

A fortiori, Future Millennia:

Didactic . . . istmas

The Hidden Tradition . . .
Existential Democracy:
Homo theists.

All Scrolls are copyrighted

istmas

By
R.O. Shepherd

Basin Printing and Imaging
950 E. 2nd Avenue, Durango, Colorado 81301

Copyright ©1997 by R.O. Shepherd

This book may be reproduced or transmitted, in part, by brief quotations, to forward the perspective herein. Accurate quotations and criticisms are an asset.

First Printing, 1997

Published by Basin Printing and Imagining
950 E. 2nd Avenue
Durango, Colorado 81301

Printed in the United States of America
by



515 Isleta Blvd. S.W.
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87105

To You

Table of Contents

Preface.....	ix
Introduction.....	xi
Part I -- In Preparation For.....	1
1. Persuasion.....	3
2.....	29
3.....	55
4.....	57
5.....	59
6.....	60
7.....	61
8.....	62
9.....	63
10.....	64
11.....	65
12.....	67
13.....	68
14.....	69
15.....	70
16.....	72
17.....	73
18.....	76
19.....	77
20.....	79
21.....	81
22.....	84
23.....	87
24.....	89
25.....	91
26.....	94
27.....	99
28.....	102
29.....	105
30.....	113
31.....	117
32.....	118
33.....	122
34.....	125
35.....	129
36.....	132
37.....	133
38.....	135
39.....	137
40.....	142
41.....	145

42	151
43	155
44	168
45	173
46	175
47	187
48	193
49	205
50	211
51	219
52	220
53	222
54	235
Part II -- The Other Side to Consciousness	241
55	242
56	249
57	282
58	286
59	306
60	307
61	330
62	331
63	373
64	379
65	384
66	385
67	395
68	397
69	413
70	425
71	431
72	432
73	434
74	436
75	443
76	450
77	458
78	460
79	480
80	488
81	502
82	511
83	513
84	530
85	535
Appendix A: or 86 numerous of signs:	538

Preface

The definition so selected for the title word didactic:

1. From Webster's Seventh New Collegiate Dictionary — 1961 — page 231: “didactic...fitted or intended to teach... intended to convey instruction and information as well as pleasure and entertainment... making moral observation ...”

The definition so selected for the title word a fortiori:

1. From A Comprehensive Dictionary of Psychological and Psychoanalytical Terms — 1964 — by Horace B. English and Ava Champney English, page 16: “a fortiori...of a conclusion that follows with even greater logical necessity than another already accepted.”
2. From Dictionary of Philosophy — 1981 — Peter A. Angeles, page 5: “a fortiori: ...Refers to having to accept something on the basis of even stronger and better evidence...”
3. From Dictionary of Philosophy — 1960 — edited by Dagobert D. Runes, page 7: “A fortiori: ...A phrase signifying all the more; applied to something which must be admitted for a still stronger reason.”

The signification for the species Homo theists:

1. From Webster's Seventh New Collegiate Dictionary — 1961 — page 397: hom- or homo- ...one and the same: similar: alike...”
2. The word theists: the word “theists” is used signifying a belief for a paradigm of activity, an activity that is uniquely a species; than, any doctrine that diverts this paradigm of activity. In the use of this word “theists” we reduce the metaphor, allowing for greater clarity as we signify our species. The sameness of our species is to be our foundation — in activity — than any diversion from this quality.

Some perspectives are more comprehensive than others; more fundamental than others, more ultimate, more analytic, more all-encompassing. How might we describe that is liking to any person, every person; then, what shall we do about it?

There are at least four straight forward comments that need to be expressed: 1) It would be desirable for one to acquire good comprehension of Part I before going to Part II. 2) There is no intention that this work signify a single thought or expression to which has not been before. The following manuscript is a kind of expression involving all this type of classification unto another era: it is more of a reaction without such consideration. 3) It is not that any definition be learned to memory; but, that a context is to be signified and merged within you. 4) In many instances it will be the second reading etcetera of the manuscript that fuller comprehension will occur for you.

When i had finished this composition, ready for typing, i found myself needing further signification in order to complete the total presentation of the manuscript. So, i decided this short introduction to complete continuity. This is just the way it happened.

Introduction

In doing philosophy it is paramount that we keep alignment with ultimate, fundamental, final ground. When this ultimate alignment is lost then ambiguities began. It should be a first principle of philosophy; an ultimate, fundamental, final principle; that this ground of alignment be always maintained in all of its signifying. Well, philosophy has been diluted also, as different perspectives; over different times; were established: sustaining various prejudices.

In this manuscript it is demanded that one have some spatial ability: a spatial field in which to have imagery; and, involve perspectives of conflicting accord, view, “position of signifying”. When we study article 1 and article 2 such exhibition is required for comprehension, as we consider solipsism and some aspect of Zeno’s Paradox respectively. The demand for such ultimate comprehension will be consistent throughout the total manuscript. We shall not loose this alignment of abstract conceptualizing: thusly, there will be specific terminology; defined by/in context; sustaining ultimate, fundamental, frame of reference.

In article 1 it must be clear as to what is signified by solipsism: “solipsism, metaphysical. Literally, ‘I myself only exist’. The theory that no reality exists other than one’s self. The self (mind, consciousness) constitutes the totality of existence. All things are creations of one’s consciousness at the moment one is conscious of them. ‘Other’ things do not have any independent existence; they are states of, and are reducible to, one’s consciousness”.¹

In article 2 there is needed some understanding of Zeno’s Paradox. The following shall suffice: “Zeno’s Paradox. Zeno of Elea, a disciple of Parmenides, attempted in a series of arguments to disprove positions contrary to Parmenides’ philosophy that only the unchanging one exists and hence

¹*Dictionary of Philosophy*, Barnes & Noble Books A Division of Harper & Row, Publishers, 1981, p. 265, Peter A. Angeles.

nothing in reality can move. Zeno's arguments proposed to show that the concepts of many (plurality), motion (change), and place (space) were inherently contradictory and led to absurdities, and therefore could not be used to explain the universe and its phenomena. The most famous of the paradoxes is the Achilles and the Tortoise Paradox used to deny the existence of motion: If there is motion, then the slower (the tortoise) beginning first in a race will never be overtaken by the faster (Achilles). Achilles must reach the point to which the tortoise has already advanced. But during the time it takes Achilles to get to that point, the tortoise has advanced to another point. The tortoise may cover less ground; never the less he is still advancing since he is not at rest. The distance between Achilles and the tortoise are successively less but without limit (on the assumption of the principal of the infinite divisibility of magnitudes, that there are an infinite number of points between any two points). The tortoise will always have a lead regardless of how close Achilles gets to the tortoise. Achilles though he is faster will never overtake the tortoise. This is an absurd conclusion and therefore the statement that 'motion exists' from which it is derived is also absurd." ²

These two articles are difficult. Some repetitious reading will be necessary. But best comprehension will be after concluding the rest of the manuscript. Starting can be difficult.

In the total of the manuscript much terminology will be introduced and developed, defined by context, as aspects of the manuscript unfold.---By the end of the first segment (article 1-20) one should be within the direction of the manuscript. ...Several sets of terminology are used signifying over and again ultimate Being. However, this diversity of expression allows for compatibility with various ways of thinking, that we can understand one perspective.

In conclusion of this "short" introduction let us exercise within, on, ultimate ground:

²*Dictionary of Philosophy*, Barnes & Noble Books A Division of Harper & Row, Publishers, 1981, p. 320, Peter A. Angeles.

Dimension:

Duration has to do with the self-evidence that there is motion. If we existed or not in the universe, the universe would still exist; and, the universe would still be in motion. If there is motion; then, there is duration.

Time has to do with some measure of duration by some subjectivity correlating with some standard of activity. If one goes to the store and back in twenty minutes; then there was a motion of some duration. To say “this event took twenty minutes” signifies some measure in/of our subjectivity (This mass [subjectivity] arranged as it is, oscillating, in process). In/of our subjectivity, we signify that the earth moved a certain distance (motion [of mass] from one place to another: distance is self-evident also) of its turn of one day; as measured, in/of subjectivity, twenty minutes using a measuring device called a watch or clock. (These clever devices made by subjectivity.) The relation of “this event” to “the earths event”; a division of twenty-four hours; is correlated. Time always involves relevance involving subjectivity with its (subjectivity’s) created, signified, standard: this specificity. The events (“going to the store” and “a segment of the rotation of the earth”) are related by subjectivity, signifying a standard of measure : time : “the earths event” related to “going to the store”. Duration becomes specific to a standard; then, there is time. “Duration”(a simultaneity with motion; but, there is no time at this ultimate signification. Duration is alone with motion, always a relation of property; but, only “one” [(an) infinity] continuous duration of mass [property-control]) “exists”³, if any subjectivity exists or not. Time is only by comparison of one event to another, by some subjectivity.

If there is motion; then, there is mass; and, if there is motion, there is duration; and, if motion, then there is distance: but, the amount of distance has to do with some measure of some subjectivity correlating this distance. While, [an] infinite distance is not an amount for measure, it is a continuation. Only if there is subjectivity, with some standard of measure: then, there is

³If motion is self-evident for you; then, duration “is” self-evident.

time; and, an amount of distance is so signified by some standard.⁴ Time involves three aspects of mass: 1) some subjectivity; a type of standard of activity itself 2) some standard for comparison and 3) some event to measure. And, this is also true for the meter; measuring distance.

Seemingly, space has to do with duration (duration exclusively signifies about mass) and does have to do with distance: by some measure, subjectivity; this standard of activity: as when we signify the dimensions of space “from any point; or piece of ultimate density, for relevance; in every direction, at any time, for infinity.” But, “space” has no property, no mass, and no control: “it” is always neutral, not existent. The only property-mass-control of space is “in that subjectivity signifying.” “Space” is inevitable considering our perceptions of mass (this contrast of mass). Space has no duration, and has no dimension except distance; though, the distance of space (as infinite) is totally irrelevant than in/of a signification in/of some subjectivity.----- Dimension: as the “time” of events; as the “distance” of space: has to do with measure which is always a function of subjectivity. Measure has to do with subjectivity’s; this property’s-mass’-control’s; involvement with some standard which should always involve some property, some mass, some control, exclusive of any immateriality save our comprehension of space needed to fulfill our description. When we signify that space is infinite it is that what is signified by space’s infinity is self-evident to us; when we imagine another “place” or another possible “space” — as ad infinitum — while space “itself” “is” where there is, or where there is not, mass; and, what is signified by “space” has dimension only if there is some subjectivity to signify it. The dimension(s) of space is (are) solely contingent on some mass.⁵ Space has no motion and no duration.

⁴The standard for a length; the distance of a meter; is of aluminum kept at a specific temperature etcetera.

⁵For additional proof of the infinity of space: In article 2 we shall adventure some characteristics of the universe and show that there is [an] infinite *amount* of mass in the universe; therefore, space is infinite... We remember, dimension always involves some measure by subjectivity.

Space has distance, only contingent on some mass. Space is self-evident and infinite with distance: this measure, this dimension. Our measure of distance of space is in/of our self-evidence. We seek the self-evidence that is veridical, non-illusory. Space and the infinity (continuation) of space is self-evident: according to a standard in/of subjectivity. ----- There is motion. “Of what?” Mass. Then, there is signified duration and distance. “Mass”, “duration” and “distance”, with what we signify as “space”, are all self-evident. Dimension has to do with some specific measure.

*

The elaboration in Article 1 and 2 is a way we shall involve some history of thought. The remainder of the manuscript will exemplify these two articles.

* *

The conceptualization of a context is not the context at all: But we can provide for a conceived context. It is positive emotion, positive for our frontier. There is a living reality there, here. We shall enjoy another and others: positively.

*

The word veridical is to be understood: not illusory.

