteful existence? But, that's the thing. To find something to unplug, sotospeak. For as you grow to greatness, you would prefer not to worry that the things that support it might suddenly vanish – to then leave you back where you started, or worse. Considering the time that went into it – it might be more than just a setback. And the best way to do so, in my opinion, is to do "the good work" and leave the development of greatness to what's actually there rather than *'living on borrowed time'*.

### Allahu Aqbar

But then ... all it takes, to be downed as pathetic, is someone to find a way to talk shit about you. The best you could have in that case were the fortitude to be beyond that. However, if say ... a Government employee from a state like China were to visit you – telling you in kind that there is one smart choice you can make and an array of bad ones ... yea. That sucks. Depending on what kinds of choices you would like to make. And that is the kind of stuff Martyrs are made of. And I don't have a magic potion to help you fix these kinds of issues. But it's also less about the human condition at large and more about "interpersonal Drama" where the best choice is more like a test of Character. And then what you believe about the world and infinity matters in a way that ... isn't only esoteric anymore. And in context of infinity ...

Yes yes, as a Christian I'm supposed to tell you about losing your life to gain your life ... the virtues of martyrdom where "in sha'Allah", God willing, you will receive some amount of brownie points for your deeds. But also are we supposed to save up treasure in heaven; And being unalve is counter-productive to that end. Well, I admit. It's a silly argument when it comes down to it – but, eventually worth considering nonetheless. More to the point, I personally deem it necessary to also emphasize the self-preservation aspects of the Gospel. Self-Sacrifice is all fine and dandy ... at least for those you're sacrificing yourself for ... and quite possibly the balance of your Jesus Investments Inc. Bank account ... but when taken to the extreme, it starts to become meaningless. That, if we all engaged in it – we would have to ask ourselves what we're sacrificing ourselves for.

Now, I don't want to tell you that self-sacrifice is bad. There is this and that niche situation where it could very well be very profitable ... in heaven bucks. But it's a double edged sword. I certainly did engage in some self-sacrificial behavior and to my understanding it paid off; But had I continued to do so I would have eventually sacrificed myself a little bit too

body parts, which I think describes the process of consolidation. So "Eteraphaope-Abron created his head; Meniggesstroeth created the brain; Asterechme (created) the right eye; Thaspomocha, the left eye; Yeronumos, the right ear; Bissoum, the left ear; Akioreim, the nose ...".

### The Logos

Being one day way too deep into those writings, I took a break - went out and smoked ... either a cigarette or a Joint, don't remember. And there I had ... an insight. So, starting with "I" – something as an orb, as reflected on the surface of some water, emerged - then "I am" - manifesting as an orb with a little addition, one left and one right - and then moving on to "I will be" - manifesting as an orb with the same additions but directed away from it ... and so I saw that this formed a humanoid figure. So, that extra something of the "I **am**" being arms - and the 'forecast' being not parallel to the center orb - but stretched into the 'future', such as legs. When applying that concept to these seemingly pointless body parts, we can assume, that "Eteraphaope-Abron" is the word that shaped 'the Head' - which would encompass the basic outlines of His existence. The general idea here is, that ... thoughts are just vague impressions; And **by assigning a sound, or whatever the original equivalent would be, to them, they become more concrete.** And that so, after a while in the chaos, God came to clarify what He understood all of it meant – through labeling them. "Mennigestroeth" then is the word that shapes 'the Brain' - which would encompass the understanding of His consciousness or conscious presence. Further are there two eyes and two ears. One ear probably so for the general perception and one for the specialized perception such as recognizing a specific word or symbol, that sort of thing. One eye for seeing things and one for seeing meaning. This continues until we arrive at "Miami", the nails of the feet; And then we only read one more word: **Labernioum**. A.k.a. the whole thing, probably.

And so we've just taken an enormous leap. From understanding 'the Word' to be no more than an insight - to being a concept of His identity in form of an entire Codex of Knowledge pertaining to the Nature of the All-Encompassing Spirit, down to the inherent expression of it all in form of a Humanoid Shape that at large represents God's self-identification as the Eternal Life(=Existence).

??? -> "Arabeei, the left penis; Eilo, the testicles; Sorma, the genitals" ... ??? OK, there's some weird stuff going on. Like ... this creation doesn't seem to have upper arms. So, some Rayman-esque shenanigans be going on here; Which I think speaks to a gap between God's self and visible creation. But maybe that's just the physical wear on the scrolls. Anyhow ... Some say that we could describe Jesus as a trans-man ... and it's not the most absurd idea that has ever come from Queer spaces. So, God – a shapeless being – identifying as a man. With ... stuff. And yea – try to make the argument on GOD that Biology fuckin' matters. ... Buuuu ... moving on ...

### Back to Politics – Mythology

Now, apart from the initial bad example, it makes sense to more generally speak of Mythology.

describe an innate property of thought. One we can experience as thoughts eventually impart pressure on our mental ease, shower thoughts come to mind or we act out of habit while our mind is somewhere else. Where now once God withdraws His active wanting from a thing, it will act on its own based on whatever might have it act. As how Life, Will and Thought are just one and the same substance, a.k.a. Grace, so is Yaldabaoth, this primal chaos, the consequence of God's awakening, where God would just randomly leave parts of the chaos that had manifested, to themselves. Sprinkled into that may have been humanity, being ourselves another way in which this self-willingness works, which, in its reaction to the events between chaos and order, would exacerbate the process. That at least lines up roughly with the texts, where puffs of humanity would develop into different directions based on whether they spawned in a happy place or not.

**What a human now is**, I think has to be something about how the thought is created. At first I would for instance think of categories such as free and unfree – then the question is whether or not we can create humans by thinking; And if so, that'd potentially make God a very busy father. At the end of the day I however just settle with the fact that the potential is there, based on so: The nature of the spirit.

When it comes to **the Barbelo** - I always thought of it as the horizon of creation. Though eventually it might just be a plug to the question of "where" all of this took place. I mean, how is a place ... in infinity? Where is anywhere? My best answer is that everything is nowhere - and that which is, is itself all that is, in its own nowhere. And so the Barbelo would be the first somewhere to come out of this nowhere - and everything that followed would somehow be in relation to it. Each thought may certainly extend into and from its own nowhere - but it all still somehow comes together within consciousness. Which, through our imagination, extends into realms.

The most I can on the other hand make of the issue between the "forethought" and the "foreknowledge" is a matter of **growth**. "And he anointed it with his goodness until it became perfect, not lacking in any goodness, because he had anointed it with the goodness of the invisible Spirit". The part about *the pentad* leaves me to suggest that there are five aspects to this first creation. "Thought", "foreknowledge", "indestructibility" (Unvergänglichkeit → imperishability, timelessness → "non-evanescence"), "Eternal Life" and "truth". Something like, the 'ability to think' required 'foreknowledge' as → a state of tension that didn't cease to exist; The realization of which produced the concept of 'timelessness' (imperishability, indestructibility), → "creating time" in the sense of 'Eternal Life' - as the prevailing 'truth' that came into being. Something like that.

Right now the concern to me is, that there's a timeline I've understood. And it generally follows the account in the Apocryphon of John. This first insight happened, the spirit awakened and upon accounting for the things that be, produced insight concerning the three Principles and the four Lights. Eventually however Chaos would follow. Perhaps due to questions akin to what and why. And within that, God had to come to further terms with reality. While the narration of the Apocryphon doesn't explicitly suggest it, we at some point get to read about a lot of words associated to

much for me to be here today. And what I had to learn in the aftermath of that, is that all the talk of individuality isn't the only way to talk about the "Love yourself" part of the Bible. One can think of the self-sacrifice as a key. And there are a couple of doors it fits into. But a lot more doors exist that mimic their styles but lead to a cliff and not the promised land. As so, what we have as 'civilization' is the product of our cooperation. It is the penultimate outcome of us living out our lives. It is for us to live a fulfilled life as it is for others to do the same. And if the one side sacrifices too little and the other too much, we get an imbalance. Such and such. And one place to start is to recognize, that selflessness isn't an absolute virtue of the way. If your self finds fulfillment in selfless endeavors, well – that's an entirely different story. Eventually it's all a matter of perspective.

### Infinity?

Well. There may be much to be said about it. But when talking about coming to terms with living forever, everything can somehow be talked about. Perhaps in how problems that re-enforce themselves are very 'this world' problems that only get worse when seen in the light of infinity. The question being: When do/can we learn the things we need to learn? And eventually things concerning infinity might seem more boring than you'd like – but that is where fulfillment comes in. At least at a certain age. On the other hand there's the thing that people tend to make life more difficult for themselves than it needs to be; And I think it is really common – while on the other side people can also tend to make life more difficult for others. Envy would be one of those things that can further amplify this problem. And the concept of fulfillment is replaced by a hollow pursuit for satisfaction.

As when it comes to God, I'm under the impression that God must not be fair, sortof – because fairness might actually suck for you more than you're willing to consider fair. And this might just be the biggest enemy people will have to overcome in their quest for Enlightenment. Their own stubborn self. But yea. I get lots of cool stuff out of being stubborn. The Bible praises Israel/Jacob for being stubborn. The Bull is highlighted a Symbol thereof. But so, if my/our Stubbornness is righteous, and yours isn't ... "we are not the same".

But what is righteous? A seething hatred for humanity at large? I mean, Jesus said: "I didn't come to judge, but to redeem". In other places the Bible laments: "not one righteous soul lives in this world". So yes, but to what end?

**>>> O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets,  
and stonest them which are sent unto thee, how often  
would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen  
gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not!  
<<<**

### Matthew 23:37

On another note, there's the "main Character syndrome" - where everyone is like Neo or Trinity in their own Matrix; Based however on nothing but their own ego. And it sure would be unfair to just regard everyone as

equal; Even if the big difference would at first only be a matter of Luck. The rich getting richer and the poor getting poorer ... is certainly true for more than just money. And eventually all that would make Salvation pointless; For eternal Conflict were the only real ... well. It's not a 'solution' per se, just "the natural order". But so, what if ... there was a choice? Or ...

## B - Savior and Salvation

Jesus isn't your ordinary savior as you would find in your average Epic. In those, we usually learn of some (worldly) conflict – and a person who steps up to resolve it. If we however take a look at history, there certainly is no shortage in conflicts and victories – leaders that would rise to glory and crumble back into dust – kingdoms that reached for the world and kingdoms reduced to ash. How often did the end of one conflict only mark the beginning of another? And so it seems like we need salvation of another kind.

And sure enough. Eventually have we lost more and more of our savage roots - and figures such as Jesus, Gandhi or Schindler would rise unto the ranks of figures that inspire us. This isn't merely a letting go of savagery for some sake of compliant peace. It is still fully savage if dissent unto injustice is considered savagery. But even here we eventually find encroaching darkness. There certainly is a wealth of opinions that is shaped from a wealth of possible nuances to all sorts of things. It nowadays might be easier than ever to feel right with in about any arbitrary opinion one might hold.

So, inspiration alone eventually isn't enough. The term, inspiration, is at times itself a source of chaos. (In art for instance, we can take the matter to the point of questioning whether or not the inspired artist is duely responsible for the product.) When things "come together" to "make sense" - we might feel a rush of dopamine that gets us high on having discovered some deep conclusion of reality – and without the tools to see that in relativity to all the other deep conclusions that have been made by other people ... we eventually fail to properly contribute to society. Or more importantly: We fail to use our time as meaningfully as we otherwise could. Not only to our own dismay. Which ... may be unfortunate ... .

In the Gnostic sense now, the concept of Savior and Salvation isn't one of human deeds – but one of Gnosis. Or so, the Light that illuminates the Dark. Darkness being the ultimate peril – and Light being the Salvation from it. Enlightenment, in that sense, being an accomplishment – an abandonment of the life in Darkness unto an existence in the Light.

So, as the first insight (we'll get to that ...) produced the self-awareness that would first illuminate existence into a state of pro-active living – it is itself the primal savior; Being itself infinite life delivered into something finite.

And it is this image ... that is truly the Grand Metaphor of Gnostic belief.

Anyway. For once I think it's vital to think of these texts as deliberately confusing. The way I see it, a theme is being picked, wrapped in some terminology, and that terminology then is expanded into a whole bunch of gobbledygook to obscure what's actually being said. This eventually makes knowing or understanding what they're on about a lot harder; And the tired translator so much more hateful of their life (guess).

Now, when I read: "*And his thought performed a deed and she came forth, namely she who had appeared before him in the shine of his light. This is the first power which was before all of them*" - I to be honest wouldn't know what to make of it. I suspect. Yet when I first read this passage in the German translation I have, this stood out to be a pivotal part. Perhaps THE pivotal part. But it's also that I have some issues with English. So, when I read 'thought' I usually read it as "a thought". Not 'the ability to think' - which I would suppose translates into 'thinking'. So to me it's then either "*And his thought performed a deed*" or "*And his thinking performed a deed*". Then it's "*and she came forth*" - which isn't gendered in the German version I use. Grammar allows us to forego pronouns in certain conditions - so: "*And his thought performed a deed, came forth from him and revealed [itself] before him in the glory of His Light*". Then also "*performed a deed*" in the version I use reads "*became active*". So what we have in the version I use is, that His thinking became active and produced something - herein called "*the first power*" or "*the forethought of the All*". The German text I have also has a paragraph between the "the first power" bit and the "the forethought of the all" part. So:

And his thought (thinking) ~~performed a deed (became active) and she came forth, namely she who had~~ (and) appeared before him in the shine of his light. This is the first power which was before all of them ~~(and) which~~ It came forth from his mind, ~~She~~ it is the first thought of the All ...

But it is then also a bit more complicated. The account eventually leaves room for interpretation. So, at first there is the "forethought" - and then "<She> requested from the invisible, virginal Spirit - that is Barbelo - to give her foreknowledge", which now begs the question: Is it deliberate confusion or is it a more detailed step by step account of the process?

(The) Barbelo is one of a few "Characters" that are being introduced and stand out due to the position that is given to them. To ... not much clarity. So to me, taking things that I don't understand at face value is a bad idea. But so, my interpretation of the text requires me to have understanding to project into it, rather than trying to extract much out of it. But it's also a back and forth. Through a **given** meaning projected into it, things eventually make more sense – and that's how it works for me.

So is there **Yaldabaoth**. Often a ... big, horrible, undefined ... source of infinite dread and chaos. (Perhaps like Parallax (Green Lantern)). With my limited talent to translate certain things into English, I'd translate the term associated to "him" as "self-willfulness". I suspect that another "good" translation for it would be "Selfishness". I however don't recall where I read that. And one day it struck me – and it all made sense. I suppose it to

forget the corrupting forces of evil. It's also very anti-Gnostic in that strength is taken as the superior trait somehow. For, what are the prospects if strength is the solution to produce "good times"? So, it's a very bad, jumbled up example of this other type of Esotericism. Perhaps so because it tries to capture years, maybe centuries or more – of human development – into simple items. And the experience ... would be that folks that conquer other folks end up being the more successful ones and those would inevitably project some kind of ... "stronk". Or that there is a kind of frustration over political stale-mates. So does strength eventually also project order in that it functionally substitutes what is otherwise left to agreement or agreeability in this shared reality of ours.

So, we cannot always – or at all – trust our esoteric musings. Is what every science communicator would in one way or another try to tell you. Like, finding an opposite position was this grand discovery at the basis of Enlightenment. A.k.a. the scientific method. There so is what I call "alpha thoughts". Those are our thoughts as they emerge to our mind – and a good rule of thumb is that they cannot be trusted; Because as our minds, nowadays more so than ever, are constantly exposed to lots of random stuff – it ought to also produce lots of random stuff in response. That's the dark side of media consumption. On the other side, they give us some raw material to work with – and the challenge is to develop them into "beta thoughts". And depending on how deep we want to go, there are subsequent steps. And this is basically the first serious application of free will as far as this document is concerned. So, racism, sexism, that sort of thing – would typically be alpha thoughts we have (passive contempt+every day perceptions); And of it come what we might call alpha ideologies; Which supposedly would happen to be very naturalistic, with a worldly slant in case of political movements. In that regard for instance, one might come to transform good alpha thoughts into weird beta stuff. Eventually we however get to established theory and science – but the divide also doesn't really end there. But to the point: are there instances where education can be one way of mitigating personal error. Good faith provided. To prove it wrong, one has to know what's wrong about it. So on and so forth.

Now, before we move on – here's a thing I've read on a postcard. It is only loosely connected to the topic at hand; And a reason for me to share it is to somehow buffer the whiplash from the change of subject:

**"I have gone looking for myself. In case it returns before I do, please tell it to wait for me".**

So, we're returning to the Word – that was in the beginning – that was God – which does act as a Savior, even at the moment everything began. So, I quoted the Apocryphon of John - of which I have a German translation which uses slightly different Words to describe certain things here and there ... and because I cannot comment on the quality of the respective decisions, I'm in a bit of a situation. I have no problems presenting passages that are pretty much the same both ways, but when the provided understanding actually diverges ... I can currently only guess or pick my favorites, were I more concerned of it. For concerning the texts that I quote here<sup>3.3</sup>, I however just go with straight copies.

Knowledge, or rather: empirical knowledge, speaks to us of the certainties within our **shared reality**. Alignment to its truth would allow us, for once, to greatly diminish the destructive reign of chaos. And this is in contrast to what we might, for ease of use, label the naturalistic side of our lives. And to expand upon this, I have to go on a bit of a tangent.

### **"Naturalistic Christianity Exposed"**

From the time where I have been a rather zealous and somewhat naive Christian, a time where all my mind went into the intricacies of religion, I recall that "the academic sciences" would have a propensity to anger me. And it seems to not have been an isolated incident. I find that Christians, or believers in general – at least of certain persuasions, quite frequently take offense in science. There are probably intentionally provocative terms such as "the God particle" - but also is there eventually Evolution just in general.

The thing however is, that the "traditional" Christian belief is VERY naturalistic. From an evolutionary standpoint one might find little to nothing about this concept of living that isn't entirely in line with evolutionary expectations.

Through our lives in this world we inherit aspects of our biological vessels such as hunger and thirst. These are naturalistic needs that all life on earth, in the evolutionary sense, has adapted around. If an organism cannot meet those needs, functionally, it will go extinct. The human being thereby is a social being. We gather in communities, we develop rules of co-existence – and these rules in the "traditional" Christian sense happen to be very procreation oriented – or heterosexual. The other basic thing a living organism needs to be mindful of, if it doesn't want to go extinct.

And, to top it all off, the "traditional" Christian worships the creator God for having instituted this song and dance of life.

There now is a thing to be said about Chaos. Any way of life that manages to cover the basic needs of survival and procreation can be deemed fit for purpose. Chaos however emerges in their incompatibility with other truths that try to accomplish roughly the same thing. And there, eventually, one way or another, the "religion" turns dirty or ugly. Either in its embrace of change, or opposition to the other. Selfishness may come in because ... preservation of the group, dominance versus submission, personal freedom, so on and so forth. If now these conflicting ideals were able to see their **shared reality**, this Chaos would or could be diminished. And when done well enough – the different worldviews could come to support each other – rather than lessening one another.

This is now a process I would attribute to our esoteric growth. It isn't necessarily in our biological interest – or at least not immediately visible to our biological interests – why we would bother to sit down with the other rather than just trying to dominate them.

So, in the Gnostic sense, it is the truth that contains certain transformative properties until some degree of perfection is achieved. The story of Jesus so reads as an attempt to tell us about "the way" of bettering ourselves, of holding ourselves to higher standards, of not killing each other – over silly nonsense or at all. And ... I need a moment. I need to ... take pause ... for a personal moment, although I may have done too much of that already.

### The retroactive discombobulation of misguided Christianity

I think, this stuff is pretty basic stuff that everybody knows about. Except for believers (slightly joking). Now, Christians – in their critique of atheism – would have us believe that atheism would lead to all sorts of mad behavior, uncleanness, degeneracy, IMMORALITY, that sort of thing – while it is the believers who walk in the Light of perpetual peace. And still ... every Christian religion eventually has "the reason" why they're better than the others, but that is what eventually has them at odds with each other. Like, they know the true name of God or whatever. And beyond that, in interaction with other Believers, everything tends to more or less arbitrarily revolve around that one point of theirs and issues the respective other has with it; And so they naturally run into problems. So, is it Jehovah or Yahweh, is it Saturday or Sunday, is it law or forgiveness, is it labor or mercy – such and such.

Cometh Enlightenment:

Jehovah, Yahweh, Yahuwah ... are attempts at pronouncing the so called 'Tetragrammaton': YHWH (יהוה) - a.k.a. the original emoji. Jewish tradition explains its meaning to be a combination of the terms היה (HYH), הוה (HWH) and יהיה (YHYH) – or so the phrase 'יהיה הוה יהיה' ... translated as "he was, he is and he will be"<sup>3,2</sup>.

Saturday is traditionally the Sabbath day – and Sunday the Day of the Lord. No reason to get upset over either. I never liked going to Church, until I had a reason to, but if I had a choice between "the Day of Rest" and "the Day of the Lord" to do so – I'd pick the latter.

Such and such comes out if we can maintain an open mind in acknowledgment of our own ignorance and imperfection. If you however need to maintain some odd prophetic claim – your rationality may turn apologetic. And this is what atheists nope out of. For if Christians can't make sense among themselves, what reason or perspective is there really in joining? It seems ... like too tall an order for anyone. One would have to be crazy. I only got lucky.

But yes. It eventually is easier on paper than in real life. In the idea now, we still need personal Salvation before we can look forward to more.

### Matthew 7:3

>>> And why beholdest thou the mote that is in thy brother's eye, but considerest not the beam that is in thine own eye? <<<

### And it gets Political!

Because, of course it does. In a few ways. And perhaps the Politics segment actually starts right here. For once, there's a very weird overlap between Politics and the Esoteric that'll be a bit of a topic during this next segment. To which then there's "the" other side touched upon in the Politics segment.

But it doesn't have to be. Politics, in many ways, does, to us, serve as a prism for the "us". And so, **the Salvation we crave, has to somehow enter that domain, to ... well.** Technically: radiate out into the rest of us, but closer to the individual intent or motivation: **be valid goshdangit.**

If we however can't (even) communicate shared reality to each other in a way that makes sense, the buck stops right there. And in this day and age, I wonder how successful a "the sky is blue" party could be. Trolls, or not, mostly situated in the UK are gonna say nay and start the "the sky is clouded" party, grumpy people everywhere will find peace in the "I don't care about the sky" party; While some of the rest is going to gather into a "these are already too many parties" party. And as per German tradition one would then go to start the "one more party" party.

The upside to so many parties is, that the monopoly to all decisions doesn't reside within just two fundamental opposites. Which is probably why Germany did good so far skating by the right-wing, nationalistic/conservative rise that's been going on. I mean, there were attempts – even to some success. But ... not enough!

But yes. Technically the truth could or should not be so divisive. But because 'truth' is also a technical term that applies to a great variety of things, there's a near endless sea of issues to choose from and get political about. Whether it makes sense ... doesn't matter. One can twist it, one can spin it. It does taco, and it goes with fries. So ...

### A. THE OTHER SIDE OF THE ESOTERIC

Another way I use the term 'esoteric' at my own leisure, is when speaking of metaphysical concepts. So, pretty much in the aforementioned sense is there an 'inner' logic, mayhap to the things around us, but also within ourselves. The way we relate to the world isn't necessarily through what we know of it, what we see, how we know we maybe should - but through how we have internalized it, **how we feel about it.** And so often enough we also create shorthands for certain things. A particularly gross one is the "Hard times create strong men, strong men create good times, good times create weak men, weak men create hard times" take on political history. For it totally misses out on how often "strong men" have ran their nations into a wall; Or that during good times people tend to