

ALTAR OF PEACE

COPYRIGHT©2011TIAGO BONACHO

NOTE: THE TEXT HAS BEEN WRITTEN IN ENGLISH AND REVISED BY THE AUTHOR, TO WHOM, NONETHELESS, REMAINS STILL NOT BEING THE ORIGINAL LANGUAGE. AS OF THAT, DISCRETION IS ADVISED WHEN IT COMES TO GRAMMAR.

I

– Kant stated that everything that is perceived and made conscious is only phenomenon, manifestation of something that is ungraspable in its true being. That is, information, so to become something in consciousness, inevitably appears pre-determine by what cognitively enables us to consciously know whatever it may be, hence the things in-themselves and unconditional understanding, so to say, the unconditioned knowledge is thus impossible to us, given the preconditions that every experience is invariably invested with so we can even know at all. God, then, understood as in being of transcendental Nature, that is, in theory, not only deemed unavailable in the world of phenomena (the only one where we obtain experience and knowledge from), but also without correspondence in the abilities of our intellectual grasp, God is then an issue on which reason might dwell on, but on grounds

where its unable to grasp or at least affirm anything that could be settled for universally valid, since we don't seem to have appropriate cognitive instruments, alike the ones that make mathematic and geometry possible, that would enable us to produce affirmations about God as we do for the latter issues (that don't need exterior proof so to be reckon as evidential truth, but already hold as evidence by intuitive logic and conceptual demonstration alone). Under this scenario, theology is therefore understood to be an area on which reason can dwell on, but only to deliberate about it in antinomies, as in, reason can assent to the existence of God as well as to its opposite, because both the existence of God as well as His inexistence are things that can't be proved, neither by objective, exterior perception (because we condition everything we experience, and God is subjectively understood as objectively unconditioned) neither by self-evident conceptual reasoning (because we don't understand ourselves as in possessing similar cognitive instruments as to those that make mathematics and geometry possible, so to turn the existence of God self-evident by logical demonstration alone).

»Let's say that there are two kinds of evidences or ways to obtain proof: the ones that require proof by practical demonstration, by

experience, and the ones that don't need exterior demonstration, but can make themselves evident solely by logical reasoning. Kant seems to say that human understanding inevitably imposes conditions on what is experienced, adding or changing already what is experienced, as it inevitably contextualizes it into a sum of conditions just to make the act of knowing even possible. Dogma is thus impossible and all that might be said about God is only speculation, because we are already unable to prove His existence, for two reasons: 1. Objectively, exteriorly speaking, because God is understood as in being of unconditioned Nature (and since we inevitably condition whatever we experience so to know, the unconditioned, like God, is impossible to experience, to point Him out in nature, so to speak, which we wouldn't be able to do even if we saw Him, as in, in the world of phenomena, God seems to be unrecognizable); and 2. as far as proving His existence by logic alone, we don't seem to have an inherent cognitive ability, alike the ones that we have that make mathematics and geometry possible, that would somehow make the existence of God irrefutable by idiosyncrasies' comparison alone, so to speak.

»Consciousness seems to be related to God understood immediately as an infinite beginning. A self-evident Conscious Origin. Self-

evident because the concept of consciousness (and thus our fundamental sense of self) is impossible, if taken in any way deriving from unconsciousness. If denying that premise, that is, if denying consciousness or awareness as not being accidental but expression of Origen, one seems to be denying all consciousness beyond and prior to oneself; we'd be saying that consciousness is exclusive of whomsoever claims that attribute for himself – needless to say, bound to believe in that claim solely when affirmed in our regard – unless we realize now that in fact we are not alive, but dead, and, although writing or reading these words, we are actually unaware or unconscious of ourselves thinking that we are – not by mistake but by illusion – which seems to make death less of an end, but a door out of a paradoxical dream.

II

– That's how it starts.

»Someone talking. We all arrived in the middle of something, anyway. What's the point? Is consciousness just a shadow, a synchronized dance? Not a reflection, but origin of movement, thus errorless and omnipresent illusion of self?, alike the insight beyond the forgery of laws, trying to pass in rags for yesterdays or just now. Eternity, without you, there is no meaning.

»Unmerciful originality of the present – knowledge, what are you? Memory's divinity? What's the mystery of life? Will our souls blend with fate? Will we cry the rains or smile the sun?, wink the night and sigh the moon?, sow with stars and talk with Angels? Are we not the conscious ones, or are we the reflection of someone else, bounded in someone else's consciousness? Not the person but the shadow, not projector but reflection, not beholder but

beheld, not a subject but an object, like trying to say something amidst a hard hushed panic, believed as a child would a puppet. Eternity, you are the cradle of my mind. What are these invisible walls? They echo like a church.

»Are you still there?

Anubis barked.

– Come here, boy – said the Witness, petting Anubis. – The Christian disposition to discuss Christ in philosophical terms wasn't and isn't deemed inappropriate because it is held as at least unoffending to God's Majesty. But it is not being discussed a philosophical God, conjectured sole out of reason's foreseen necessities for the existence or not of a supreme supernatural entity. We didn't reason ourselves onto Christ. God, in Christianity, is a Revelation.

»It feels like the dialogue between philosophy and Christian Doctrine, throughout the centuries, gradually arrived at a point where God was no longer thought upon as a God that is believed true not fundamentally because of what our reason may assure us about Him out of our perceptive abilities or logical reasoning, but mostly because of being believed as a God that revealed Himself throughout History; a God most of all reckoned as such more out of testimonies of power rather than of reason's

speculations about divinity, needless to say, a God you have to believe in, a God that seeks faith.

»Both the ones that believe in God as well as the ones that don't, say that we should all get along and live in peace. But the ones that don't believe in God announce that out of fear and the ones that do believe in God out of hope. Because the inexistence of God justifies violence and all sorts of evil, which is then a very relative thing, that's why the ones that don't believe in God, despite denying His existence, still say that we should live in peace, but out of fear or ignorance from the natural outcome of that disbelief.

»People, in general communication, don't seem to express themselves through paths, but destinations. That's why we seem to disagree. Mathematic is just a form of knowledge, nor better nor worse than others, just different in nature and use. If mathematical knowledge is the only thing certain we can know for sure, what are we, then? An echo of a zero in space and its relation to existence? A talking number, looking for a name? A conscious number is then a question: who do I serve? Which seems to lead again to theology. Which, as Christians, leads us to where we presently are.

– Theology led us to the north of Spain? – asked Vanessa.

III

– Time is very important in Christianity – continued the Witness. – Hence this place. This place is like the continuation of the apparitions of Fatima. Are you familiar with them?

– Yes – answered Vanessa.

– In this place, Our Lady and Saint Michael the Archangel appeared to say, well, overall, to say what Our Lady has been saying throughout the years: remember God in your lives. Convert. Be good.

– Anything specific?

– Yes. We have to apprehend the state of the world in comparison to God's plan for humanity. It has already been said and noted that the world is in a current state similar to that of Sodom, godless, perverted and depraved. The image of an alcoholic elderly woman, in the

night, with too much makeup on and overdressed for her lonesome, listening to old records or something, always seems to come to mind when thinking about the state of western civilization. Do you see what I mean?

– I think I do. That’s a funny comparison
– giggled Vanessa.

– But it’s no laughing matter, I assure you. Our Lady said that God would leave a visible supernatural sign that would remain here until the end of the world.

– Is that what this is about? The end of the world?

– I can’t answer that question, but I think not, but rather the end of times, of an epoch, if you like. Our Lady said that before that miracle comes, a warning sign would be sent to all humanity, that will, it is assumed, light up the light of God in us, so we can see ourselves through His eyes, realizing all the real good and evil that we’ve done. I should underscore real, because people might have a wrong idea about themselves out of what they might consider as in living a «normal life». But if God has no part in that «normal life», you seem to be dead. The suffering and devastation that was brought about by World War II wasn’t the only harm done. Another harm that that war produced was

very low standards, as in, if I don't do what that guy did, well, I guess it's safe to say that I'm home free. But good as well as evil are related to something, related to the Truth.

– I Am the Way, the Truth and Life – said Vanessa.

– No one comes to the Father except by Me – completed the Witness.

– John 14:6.

– That's what Jesus said of Himself. But good and evil, on their own, seem to be but subjective concepts. They are what they are in the light of the Truth, compared with something. Because, on their own, it's like forcing you to choose between two things without context, as in, a car or a parachute? Well, a parachute, because I rather walk to the store wearing a parachute backpack than drive out of an airplane. But good and evil, while related to the Truth, seem to send that question for what happens after death. So the question is who are you going to believe about that subject? The question is credibility.

– So how can we distinguish?

– Saint Agustin wrote that one of the things that still amused him in other philosophies, before he converted to Christ, was

the package rather than the substance, some sort of eloquence, if you like. He commented, however, something like, it is not the eloquence that makes it true nor does the truth, so to be recognized as such, has to be conveyed in a poor manner.

– Sure.

– But concerning credibility – continued the Witness –, it looks like God, maybe not always, but many times, chooses people that are not very scholar type persons concerning religion or whatever subject. You have, for example, prophet Amos, in the Old Testament, saying that he was only a shepherd and/or a farmer. And you have Jesus that had fishermen among His Apostles. Many times they argued with God that they thought they were unable to do what God was asking of them. But God, I imagine, answered them that it was precisely because of that, or one of the reasons, He had chosen them, so it would be recognized that it was Him, God, that was at work there. Again, this is not to be taken as a law or defining characteristic. There were other prophets that were priests, so obviously more schooled in religion than the average person.

»For me, Saint Paul, regarding this matter, seems to be the best example. An ultra-zealous Pharisee, that went from city to city

persecuting Christians, what does he say: I was on my way to Damascus, so to bring in chains Christians that were there, when suddenly, boom!: white light everywhere, and a voice: Saul, why are you persecuting Me? Saint Paul was an educated man, naturally well schooled in Scripture. When he defends Jesus as in being the Messiah and the Son of God, more than trying to deliver an interpretation of Scripture to justify his faith in Jesus, he just simply tells what happen to him when he was on his way to Damascus, as in, why such a radical change occurred with him? Naturally something extraordinary had to have happened to him. Credibility, as in bearing in mind what he was and what he became. Do you see what I mean?

– Yes, I do. And the supernatural sign will be left here?

– Yes, down there, on the pine grove. And the ones that are here when it happens, if unbelievers, they will convert, and the sick will be cured.

IV

– Some sort of low mystique.

– That’s an interesting opinion about writing – answered Vanessa, as she continued following the Witness down the mountain.

– A writer or, best said, a poet, attempts what mystiques do when endowed in God’s grace.

– What do you mean?

Anubis barked.

And rushed down into the Village.

– Never mind – answered the Witness.

Both kept descending in silence for a while.

Thank You for previewing this eBook

You can read the full version of this eBook in different formats:

- HTML (Free /Available to everyone)
- PDF / TXT (Available to V.I.P. members. Free Standard members can access up to 5 PDF/TXT eBooks per month each month)
- Epub & Mobipocket (Exclusive to V.I.P. members)

To download this full book, simply select the format you desire below

