

MESSENGER
AND
MESSAGE

V. Design 02, Wpw
1993-#17 (2)

February 5, 1993

Message-Messenger
1947 #5

ON DESIGNS AND DESIGNERS

*In particular
It has been asked how*

Can we differentiate the dancer from the dance? The musician from the music? the designer from the design? Without the dancer there is no dance, without a dance there is no dancer. Without the designer there is no design, without a design there is no designer.

Can the same be asked of designers & design?

We can differentiate a dancer from the dance if the dancer can perform many dances and if many dancers can perform the same dance. Otherwise differentiation is not possible. We can differentiate a designer from the design if the designer has designed many designs and if the same design has been used by many designers. Otherwise differentiation is not possible.

When we come to the cosmos we ask two questions:

First, is there a design? If so, then there is a designer.

Second, is there more than one design? If so, the designer and the design can be distinguished. Otherwise the designer and the design are one. God and God's creation cannot be distinguished. God is his creation. Creation is God

Back to the first question. How are we to decide through a set of experiences that a design exists? We must look for some self-referential activity. Earth is

e.g. Humans or their equivalent

Question 2: How can we decide more than 1 design exists

Design & Design are two levels

If \exists 1 designer \approx Monothelism

If \exists 1 design \approx Monism

Source of Novelty
Self-Organizing
to
Outside the system

\therefore Monism \Rightarrow 1 level

Creator = Creation
God = Creation

Pluralism \Rightarrow > 1 level

Creator \neq God \neq Creation

but $\not\Rightarrow$ monotheism

i.e. there may be more than 1 designer

Two Creators have been postulated:

2 levels 1) God, a designer apart from the creation
the design

1 level 2) Chance, a designer implicit in the design

Creation becomes the Creator

Design becomes the Design cf. book

Selection becomes the Selector

Messenger becomes the Message when the Message should become the messenger

02/06/93

By Supernatural we mean 3 more than one level

How is the Supernatural experienced?²

- 1) per violations of level #1 "laws"
e.g. miracles

- 2) we ourselves can experience (glimpses)
the level #2 phenomena directly

Since some humans have spiritual experiences (e.g. mystics)

∴ 3 more than one level (whether or not 3 miracles,
i.e. ~~whether even if~~ Brahma must always obey his own laws!)

a) If there is only one level Creation = Creator
and God is ∴ immanent — always in us

b) If 2 (or more) levels ⇒ God is transcendent
∴ there must be a vertical connection — a Christ

Both a) and b) are right! [which seems inconsistent to our minds]

i.e. The Creator >C Creation, autocreation
and

The creator created creation
and

Mankind is the vertical connector

Man is actor and acted on

Thus the self-referential vertical connection
is consciousness

Consciousness >C Christ.

Christ is an example of Consciousness

cf. The Great Dialectic
of iterated theophanies

Trinities

Designer - Designing - Design

Creator - makes - worlds

Subject - verb - object

again our language imprisons our epistemology
and hence our ontology

02/23/93 When we sing or move spontaneously, the singer and the song are one
more dancer and the dance

When we sing the songs of tradition, we separate the designer from the design,
more movements (e.g. Tai Chi)
we remove God from Creation

But it's a discipline in Tai Chi that has a value of its own

When should we sing spontaneously

and when should we move in tradition and discipline it?

An Answer:
Spontaneous
Spiritual Growth
Tradition
Built Community

M. Design 02, W.W.
1993-#17

February 5, 1993

ON DESIGNS AND DESIGNERS

*In past we
It has been asked how*Message-Messenger
1997 #5

Can we differentiate the dancer from the dance? The musician from the music? the designer from the design? Without the dancer there is no dance, without a dance there is no dancer. Without the designer there is no design, without a design there is no designer.

Can the same be asked of designer & design?

We can differentiate a dancer from the dance if the dancer can perform many dances and if many dancers can perform the same dance. Otherwise differentiation is not possible. We can differentiate a designer from the design if the designer has designed many designs and if the same design has been used by many designers. Otherwise differentiation is not possible.

When we come to the cosmos we ask two questions:

First, is there a design? If so, then there is a designer?

Second, is there more than one design? If so, the designer and the design can be distinguished. Otherwise the designer and the design are one. God and God's creation cannot be distinguished. God is his creation. Creation is God.

Back to the first question. How are we to decide through a set of experiences that a design exists? We must look for some self-referential activity. Earthly

e.g. Humans or their equivalent
and
Question 2: How can we decide more than 1 design exist?

Design & Design are two levels

If 1 designer = Monothelism

If 1 design = Monism

∴ Monism \Rightarrow 1 level

Creator = Creation
God = Creation

Pluralism \Rightarrow > 1 level

Creator ≠ God ≠ Creation

but \neq monotheism

i.e. there may be more than 1 designer

Source of Novelty
Self-Organizing
to
Outside the system

Two Creators have been postulated:

2 level 1) God, a designer apart from the creation
1 level 2) Chance, a designer implicit in the design

02/06/93

By Supernatural we mean 3 more than one level

How is the Supernatural experienced?²

1) per violations of Level #1 "laws"

e.g. miracles

2) we ourselves can experience (glimpses)

the Level #2 phenomena directly

Since some humans have spiritual experiences (e.g. mystics)

∴ 3 more than one level (whether or not 3 miracles,

i.e. what even if Brahma must always obey his own laws)

a) If there is only one level Creation ≡ Creator

and God is :: immanent — always in us

b) If 2 (or more) levels ⇒ God is transcendent

∴ There must be a vertical connection — a Christ

Both a) and b) are right! [which seems inconsistent to our minds]

i.e. The Creator > C Creation, autocreation
and

The creator created creation

and

Mankind is the vertical connector

Man is actor and acted on

Thus the self-referential vertical connection
is consciousness

Consciousness > C Christ.

Christ is an example of Consciousness

cf. The Great Dialectic

of iterated Theophanies

Trinitas

Designer - Designing - Design

Creator - makes - worlds

Subject - verb - object

against our language imprisons our epistemology
and hence our ontology

02/23/93 When we sing or move spontaneously, the singer and the song are one
move dancer and the dance

When we sing the songs of tradition, we separate the designer from the design,
move movements (e.g. Tai Chi)

we remove God from Creation

An Answer:
Spontaneous
Spiritual Growth
Tradition
Build Community

But it's a discipline in Tai Chi that has a value of its own

When should we sing spontaneously

and when should we sing in tradition and discipline?

A problem in Entitiation
February 23, 1993

ON DANCE AND THE DANCER

CF DESIGN01.P51
1993-#9 1997 #5

The poet has asked, How do we differentiate the dancer from the dance? The singer from the song? Without the dancer there is no dance, and without the singer there is no song. But is it not also true that without a dance there is no dancer, and without a song there is no singer.

We can differentiate the dancer from the dance only if other dancers can perform the dance or if the dancer can perform other dances. We can differentiate the singer from the song only if other singers can sing the song or if the singer can sing other songs. Otherwise differentiation is not possible.

When we dance spontaneously, we and our dance are one. When we sing spontaneously, we and our song are one. No one else can dance our dance or sing our song. But if our dance is copied, in the minds of others we and our dance have been differentiated. And if our song is simulated, in the minds of others we and our song are separate.

When we dance a copied dance, it is not our own dance and we and the dance cannot be one in the same sense as when we dance our own dance. When we sing another's song it is not our own song and we and that song are separate. In dancing and singing the dances and songs from tradition we have separated the creators from their creations

When is it appropriate to dance our own dance, to move spontaneously, and when is it appropriate to dance the rituals of tradition? When must we sing our own song and when should we sing the songs of tradition? What happens to us in spontaneity and what happens to us through the repetition of the movements and songs of tradition? In spontaneity we celebrate the oneness of creator and creation. In repetition of tradition we separate creator and creation in an attempt to make the creation our own. For in some limited sense whenever we sing another's song it does become partly our creation.

All of this is of relevance in our practice of religion wherein we have two objectives: we wish to create and participate in community and we seek spiritual union with the Higher. There is great disciplinary value in the rites of tradition, and it is these rites that are basic to community. We build our community in singing the songs of tradition and moving to the rituals of tradition. But in all of this we have separated the Creator from Creation. Perhaps the price of community. But the spiritual path requires something different, that creation and creator be one. We cannot find God except through God's Creation, so we must not separate God from Creation. We preserve this unity by achieving unity with our own creation. Thus to find God we must learn to sing our own song and dance our own dance.

Can we dance more than one dance?

"O body swayed to music,
O brightening glance,
How can we know the dancer from the dance?"

AUTHORTY.WPW

4/19/93
02/19/86

ON AUTHORITY

Authority is a mental construct. It is a concept that the Chief, the Pope, the Academy,... will be the source of the criteria for my decision making. In this authority is projected. We project authority then place ourselves under it. But projections may be given and they may also be withdrawn. Power is intimately associated with authority. Direct power limits my options for action. The indirect power of authority limits my options through placing mental limits on my option space.

Authority works because each of us as a helpless child had to place ourselves under the authority of our parents to survive. The process becomes habitual. Further the confusion created by a large option space leads us to seek constraints. At times it is a relief to have some one tell us what to do, what not to do. All choice and decision is difficult, correct choice and decision demands maturity.

Authority supports itself by threats to resort to direct power. You will either limit your option space or we will do it for you. However, once the projection of authority is withdrawn, the power behind it quickly erodes. No power can sustain itself for long once its authority has been lost. The first step in revolution and rebellion is the withdrawal ^{the projection} of authority. Preceding this is usually loss of respect. i.e. respect is usually the first aspect of authority to be lost.

Authority should belong to every individual, as with sovereignty according to Thomas Jefferson.

The most powerful authority operating in the world is the authority of the past. This includes established institutions, traditions, customs, and habits. We live in a past oriented society. We hold that the past is this best guide to the future, but this idea is breaking down in our times.

See Also 95-#33

95-#23

97-#5

93-#17

93-F9

ON MESSAGE AND MESSENGER

At some time near the end of the first century B.C.E., sculptured Buddha images closely resembling Greek sculpture came to be made in the Gandhara region in Northwest India. These were influenced by Hellenistic culture, and possibly inspired by an earlier Indian tradition of Buddhist imagery. At about the same time, more characteristically Indian images of Buddhas and bodhisattvas were being created in the Mathura region. Such sculptures, appearing more or less contemporaneously with Mahayana, indicate a trend toward deification of the Buddha, who began to take on the aspect of a transcendental being of which the historical Shakyamuni had been only an earthly manifestation.

Among the earliest Mahayana sutras is one, written around the time that the Buddhist sculpture of Gandhara was being made, describing practices by which the bodhisattva practitioner could cause Amida Buddha to manifest. The sutra describes these meditations in conjunction with the creation of Buddha-images. Such images seem to have been closely linked with worship ritual, including internal visualization of a Buddha. The concept of Buddhas as anthropomorphic objects of worship thus stimulated the development of ritual forms of worship, and Mahayana incorporated Brahmanic religious ritual formats myths, and mystic disciplines into its own growing devotional practice.

(Shingon--T. Yamasaki p7)

We have here evidence from India of the Greek imperative to anthropomorphize concepts and deify individuals. The primary manifestation of this tendency was of course the Olympic Pantheon and the ensuing body of Greek myth. There is little question that it was this Greek approach, the anthropomorphizing of doctrine and the deifying of teachers, that resulted in the theology of the Christian church. The parallel of what happened to the Shakyamuni Buddha and to Jesus of Nazareth in this matter of deification has overshadowed the many important parallels in their teachings. However, it is the parallels in the teachings that provide affirmation of their validity, rather than their being the revelations of deities. But the great majority (not only Greeks) demand validation of doctrine be based on authority supported by signs, miracles, and an origin which is on high. It takes maturity to accept multiple empirical demonstrations for validation, and it requires wisdom to understand that it is the message, not the messenger, which is the essence, to understand that the deity resides in the teachings, that is in the Word, not in the teacher.

Gandhara

Divinity resides in the Message - not in the messenger

In the Beginning was the Word
— The Message
Later came messengers
And the Word was with God
And the Word was God

BUDOCARI.WP6
1995 MAR 30

23a

See also

95-#33
94-#61

THE BUDDHIST-CHRISTIAN DIALECTIC

PROLOGUE

A question frequently arising in the study of origins is whether things that appear in different parts of the world have been independently discovered or have been discovered in one place and their existence communicated to others. This question of independent origin versus diffusion becomes more critical as the estimated periods of first appearance in the different locations converge toward the same date. Adherents of the independent discovery hypothesis feel that when a need becomes pressing and the levels of cultures are similar it is inevitable that such things as the use of fire, agriculture, the wheel, etc. will take place without any communication between cultures. The diffusion school holds that when the time is ripe an innovation will occur through the efforts of some genius and that the development will then spread abroad by word of mouth. [An intermediate view would be a single point of origin with the spread occurring not by communication, but by the "100th Monkey Process"]

Southern California is frequently plagued by brush fires and when there is a high wind these fires can spread rapidly and do considerable damage. Consequently the origins and modes of spreading of these fires became a subject of scientific study. It had been universally thought that wind blown hot ash was the vehicle of spread. But then from time to time a fire would spread up wind! This occurrence led to an investigation in which high speed cameras were brought in to study in as much detail as possible the manners in which a fire could spread. The cameras recorded instances in which a turbulent tube of fire would sweep up and arch over a large distance touching down and igniting brush even in a direction contrary to the wind. These turbulent tubes resembled the prominences seen on the limb of the sun and in one case bridged a freeway frustrating attempts to contain the fire.

Now what have these Southern California brush fires to do with the independent discovery/diffusion question? They suggest a third alternative to the spread of discoveries and innovations. The fire, the discovery, the innovation, contains its own imperative. That which was incarnated takes charge and commands its own transmission. The result may appear as independent origin or as diffusion depending on temporal sequences but the driving force lies neither with the discoverer nor the transmitter. It resides in the innovation itself which mandates both its birth and its diffusion..

Also for quasi life

March 30, 1995

4 Hypotheses according to Roy Amore

- 1) Coincidence
- 2) God → Universal Truth will be discovered and re-discovered
- 3) I am Ur-Source [Upanishads?]
- 4) Diffusion

JudeoChristian → BuddheoChristian

The message has its own
imperative, life

ACTACTN.WP6

See Also 94-#61

April 23, 1995

95-#23

97-#5

MESSAGE AND MESSANGER

The poet asks, "How do we tell the dance from the dancer?" and the yogi asks, "Is the meditator not the meditation?" These questions are of the genus, "How do we tell the action from the actor?" In Darius' day in ancient Persia the messenger was held to be part of the message and it was the custom to put to death a messenger who brought bad news. Evidently from earliest times to the present people have found the action/actor discrimination to be difficult. Is not McLuhan's "The medium is the message" referring to the same identificaton?

Examples of mixing the message with the messenger that have had far reaching consequences occurred in the field of religion. When a teacher brings a great message, the teacher is again viewed as part of the message and is bestowed with the qualities of the message. If the message appears to come from God, the messenger is deified, as happened to both Jesus and Siddhartha, and earlier to Hermes/Thoth. Nonetheless, **the divinity resides in the message, not in the messenger.** God, the Word, resides in the Gospels, not in the man Jesus. However, it was though the human Jesus that the Gospels were incarnated and through his sacrifice that they were given life and the ability to survive through time.

One of the most difficult examples of this question occurs in separating the Creator from Creation. Before there was Creation, was there a Creator? Or did the Creator come into existence only at the moment of Creation? In the former case, the Creator and Creation can be separated, in the latter they cannot for the *co-emergence* Creator is created along with Creation. The Action, the actors, and the consequences are inseparable. Which way are we to think about this? Traditionally Creator and Creation were separate, but St. Augustine raised the possibility of the simultaneity of their coming into existence. And today creation ex-nihilo becomes of interest in the simultaneous creation of plus and minus, of matter and anti-matter.

We, through our rituals, separate the Creator from Creation. When another party celebrates the action/actor that is not originally his, then the two are separated. Thus mankind created God. See 93-#17

when linear - can be separated e.g. message
when non-linear - cannot be separated as dance. unity

non-linear cannot be separated

The artisan is one with every thing he ever made.

I am the totality of my creation

Talk show hosts resent Clinton's criticism. They say he is killing the messenger.

ON SACRIFICE

Theorems on sacrifice:

1. A] One is permitted to sacrifice only that which is theirs, their possessions, their money, their health, their life,...The difficult question here is often , What belongs to one?

B] A more strict interpretation of this first theorem is that one can sacrifice only themselves, not even that which just 'belongs' to them. The difficult distinction here is that between oneself and one's belongings, the message and the messenger, the dance and the dancer.

2. A] The usual sacrifice is the lower for the higher. In the Gospel of Thomas it says: It is well for the man to eat the lion but not for the lion to eat the man.

B] The higher is sacrificed for the lower only in rare and profound circumstances. God sacrificed His son for the sins of the world. Certainly a sacrifice of the higher for the lower. And certainly a sacrifice of something that belonged to God. But in the strict interpretation, theorem 1 B], God had no right to sacrifice His Son, therefore the sacrifice led to the notion of the Trinity, God was indeed sacrificing only Himself, because the Son was part of God.

Which ~~coll~~^{univ}, VALUE or VIRTUE, does sacrifice belong in?
If either.

Sacrifice of —
 for —
 to —
 by —

Sacrifice as "a deal with the divinity"

Thankful for me of
 to
 by

DHRMSANG.WP6

April 12, 1996

See 1994 #36 Red & white
 1996 #38 INTRA-WARS

DHARMA OR SANGHA ?

Several items in the daily news this week have brought into focus a difficult ethical question, one that Josiah Royce in his praise of loyalty did not cover: When two loyalties conflict, how does one choose? Two current stories reveal different decisions on this issue:

The first story has to do with the identification and capture of the unabomber, with Ted and David Kaczynski. David led to suspicions that his brother Ted was the unabomber, made a careful investigation, and fearing that his findings did indeed confirm his belief, after months of agonizing reported his evidence to the FBI through an attorney. He felt that his loyalty to people yet to be killed was higher than to his blood brother.

The second story has to do with the family of a rapist. Alex Kelly of Darien, Connecticut. His parents found that Alex was indeed the rapist in at least two local crimes. They sent him to Switzerland and supported him there for eight years covering up his crimes on the basis that their first loyalty was to their son.

Positions and comments on these two incidents vary:
 David Letterman on David Kaczynski: the unaskable
 CNN on "Talk Back Alive": Saint or Snitch?
 E.M. Forster: "If I had to choose between betraying my country and my friend, I hope I should have the guts to betray my country".

While the above stories deal with individual families, we see the same issue at stake in Northern Ireland, the Middle East, and in former Yugoslavia. Is loyalty due first to principles such as the value of life, to justice or to peace; or is loyalty due first to blood, to relatives, to neighbors, to the state? To a political party religion: Protestantism, Catholicism, Judaism, Islam?

How are we to think about this issue? Is first loyalty to the teaching or to the group supporting the teaching, to the gospels or the church, to the Torah or to the House of Israel, to Islam or to Muslims, to the Dharma or the Sangha, to the message or to the messenger? [To the Red or the White]

Then there is also the story of Judas. When he protested the pouring of oil on Jesus instead of selling it and giving the money to the poor, was his loyalty more to Jesus' teachings than to the person Jesus?

What about conscientious objectors? Only as recently as World War I was there even the possibility of allowing a man to place his loyalty to his beliefs above loyalty to the state.

And it has been said about the Holocaust Museum in Washington D.C. that it is a monument to misguided loyalty.

Following Orders

Nov 16, 2002

AND NOW COMES THE CATHOLIC BISHOPS
THE LOYALTY TO THE CHURCH, THE INSTITUTION, THE MESSENGERS
W
LOYALTY TO HUMANITY, THE INNOCENT CHILDREN, THE MESSAGE

MESSAGE AND MESSENGER

History tells us that King Darius would put to death a messenger who brought bad news. At the other extreme History also records instances of the deification of a messenger with a profound spiritual message. And in our time, McLuhan affirms, "The media is the message". However the message and the messenger are not entities of the same level. The letter I am reading is not the Postal Service. What I am hearing on the telephone is not the Bell System. Why then has there been this confusion of message with messenger? Perhaps it is because when there is but one messenger and one message, discrimination is not possible. Only when one messenger brings many diverse messages or when many messengers bring the same message, can messenger and message be discriminated. [A parameter having but one value is never perceived.] The importance of this discrimination is crucial despite the fact that the media does delimit the messages it can transmit. But as with many discriminations, once the first has been made others follow:

of
parameters
2 values

The First Discrimination:

Deity, Truth, Wisdom,... reside in the message not in the messenger. Reside in the Scriptures, not in the scribes who wrote them. In the water, not in the pipe. In the stars, not in the astronomer.

in the mediation not in the carrier wave

The message
not the carrier

The Second Discrimination:

Nor is it the message itself that is the Deity, Truth, or Wisdom. It is in the process of decoding the message, interpreting it, challenging it, wrestling with it, that can bring about transformation, which in turn allows the perception and reception of God, Truth, and Wisdom.

The Third Discrimination:

It is not this process alone, but the commitment to it and the sacrifice for it that brings God, Truth, Wisdom,...

The Buddha said:

Rely on the message of the teacher, not on his personality
 Rely on the meaning of the message, not just on the words
 Rely on the real meaning, not just on a provisional one
 Rely on your wisdom mind, not on your judgmental mind.

interpretation

Aphorism:

It is not the messenger, but it is the message
 It is not the message, but it is in the message
 It is not in the message, but it is in the interaction of the receiver with the message
 The message and the receiver are like sperm and egg
 If there is fertilization, a child is born

an idea

What McLuhan means in his broadsweeping statement is
that how the message is delivered is part of the message.

Message + Messenger

A problem in entification

see 1993 #17 On Dance and Dancer

1993 #9 On Design and Designer

1995 #33

1995 #23

1994 #61

Apophysis also applies to a love relationship:

Your love is not ~~of~~ the other person, it is ~~of~~ the love that is in that person.
It is not ~~of~~ the love that is in that person, it is ~~of~~ love itself.
It is not ~~of~~ love itself, it is your response to love itself.

Treasuring that response, carrying it always with you,
will enable you to externalize the relationship
even though the other person departs.

It is the existence of a thing that matters,
not what it tries to teach, but what it is.

Jerusalem City Book pg 44

A Jerusalem Rabbi

Judaism produces many views but no dogma,

People focused on the pointing finger,
not to what it was pointing
Then on the pointer him/herself

Having received both the Gospels and the Dharma, we can discriminate Jesus from the Gospels and Buddha from the Dharma. In both cases we can discern that the Deity, Truth, Wisdom is in the message rather than in the messenger. Then, it is up to us to take the message from there.

It is in the water not in the pipe. Why then are we always concerned with which pipe, rather than with the water. And why do pipes want to take the credit for the water? Perhaps Darius was weary with pipes seeking credit, and decided to teach a pipe a lesson.

A single photon is an insufficient messenger to bring us the message ~~of~~ of the value of a red shift. [absorption line] It requires many photons. A context is needed to decipher the message (a laboratory comparison spectrum) The receiver must possess the code book in order to understand the message.

The perfection envisaged in the Gospels is unattainable in earthly terms, whether through good works or revolutionary changes. It is aspiring after this perfection that our intrinsically imperfect nature can be redeemed, and the world made a happier, more just and harmonious place to live.

Leo Tolstoy

ON DEIFICATION AND LINEAGES

Milarepa, the great Tibetan arya, rejected for himself the anointment of tulkuship. While this, in one sense, is a theological parallel of the political rejection by Cincinnatus of the consulate, or by Washington of a crown, much more is implied. Milarepa has taken the position that anointment cannot be passed on through some heredity process: Not through genetic heredity, as with the divine right of kings nor as with the Jews in their assertion of being the "chosen". Nor is anointment bestowed by some electoral process as with the election of Popes, nor by some selection process as with tulkus who are the supposed reincarnations of some deity such as Avalokiteshvera. Indeed, in a broader sense Milarepa's rejection supports all who were anointed without the blessing of an orthodox lineage. The names of Shakimuni, Jesus, and many prophets, saints, and sages of far flung lands come to mind. It may well be that new and higher wisdom always enters the world from outside hereditary and selected lineages. And is that not the meaning of virgin birth?

A second and very troubling implication, that Milarepa avoided by his rejection, is that anointing the messenger is a diversion that neutralizes the divinity residing in the message. First, the focus turns from that which was pointed out by the finger of the messenger to the finger itself. Second, the focus turns from the pointing finger to what it is newly pointing to: viz. a new lineage that claims ownership of the message and its messenger. In these refocusings what is left of the message and the messenger becomes blurred and confused, ultimately being redefined and corrupted by the new lineage.

But not only does anointment or deification of the messenger tend to vitiate the message, it destroys the role of the messenger as exemplar. In deifying the messenger, a chasm is placed that separates both the divine message and the anointed messenger from those for whom the message was originally intended. The lineage substitutes a false code book and the original meaning of the message is lost. For such messages always contain the code book by which they are to be interpreted.

Religious lineages are like schools in the arts: Impressionism, Surrealism, Symbolism, Modernism. They continue until the variations on their themes are exhausted and some new "anointed one" breaks away and introduces a new theme. When

only

Only when

did he feel

Hiroshige's teacher died, ~~he felt~~ he was free not to have to paint in the tradition he was taught.

Lineages become cults. They define what is orthodox and what is heresy. Lineages become poles rather than trees. They abhor branches. But the great teachers held otherwise. The Buddha Shakimuni's last words were an exhortation not to stop with what had been taught, but to continue to work out your own salvation. Jesus said I am the vine and you are the branches. You can not only do what I did but much more.¹ (And Carl Jung said, Thank God I am not a Jungian).

Above the introduction of a teaching that departs from the lineage was compared to Virgin Birth, and certainly Virgin Birth is a proper metaphor for such innovation. In addition to the birth of Jesus² there are many examples of new ideas and concepts that are not contained within any lineage: Kepler's introduction of ellipses not part of lineage astronomy; Napier's introduction of logarithms not part of lineage mathematics; Buckminster Fuller's geodetic domes not part of lineage geometry; Superstring theory not part of lineage physics. The secret: That of Mary, emptiness, *and consent, and courage* *Kinessis*

There are many forces operating to destroy whatever is born of virgin birth. The old order crucifies the messenger and the new order corrupts the message. But most deadly is our ignorance and inability to understand. We fail to realize that with the new message is also given a new code book, [for code book read consciousness] and our interpretations of the message based on the old code book do not apply. It is ever a wonder that what is incarnated in the manner of virgin birth survives in any part. But it is those parts that do survive that have raised us up and given us the visions that enable us to persist in our search.

¹Breaking with a lineage and taking up a new theme shortens the life of a lineage. If the primary value is merely longevity or survival, instead of fullness and richness, then keep the teaching pole like. But that is neither the way of the Great Teachers nor of cosmic and bio-evolution.

²It is an *anomaly* that the writers of Matthew and Luke attempted to show that Jesus was of the lineage of David. They felt he had to be authenticated by belonging to a lineage.

~~diachronic~~
lineages are "old boys clubs" spread over time

Judaism derived the message [Torah]
Islam derived the message [Qur'an]

Christianity derived the messenger [Jesus → CHRIST]

Suppressed the gnosis, ad → power trip

ON MESSAGING

A recent article in Science News [Hiding secret data in plain view SN May 2, 1998 p286] tells how embedding a message within another message allows confidential communication without encryption.

"The sender breaks the confidential digital message into packets and tags each packet with a short string of digits known as a message authentication code. The message packets can then be intermingled with fake packets bearing bogus authentication codes to create a plausible missive. Because the sender and receiver share a secret method for authenticating the origin and contents of each packet, the receiver can readily distinguish between the legitimate information (wheat) and the gibberish (chaff). The individual packets are not encrypted."

This of course is essentially the CDMA [Code Division Multiple Access] mode of communication that is now being employed by increasing numbers of wireless, telephone and data transmission companies.

While these embedding methods claim to be innovative developments in communication technology, they are in fact but updated versions of modes of messaging that go back to ancient times. The Holy Scriptures are said to contain many messages of this sort. Not only Gematria type messages, in which each letter of the alphabet has numeral associations, but messages extracted by reading, for example, every seventh letter or word. And then there are the parables, which may be read on many levels, each level containing a different message. And there is the enneagram which illustrates the embedding of one sequence within another: The "peri" sequence around the circumference of the circle, according to the progression of time, and the "dia" sequence following chords connecting nine points on the circumference giving an alternate causal or developmental sequence. And there are the "Camelots", moments of similar quality embedded in history at widely separate times.

We note here the following four modes of messaging:

- The direct mode, all wheat no chaff
- The CDMA mode, embedding packets of one message within another. This would include examples like the enneagram and Camelots.
- The parable mode, an open message that can be understood on several levels.
- The Gematria or encryption mode, which would include a plethora of different schemes.

What each of these modes have in common is that they all require code books. In the direct mode the code book is public available to all. The CDMA and Gematria modes require that the sender and receiver each have possession of the same private code book. The parable mode requires that the receiver must develop or derive for himself the code books that decipher the different levels of the message.

cf. modes of messaging 1998 # 30

and modes of messaging 1998 # 2

TRUTH AND AUTHORITY

What is truth? --Pontius Pilate John 18:38

Is there *truth* apart from authority? Is what we call *truth* only the pronouncement of some teacher, judge, scripture, or process? Or is there something meant by *truth* that transcends all human claims, and if so can it be known? When examined, what we mean by *truth* is a concept endowed with the attributes of universal and eternal validity. But whenever some specific is given us proposing to fit that concept, it always comes through the claim of some authority. But all authority and authorities are ephemeral so there is nothing claimed by any authority on the basis of authority that can fit the concept of *truth* in having universal and eternal validity.

...they believe the writings and neglect the truth.
Regiomontanus

Who and what are the authorities that have been endowed with the power of proclaiming truth? These fall into two classes: those set up by another authority, and those who self pro-claim their authority. In the first class are judges and juries appointed or elected by some second authority. In a democracy the second authority is the people. And the people's authority is in turn determined by the authority of majority. Then there are those who like Pope Pius IX in 1870 who proclaimed his own authority, the validity of his claim resting on the circular argument that he prepossessed the authority to make such a proclamation.

And they asked Jesus: By what authority are you doing these things, and who gave you authority to do this.
Mark 11:28

Next we come to scientific truth and the authority of science. Science delegates authority to a process, the so-called scientific method, which includes the inductive testing of hypotheses. But since an inductively established "truth" may at any time be falsified, science rejects the notion of *truth* in the sense of having ubiquitous validity. Instead science maintains that truth must be replaced by that which has been shown to be valid over some limited region of space and time. [But this is violated in cosmology by scientists assuming the "Cosmological Principle" which says that the laws observed to hold locally are valid everywhere.] Of course science too has its authorities, the Newtons, Darwins, and Einsteins who hold sway over scientific thinking for generations. But the ultimate authority resides in empiricism not in a publication.

Finally there is *recognition*, the learning of something new that you realize you had known all along. If there is anything that would approach a methodology leading to the ascertainment of *truth* it would be recognition. And recognition is not opinion. Opinion arises from the authority of ego; recognition arises from an invisible ineffable source shared by many. It is the test we each possess for discerning the validity of the claims of all the authorities. But it is not the source of our foible of projecting authority on "authorities".

MESSAGE AND MESSENGER

It is reported that King Darius I of Persia (522-485 BCE) would reward messengers who brought him good news and put to death those who brought bad news. We would say that Darius could not distinguish the message from the messenger. Of course, Darius was not alone in this confusion of message and messenger. Great teachers who brought liberating messages [e.g. Jesus and the Gospels] were often deified. And in our times Marshall McLuhan has maintained that the media [the message bearer] is the message. Why this confusion of message and messenger?

A few years ago I purchased an Apple II computer. There was a program available that had an outstanding random number generator. I used this to generate white noise, the kind of noise that contains all frequencies. Then, for some reason I have forgotten, I decided to modulate the white noise with white noise, and what appeared on the screen was a gaussian or bell shaped curve! This amazed me [I had at the time never heard of the central limit theorem]. Here was a mix of the messenger [the carrier wave] and the message [the modulating signal], in which the message and the messenger were identical, both white noise. If either the message or the messenger were put to death, the result would be white noise, but if both were left intact something entirely new emerged. Further modulations of the bell curve resulted in decreases in the dispersion, successively evolving toward a single spike (~ a Dirac function). All of this, besides its mathematical interest, seemed to have a metaphorical content.

It just may be that both Darius and McLuhan are correct in holding that there is an indivisible link between the message and the messenger, and some third essence emerges whenever a messenger delivers a message. And this is readily extended to the case—whenever an observation of the natural world is made, since a messenger and message are both involved, something in the world is changed, something new emerges or is put to death.

But it is the iterations that are especially of metaphoric interest. The iteration or repetition of the message narrows its essence. When repeated many times it narrows into what might best be called a *dogma*.^{*} Both a *weltanschauung* and the world itself are simultaneously created by repeated observation. The ontological translation of the messenger is the mode of observation, that is, the epistemology. The translation of the message is the observational or empirical data acquired, and the translation of the emerging essence is the modification or re-creation of the world itself.

If the nature of the world is such as to lend itself to being shaped and re-created by a consciousness that interacts with it by observing it, then what we choose to observe, what questions we choose to ask, not only guide the course and development of our knowledge of the world, but are simultaneously directing the evolution of the world we observe. In this sense we do create our own reality.

clinet

* Wittgenstein adds that after sufficient repetitions meaninglessness ensues
 In many names of God - make God nameless
 Both many gods make them "godless"
 And 1 God → no God

The world is the Weltanschauung ?

Message

meaning

An excellent response! Good thinking and good writing. Your message is needed.

I have been concerned about these same issues long before the appearance of "The DaVinci Code". Why are people so obsessed with the messenger and overlook the message? It is like worrying whether the postman's shoes were shined and his tie of the proper shade and forgetting to open the letter he delivered. If one's weltanschauung, faith, and value system are all based on details about the messenger's life, and some long accepted details have been shown to be wrong, then it is time to look at the message itself.

Your two questions: "Why shouldn't individuals work toward higher levels of consciousness and goodness?" and "Why can't we dig deeper to understand more about Jesus' real message?" are basic ones. The church was supposed to support each individual's spiritual path, instead it chained people to dogma and burned those at the stake who saw more depth in the message. And still today, for the most part, the mission has been replaced by the institution. If the discoveries at Nag Hammadi, the Judas book, and the Da Vinci Code pull the rug out from under a power structure that has put a lid on people's spiritual growth, it is long overdue.

At the Mount of the Transfiguration, Jesus appeared with Moses and Elijah. All three had brought a new theophany, and the message was that there would be ever more theophanies, new messengers, bringing the timeless message but with deeper understanding.

In the Gospel of Thomas, Jesus says: "If there be those anywhere who suffer, then I suffer." In the Koran, Muhammed says: "If any Muslim suffers, then all Islam suffers." Jesus said to his disciples: "You too can do all that I have done and more too." The Buddha said to Ananda; "You have learned all that I have taught, go now and light a new lamp."

Compare the Tao de Ching (c 550 BCE) with the Sermon on the Mount (c 80 AD):

He that humbles himself shall be preserved entire. He that bends shall be made straight. He that is empty shall be filled. He that is weary shall be renewed. He who has little shall succeed. He who has much shall go astray.

Matthew 5:5 Blessed are the meek: for they shall inherit the earth. 5:6 Blessed are they which do hunger and thirst after righteousness: for they shall be filled. Blessed are the poor in spirit: for theirs is the kingdom of heaven

Many postmen, the same letter; Many messengers, the same message.

*Why does the value of the letter
depend on the postman's haircut?*