

# Synopsis

## The Desired View

The Universe is, indeed, reality and once detected by the senses is perceived by man and upper animal alike. Language is the means by which humanity conceives the Universe thus making of it a virtual-notional reality. If the use of language is faulted then the conceptual vision it produces is, likewise, faulted. This vision, as seen through the mind's eye, is subject to bifurcation, near and far sightedness, astigmatism, and other anomalous effects just as is optical vision. Sapient Thought Processes, if applied, can correct these "conceptual vision anomalies" by aligning thought more with Reality, thereby, reassuring trust between testimony and truth.

December 17, 1993.

## Read The PREFACE

---

**“It is my thought that the basic elements  
of reality are simple ones that can be come upon  
through plain, but well disciplined observations.”**

*J.J. Rappoport*  
*March 31, 1970*

**D**ears ago, when first induced to place pen on paper, I had visions of changing the world. Then, in the midst of the endeavor I realized that I would have to change as well. The content of this work is primarily the result of the ensuing introspection that took place, *not scholarship*. Chronological journals covering a period of over thirty-five years had been kept only of thoughts and notions believed by myself to be *absolutely* true. The writing of this book incorporated many of those truths discovered during this period of journal keeping. Sections one and two came primarily from this source. The contents of section three, however, came to fruition during its actually being written and with no preconceived notions of what it was to be about, other than it had to be concerned with the significance and implication of the self’s involvement with others.

The techniques that I applied to this endeavor were unique to my way of doing things. I always seemed to be resistant to what was until it became my idea. As a child I had a gnawing sense that *something* was not quite right, but I could never express my concerns sufficiently to where anyone would listen or give credence to what it was I saw and felt. Perhaps it was due to my not yet having

acquired sufficient knowledge of the world around me that I was filled with this feeling of uneasiness. Even my sixth grade teacher, Mrs. Spriggs III, referred to me as “Jerry, Jerry quite contrary”. I know now that there was no way that I could have made myself, as a child, be understood. It was as though the world was looking out a window on one side of an aircraft and I on the other. For some reason, to which I have no answer, I stuck rigidly to what I believed to be true and faked seeing what it was that the others saw. It was like my being an illiterate person making it all the way through school, the military, and forty years of business without being able to read a word. However, because I did it without *significantly* sacrificing my sense of integrity, the illumination that I have received became ensconced within my being and has never left me and the result has been cathartic and therapeutic. Therefore, having undergone this prolonged, yet modest metamorphosis, my internalized eyes have once again been able to develop an outward vision. However, what is now seen incites me, as it did the prophet Jeremiah, to want to stomp, tear down, and replant.

Writing this book was the most difficult endeavor that I’ve ever been involved in and it has been five decades in the making ever since I was sixteen. That was when my English teacher asked the class to write our philosophy of life in two pages or less. Mind you, it wasn’t our philosophies she wanted, just something on paper so that she might have material with which to evaluate our ability to spell and display our level of grammatical expertise. What I got back, in addition to the corrections, was a big bold comment scratched in red across the lower margin of my paper... *“MY, AREN’T YOU BEING SUPERIOR TO JUDGE!”* I remember thinking to myself, “If what I wrote is just for English class, why, then, is she reacting in such a critical way regarding my view of life?”

Looking back upon it, now that I’ve put a few years behind me, her reaction is somewhat understandable. The particulars of what I had said in my philosophy of life really aren’t important now, but the general concepts and ideas that I had put forward went against what she had been taught to expect as normal. It was her reaction,

however, that started me down a path of questioning what it was within people that made them feel as if they had the right to cast judgment on the thoughts of others. I, of course, was doing just that in my written philosophy paper, but at the time I was only concentrating on my point of view and why I was at odds with everyone else. Furthermore, I was addressing humanity at large and was not criticizing any one individual. The actual text of that school paper can be found at the end of this segment under the heading “Embryonics” and is the seminal document that eventually led to the “Synopsis” that was just read.

What I have discovered from years of introspection, somewhat stimulated by this teacher’s snide remark, was that society passed down a story line of what was. In other words, reality, to society, was what society says it was regardless of what reality may have actually been. I discovered also, that society had a schizoid character and seemed to manifest it in two primarily different ways. Throughout history, general society had attempted to present the story line from either a literal or a figurative point of view. Unfortunately for those who made up society, they were usually presented both views simultaneously. The resultant shuffling of concepts scrambled and blurred their vision of the story line. Regardless, the poor recipients of the story were expected to align themselves and declare fealty to one camp or the other. In addition to this dichotomous presentation and choice, each camp developed and cherished its own jargon or customized language which happened to reflect its culture. This further complicated the issue and deepened the schism further. What they were left with were two camps, each hurling invectives upon the heads of the other, and each *secretly* longing for reconciliation and peace. As the animosity increased and deepened, the schism became perceived as an abyss or bottomless chasm. They feared that those who fell into this fathomless pit would be lost with no redemption possible. What these two camps did not recognize was that this bottomless schism was capable of being traversed without fear of danger because it had little or no breadth. It was a hairline crack! But, not appreciating this, and fearing that it could consume them, had prevented either side from attempting a crossing. Therefore, this

meaningless misconception had prevented them from ever being able to realistically address the matter. As spokesmen for humanity, this is where science and religion have always been in relationship to each other and where they still are today.

This is also where I as a child in English class was, smack dab in the middle of these two behemoths not recognizing the significance of the void within which I thought I was stuck. Driven by dissatisfaction with the only world view I supposedly had at my disposal, I attempted research into each camp trying to comprehend what motivated them and which, if any, was correct in their outlook.

One day, while looking up the word Vitalism in the dictionary, I noticed at the end of the definition, an indication that it was the antonym of Mechanism. Well, having a Bachelor of Science degree with minor studies in mechanical engineering, I was curious as to what the heck a mechanism had to do with vitalism: as I found out, after looking it up, absolutely nothing. What I did find was that the mechanism spoken of here was a philosophical approach in the nineteenth century that believed the universe and all within it, including life, could be explained totally in terms of chemistry and physics. Vitalism, on the other hand, agreed with mechanism, but didn't quite *feel* that the subject of life could be done justice in terms that were strictly physical. It, they believed, possessed a yet unknown quality that was unique and that would require an amplified explanation beyond the limits of chemistry and physics. That sure sounded simple enough but precisely what they were talking about I hadn't the slightest notion – nor did they!

There was an East Indian sage I was fond of named J. Krishnamurti who said, “If you have a problem seated deep within, you must think of it as though it were a wild horse that must be mounted and ridden into submission. If you get bumped off prematurely, the horse will still be there and you'll have to ride it again. But if you ride it into submission the unsettledness will be gone and, at least, you'll not have to face that issue again.” I'm sure I've botched the story but the principle is there. It was this approach that I applied to the enigma of

Vitalism vs. Mechanism. I wouldn't leave it alone until I developed an understanding that satisfied *my* need to know what the difference was. The ensuing understanding was mine, not one gleaned from a book, and that is all that was necessary for *my* self. From this point I moved on with knowledge of an answer until the position was challenged by another person. Debate and inquiry would either change my mind, or not, and I then once again moved on. Had I not done it this way, I would have been blocked and prevented from participating in the arena that this subject had offered. Had I pursued the traditional path and researched the subject, I would never have developed the viewpoint that I acquired.

On the surface it seemed clear that there was a difference between mechanism and vitalism. In reality I found, by riding Krishnamurti's horse, that there was no *tangible* difference. The language used by both groups was different, not on the surface, as was stated in the dictionary, but in the minds of the participants of each group. They subconsciously translated the words they heard into their own internal language that had meaning and significance for them. As I sit here composing this document I'm looking at a little brass sign that I keep around as a touchstone; it reads, "*I know you believe you understand what you think I said, but I am not sure you realize that what you heard is not what I meant.*" Science and religion today speak to each other in this manner. In the past they didn't speak. The one in power commanded and intimidated the other to shut up. Today we have scientists (Mechanists) who believe in G-d and we have religionists (Vitalists) who believe in god. [No, I didn't forget to capitalize the G, and the - in G-d is but a reverent gesture.] Then we have those who fit the standard definition of atheistic scientists and G-d-fearing religionists. Let's not forget the agnostics, the outlanders who have not yet taken a stand. All these, claiming to represent the common man, are hodge-podged together in a crazy quilt called humanity and all together help to further mystify the story line that they inherited from equally clear thinkers from out of their distant past.

What I first envisioned as a solution to what I perceived was the human dilemma was a common language. This did not mean that

English, German, French, etc. were all to be blended together; rather, the subtle jargonistic elements within the languages were to be. Remember, too, that people coming from different backgrounds and histories affix different meanings and/or significance to a common word. Then it hit me like a bolt out of the blue, the missing element alluded to by the Vitalists was feelings. You know... all the fearful gut wrenching and the mushy sympathetic tear-jerking that we all refer to as emotions! Emotions, this is the element thought to be outside of chemistry and physics. Though scientists may only know and reduce it to a gradation on a metered scale and no more, they will never know what it represents to you or me when felt – the *meaning* for which we live and die!

## **SCIENCE with SAPIENCE**

Earlier I had mentioned how difficult it was writing this book. As it turned out the difficulty was rooted in my coming to the recognition that I would have to reinvent the world by dismantling the old one concept by concept, thought by thought, principle by principle, and word by word. The story line as given me by my parents, they by theirs, culture by changing culture, throughout all the epochs of social evolution, would have to be sifted through the analytical processes of a simple human mind... mine! This is where I recognized the need to turn inward. Some would call this an act of escapism and some would call it cowardice. Some would call it both! But, I call it something else. To me and to some others it is just letting go and letting G-d. Whatever you wish to call it, that technique is critical to identifying an approach to problem solving that has its roots in wisdom. Sapience is another word for wisdom. Its root element is sap; the living fluid found in trees that we can experience through tasting. It is an aspect of experiential knowing that is different from intellectual knowing.

In principle, science and religion do not differ except on where to draw the line. Concerning the physical universe, religion works within a set of limits that the participants are willing to respect.

They have an entire jargonistic language with which to support the endeavor. Science, on the other hand, works within limits set down by the scientific method, has its own jargonistic language, but the subject matter they address is without limit. This places the two at loggerheads with each other going out the gate. Science staked out the material universe as its territory and laid claim to all within its domain, including life. They have explained, mechanistically, how the biological world functions. What they continuously try to explain, but haven't, nor ever will, is what one should do with the feelings that drive one to speak and act as one does. Religion has corralled this territory as their own, but their jargonistic language is of olden times. It is raked with the moldy tatterings and antiquated notions of different cultures that fly in the face of current knowledge and practice; or so it seems. And science, that old usurper, is still trying to confiscate this domain as well

Please don't misunderstand what is being said here. I wouldn't dare suggest that religion is passé and has no place in the world of what's happening now. The need that religion *tries* to fulfill is real and authentic and in many respects takes primacy over science. The old adage, "Don't throw the baby out with the bath water", is valid here. Because of the preeminence that science has attained with the masses, owing to all the gee-gaws and gadgets developed and marketed, which has brought excitement, empowerment and improvement to many, religion is being forced to alter and reinvent itself. But the question will be, what, why, how, how much, and when. What little change has taken place to date, I assure you, is totally cosmetic. Perhaps a paradigm change from religiosity (excessive or affected piety) to spirituality (that part of the human that is associated with mind and feeling) is all that is in order.

Einstein once said that mankind's dilemma is that he has a precision of means and a confusion of ends. Conversely, as you might expect, Rappoport says that mankind's dilemma is that he has a confusion of means and a precision of ends. This best describes the difference in perspective between a scientific mind and a sapientific mind. Einstein thought that man knows exactly how to do things, but

doesn't know what it is he should be doing. I think he knows exactly what's to be done, but doesn't know how to do it and/or, if the truth were known, doesn't *want* to.

Religion must drift away from dogma toward a religious (spiritual) process that enables the individual to develop a visceral understanding of where he or she stands in the universal scheme of things. Where science dominates the realm of material objects (and rightly so), religion must dominate the realm of immaterial subjects, properly named spirit (and rightly so). Where science is in the process of developing a Unified Field Theory, religion, which I would like to now call sapience, must work toward the development of a Unified Feel Theory. Feelings are at the root-core of our human intellectual world and a thorough comprehension of the subject must reside somewhere, anywhere, but with science. Science can be defined as knowledge derived *experimentally*. Sapience can be defined as knowledge derived *experientially*. Where science employs a technique called **research** (literally: explore: *ex* = out + *plore* = to weep) or to weep outwardly or have a longing for things outside the self. Sapience will employ a technique called **mesearch** (literally: implore: *im* = in + *plore* = to weep) or to weep inwardly or have a longing for things inside the self. Science and sapience are not in competition; they are not meant to function in parallel, but in series; feeling (at root) always comes first, and then comes thought in response. Although they are associates, and even partners, still, one is senior! CONSCIENCE (con = *with* + science = *knowledge*). Science has its place, but with sapience as *its* conscience. Not science and sapience, nor science vs. sapience, but science *with* sapience. Literally translated - knowledge with wisdom: Wisdom must always be preeminent, knowing that its genesis is from feeling; for knowledge on its own is an ungoverned weapon!

Let's recap briefly. We have society at large developing and evolving a story line that defines reality for each of its members and is the common bond from out of which the culture develops. In the process of culturizing the story line, two factions evolve: 1) those who see things objectively and 2) those who see things subjectively.

As the pendulum swings over time, one faction dominates then the other, and visa-versa, ad infinitum, ad nauseam. The one dominating believes they see reality correctly and the other incorrectly. Has it not been said, “The winners of war write history”? The losers disagree and foment trouble which establishes the dynamic for ensuing political action. So what, then, is real?

In the midst of this intellectual maelstrom, there is an underlying current of biological reality. In other words, regardless of what one side or the other thinks, what is so, is so, on its terms, not theirs. Cognizant-biological reality states that from the moment of birth you are dying and things, both internally and externally, are trying to eat and/or dissolve you. If you do nothing in your behalf, or cannot do anything in your behalf, and/or others do nothing in your behalf, you will die and be consumed in short order. This reality is very hard for a sentient creature to accept and deal with. It’s downright frightening! So scary, I contend, that the awareness, extent and veracity of this reality has driven humanity to such an extreme that their rationale and behavior can be truly classified as psychotic.

That’s right; mankind’s crowning achievements have been provoked by psychotic stimuli. Ironically, so many people have been identified as being mentally ill whose only failing was to see reality for what it was and, being of sound mind, recognized that there was no viable response possible which could change it. They, then, escaped by retreating inwardly or acting outwardly with both events being seen and classified by society as anti-social (mild catatonia). When they are eventually handed over to the professions of psychiatry and/or psychology, then the truly mentally ill are given the task of trying to convince the truly mentally healthy that it is, indeed, they, who are sick. My contention here is that mankind may be psychologically diseased and disordered, but that society (the social order) is mentally ill to the extent of psychosis and, in effect, rules tyrannically over mankind. Words, as I use them, are a critical issue in this work and required the creation and application of a glossary that can be found at the back of the book. Use it for words **boldly** highlighted.

Again, please don't misunderstand, humanity is doing what nature would have them do – kill or be killed! If man were purely an animal he would kill and consume immediately, or kill and store for later. He, however, differs from the animals in that he is psychologically dealing with three factors, whereas the animals deal only with one. Animals function by means of **perception**. Man, too, by perception, but he also functions by means of **conception** and **speculation** and this, the animals do not do. Animals kill to eat or kill to defend themselves based on feelings perceived. Man kills for these reasons as well and he kills based upon concepts he develops in response to feelings he perceives, as well as those feelings he conceives. However, the part that we are concerned with here is the story line that he develops to gloss over and whitewash the abhorrent behavior in which he has participated. Feelings of weakness and inadequacy permeate his being, as well as the fear of death that he knows awaits him at the end of his journey regardless of what it is he does or achieves. For him, this is seen as being grossly unfair; and having no *real* government to which he can appeal is seen as being equally unjust. Rage or diversion is his only avenue of relief.

As for a hint as to what will follow in the body of this work, it is related *inversely* to the lyrics of a song I remember from when I was a child in the 1940's. It goes like this, "*You've got to accentuate the positive, eliminate the negative, latch on to the affirmative, and don't mess with Mr. In-Between.*" This, I contend, is what society has been selling to the masses from time immemorial and it is the crux of most of our social ills today. Does this sound a bit bizarre to you? Well, hang on to your hat because it's going to be a bumpy ride.

In this work we will evaluate what it is that drives selves to think and act as they do. Then, we will evaluate how this translates to the way the corporate social body thinks and takes the actions that it does. In addition, we will look at the interplay between the two and how each influences the other. There may even be some suggestions as to what can be done by each to alter the course of the other and, hopefully, affect the future to our liking.

When I look out upon this world and see that which we call life, it's as though it is a very cruel hoax. Maybe that is why the story lines that have been concocted are so outlandish and hard for me to take seriously. Maybe, too, that is why each culture holds in contempt every other culture's values. Scientists, religionists, and the common man all have an ax to grind or a bone to pick with some faction within their own group; not to mention what they have up their sleeves regarding others. This image brings to mind a plea from Rodney King, a street hood some years ago who exclaimed, "Can't we all just get along?" Even Jesus Christ, who came upon this earth to make things a little simpler by offering his thoughts to mankind as "The Good News", is now torn asunder by his own followers. How in heavens name can so many Christian denominations develop, with each thinking that the other is going to hell simply for disagreeing about some point concerning what Jesus said, or what they thought he had said, or more accurately, what they wished he had said? I saw a bumper sticker some time back that said it all: "*JESUS IS COMING – AND BOY IS HE PISSED!*" I rest my case. We can all do better than we have simply by taking responsibility for the development of our *own* story line. We must be cautious not to become overzealous in our expectations however, and become very aware that the hu- in human can either stand for hubris or humble. Which hu- are you?

# Embryonics

## High School English Paper

Who can judge what is right and what is wrong? Not humans by any means, but they act as if they are the Lords and all highs of our universe. That is why I have no respect for the human race in general. Perhaps if they brought their minds down a few hundred notches in the sense of know-it-allness, I would begin to consider what they have to offer in the way of words and knowledge. Yes, there are a few well adjusted humans, but that group is so small that I fail to see the necessity of bothering to count so few. I don't believe in a god as other humans do. Imagine, believing it to be a super being roaming around in space with a mind of its own, governing us to a specific plan and diagram. This is almost utterly impossible, yet so many of them believe it. Then there is the belief that when the human dies, the soul escapes from the body and goes to a wonderful dreamland called heaven and, there, lives a never ending life. They just won't accept the fact that when the human dies, this so-called soul goes into the limbo of nothingness and I'd like to see any human prove me wrong. I agree with Thoreau that the world would be one-hundred percent better if we were wiped off the face of the Earth."

March 2, 1956.