

Essay

On Atheist Spirituality Part VII: Problems with I, New and Old, Within You, Mystery and Conclusions

Elemér E. Rosinger ¹

Department of Mathematics & Applied Mathematics, University of Pretoria, Pretoria, 0002 South Africa

Abstract

In this series of essays, I explore and discuss spiritualization of materialistic atheism in support of Andre Comte-Sponville. These essays are further dedicated to Marie-Louise Nykamp. This essay contains: Oh, that I, ... Problems with I, New and Old ...; And Again, the Same Finger ...; To Bring, or Not, Forth What Is Within You ...; A Question ...; Is it a Mystery? and Conclusions

Oh, that I, ... Problems with I, New and Old ...

It is incredible how many problems have been caused by that “I” ...
Quite likely because it appears to each of us to be so obviously us, and only and only us, thus nobody and nothing else ...

Where would, for instance, Psychology, modern or ancient, or for that matter, Psychiatry be, without that “I” ?

In this regard it may be instructive to consult the 1981 book “Maps of the Mind”, of Charles Hampden-Turner ...

But if we are here involved with issues called spiritual, then it may be worthwhile in this regard to recall the immense problems which accompany Christianity for more than two millennia by now, problems related to the confusion which, in their usual reading of the New Testament, identifies “I” with the very person of Jesus Christ ...

In John 10:30, for instance, Jesus says “I and the Father are one ...”, where the “Father” stands of course for God ...

And certainly, this is quite hard to interpret if one assumes, as it is typically done for more than two millennia by now, that the “I” in the above statement is the very person of Jesus ...

In John 14:6, Jesus says “I am the way, the truth and the life. No one comes to the Father except through me.”

And the usual interpretation it has had in Christianity is that Jesus is the saviour, and the only one as such. Therefore, all those who do not believe in Jesus are condemned to Hell ...

In addition to Jews, this of course goes for Moslems, Hindus, Buddhists, and needless to say, for atheists, agnostics, nihilists, and the whole similar lot ...

Even in our own days, more fundamentalist Christian Churches have that interpretation as one of their basic dogmas. And some of these churches are quite influential, among others, in America ...

By the way of the bumper sticker “Jesus saves.” In John 6:44, Jesus says “No man can come to me, except the Father which has sent me draw him”, while in John 6:65, along the same lines, he says “... no man can come unto me, except it were given unto him of my Father.”

¹Correspondence: Elemér E. Rosinger Email: eerosinger@hotmail.com.

Indeed, as known in many traditions, salvation is an act of grace ...
Therefore, it is not in the power or ability of anyone to bestow it upon somebody else, and not even upon himself or herself ...
Yes indeed, it seems that ... you have to be enlightened, in order to become enlightened ...

As it happens, however, the gravely misleading interpretation of “I” did not start with the Christians. In John 8:58, Jesus says “Before Abraham was, I am”, and those who happened to hear it reacted violently to it, threatening Jesus with stones, since they could not accept such a statement, given that Abraham had lived about two millennia before Jesus ...

Further, in John 14:12, Jesus says “He that believeth on me, the works that I do shall he do also; and greater works than these shall he do; because I go unto my Father.” And in view of his assumed godly status, this is clearly not supposed to be true, in case “I” in this statement is merely his person ...
And to add to all that, in the New Testament, in Hebrews 6:20, his ascension to Heaven is described as follows : “... where Jesus has gone as a forerunner on our behalf, having become a high priest forever after the order of Melchizedek ...”
And needless to say, this sound immensely strange if “I” is indeed the person of Jesus, thus Jesus being “I” is the same with the Father, who is God ...
Also, it clearly conflicts with the Nicene Doctrine of Trinity, established in 325 AD ...

Needless to say, in Catholic churches one does not give a sermon commenting on the New Testament, so that it can never come to having to comment on citations as those above. On the other hand, an important feature of Protestant church ceremonies is precisely the performance of such commentaries during many sermons. Yet, hardly a Protestant can ever remember that any of the above citations was commented upon otherwise than with “I” being identified with the person of Jesus ...
As far as the last above citation, namely, from Hebrews 6::20 is concerned, for instance, are there many Protestants to have ever heard any comment upon it during a church sermon ?

And now, as a background, we can recall that in the Old Testament, in Exodus 3:14, God tells Moses that His name is “I Am That I Am”. Thus it may appear that, again, we are being faced with that “I”, the Divine “I”, and not just that of anybody around ...
However, the original Hebrew formulation of that statement only contains three words, and not five ones, as above. Indeed, and perhaps quite surprisingly for some, there is absolutely not reference to any “I” in that Hebrew formulation which, with some transliteration, reads “Ehie Asher Ehie”. And the Hebrew word “ehie” means “to be now and for evermore”, that is, it is about being now, and being in the eternal future.
So then, what happened to that “I” ?
By the way, in the Old Testament one can also find written “I” in the original Hebrew text. For instance, the first of the Ten Commandments starts with “Anohi ...”, which is a form of “I” in Hebrew ...

So much for some of the ever ongoing problems caused by that “I” ...

And Again, the Same Finger ...

Well now, even at a slightly more careful analysis it becomes quite obvious that it is not so easy to identify that “I” which moved the finger ...
Indeed, let us mention a few related instances in this regard in connection with the finger that moved ...

Latest, state of the art medical science may identify a rather small bunch of neurons, or perhaps, even a single one, in one’s brain which - just like the respective finger muscles - have essentially been involved, that is, whose involvement is sine-qua-non, since without them the respective finger would remain at rest.

However, as far as present medical science happens to know, that bunch of neurons, or for that matter, single neuron, is a mere tissue, that is, a biological mass of matter. And matter, as the modern atomic theory in Physics or Chemistry tells us, is mostly void, and only and only functioning according to certain impersonal laws.

So then, who really moved the finger ?

Who excited those neurons, or that single neuron ?

Needless to say, modern medical science has no answer to that question ...

And of course, is glad to consider such issues completely outside of its realms of interest ...

As for modern Psychology or Psychiatry, well, there is, among others, the ego, or if you prefer, the super-ego, or on the contrary, the Id, which can be thought as originating the movement of that poor lonely finger ...

Well now, if that finger happened somehow to pull the trigger of a gun, and somebody got killed, be it intentional or not on the part of the one to whom the finger belongs, then the Police, for instance, may arrest that person, the whole of that person, and not only the finger, and start a tedious process of investigation.

Thus the Police assumes to be perfectly clear about ... who, or what moved the finger ...

However, if that unlucky person happens to employ a good lawyer, then that lawyer can argue in a court of law that, so sorry, all that happened during a temporary short period of insanity of the ... owner of the finger ...

And some lawyers can, and do, get away with it ...

And in such a case, so does of course, the finger ...

Therefore, who, or what did, indeed, move the finger !!??

Well, sitting there, relaxed and peaceful, one may try to contact or connect with that most subtle and elusive entity which may have in fact decided, and then moved the finger ...

And in the process, one may come to the realization of a “trinity” to which one is so essentially and ultimately connected, and connected so, just about all of the time : the “Father” underlying it all, the “Son” who can decide and move the finger, and the “Holy Spirit” which is observing it all ...

Coming to such a realization of a “trinity” from that simple exercise of moving one’s finger may be an illustration of an instance of “abstract” thinking and awareness ...

As far as Aristotle is concerned, he would simply put the whole story on the account of that unfathomable ... Unmoved Prime Mover ...

And for some Christian theologians the term would be God-Head, which is supposed to be the eternally ever the same Principle behind God, the active and creating God ...

And where is all that leaving us from a more practical point of view ?

We humans happen to have at least three rather different beings in us : the physical, the affective, and the cognitive.

Our lesser brothers, the animals, as well as our small children, are mostly endowed with the first two.

As for our physical being, to the extent that we are privileged enough socially, we do not face insurmountable difficulties.

On the other hand, no matter how privileged we may happen to be, our affective being can still end up

feeling a long ongoing and rather hopeless hardship ...

The human novelty of a significant cognitive being can come and help our physical and affective beings in having it better in life.

Yet there are severe limitations in this regard. Indeed, each of our mentioned three beings tends to be happy in rather different ways, and the happiness of one, or even of two of them, does not necessarily imply the happiness of the remaining one as well ...

Unfortunately, this very simple and basic “fact of life” is not adequately well known, understood, or taken into account ...

Consequently, all sort of often sterile but considerable and sustained efforts are made to keep one or another of our three beings happy by implication, that is, as a hoped for effect of the happiness of another of our being ...

And typically, our affective being is the hardest to keep happy ...

And if we are lucky enough not to experience unhappiness in our physical being, and on top of it, we have a well developed cognitive one, then so often, all we can think about is to make our affective being happy by the happiness which we hope that it may “trickle down” from our cognitive one ...

Indeed, those among us who happen to be blessed with “knowing about infinitely better” than they feel in life, can easily be tempted to try to impact that gift of their cognitive being in a positive manner upon their affective one ...

And much of the venture of Gnosticism can be seen as having - even if often less than consciously - such a source, motivation and aim ...

Yet, for the individual, this is, in the medium and longer run, but ineffective ...

And then, if the ways of happiness of our mentioned respective three beings happen to be so different from one another as not to be easily and sufficiently convertible from one into another, what can we do ?

One possible way, again through the offices of our cognitive being, but not necessarily through a Gnostic detour as well, may be the following :

Realize that there are two immense gaps, or divides, which we tend not to know about :

First, between the Unmanifest, and on the other hand, Manifest Creation.

Second, and within Manifest Creation, between Being, and on the other hand, Knowing, Understanding, Doing and Having, and so on ...

And overlooked, these two gaps have been, and continue to be ...

Related to the second, and as mentioned earlier, the German philosopher Martin Heidegger points out as a fundamental feature of Western philosophy that, for more than two millennia by now, that is, ever since Plato, it has forgotten about Being ...

With respect to the first gap, needless to say, the ignorance is even more pronounced. And in the available literature, one has to go back to the ancient Hindu Cosmology, to be able to read about the fact that Manifest Creation withdraws cyclically into the Unmanifest, and it remains there for no one can know how long periods ...

And yet, the Mother of all Manifest is the Unmanifest ...
 And when our affective being is yearning for happiness, and cannot find it, it should perhaps remember all of that ...

Clement of Alexandria, in his *Stromata*, writes about the irresistible call of the Gnostic way in some of us :

“I will dare aver that it is not because he wishes to be saved that he, who devotes himself to knowledge for the sake of the divine science itself, chooses knowledge. For the exertion of the intellect by exercise is prolonged to a perpetual exertion. And the perpetual exertion of the intellect is the essence of an intelligent being, which results from an uninterrupted process of admixture, and remains eternal contemplation, a living substance. Could we, then, suppose anyone proposing to the Gnostic whether he would choose the knowledge of God or everlasting salvation, and if these, which are entirely identical, were separable, he would without the least hesitation choose the knowledge of God ?”

And yet, temperance is clearly in order as Tennyson brings it to our awareness in his poem “The Ancient Sage” :

“For nothing worthy proving can be proven,
 Nor yet disproven : wherefore thou be wise,
 Cleave ever to the sunnier side of doubt,
 Cling to Faith beyond the forms of Faith !”

The great and, until modern times, rather unique charm of Gnosticism has been its immense propensity to come up with ever new and yet more impressive visions of Creation ...

Since the advent of modern hard science, we have had going on a second such protean human venture ...

The shortcoming of hard science is that the new realms it keeps bringing in such abundance into our awareness are definitely far below of, or far lesser than, whatever may be called or meant by spiritual, divine, or any of the kind ...

Added to it, hard science is also an elite venture, since very few humans are attracted to it, or capable of pursuing it properly ...

On the other hand, it can keep delivering ever new and quite formidable practical applications of significant everyday use ...

And needless to say, the credibility of these new realms brought to our awareness by hard science is incomparably more solid than that of the visions of Gnostics have ever been ...

However, and as mentioned earlier - and so long time ago, and so wonderfully suggested by Clement of Alexandria in the above citation - the major and unprecedented novelty brought to us by modern hard science is that the traditional dichotomy between the known, and on the other hand, the unknown, a dichotomy which for ages has kept our awareness, and especially on the individual level, fixed so rigidly in what appeared to be given for evermore, is by now clearly but an illusion of times past ...

Coupled to that comes the fact that modern hard science is essentially about more and more “abstract” ways of awareness, which however, are clearly not mere imaginations. Indeed, no matter how practically useful its application are, it is developing within realms which are less and less intuitively accessible to many, and instead, are more and more counter-intuitive, and in fact, sheer un-intuitive ...

And then, who knows, one day, we may even find ... who, or what moves the finger ...

But even if that may ever come to pass, it would quite likely happen not so much along the ways of hard science, or for that matter, of Gnosticism ...

Meanwhile, are you not afraid to remain alone, especially during the dark of the night, with that which moves your finger, and about whom, or about what, you happen to know just about nothing at all ?

Let me tell you honestly, and please, keep it confidential for my own sake : sometime I myself prefer to sleep with the lights on, just in case ...

To Bring, or Not, Forth What Is Within You ...

So then again, who, or what moves the finger ?

An “abstract” enough mind may go quite far along finding that ...

And of course, finding it not as a mere answer ...

After all, Gnostics, as well as the elite chattering class, have for evermore been most creatively busy with giving such assumed answers ...

However, if we are here now in the realms of writing, and not of, say, painting, sculpting, singing, dancing, praying, or other such ventures, then let us try to end by one of the most impressive Gnostic citations, a saying of Jesus Christ in the Gospel of Thomas :

“If you bring forth what is within you, what you bring forth will save you. If you do not bring forth what is within you, what you do not bring forth will destroy you.”

Yes indeed, we should better consider that there are dichotomies in life which simply cannot in any way whatsoever be negotiated by some clever give and take type manipulations ...

And instead, we have to go along one, and only one of the two ways ...

Go along, and eventually face the consequences, if we made the wrong choice ...

And that which moves your finger is quite likely in you, as much as in anybody else, and also in everything else ...

And then, the above dichotomy may indeed be worth considering for a while longer ...

A Question ...

So often, we tend to decide or act quite instantly, and we definitely seem to like it when we do so ...

It is, after all, but the ... eternal call of the jungle ... in us, the remembrance of how we did things when for millions, if not billions of years we were animals in the jungle, in case Darwin is indeed right with his theory of evolution ...

Certainly, we do not like questions, and especially those kind of questions we do not seem to find a satisfactory enough answer for, and then have to live with them for longer ...

Well, a question which we could hardly do better than live with it all our lives is :

“What does it really mean to be human ?”

Amusingly, a typical and rather instant reaction to this question can be to consider it all too trivial, since it is so easy to roll out a long list of qualities we humans alone have among all creatures known to us here down on Planet Earth ...

And yet, this question is not at all about any such list ...
No, not at all ...

Indeed, it does not take a human to see that we are in many respects so much different from animals. After all, animals themselves, like for instance, our pets can, and do, see that ...

So then, what does indeed mean to be human ?

Let us try and start nearer to home, that is, with what goes by the name of Western tradition. In the Old Testament, up front, and as soon as we humans are mentioned for the first time ever, that is, in the very first chapter called Genesis, and in verses 26-28, it is written no less than four times, and one after the other, that God made us according to His image.

As such, needless to say, that statement can be by far the most hard to understand one in all of that book ...

After all it contains no less than a double mystery : about God and about man ...

Yet it is precisely that very fact which should make one try to understand it better, even if it would most likely take one years upon years ...

After all, and quite likely, the statements made by Leibniz and a few Hassidic masters, mentioned in the first section of this book, are related to Genesis 1:26-28. Indeed, by what Leibniz said, he merely tried to elaborate somewhat on what that Old Testament statement may indeed mean. And the Hassidic teachers merely tried to further such an elaboration, even if they were not familiar with Leibniz ...

But let us not pass so easily upon Genesis 1:26-28.

According to one of the learned important ways regarding the interpretation of statements in such books like the Old Testament, the importance of a statement is evaluated by how upfront in the book it is made, how many times it is repeated, and whether it is emphasized by being made one after the other. Well, in this regard, the statement that man was made in the image of God happens to take the top place : it is made as up front as possible, it is made four times, while very few other statements in the Old testament are made even three times, and it is made one after the other ...

But now, what on Earth may really mean to be made in the image of God ?

Well, let us have a look at what the very same book says about God.

In Exodus 3:14, when Moses ask God to tell His name, so that Moses may communicate it to the children of Israel, the answer of God is : "I Am that I Am".

And one of the remarkable facts about that answer is its self-referential nature ...

Here, of course, it is worth recalling what anthropologists tell us, namely that the tree major themes found in ancient pre-literate human cultures are change, self-reference and infinity. And clearly, today, we are not anywhere near to a satisfactory understanding of them. Quite on the contrary, they still fuel much of philosophical discourse, and the corresponding countless differences of view ...

As for self-reference, ever since the ancient Greek celebrated Liar's Paradox, we tend to do our very best in avoiding it ...

Yet the even more ancient Hebrews found it to be not only unavoidable, but in fact, the very name of God ...

Amusingly in this regard, in the last couple of decades, theoretical computer science found it useful to develop logical approaches which do essentially involve self-reference. Needless to say, however, that such a venture is still strictly limited within rather small circles of specialists ...

And not less amusingly, instead of self-reference in its name, the strange term "vicious circle" is used ... Yes indeed, the dread and fear of ancient Greeks when facing self-reference still lurks deep in human emotion ...

But now, what has self-reference got to do with us humans ?

And if it has got anything at all, then in which way it may indeed indicate that we are made in the image of God ?

Well, here, I am afraid, we are back again to Darwin, in case his theory of evolution of species has enough validity ...

Indeed, it is a most obvious and essential trait of animals, as well as of our own small children, to become totally involved in the situations in which they participate. In other words, they are simply overwhelmed - and amusingly, love to be so, since this is the only way they know to be fully alive in the here and now - whenever a situation affects them, or is created by them.

And whenever that happens, nothing in them remains - or is supposed to remain - uninvolved ...

Therefore, they cannot be aware of anything else except that situation which becomes one with them, with all of them ...

And as it happens, most of adult humans tend to function in similar ways ...

There are, certainly, less involving momentary situations, or situations which extend over some longer duration which makes it difficult for us to keep being totally involved all that time ...

And then, perhaps, one may be able to step back for a moment, and find in oneself the space, the ability, the possibility to see one's whole involvement, and see it as an outside and rather detached observer may do ...

An observer, an outside and detached observer ...

An observer who is not interested in any way whatsoever in what is going on, let alone to get involved in it even by a mere opinion, evaluation or judgment ...

An observer who, precisely due to that detachment, can and does observe everything ...

Is that observer in any way related to what is that which moves your finger ?

Is that observer, and even more so what moves your finger, eternally the same in you ?

Do they, indeed, feel being the same, without any change in any of them, right across all of your life ?

From your earliest childhood you can remember, till your very last days ?

Hindu and Buddhist tradition are quite explicit about such an ability in each of us humans ...

And quite clearly, it is but part of the self-referential ability of human awareness ...

Part of that self-referentiality which in Exodus 3:14 is told by God to be His name ...

That God which in Genesis 1:26-28 made humans in His image ...

Well, this is, therefore, quite likely but about one of the more important features which happens to make us be human ...

What else may be there to make us be human ?

And who or what may stop you to start wondering about that !!??

Is it a Mystery ?

In the Western tradition all sort of terms got some kind of monopoly to label certain truly important concepts, and in doing so, often misrepresent them rather copiously ...

Two of them are the terms “saint” and “mystic” ...

Of course, terms such as “religious”, “atheist”, “realist”, “pragmatist”, and quite a few other ones of the kind, do equally little justice to what they claim to label ...

And the use of human language in human thought being what it is, here we keep digging ourselves in a variety of holes, and do so for millennia by now in a happy go lucky manner ...

But let us not open too much such an awfully large can of worms, and instead, try to focus only on one such term, namely, that of “mystic”.

Well, the fact is that even at a most cursory look, there is simply not much - and in fact, there just cannot be much - mystery about being, or on the contrary, not being a “mystic” ...

Indeed, one of the greatest miracles of life, and therefore of human life as well, is that it can go on and on with so little right kind of knowledge, and against what appears to be no less than an infinity of what is not known, yet may be relevant to life, not to mention the mistaken kind, or simply false knowledge ... After all, it is one of the major novelties brought to human awareness by our times of prominence of science research that what we do know is always but a finite amount, and what we do not know, and shall never ever know, is on the other hand nothing short of an infinite amount ...

So that, one may have any number of PhD, DrSc degrees, Nobel and other prizes, yet one will only have a finite knowledge, and an infinite ignorance ...

In other words, one will always face the mystery of that infinite amount of what one does not know ...

And then, here we are : we humans are, each and every one of us, but ... mystics ... !

And to add to it, we are so, either we like it, or not ...

And in fact, we do not have to do anything about it, since from the moment we are born, and until the moment we die, we are mystics ...

And the real aggravation is that we cannot do against it anything either ...

Now, certainly, some of us may be quite a bit more of a ... mystic ... than others ...

Yes indeed, some of us have a PhD in, say, biology, or much more frighteningly and intimidatingly, in mathematics, or not to mention, quantum physics, for instance ...

Yet, what can all of that ever do to abolish that infinity of knowledge which we do not have, and shall never have !!??

And then, coming back to important practicalities : do you want to have a good life ?

And how do you want to have a good life if you did not give enough thought to what good life is really supposed to be ?

And how could you ever find out what good life is, if you did not first find out what is supposed to mean being a human ?

Mystery is the bottomless ocean in which we all swim and must swim ...

Yet certain things can help us do so ...

And in the light of seven or eight millennia of continuously recorded civilization on a few continents, we do not have to discover just about everything for our own selves, and do so for the very first time in human history ...

No, not at all ...

And instead, we may try to study more carefully, a lot more carefully in fact, what may go by the name of wisdom literature ...

That literature which not in its entirety ended up being appropriated and misrepresented by one or another of the so called great religions ...

Therefore, try, and have a nice day ...

And you may at last even manage to know what a good life means, and then, have a good life ...

Conclusions ?

Conclusions ?

What conclusions !!??

As long as one is alive there are not, and there cannot really be conclusions ...

And yet, albeit we may know that, the fact is that more than on occasion we do feel the need for certain conclusions ...

And what can you do when your affective being, the feelings in you, those relentlessly urging waves upon waves of feelings, happen to demand quite urgently and categorically one or another thing to be satisfied ?

Anything at all ?

Yes, this is the very root of far too many troubles we humans face : the inappropriate integration and interplay between our affective, and on the other hand, our cognitive beings ...

Just think about all those who, for instance, know very well that smoking is damaging to them, yet cannot give it up ...

And they cannot, even if they happen to be outstanding medical doctors, and have already tried to give it up quite a number of times ...

Well, the presence in us of our affective being we share with just about all living creatures, including possibly plants ...

And if there is even the slightest truth in the theory of evolution of species, well, then, our affective being is indeed most deeply embedded in us ...

On the other hand, certainly, we as humans cannot say anything of the kind about our cognitive being which appears to be a rather recent endowment ...

Is, therefore, so surprising that in so many situations our cognitive being ends up mostly like a mere hit-man in service of our affective being ?

Is indeed so surprising that related to a variety of situations, many of us happen to know about infinitely better than they feel most of the time ?

That we do indeed know about heaven, know that it may exist somewhere, and hopefully, also sometime later even for us, and yet the way we feel at the time rather reminds one of the purgatory, if not in fact of some sort of hell ?

This massive disconnect between our affective and cognitive beings is that which causes in us the failure to agree with Leibniz that ... this is the best of all possible worlds ...

And how, indeed, can we agree when we do not share that immense gift of grace Leibniz enjoyed in having a far more perfect integration and interplay between his own affective and cognitive beings ?

Let us therefore try to have once more a better look at our cognitive being ...

And try to do so, as if instead of some conclusion ...

A most remarkable ability of our human cognitive being is to know about, to be aware of the existence of the unknown, the existence of what one does not know at any given moment in time ...

And in fact, one can also be aware that the unknown is far far larger than what one happens to know about ...

Far far larger, you would say ?

Well, how much larger ?

Say, infinitely so ?

Needless to say such an awareness can be rather pure, and as such, without having us venture into any of its specific consequences, let alone getting us flooded by too many emotions.

And yet, one can hardly avoid in such a case the awareness that the immensity of the unknown may be as much relevant to oneself - if not actually far far more so - as are the realms which one happens to know about ...

This is thus one way to see ... God ..., The Kingdom of Heaven ..., and so on ...

This is one way one can know about God, one can know that God exists, even if one may never know God ...

After all, we may never ever know that immensity of the unknown ...

Well, in simpler terms, that immensity of the unknown may strike our awareness not only as being relevant for us, but as being the true home of our soul and spirit ...

Of course, that need not at all mean to abandon in any way the known ...

And it only means that the known will now become of a completely changed relevance, a relevance no longer including any kind of more dramatic feelings ...

Yes, the known, the world of our every day, the world of our usual dreams may by now have such a secondary relevance as to make us realize and understand why some of those alleged heretics who were burnt alive on the stake by the Church could take it as just another of those painful moments in one's life ...

Yes, a more proper integration and interplay between our deeply embedded affective being, and on the other hand, that rather unique cognitive one - unique as far as we know, at least on Planet Earth - means that we feel about the immensity of the unknown as our true home ...

And even if so often we do not quite manage to feel in this way, well, we can always remember that we know about all that ...

And remembering often enough that we do indeed know about all of that, may slowly slowly help us better integrate our affective and cognitive beings ...

Yes, it was said a long time ago that behold, the Kingdom of Heaven is in you ...
And that, seek ye first the Kingdom of Heaven with its righteousness ...

If God does not exist, everything is allowed ...
Everything is allowed, including not having everything allowed ...
Everything is allowed, among others so is playing out of tune ...
And we can blissfully choose being in harmony ...

Anyone else can choose in any other way ...

Freedom of choice is but an opportunity to be able to choose properly ...
And choose we do, either we like it or not ...

Freedom has its true value in "freedom for", after one has become "free from" ...
"Free from" is only a necessary condition ...
Its fulfillment is in being able to be "free for" ...

When one makes a choice, there are consequences ...
And one is not "free from" them ...
Thus being "free for" means not only being already sufficiently "free from", but also not further diminishing one's being already "free from" ...

Tough game, isn't it !!??

We are the great ignorers of ignorance ...
We ignore the immense role in our life of what we happen to be ignorant of ...
And we do so by focusing on, collapsing upon, and becoming intoxicated by the growing amount of what we happen to know already ...

In the last few centuries, it is indeed for the first time in known human history that the realms known to us started to increase dramatically even during the relatively short lifetime of each generation ...

And we were simply caught not prepared to deal with that bonanza properly ...

References

- [1] Compte-Sponville, Andre : *The Book of Atheist Spirituality, An Elegant Argument for Spirituality without God*. Bantam Books, London, 2008

- [2] Hampden-Turner, Charles : Maps of the Mind, Charts and Concepts of the Mind and its Labyrints. Macmillan, New York, 1981
- [3] Barwise J, Moss L : Vicious Circles, On the Mathematics of Non-Wellfounded Phenomena. CSLI Lecture Notes No. 60, Stanford, California, 1996
- [4] Mortensen C : Inconsistent Mathematics. Kluwer Acad. Publishers, Dordrecht, Boston, London, 1995
- [5] Rosinger E E : Where and how does it happen? arXiv:physics/0505041