

Journal Excerpts

©2004-2010 Cliff Hays

*available online at <http://cliffhays.weebly.com/journal.html>

2004-08-27

While writing is an action of thought expression, it is not exactly what I would consider as being active. The thoughts of Kierkegaard & Nietzsche are so great that when the thinkers were alive...a mode of being active, or shall we say, "actively existing", was virtually nullified. The greatness of their thought bound them to spend their time actively expressing it rather than actively existing. As a contrary to their mode of existence, I believe that ultimately their whole purpose was to call humankind to action. Their devotion to the expression of these great thoughts provides, for humankind, a mirror through which we can see ourselves with a previously unimaginable intensified clarity. They were (in a sense) sacrifices for the "actively existing". I feel immensely in debt to them; knowing full well that there exists no possible method of repayment.

2004-08-28

A strive to act without thought: insofar as the thought required for the rationality of the act is itself not a contemporary of the act; but rather, the act occurs within the framework of a newfound innate understanding which happened to be resultant of a prior thought.

Those who utilize every waking moment to read and quote the great existentialists under the guise of being one of their "followers" have somehow allowed the underlying purpose of existentialism to escape their view. Anyone who follows an existentialist is missing the whole point! The underlying purpose of existentialism is to call its readers to action; but never an action of its choosing...always an action of its readers' choosing.

2004-08-29

Again it is emphasized to me through what I have read that Søren Kierkegaard (without a doubt) sets forth the finest argument for Christianity I have ever encountered! My understanding of Kierkegaard's Christianity: Since the nature of Christianity is to repel by virtue of its objective uncertainty, those who hold fast their belief in God with the full passion of their inwardness in spite of what their senses tell them (or fail to tell them) of the truth of His existence are the only true Christians. They reside in the truth and in God by virtue of their intense subjectivity...their relationship to God is pure, unimpeded, and never hindered by their lack of objective certainty. ~ So says the genius himself, "...how deceptive then, that an omnipresent being should be recognizable precisely by being invisible, only and alone recognizable by this trait, since his visibility would annul his omnipresence." Thus, salvation in Christianity is unbelievably challenging; and shouldn't eternal salvation be just that?! (However, I still retain my agnosticism...)

2004-09-01

In a world of pure evil, evil means nothing. In a world of pure good, good means nothing. In a world of good and evil, good means good and evil means evil. Since the universe is Everything and Nothing, the endless strive for balance between the two perpetuated by its existents maintains its characteristically chaotic quality. Were the universe simply Everything or otherwise Nothing, no balance would be sought after due to its completeness in its finite state of order. All things happen in a chaotic universe: babies are born and are not born, buildings crumble and buildings stand tall, ships sink and ships reach their destination, cheetahs dine and gazelles elude their predator, asteroids miss and asteroids hit, guns are aimed rightly or poorly, ambulances arrive on time or do not, policemen are around or are nowhere to be found; not expecting the expected is expecting the unexpected; abaft an orderly appearance flails the chaos which it shrouds. A belief that anything can happen is the foundation for a faith in chaos.

2004-09-06

The concept called "general public" is, in reality, all-inclusive with regards to existing individuals...however, in conversation, it automatically adopts a membership policy which conveniently excludes all active participants in the immediate conversation as well as their friends & family; thereby deeming any individual in existence not currently active in a conversation containing the concept "general public", or not friends with someone who is, or not related to someone who is, as a member of the "general public". Obviously, what this means is that we are all (every single one of us) a member of the "general public". I suppose if this membership status repulses one so much that they cannot even handle being of it, they can opt to begin a sect of perpetual-residence in an isolated alcove; wherein nothing would be spoken of without regards to the "general public" so as to allow for the endless perseverance of their enclave's automatic exclusion from "it". The logical conclusion here is that while "general public" may be a useful concept in conversation, it is an utterly meaningless term.

2004-09-09

My main focus at this time is the universe as an eternal omnipresence (everywhere forever) as opposed to existence as a temporality of finite presence (here & now); and our relationship to its boundlessness through our limitedness.

2004-09-23

True patience alone can reveal the eternal embrace. Impatience is a symptom of anxiety...that is, the act of constantly attempting to dictate the future in light of past events. To achieve true patience, one must be absolutely relaxed: no thoughts of the past, no strive for the future...only immediate perception. Then, one will feel the past gently pushing forward on them; and feel the future arriving to greet them slowly: they will not fall forward; they will not fall back; they will stand embraced by eternity, purely experiencing the now.

2004-10-13

For me, Bertrand Russell and Bob Dylan fall into the same category: a category in which the wisdom is profound yet not effectively relayed. Specifically, Russell's writing cannot hold my attention for its lack of emotion; and Dylan's singing cannot capture my soul for its lack of resonance and definitiveness. Friedrich Nietzsche, on the other hand, exhibits an execution so amazing that it blinds me from beholding the profundity. Only after the initial shock of his beautiful poesy dies down can I even begin to squint at his wisdom. Where is the medium? Hmmm...I would say: Sylvia Plath, Jean-Paul Sartre, José Ortega y Gasset, Søren Kierkegaard, Martin Heidegger, among a few others. All of these writers exhibit a perfect balance of wisdom and execution.

A hatred of hate is love: thus the intrinsically negative is negated even when it is multiplied! But a love of love is infinite love; no reversion can operate here. Similarly, to repel repulsion is to embrace, but to embrace embracement is to infinitely heighten it.

2004-10-29

Regarding an annoying classmate in Existentialism: he is continually attempting to 'soften the blow' of existence: which, in my view, cannot be done. Thus, trying to do so only dumbs it down so as to normalize or regulate it; and make it easier to swallow. BS! Existentialism is not candy, it is a jagged little pill; it goes down painfully but brings about a pleasure unimaginable.

2005-04-02

The portrayal of life as a nonstop funfest is a complete and utter lie. Excitement comes in waves, and all waves must break for new ones to arrive. Advertisements are the most guilty of this portrayal; oftentimes relating this false "excitement" directly to their product.

2005-04-22

The two questions that burned me the most before my encounters with Relativity and Existentialism 1. "How do mirrors work?" & 2. "Why is the sky blue?" Be it known: both correct answers were finally conveyed to me in Climatology Classes. Incomplete answer to #1: "Mirrors show us our reflections." Complete answer to #1: "Mirrors reflect all light incident upon them in a manner in which not only is no energy lost in the reflection; but additionally in which all light rays are reflected back at an angle virtually equal to that of the original angle of incidence with respect to the mirror surface, thus facilitating the proportionality observed." Incorrect answer to #2: "The sky is blue because of the ocean's reflection." The obvious problem with that answer: "Why is the sky blue over Siberia?" Correct answer to #2: "The sky is blue because the Sun's white light (consisting of nearly all wavelengths of EMR) cascades through the atmosphere; then, because blue light is among the shortest of the visible wavelengths, it is most easily scattered by air molecules (due to its comparable size)...thus the overall scattered solar radiation in the sky exhibits a higher proportion of blue light than yellow, green, or any other of the longer-wavelengths of light."

2005-08-17

The problem with most writing I've read is this: it seems contrived. Whether it is contrived or not is not the question here - because obviously all writing is contrived!!! The solution therefore, is that the writer spend ample time cultivating the nature of their contrivance; that way upon writing it, the finished product arises seemingly out of their second-nature. In such a case, its readers will not behold random rabbits-being-plucked-out-of-hats (a feeling of reading that which was pulled out of one's ass); but instead will behold the magic itself - that very real spark of imagination and creativity wrought by writers who not only write, but who believe in what they write.

2005-09-06

I awoke in the middle of the night last night with a strange realization. To expect to see a ghost is completely asinine: because a ghost is what a living being is not, i.e. it is dead. Well, wait a minute, I don't know. If it is an energy, which propagates at a wavelength, there is a chance we might well see it. But isn't it more likely then that ghosts radiate energy at some wavelength other than visible light? seeing as the visible is not a very large part of the spectrum. Ultraviolet Ghosts? or maybe Infrared Ghosts? Would that be more likely? Where in the electromagnetic spectrum would ghosts most likely radiate their energies? Who knows. Gamma Ghosts :) OUCH!!! Strange, it was scary as hell last night in my mid-sleep state; but this morning it seems kind of silly.

2005-09-08

On August 25th I began writing my novel, Harmony in Contrast; and as of yesterday, I had finished nearly nine pages of it. However, as of this morning, guess what? I am finding it to be incredibly lame. For some reason, it is just not working; it doesn't sound right to me. I believe it is the mixture of such matter-of-fact narration and such intense philosophical conceptualization. These two do not seem to mesh well. It's sort of like seeing Barenaked Ladies open up for Radiohead - there is no comparison! Comedians / Geniuses. Mixed perceptions. Not harmonious at all, very dissonant. Because of these thoughts, I have decided that Harmony in Contrast will no longer be a novel; but will instead be a philosophical work.

2006-01-09

How can anything that occurs in the chain of causality be unnatural? Humans were created from the chemistry of the universe (utterly natural), is not anything they create therefore natural? ~ I believe the words 'natural' and 'unnatural' to be meaningless. [All is natural.]

2006-01-19

The last two days I have spent struggling to understand force, and therewith: electricity, magnetism, and electromagnetism. More and more I am beginning to believe that force is an imagined phenomenon, and that all it is is matter in motion, effecting itself, transforming itself, evolving itself, the life of the universe... To rationalize and simplify this from all of the mystifying details existent will be a challenge. To bind together the plethora of unfathomably humungous and infinitesimal phenomena we perceive: I know not how it will be done, but I will do it anyhow.

2006-01-26

One can drown in mathematical concreteness or in philosophical abstractness; they both suffocate in opposite ways: suffocations I like to refer to as metaphysical corners. On the former hand, one is purely overwhelmed with symbolism; on the latter, one is purely overwhelmed with conceptualism. In mathematics a symbolic impasse is reached when the symbols lose their meaning. In philosophy a conceptual impasse is reached when the concepts lose their meaning. Can there exist a balance?

2006-02-01

As far as the universe is concerned, if even one of its details is unknown, its entire nature remains a secret; and right off the top of my head I can think of three details unknown: the events comprising the Planck Time after the Big Bang began its dispersion of the universe's nascent singularity, the structure and composition of Black Holes, and last but certainly not least, the aftermath of Death.

2006-03-01

Do not think about the fact that you have to do it, just do it. I call euphoria the feeling that results when the body is too tired to go on, but the mind forces it onward nonetheless.

2006-03-06

The square root of negative one is such a strange little animal - a miniature mathematical phantasm: discretely impossible, but nonetheless useful. It allows the factoring of formerly unfactorable polynomials, and thereby allows the existence of solutions to formerly unsolvable equations. Unbelievable. The fact that something impossible (and therefore imaginary) proves useful in a realm as logical as mathematics is telling. Of what, though? Philosophically, it is a grand specimen of proof that our imagination is as linked to truth as our experience [which is a pretty comforting concept].

2006-03-08

The Paradox of Creativity: when engaged in a project, fulfillment is not even an issue. But what drives the project is the prospect of its completion: or in essence, the incorrect assumption that said completion will bring ultimate fulfillment. However, at the moment of completion, a fleeting wave of satisfaction followed immediately by unbelievable emptiness yields something altogether different: the discovery that ultimately, fulfillment is only achievable when engaged in a project!

2006-06-27

On the one hand there is matter, space, energy, light, and existence: from which all things are derived. Truthfully those five can be reduced to the first, expressible as such: matter, material expanses, fluctuation of material expanses, maximum fluctuation of material expanses, and reflection. Existence is reflection because all beings are made of matter and space, contain energy, and absorb/emit light. The difference is that existential matter perceives an influx and outflux of psychological energies. The incidence of objectivity, on the influx, is called ambience. The radiance of subjectivity, on the outflux, is called aura. Essentially, we are subjected to a reality of objects. The dilemma arises when we perceive another subject, because although they emit an aura, this energy is incident upon us as is the energy of all other objects, and so comes across as ambience. Leading to what? The objectification of subjectivity. This is a fundamental flaw of consciousness. Not to mention, after having ambiently perceived aural energy, we are reminded that we too are ambience to other auras. This reversal of consciousness is evident whenever we begin to think of how the ambience receives our aura, rather than what is truly important: how our aura receives the ambience.

2006-06-29

I feel three things right now: confusion, excitement, and fear. Confusion about whether or not I made the right choice; excitement about the fact that I may have made the right choice, and fear of the possibility that I made the wrong choice.

2006-07-05

What is natural is movement; so to think of the universe as fixed or stopped does not make sense. To know is to grasp; to grasp is to stop; to stop is illogical. Eo ipso, to know is illogical.

2006-07-25

Existentialism is the focus of the individual on themselves. In this sense, experientialism would be to lose focus: videlicet simply, to exist - - - as opposed to analyzing existence. But is that to say analysis is necessarily nonexistence? Not necessarily: for to analyze is a mode of existence. I seem to be creating distinctions where there is no need to do so. I suppose I am looking for some common denominator with which to construct an entirely coherent philosophical inquiry. Does such a denominator exist?

2006-08-09

The words transference, transcendence, transverse, transmit, transposition, and transformation are of particular interest due to the trans unifying them. What is this trans? Transposition possesses the root word 'position,' meaning that to transpose is to alter or move beyond an original position. It seems that trans as a prefix applies the term 'transcendence' to whatever word (if there is a root) it is modifying. Thus transformation means the alteration or movement beyond an original form. But trans can also mean 'across' or 'opposite of,' in the sense of transverse waves (which occur perpendicularly to original waves), or transatlantic (which implies a traversing of the Atlantic ocean).

2006-08-26

You forget what's going on here: a plethora of biological entities who are born, live, and will die on the surface of this planet; now, to be born has only one literal meaning - the beginning of the ability to live, and to die has also only one literal meaning - the end of the ability to live; but this 'to live' has infinite meanings.

2006-09-03

The difficulty in obtaining something is usually a clue to the intrinsic worth of it.

2006-09-14

'universe' is that concept in my mind which seeks to embody the structure truth itself might take in my perception if I had access to it in my existence. (So what *does* it embody in its seeking for embodiment?) It embodies the desire for truth itself. The universe equals truth itself, the structure of the universe equals the desire for truth itself. We are part of this structure; hence, we desire truth itself.

2006-09-22

It is interesting that in existentialism, existence precedes essence, whereas in transcendentalism, essence precedes existence.

2006-10-16

Does every generation believe their era to be the most tumultuous and significant one? Chronologically, everyday is tomorrow's yesterday - even today. And wherever there is society there will be tumult. But the media is at fault for presenting always an exclamation-mark reality. Societally speaking, if one is not yelling or being yelled at, one is hearing and saying nothing. But there are individuals in every society who realize the tumult to be a medial fabrication, as it is; and who, as a result, exist tranquilly amidst the so-called hullabaloo. Is not an era presented as most significant only by those who experience the medial fabrication? Or in other words, by those who believe they were there to experience the tumult? Consequently, every generation has its prime - a segment of their lifetime referred to as the good old days, or if they are pessimistic rememberers, the most tumultuous days of all.

2006-10-26

Does there have to be something wrong to inspire creativity? Well what if my something wrong is that I strive for creativity but there is nothing wrong to inspire it? I suppose then that the fact that there is nothing wrong is exactly what is wrong.

2007-11-25

Contrast is the manifestation of diametric states of an ultimate phenomenon as two perfectly dissimilar natural phenomena. That one phenomenon can be arrived at by the negation of another leads to the hypothesis of a unity. For example, good can be thought of as the absence of evil, just as evil can be thought of as the absence of good, therefore they must be manifestations of some superior phenomenon. And here is another: tranquility equals the absence of turmoil, turmoil the absence of tranquility. Quiet the absence of noise, noise the absence of quiet. Can not phenomena be defined as the presence of something? Or must they be defined as absence?

2007-12-11

[the illusion of temporal acceleration due to aging] What causes each year to seem more accelerated than the last is not temporal acceleration, it is the result of a perceptual ratio of comparison. That is, our second year of life is $1/2$ of our lifetime, while our third year is $1/3$, our fourth $1/4$, etc. By the time we are twenty a year is only $1/20$ of our lifetime. What is happening is that a year when compared to the span of 19 years exhibits a much shorter essence than when compared to the smaller spans, therefore time seems to accelerate.

2008-01-11

Both zero and infinity are the absence of finitude. Zero is infinite? Yes. The quantity of phenomena in the universe is twice zero or half infinity. Zero is not a counting number. Counting down from one we stop counting at zero, counting up from one we continue counting toward infinity. Counting backward reveals the limit of counting. Counting forward reveals limitlessness. Backwardness in counting reveals how the limitlessness of infinity is transferred onto zero. Again, what is the mathematical step between zero and infinity? There are infinite steps, thus there is no step. Defining something as endless is merely to state that it is undefinable. Essentially, zero and infinity are defined by the same negation, but in opposite directions. Zero and infinity are the head and tail of Ouroboros. Finitude has not one, but two opposites. If it is to be absent, one of two entities will remain in its place: either zero or infinity.

2008-04-08

The idea of truth is a formula into which any circumstances may be substituted, such that each combination of its variables and operations will yield a unique and correct response.

2008-05-21

There is a dominant worldview purporting that new doctrines are incessantly a necessity. But what if, when confronted with a particular set of circumstances, an old doctrine will suffice? What if, regarding this or that circumstance, an old doctrine represents the apex of clarity? For instance, Kierkegaard's distinction between knowledge and belief represents a concept that cannot be surpassed in its exactness and utility. Knowledge is what science understands, and what science does not understand we can only believe.

2008-05-27

The very notion of position loses its meaning in the context of quantum distances, for what we would envision as smaller than a point becomes the entirety of possible movement.

2008-07-01

If Heidegger seems obscure it is only because he succeeds in the analysis and expression of something which is - in itself - obscure. The penetration from everyday beings to the meaning of being itself is an extremely subtle one, and as such, is very difficult to grasp. However, this difficulty is precisely what causes Heidegger's work to be so endlessly alluring. Even after reading them several times the meaning of certain sentences still remains concealed, notwithstanding his persistent striving to bring their meaning into unconcealment. It was always his intention to allow being itself to arrive on the scene itself through his language, not to force it out somehow.

As an example, here is how he defines phenomenology in Being and Time: 'to let that which shows itself be seen from itself in the very way in which it shows itself from itself'.

2009-01-15

One must rejoice in details despite the fact that there exists no assemblage of them which would yield a concept of wholeness.

2009-01-26

Zero is the only possible logical meaning of the term 'infinite,' that is: the negation of the finite. If something cannot be used up, it is inexhaustible (not infinite); if something cannot be known, it is incomprehensible (not infinite); if something exists in all spaces and times, it is omnipresent (not infinite), etcetera. In the strictest sense, nothing is infinite; because the 'no-' which negates 'thing' corresponds to the 'in-' which negates 'finite.'

2009-12-08

Restatement of the induction problem: that in the past the future has behaved like the past does not imply that in the future the future will behave like the past.

As for a philosophy of mathematics, Platonism seems to be the most well-founded: for it does not ascribe to humankind a precedence over nature, nor the ability to create entities out of nothing. Formalism does not acknowledge the remarkable applicability of mathematics to the universe, whereas logicism attributes far more power to the mind than it actually exhibits.

2010-05-24

[the significance of paradox] Paradoxes trap the mind into logical absurdity, thereby forcing it to abandon all concepts; and as it turns out, this abandonment of concepts is conceptualization potentiated to its highest degree. Thus a true paradox, if one takes it seriously, is the key to unlocking higher comprehension.

Journal Excerpts ©2004-2010 Cliff Hays

*available online at <http://cliffhays.weebly.com/journal.html>