

Why marry?

With TheImmanent

The following exchange with TheImmanent (his username on Youtube) is taken from the comments to the video titled, "The Book of Wife" by Dan Rowden / MenoftheInfinite.

It's a simple and straight-forward exchange, that I like because it sticks to finding reasons for marriage in a systematic way. It is also interesting because, after TheImmanent's reasons fell apart one-by-one under my finely poised reasoning, he decided that I must be crazy. How much he values reason, who, when shown the true power of reasoning, calls it irrational!

But TheImmanent is a normal fellow, meaning, he is typical of most males I have encountered, who keep their shining jewel-like philosophising in watertight boxes, safe from the rest of their lives, and strictly for the admiration of females. For those of you that find marriage a delightful ideal, be warned. You may also find your idea of rationality is the same as TheImmanent's — follow your heart, and always trust it to lead you to truth.... to happiness.... to mindless bliss, and complete safety from thought or the troubling notion of consequences.

Kelly Jones

TheImmanent: I think your preoccupation with polemics may be as great an obstacle on the path to wisdom as the desire for particular things, or rather I think they are the same. As someone holding something for a distraction, you seem to distract yourself much with the very opinion of it. That said, I do not know how functional your generalizations of relationships are. If you posit that full co-dependency is an obstacle you are correct; if you state that marriage necessarily entails it you are not.

MenoftheFinite Marriage does necessarily entail it because attachment necessarily entails it and marriage necessarily entails attachment.

TheImmanent: @MenoftheFinite, You merely present a snowball argument, for you may equally say that any activity, possession or acquaintance necessarily entails a consuming attachment, by which you should isolate yourself as much as possible from all sensory impressions. Yet in truth it depends upon the level of wisdom of the mind and not upon the activity itself, for the mind is not the less a mind in any given situation and may know itself in all of them.

KellyJones00: TheImmanent, Bonding is one of the main functions of the ego; to ignore it is to ignore the ego's cunning.

Love is a powerful madness. A strong polemic - reason, psychology, humour, and self-awareness - is needed to educate oneself out of it.

TheImmanent: Yet you seem to assume that a monogamous relationship between a man and a woman necessarily overthrows wisdom. It is like saying that since a

glutton is immoderately obsessed about food, eating is an obstacle for anyone.

KellyJones00: TheImmanent, A special relationship between two people to the exclusion of others, itself shows delusion. Wisdom is about realising there is nothing to be attached to.

What the lover does, is imagine, and tries to project that image onto the ever-changing reality. This is why celebrities are so bland and mannequinish - you can project what you like, drape your own fantasies onto them - and why people never love what you really are, but their own mental images.

TheImmanent: Yet when you say a 'special' relationships you are already positing a relationship of emotional co-dependency. In truth a husband and a wife can live together with mutual love that is not exclusive of others in anything but the functional expression. For what hindrance do you see in the way of the enlightened mind which would prevent it from having a spouse? Agape is the love of all, not the exact same behavior in regard to all; the expression of love depends on the function of the recipient.

KellyJones00: TheImmanent, For two people to cohabit to reduce the cost of living or for ecological reasons, is reasonable. But to cohabit out of need for the other person in one's life is not reasonable. That is emotional dependency, it is love, but it is not agape.

Agape isn't an emotion, but an understanding founded through and through on reason.

Agape is not expressed differently moment to moment, situation to situation, person to person. Reason being, it regards everything *as* oneself.

TheImmanent: Emotion is merely a mind's reaction to fulfillment or the lack of fulfillment, by which it is impossible to separate emotion from reason, i.e., since the enlightened mind is utterly fulfilled and thus in a state of constant positive emotion. When you say that agape is never expressed differently in behavior, I wonder if you realize that you are hypothesizing an enlightened mind which is fully passive, i.e., that it does not interact with anything, for any act is discriminatory of other acts.

KellyJones00: TheImmanent, you say "Emotion is merely a mind's reaction to fulfillment or the lack of". Well, a sense of fulfilment, or lack thereof, is from the ego. I see enlightenment as no longer having the need for fulfilment or the need to escape un-fulfilment. Some people see this as bleak, not realising they're still holding the need for positive emotion/absence of negative emotion.

TheImmanent: Then we have a difference in philosophy. Positive or negative emotions may both pertain to the ego, namely when they arise from false ideas of the self; but when a mind is in possession of the truth, this is saying that it is in fact fulfilled in an absolute sense, i.e., that it is in full expression of its own essence, whereby it is affected by its highest joy. This is not to say that the enlightened mind has a 'need' to feel fulfilled; it is saying that being enlightened is to be fulfilled.

KellyJones00: TheImmanent, Possibly we're saying the same thing, I'm not sure. The way I experience enlightenment, which I think is genuine, is something that instinct detests and baulks at, because the animal in us wants security, peace, control, and comfort. As a wise fella said, "To have faith is really to advance along the way where all human road signs point: back, back, back." (Faith being a rational step knowing that Reality is not something to be grasped).

Bliss is a subtle error.

TheImmanent: The difference we have is that you seem to hold that suffering and pleasure are two sides of the same coin, where both must exist in contrast, i.e., by which it becomes the endeavor of the mind to free itself from emotion. However, I mean that nothing may essentially exist in relations, wherefore the true positive emotions are in fact the very nature of existence itself, inseparable from reason. The negative emotions spring solely from the consideration of negatives, i.e., nothing of substance.

KellyJones00: TheImmanent, By "the very nature of existence itself" do you mean, the emptiness of inherent existence of all things? Just following through on the idea that all things exist relatively, and not inherently. So that it makes no sense to regard, let alone love, any arbitrarily-bounded thing as if it were existing independently.

TheImmanent: There is only an inherent emptiness to relative things, i.e., they are not truly things, but rather something concrete which is viewed from a limited perspective. For to observe a thing which can be brought into being and destroyed is not to observe a thing, i.e., since it is defined by its surroundings, and thus it is in fact part of its surroundings. That is, existence as a whole is a concrete thing, a full positive, the very opposite of emptiness.

KellyJones00: TheImmanent, Which of these statements do you disagree with:

- What are not concrete are things that are relative to other things.
- The totality is not in relationship to another thing, but includes all things.
- The totality is truly concrete.
- The totality isn't actually concrete after all, since "concreteness" is a relative attribute.
- The totality doesn't have a nature, or rather, it has all natures.
- Enlightenment is just recognising what is true.

TheImmanent: Concreteness is hardly a relative attribute. The difficulty I see in your reasoning is that you treat conceptual natures as things when they in truth consist in nothing other than a limited perspective of the positive, the concrete, i.e., existence. Essentially, the observation which can be made is this; if something is true, something is concrete, if something is, something is true. You are biased by your perception, which lets you know things by contrast rather than by substance.

KellyJones00: TheImmanent, If concreteness isn't a relative attribute, it has no meaning. And yes, things can only be known by contrast with other things.

TheImmanent: If an attribute has no meaning without relations, I would like to know what the attribute of relativity stands in relation to, i.e., I would like to know what you mean exists in contrast to relativity.

KellyJones00: Well, things that are relative exist, and, since concepts are also things, therefore, the concept "absoluteness" exists in contrast to "relativity". It doesn't really mean anything to say that existence exists; compared to what?

TheImmanent: On the contrary; it doesn't mean much to say 'compared to what?' For it is necessarily so that that which may be called a thing is a thing by itself, i.e., whenever we observe something which exists in relation, this is not a thing, but rather and solely a limited view of something, which we must expand our perspective in order to see in full. The belief that relations exist in a void stems from nothing but this very limited way of perceiving things.

KellyJones00: Thingness is just an abstraction to cover whatever is finite and relative to other. It doesn't exist in itself. The point I'm trying to explain to you is that

all such concepts, like "suchness" or "existence" or "substance" are just ways to help people see that things don't inherently exist. It's a tool to bring out the psychological need for something to cling to - something by which to feel completed.

TheImmanent: Nothing relative is a Thing, i.e., the observation of its relativity is the observation of a partial perspective. The idea that nothing possesses inherent existence stems from the misinterpretation of what makes a thing a Thing, i.e., a true Thing does not have limited shape. You object to the saying that existence exists simply because its essence and existence is the same, which is inevitable for that which is concrete.

KellyJones00: So you reckon love for a wife isn't a partial perspective?

TheImmanent: You misunderstand; I never argued for the obsessive love of a particular thing, I pointed out that nothing hinders a wise mind, who is affected by timeless love towards all of existence, to have a wife. That is, the fact that a mind loves indiscriminately does not impede it from having relationships of different practical functions with different people. I will also say that two wise minds who are joint as spouses, and encourage each others' insights, will be mutually beneficial to each other.

KellyJones00: Would Richard Dawkins function as a wife? Why not? I disagree that a wise mind needs a spouse to be encouraged to be wise. Sounds very fishy.

TheImmanent: Don't be childish. You could equally ask if a fish would function as a bird, while the distinction in function is the very thing which lets you ask the question; i.e., no, Richard Dawkins does not have the functions of a woman, who, in marriage, is referred to as a wife. I have never claimed that a spouse is needed in order to attain wisdom; I said that it is not necessarily an obstacle, and that two wise minds may be beneficial to each other.

KellyJones00: What about Siddhartha Gotama, then? Would he function as a wife? Do you think he was unwise not to return to his wife and children? And would he marry an unwise spouse? What does marriage do, that discussions on the internet don't?

KellyJones00: The thrust of these questions point to something psychological. It's obviously not about the functions of nursing, childcare, cleaning and cooking since men can perform those equally well as women, as single fathers and bachelors can attest. It's the psychological drive to marry a *woman* that's the issue. What is Woman that Man is not?

TheImmanent: In essence, true thoughts are true thoughts regardless of which mind holds them, which is also why I find it unnecessary to discuss gender. However, nor does the wise mind seek carnal pleasure for its sake, wherefore I mean that a wise woman and a wise man may join in marriage for reproduction and the wise rearing of their children. I do not consider a woman any less capable of insights than a man, which is why your question is mute to me.

KellyJones00: You've now boiled marriage down to child-rearing. Fabulous! But people can certainly raise children without being married and without "mutual love", and do so intelligently and committedly. This isn't a hypothetical, but a real-life statement from my observations.

TheImmanent: Don't be so naive. You reason as if everyone should act as were they enlightened as a method to attaining it. Much more likely you will end up as an isolated and miserable individual full of spite rather than love. Mutual love and marriage can be a way to wisdom, for by experiencing love you may come to learn its

nature, by which selective love can grow into agape. Life is activity, enthusiasm and co-operation; don't walk in the trap of intellectual elitism or asceticism.

KellyJones00: TheImmanent, you say "selective love can grow into agape." There's no other way for the egotist, and everyone seeking wisdom starts as an egotist. But the whole deal is *what* one loves, what one is attached to. If it is not truth and reason first and foremost, then, I'm sorry, but I cannot accept that such a love will *ever* grow into agape. Such single-mindedness is not "misery" or "spite" but a spirited, joyful, deeply inspired romp to liberation.

KellyJones00: ... I also think that a person who can imagine themselves as enlightened every instant of every day, has a far greater chance of being so. So it is not a bad thing to "act as if you are enlightened". It stimulates the mind to find out, what ought I to do?

And again, 90% of people don't actually need to be engaged in child-rearing. So the point of marriage is even harder to rationalise (not that you're trying to, of course).....

TheImmanent: As Spinoza wrote, it is not so that a wise man must struggle with his passions; for as long as he must he is not wise, but on the contrary, when he attains wisdom his passions are overcome through it. That is, your growing degree of wisdom will naturally guide you away from passions at the appropriate pace. It can be dangerous to forswear all material things instantaneously just because the Enlightened do not need them, i.e., it can be like lifting too heavy a weight and thus break your bones.

KellyJones00: TI, you say "your growing degree of wisdom will naturally guide you away from passions at the appropriate pace." This is true. Some exchange their blood for venom, and die immediately. The weak, however, must repeat the same mistakes and sufferings many times. You say, "It can be dangerous to forswear all material things instantaneously." It's a matter of choosing a rational lifestyle that enables one to lift heavy weights. Children and spouses are often mega distracting.

TheImmanent: Obviously only you yourself know what thoughts truly lie behind your statements and your choices, but regardless I disagree that polemics in a misogynous language benefits the wisdom of anyone. Contrary to deepened reflection, I think it provokes reactions of indignation and spite, and that it disqualifies your ideas in the eyes of all who do not share them already. Anything is mega distracting when you do not pay proper attention to things. When you do, nothing is.

KellyJones00: I've often found that people who react indignantly and spitefully to the view that women often overreact emotionally, despite claiming to be rational persons, only prove the point. Marrying a woman is naturally a distraction. It's like living with an unpredictable psychological volcano: only the wisest of the wise wouldn't be troubled by its sulphuric belchings.

TheImmanent: It doesn't prove a point since indignation and spite is the reaction you will normally receive from anyone when you attack something pertaining to their identity in untactful language. On the contrary, your formulations suggest that it is you who are overbearing, and that you do not see the best way to accomplish your own intentions, i.e., to convince (if that is your intention). The final part of your post is glaringly void of reason, deduction or evidence. Is it brought on by mere antipathy?

KellyJones00: TI, Women are almost always seen through rose-coloured specs. Of course it hurts to see the glaring, ugly reality. Especially hurtful to those who have never known suffering, who prefer the misty imaginings of romance and poetry. But I'm a product of working-class rural culture. Blood, shit, sweat, pain, minimal words. Can't help but tell it that way, it's more direct and realistic.

TheImmanent: Yet were I to assume the view on Man that a child soldier from Kongo-Kinshasa develops in his suffering, while it is subjectively true and grim, I would fall short of absolute truth. You must not limit yourself to fragmented experience when you seek wisdom; to take sense-perception at face value will always lead you astray. For my part, I find nothing hurtful in your statements about women; I simply do not see any backing to them, and thus they are without philosophical weight.

KellyJones00: TI, you say "to take sense-perception at face value will always lead you astray." Women and wives are sense-perceptions. That's all they are. The philosophical weight of my statements is the folly of investing in "partial perspectives" like marriage to woman rather than marriage to truth.

TheImmanent: Any particular thing is discerned through sense-perception, i.e., it is a shape brought about by a partial perspective. This is not the issue. Sense-perception is misinterpreted when the things perceived are taken as absolute things; it is fully possible to understand the true nature of things even when one is limited in perspective. To be married to a woman is not at all exclusive of marriage to truth, i.e., for anything may be considered as what it is; marriage or any other framework.

KellyJones00: Ti, I agree completely. That's not the issue. The issue is *why* marry in the first place. For instance, you said:

- "Mutual love". No, this is not expression of agape.
- "Wise minds benefit each other". No, no one can improve on wisdom. It's there or it's not.
- "For reproduction and child-rearing". No, marriage isn't required to raise children.

Then you said,

- "From weakness." Yes, some people can't bear focussion truth.
- "Non-offensive." Yes, marriage won't offend most people.

KellyJones00: TI, it's about finding the best tools to open oneself to the Infinite, and let oneself be immersed in that freedom. Getting married to, bonding with, and attaching oneself to one particular person, is an unmistakable psychological rejection of the freedom of the Infinite. But yes, if a person is too weak to bear the awareness of the Infinite, and to bear the spite and indignation of deluded people, then they may well be forced to marry to calm their fussing ego.

TheImmanent: When I say that wise minds may benefit each other, I do not mean that there is wisdom and improved wisdom, I mean that they may share their respective insights. Moreover, until Enlightenment is in fact attained, the company of other truthseekers does increase the resolve of the mind to find truth, i.e., in the same way that the company of the deluded and aggressive may lead it astray -- in this I am in agreement with Spinoza. It is beneficial to humanity when the wise raise children wisely.

KellyJones00: Marrying is one of the worst ways to help one become enlightened. Solitude is essential to the thinker. It provides the freedom to become intimately acquainted with the Infinite, which is the source of all wisdom.

TheImmanent: It is difficult to say what way of living is most effective in order to attain enlightenment, since different people have different weaknesses, i.e., become distracted by different things. That marrying would be the worst hindrance is absurd; you would do much better to make satire on greed, superiority, prestige, status, lust for power and other such things which occupy people's minds nearly at all times.

KellyJones00: TI, I dare say to you that all those things are commonly fulfilled in

coupling, monogamous or not. To be lonely is one of the egotist's greatest fears.

TheImmanent: KellyJones, You are hardly attacking the root of the problem by putting focus on marriage.

KellyJones00: TI, Attacking marriage is an excellent way to focus on egotism, because egotism is expressed by attachment, and marriage is all about attachment. People would never get married if it didn't, first and foremost, feed the ego. That's all marriage does. Rather than the loosely structured egotism of polygamy, or open relationships, marriage is a stonewalled egotism, the ego's natural fulfilment.

TheImmanent: I will not repeat everything that has just been said, but I think you should make a distinction between the functional cooperation of marriage and the emotional co-dependency of marriage.

KellyJones00: TI, 90% of people are required to be celibate now. That's what the scientists say in regard to climate change. Yet people don't seem to be paying any attention. How functional is that?

TheImmanent: Were each couple to have one child, each generation would be half the size of the one preceding it; that is a very rapid population decline. Moreover, how many we are is not nearly as great an issue as what lifestyles of consumption we have. That 90 % of the population should live in celibacy is neither accurate, functional or realistic.

You cannot refer to what scientists say as proof since it is hardly a settled issue, i.e., there are countless of possible scenarios.

KellyJones00: TI, If not celibate, then not reproducing anyway. The reason for the 90% cull figure isn't "lifestyle" consumption per se, but 9 billion people (~2050) getting enough food if the climate is 2°C warmer, let alone 4°C in the scenario that, say the Chinese are permitted to continue their emissions rate until 2050 for economic development reasons.

Marriage for child-rearing purposes is hardly functional or intelligent when our pop. in 2100 is predicted to be <1 billion.

KellyJones00: A 4°C rise in temperature is supposed to mean much less than 1 billion.

So, even if each couple in their twenties (for best genetic transmission) had one child, it wouldn't be a fast enough decrease. Unless there's some world war wiping out the majority of our current estimated 7 billion humans, the majority will still be around until nearly the end of the century.

TheImmanent: KellyJones, I won't get into a discussion with you about a topic that incorporates a multitude of sciences and uncertain facts, since it would never reach beyond speculation. Nor do I mean that it is necessary in defense of marriage; for like two strings on a lyre are separate yet united, so too a couple may vibrate to the same tune without relinquishing anything of their independence.

KellyJones00: TI, I am glad you finally see that child-rearing doesn't make marriage necessary, and that child-rearing certainly doesn't make sense for most people given the need to reduce our population. But you haven't relinquished speculation, I'm afraid. Harping_ on the "mutuality" motif again. You seriously don't like being alone, do you?

TheImmanent: I am a bit surprised that you would have interpreted such things from our discussion. I never said that marriage was necessary, nor have I said that child-rearing doesn't make sense for most people. The benefit of pairing does go beyond speculation since it is one in which all the information may be found in the mind itself. I find it ungracious of you to attack the debater rather than the arguments; especially since I stated that it is not a personal issue for my part, but a philosophical one.

KellyJones00: TI, About your earlier analogy of a lyre: I prefer the piano myself. 242 strings... Bring on polygamy, eh? You say, "the benefit of pairing does go beyond speculation since it is one in which all the information may be found in the mind itself." I'm not a Borg assimilee, so you MUST explain what information this is. Resistance is futile! If you're going to repeat "child-rearing", I'll repeat, "undesirable for the majority 20-year-olds (the best age for genetic transmission)".

TheImmanent: KellyJones, When I say that the information may be found in the mind itself, this is because the information is nothing but the nature of thought; i.e., Thought may only know itself through regarding itself. This is a different situation than attempting to foresee environmental or demographic changes, since these things depend on other things than the limited mind.

Marriage as shared insights and cooperation is not difficult to see the benefit in.

Panoculus TI, your thinking is very lovely and poetic, and feminine, but your perspective on marriage is **after the fact**. You don't think about the psychology that drives egotists to rationalise marriage in the exact way you're doing. You don't investigate the **why** of that psychology. You just accept it, and **then** you begin to explain that acceptance.

What you're doing is not thinking, I'm sorry. But you're young. You're inexperienced. You need to get your fill of the reality, and stop dreaming. It's KellyJones00 - I was logged into this old account to turn off comments on my video there, on "Logic and Love". I asked a fella to move over to my current channel, but he seemed incapable of following instructions.

TheImmanent: KellyJones, While your intent may not be to appear patronizing, you do manage it. It seems to be a common rhetorical tactic in debates around here, though personally I do not see the philosophical value in it. The fact is that you do not know who I am or what experiences I have had; any such judgment of me comes to less than speculation.

I am quite aware of the common incitements to marriage; in fact you seem to object against emotional co-dependency, which is not the case I'm making.

KellyJones00: Argumentum ad hominem can be used in the case of a person who continues to present arguments that have been shown to be flawed.

In this case, the ad hominem is an attachment to an ideal relationship (marriage, as the notion of being completed by a Mr or Miss Right), and symptomatically expressed by poetic speculations and complete absence of logical thought.

TheImmanent: The interesting thing is that you insist that I have claimed that marriage is necessary for something, when my case is far simpler: marriage can at times be beneficial for a mind.

This stands against your argument, which is: marriage is always a hindrance.

(Actually, you seem to think that women are mentally retarded, but frankly that is a

discussion too childish for me to get into right now)

KellyJones00: TI, The greatest thinkers of human kind either rejected marriage, or were not intellectually indebted to a spouse: Socrates, Diogenes, Lao Tzu, Chuang Tzu, Gotama, Jesus, Hakuin, Kierkegaard, Nietzsche, Weininger, Rama Krishna, and Solway.

And, yes, I do think that women are retarded. Women included the feminine-minded, the naive, those who "think" reason and emotion must be balanced, etc.

Child-raising doesn't require marriage, nor does sharing ideas doesn't require marriage.

KellyJones00:Sorry, "nor does sharing ideas require marriage." For the nth time.

TheImmanent: I'm sorry, KellyJones, but you still seem to argue against emotional co-dependence, making it quite pointless for me to reply. You are having a discussion with yourself since you do not pay attention, and so your "ad hominem" argument is terribly misplaced. You even go so far as to use your subjective, and quite erroneous, impressions of a simple analogy (which you interpret as poetry) as arguments.

I do not know whose arguments are proven flawed; you have never even dealt with mine.

KellyJones00: TI, so if your "vibrating" analogy wasn't an argument for marriage, what was it?

TheImmanent: KellyJones, It was neither an argument nor a proof, but a mere analogy to illustrate how two subjects may work together without relinquishing their independence; i.e., they produce something together without compromising their own natures.

As for your other comment, you do not present an argument by referring to the unmarried status of a selection of intellectuals, you only demonstrate your low standards of evidence.

KellyJones00: TI, I was only referring to the very creme of humanity's thinkers, and it is not putting too fine a point on it to call them *masters* of the idea. That none of them drew any inspiration from being married, but instead drew inspiration from not being married, says ots.

You might prefer a person like Deepak Chopra, Stephanie Dowrick, Eckhardt Tolle etc. They would say: "marry your true soul-mate, and watch something marvellous bubble up."

KellyJones00:...But great ideas are not produced by whacking geniuses together. A thinker is always solitary: what stimulates them is their own interpretation of an idea.

And one certainly doesn't have to marry another genius to be inspired. In fact, marriage itself draws one away from the world of thought into the world of finitude, human relationships, psychological need, etc.

We live in a world of thought - just think!

TheImmanent: I strongly disagree that you referred to the "creme" of thinkers, nor do I put worth in references to authorities, since if the ideas do not speak for themselves a few names make no difference, i.e., they are nothing. In the same spirit;

no I would not prefer the other persons you list, nor would I base arguments on the ground that "he or she said so". It is quite childish, and very distant from the self-reliance that you elsewhere seem to advocate.

KellyJones00: TI, False assumption. It wasn't an appeal to an external authority, but to real-world evidence of the solitude of the thinking person. You refer vaguely to the hypothetical "shared insights and cooperation" being an argument for marriage. I refer to actual evidence that the most intelligent humans in history have not been married, nor argued for it as vital means to their purposes.

Spinoza had great insights, but wasn't of the calibre of the others, so I didn't include him.

TheImmanent: "I refer to actual evidence that the most intelligent humans in history have not been married"

And what, may I ask, is the evidence that they were the most intelligent people (intelligence, for that matter, isn't really the relevant thing, rather insight which may or may not follow from it).

Let us moreover discount the semi-mythological figures you list without any apparent care for evidence.

Also, Spinoza expressed agape; Nietzsche mostly seem to have lived and died in misery.

KellyJones00: TI, Agape *is* non-attachment, the greatest love. Nietzsche wasn't perfect, but he was several rungs higher than Spinoza in his expression of non-attachment. 'Thus Spake Zarathustra' is packed with gems like "Together we must learn all, we must learn to climb above ourselves to ourselves, and cloudlessly to smile - Cloudlessly to smile down, shining eyed and very remote, when beneath us violence and purpose and guilt steam like rain."

His joy was very different to the ordinary mortal's.

KellyJones00: ... and yes, I judge intelligence based on wise insights, not on IQ.

The evidence is in their understanding of reality, and how they behaved.

Being happy and contented humanly has nothing to do with being wise.

Anyone who enters the path to enlightenment must open themselves to suffering, rather than to desire the truth out of a fear of suffering.

The happiest man is an idiot.

TheImmanent: Well, your view on wisdom certainly explains your fondness of Nietzsche, who among other follies may count concepts such as: Will to power, principle of eternal return, nihilism, rule of strength (fascism) etc. I should not comment on this, since I notice that our views are diametrically opposed; Nietzsche was utterly confused and egotistic in my eyes.

Also, the wisest man is the most joyful, since wisdom is nothing but the true fulfillment of thought.

KellyJones00: TI, the will to power is a very useful concept in the path to enlightenment, simply being the will to create anew, freed from herd-bound habits. Unfortunately, it has been often misinterpreted (by fascists, white power, etc.) as free

will or "might makes right", which Nietzsche was definitely not saying.

By principle of eternal return, are you referring to where he talks of karma, or where he talks of the nature of Reality?

Ref: Nihilism is a pointer. It doesn't actually exist.....

TheImmanent: The principle of eternal return was one of Nietzsche's scourges, by which he feared that all things repeated themselves infinitely. As I said, he does not give the impression of having lived a contended life, and there are many things in his works that contrary seem to suggest that he was extremely emotionally volatile (also the way he died does).

If you instead read the Emendation of the Intellect by Spinoza, you will find more meticulous and precise insights (full text available in wiki).

KellyJones00: TI, Nietzsche uses the idea of the eternal return in two different ways (at least).

One (Book 2, 42: Redemption) is to describe the eternal return of guilt so long as there is eternal justice. This is one of the ways he attacked the concept of the Xian God.

Two (Book 3, 46:2 The Enigma and the Vision) describes the eternal return of all things in the sense of unbroken causation. Everything exists because of past causes. Nietzsche's liberated man understands this.

KellyJones00: ... Nietzsche came to enlightenment late in life. Thus Spake Zarathustra was his greatest work, but only written when he was in his early forties. To try to adjust at such a late age, when one is deeply immersed in egotistical habits, is to akin to a psychological horror-story. It is no wonder that his brain was unsettled by it.

The earlier one realises the emptiness of all things, the better. I firmly think 25-26 for females, 30 for males at the latest.

yupiiie "The earlier one realises the emptiness of all things, the better. I firmly think 25-26 for females, 30 for males at the latest." <-- never saw anyone refer to that before, other than vague teachings of Dhammapada about "young people". Interesting Kelly.

yupiiie so true.

∞ [Back to Top](#) ∞

Return to Index