

PHENOMENON



The Magazine of the World Intelligence Network



EDITED BY KRYSTAL VOLNEY AND GRAHAM POWELL

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	p.3
BIOGRAPHY OF PROFESSOR BENOIT DESJARDINS	p.4
CONVERSATION WITH PROFESSOR BENOIT DESJARDINS	p.5
BIOGRAPHY OF SAM BULLY-THOMAS	p.11
POETRY BY SAM BULLY-THOMAS	p.12
POEMS BY MC DONALD DIXON THE POET	p.15
POEM BY THERESE WANECK	p.23
ART BY ANJA JAENICKE	p.24
THE SPECTRE SUDOKU	p.26
BIOGRAPHY OF SHARON WEIL HORNSTEIN	p.28
SHARON'S PHOTOGRAPHY	p.29
HEIDEGGER ON ARISTOTLE'S METAPHYSICS Θ 1-3 BY PAUL EDGEWORTH	p.34
RICORSO BY PAUL EDGEWORTH	p.51

INTRODUCTION

Dear readers,

Welcome to another Phenomenon magazine.

It gives Krystal Volney and I great pleasure in presenting for you more excellent creations by talented people from across the world, so truly reflecting the ethos of the World Intelligence Network.

Our resident interviewer, Scott Douglas Jacobsen, this time gets into conversation with one of the great physicians in science today, Professor Benoit Desjardins. Read some aspects to being profoundly gifted and what the professor is pursuing in life, and why.

There is a plethora of poetry, including a piece by Genius of the Year for America, Therese Waneck. The current Genius of the Year for Europe, Anja Jaenicke, also contributes two paintings, fittingly of two of the greatest geniuses of all time. Take a look to see who she chose...

To intrigue you even more, James Bond asks for your help in getting him out of a difficult situation. Will you emerge as a collaborator, or maybe a future 'M' - so lead one of the foremost ministries of the British government?

A great contributor to the World Intelligence magazine, Paul Edgeworth, once again gives us some insight into the complex philosophical discourse of Heidegger. He follows that essay with a quixotic piece of verbal imagery, something to muse over for some considerable time. So, dear readers, enjoy the experience!

Graham Powell

Cover photos-

Professor Benoit Desjardins, Mc Donald Dixon the poet,

Sam Bully-Thomas and Sharon Weil Hornstein

BIOGRAPHY OF PROFESSOR BENOIT DESJARDINS, MD, PhD, FAHA, FACR OF THE OLYMPIQ SOCIETY

Professor Benoit Desjardins, MD, PhD, FAHA, FACR is an academic physician and scientist at the University of Pennsylvania. He is a member of the Mega Society, the OlympIQ Society and past member of the Prometheus Society. He is the designer of the cryptic Mega Society logo. He is member of several scientific societies and a Fellow of the American College of Radiology and of the American Heart Association. He is the co-Founder of the Arrhythmia Imaging Research (AIR) lab at Penn. His research is funded by the National Institute of Health. He is an international leader in three different fields: cardiovascular imaging, artificial intelligence, and cybersecurity. He discusses: growing up; extended self; family background; youth with friends; education; purpose of intelligence tests; high intelligence; extreme reactions to geniuses; greatest geniuses; genius and a profoundly gifted person; necessities for genius or the definition of genius; work experiences and jobs held; job path; myths of the gifted; God; science; tests taken and scores earned; range of the scores; ethical philosophy; political philosophy; metaphysics; worldview; meaning in life; source of meaning; afterlife; life; and love.

Conversation with Dr. Benoit Desjardins, M.D., Ph.D., on
Background, Academics, Intelligence, Science, and
Philosophy: Academic Physician; Member, Mega Society (1)

Scott Douglas Jacobsen: When you were growing up, what were some of the prominent family stories being told over time?

Dr. Benoit Desjardins[1],[2]*: Nothing interesting. A very ordinary family, trying to stay afloat financially. I found out on my wedding day that my father was adopted, which added mystery to the family for the first time in my life. But I chose not to investigate further out of respect for his wishes.

Jacobsen: Have these stories helped provide a sense of an extended self or a sense of the family legacy?

Desjardins: No, not much of a legacy. My family history did, however, make me prioritize financial stability as one of my main goals in life.

Jacobsen: What was the family background, e.g., geography, culture, language, and religion or lack thereof?

Desjardins: French Canadian, catholic, I grew up in Montreal. I was a first-generation college student, although I never really attended college and was fast-tracked directly to medical school and graduate school. We were not a very religious family. A priest had cursed my mother to get a physically disabled child when she was pregnant with me because she missed mass, and my parents then dissociated from the church. I was fortunately not born with any handicaps.

Jacobsen: How was the experience with peers and schoolmates as a child and an adolescent?

Desjardins: Not great. I was not good with human interaction. I was a bit of a recluse, although I did attend school but did not have many friends. I went to an all-boys high school. I only became comfortable interacting with girls a few years after high school. Now I have a wife and kids. Happily married for 34 years.

Jacobsen: What have been some professional certifications, qualifications, and trainings earned by you?

Desjardins: My path was unusual. I was fast-tracked to medical school in Canada because of my exceptional intellectual abilities, skipping

college. But medical school did not satisfy me intellectually. So, after medical school, I received a very prestigious Award to pursue four simultaneous graduate degrees in the US, combining Pure Mathematics, Artificial Intelligence, Formal Philosophy (Logic), and Theoretical Physics. I called this my “intellectual interlude”. I then completed the medical curriculum (internship, residency, fellowship) to earn a living as an academic physician. So, I have an MD degree, a PhD degree, half a dozen Masters, and medical post-graduate training certificates. I also completed several additional certifications on the side, like recent certifications in hacking and cybersecurity. I love to learn new things, and these certifications force me to learn new fields very thoroughly.

Jacobsen: What is the purpose of intelligence tests to you?

Desjardins: Their purpose is to attempt to evaluate intelligence. I just take those tests for fun as I love to solve complicated problems.

Jacobsen: When was high intelligence discovered for you?

Desjardins: It was in high school since I was pretty much a recluse before that.

Jacobsen: When you think of the ways in which the geniuses of the past have either been mocked, vilified, and condemned if not killed, or praised, flattered, platformed, and revered, what seems like the reason for the extreme reactions to and treatment of geniuses? Many alive today seem camera shy - many, not all.

Desjardins: It usually depends on the mindset of the society in which they live. If it is not open to new ideas or non-traditional ideas, geniuses get vilified, sometimes imprisoned (e.g., Galileo), or killed (e.g., Socrates). On the other hand, if it values new ideas and risk-takers, geniuses get praised or platformed (e.g., Gates, Jobs, Musk).

Jacobsen: Who seem like the greatest geniuses in history to you?

Desjardins: One hundred billion humans ever lived on Earth, so out of those, there were quite a few geniuses throughout history. Here are a few: Socrates, Galileo, da Vinci, Einstein, Darwin, Newton, Aristotle, Turing.

Jacobsen: What differentiates a genius from a profoundly intelligent person?

Desjardins: Extreme creativity and long-term focused effort characterize genius. Profoundly intelligent people are much more common, and most don't amount to much in life.

Jacobsen: Is profound intelligence necessary for genius?

Desjardins: Profound intelligence is usually a left-brain process. Extreme creativity is usually a right-brain process. So no, it's not necessary.

Jacobsen: What have been some work experiences and jobs held by you?

Desjardins: The main path I followed is that of an Ivy League academic physician and scientist. But I have always pursued multiple sidelines in parallel. For example, one of my current sidelines is being a hacker and a cybersecurity specialist.

Jacobsen: Why pursue this particular job path?

Desjardins: Early in my life, I sought an intellectually challenging career, which generated good financial security income. However, I quickly realized that such a career did not exist or was very difficult to find. So, I decided to pursue two careers in parallel. I picked academic medicine to generate income and pursued many other activities in parallel to provide an intellectual challenge.

Jacobsen: What are some of the more important aspects of the idea of the gifted and geniuses? Those myths that pervade the cultures of the world. What are those myths? What truths dispel them?

Desjardins: There are many myths. For example, the myth that gifted people always do well in school. But, unfortunately, the structure of the education system is not always appropriate for many geniuses, who either do poorly in school or drop out (e.g., Einstein).

Jacobsen: Any thoughts on the God concept or gods idea and philosophy, theology, and religion?

Desjardins: God was an invention of prehistoric man to explain what he could not understand. Eventually, science explained more and more and made God and religion irrelevant. As for philosophy, it is a field that helps sharpen critical thinking, analysis, and writing. Therefore, everyone should take courses in philosophy, unless one aims for a job not requiring much thinking, like a farmer or a US congressman.

Jacobsen: How much does science play into the worldview for you?

Desjardins: I earn a living as a physician and scientist, so much of my worldview is based on science.

Jacobsen: What have been some of the tests taken and scores earned (with standard deviations) for you?

Desjardins: I took the Mega test and Titan test in the mid-1990s for fun. My scores on those were good enough to qualify for membership to the Mega Society. Whether they are appropriate tests to measure very high IQs is still an open question, but all similar tests face the same problems. I probably have taken other tests as a kid, but I don't remember much. I also do puzzles and quizzes whenever they come up, such as Tim Roberts quizzes, and I usually finish first at most of them.

Jacobsen: What is the range of the scores for you? The scores earned on alternative intelligence tests tend to produce a wide smattering of data points rather than clusters, typically.

Desjardins: High enough to qualify for membership in the Mega Society. Narrow range, around five-sigma.

Jacobsen: What ethical philosophy makes some sense, even the most workable sense to you?

Desjardins: I take a little bit from each of the main ethical philosophies, depending on the context. Deontological ethics mainly guides physicians, but a utilitarian approach often makes more sense to me.

Jacobsen: What social philosophy makes some sense, even the most workable sense to you?

Desjardins: I value the "Live and let live" social philosophy with a set of practical constraints. As long as people's behavior does not harm others, does not harm the environment, and does not harm the social fabric, let people do what they want to do. If they're going to hurt themselves, it's their choice. You can always provide them with the best possible advice to help them realize the consequences of their actions, but in the end, it's their choice. Physicians use that approach a lot. For example, we inform patients who drink too much or do drugs

about the consequences of their actions, and if they chose to continue, it's not our role to forcibly stop them from harming themselves.

Jacobsen: What economic philosophy makes some sense, even the most workable sense to you?

Desjardins: Well, I cannot tolerate the cruelty and exploitative nature of predatory capitalism in the US. I instead value any economic system that provides people with the means to achieve their goals in life and reap the benefits of their hard work while at the same time providing a robust social net to prevent people from falling through the cracks. Canada, where I grew up, is a social democracy that provides all these features and makes sense to me from an economic perspective.

Jacobsen: What political philosophy makes some sense, even the most workable sense to you?

Desjardins: I oscillate between social liberalism and social democracy, depending on the context. Their basic policies are often the same. I value the power of the state but do not value as much the power of unions.

Jacobsen: What metaphysics makes some sense to you, even the most workable sense to you?

Desjardins: I have a purely atheistic scientific view of the world, and I do not need metaphysics.

Jacobsen: What worldview-encompassing philosophical system makes some sense, even the most workable sense to you?

Desjardins: As a scientist, post-positivism is the worldview philosophical system that makes the most sense to me. Reality is accessible through careful observation and scientific reasoning. Scientists make theories that can evolve, and they use observation to support or disprove a theory, knowing that all observations have a certain amount of error in them. Thus, science makes steady progress towards understanding reality.

Jacobsen: What provides meaning in life for you?

Desjardins: Three elements provide meaning to my life: my wife and kids, job and research work, and achievements. For the past few decades, I undertook a series of Grand Challenges outside work for personal growth and achievement. Each new Grand Challenge had to

meet three conditions: (1) be something I had never done in my life, (2) enable me to grow as a person, and (3) have a well-defined end goal. I have pursued many such grand challenges, such as getting a Black Belt at Tae Kwon Do, earning a Wood Badge with Boy Scouts of America, becoming a pilot, becoming a competitive master marksman, etc.

Jacobsen: Is meaning externally derived, internally generated, both, or something else?

Desjardins: It's both. In my case, my grand challenges are purely internally generated. However, other aspects such as wife and kids are externally generated.

Jacobsen: Do you believe in an afterlife? If so, why, and what form? If not, why not?

Desjardins: We either get cremated or eaten by worms and get recycled, currently into dirt, but eventually possibly into Soylent Green.

Jacobsen: What do you make of the mystery and transience of life?

Desjardins: Life is a beautiful thing. It appeared by itself out of nothing billions of years ago. It kept evolving until it produced Homo Sapiens, which could colonize and change the planet, and might eventually become interstellar. Science has taught us more and more about the mechanisms of life, so it's becoming less mysterious with time. The transience of life is a good thing, as otherwise there would be 100 billion people living on Earth, 94 billion of them living in old people's homes.

Jacobsen: What is love to you?

Desjardins: Love is an emotion that binds people to each other. I never thought of it more deeply or philosophically. But I express it regularly. For example, I've bought roses for my wife every month since we started dating, and I have not forgotten any monthly roses in the 37 years we have been together.

BIOGRAPHY OF SAM BULLY-THOMAS

Sam Bully-Thomas was born in upstate New York. Her mother is Caribbean and her father is from the Midwest. She grew up in Iran, Kuwait, Malawi, South Africa, New York and the windward island of the Commonwealth of Dominica where her mother is from. As an adult she has lived and worked in Sao Paulo, Rio de Janeiro, Tokyo, Alaska, Ireland, England, Miami and most recently Athens, Georgia.

She has a Master's in Creative Writing from the University of Oxford, England. Prior to that, her research and writings on the history of sugar earned her a Master's in Humanities from Waterford Institute of Technology in tandem with the acclaimed Poets House of Donegal, Ireland.

Cane is her first collection of poetry published by Wundor Editions, London. Her poems have appeared in Sons & Daughters, Threepenny Review, S/S/Y/K, Naugatuck Review, The Harlequin and other publications in the UK, USA, Ireland.

POETRY BY SAM BULLY-THOMAS

Making

Was blue.

That is
Encountered itself
As is
Then fed to itself
What is
The outside spiral of attack
That is
The same as a raptor follows
And is
As a Fibonacci spray holds prey captive in
What is
One cell unfurling
A clear black night.

The sextant swings beneath
That is
Hissing into its crescent shackle
What is
The phonics of a darkling map.

Holding the nautilus
A pinhole eye lets the water in
Miscible stars above spin
In logarithmically in
What is a clear black night
At the blue shore
Making.

Havana, 1857

And I remember now how the snow looked
even here, watching ash fall from the sugar still,
and that it was a cold noon in the Xianhing valley.
And you, my brother, after a long nights drinking
were sitting backwards upon the old grey donkey
we carried turnips to market with. The cart
he pulled slowly barely as solid as the light dry hay in it.
And as it was after market we headed for the passage
and remarked on the chill in the air, and I counted
the giant rocks on each side, round as plums
And how you sang, up until the white sun
was well behind our backs.
And with the river close enough to hear from the road,
we stopped to eat the rest of the rice mother
had prepared from two bamboo boxes with straw
hinges. The sting of soy spattering your hand as you
laughed about the innkeeper's face the night before
and how frightened he was when you roared
that you'd be back to burn his inn down.
How you knew his young daughter, Su-Tian, watched
from a slit in the paper walls. She could hear everything.
And at this you became silent. We packed up
our dinner and rode on towards the bridge.
It was after we crossed and started up the mountain
that they came after us, charging from the cedars
still wearing their reveling silks. You had dishonored them,
they said, and I was afraid and ran into the high grasses.
And watched as they dragged you from the donkey
and tied you behind it. But we were so far from home
and not knowing how much further it could be, I followed
and signed the contract with you to work eight years
in a foreign land to repay the dishonor.
And we were upon the ocean for what seemed like
a lifetime and you were dead before we even made
it into port. Your sores from their beatings never healed.
And I was traded many times over, my brother and think
maybe it is ten years on. Only now since they put me
to work in this mill am I finally left alone to think
on these things and where exactly we might have been
and the snow that day in Xianhing valley.

Late August, Donegal

Four in one, a rose, the sun, a single
entry. Below
layered stone a measured hand
stacks dusk as sun-raped hills wave a violent
beckoning to the moon.
And the wind flays you out evenly,
and soon you don't see yourself at all.

Vanities eroded you walk slowly on
towards the bridge.
A poisoned king lies shrouded in
his glen, red berries for weapons. Summer
velvet pressed overhead,
his daughter stock-still, one forefoot punched through
the muddy bank, breathless, gloveless, unattended.

Beside her, the river Raye's moon flood ices over
steel shod with salmon, all
parts of fortune shifting back and in and up
to the Stone of Forgetting.
A moment of darkness
holds the horizon as you cross the bridge
palms high for measure and oval and bloodless,
the sun lifts again.

POEMS BY MC DONALD DIXON THE POET

ARMISTICE (for Clement Welch BWIR, in memoriam)
to remember 100 years since the great folly.

We did not know, we were not told
dying from typhus and plague,
eleventh hour, eleventh day,
eleventh month, no one told us
the war had ended.

Shoving and shovelling in cramped space,
competing with frost-bitten rats,
black or white in this hell hole they look alike.
Same shade as the grey dawn lingering
over no man's land, backlight by dull suns
on a spot they call the Western Front.

Frozen in our trenches we watch
and wait for mornings shells to fall,
then count the dead. Finding jobs here
is not a problem, don't need unions
to fight white collar crap.

It's over sooner than you think,
sometimes buried where you stand
without a box. There is no preference
over here, whether lying down
or standing up.

AWAKENING

For Merle, In memoriam.

Beauty becomes morning, light and heaven
lovers draped in cloud, above a blaze of
African tulips blaring trumpet tongues.
Nerves curdle light, and droplets pour from eyes
for centuries weaving mountains and monuments,
squared on clay and levelled in sand.
A distant river writes her name on slate,
the hieroglyphics hemmed in green.
Hills chant gutsy librettos to the wind.

Morning is a peregrine's song, airborne,
here nothing colour minds, (except for place)
without Niger's tour-de-force, or the Nile
oozing from a pharaoh's sarcophagus.
History finds solace buried deep in shale
with spear and adze. Lizards claw the midden,
leftovers from some dark Jurassic past
yield unleavened bread. Passovers bleed
for a discerning faith— tyrants multiply.

Bloody Monday -Grenada January 21, 1974.

I dream of revolution, blood and guns
moulding new constitutions.

Angry orators spewing hate while bullets
file through silence.

When that dream becomes a journalistic
whore, the real stench of cordite stinking air,
screams haunt this conscience.

What bleeds are islands, a sleeping leopard
stalks their cribs. Dawn brings its new age, fury.

I do not feel foreign here, nor can I turn
my back on causes that can someday
ignite those quiet streets around St. George□
but without guns, a voice is not enough.

Silently I stand watching coffins pile,
while anger bleeds, your dead and mine are one.
I cannot understand that savage curse
that makes us docile lambs.
Even as bullets surge,
calm waves caress our lands.

EASTER LILIES

They never bloomed until that month I've sworn
to forget—rooms filled with sickly scent,
each touch cloistered with your smell.
Who needs emblems at this final hour
to remind us of roots tangled in dirt,
unburied bulbs, living symbols, pasted
forever to the walls of this house
that will not dare let go of your smile.

You saw them bloom, fragile white angels
on feathered wings before your star pitched
to greet the frangipani's sickly blooms,
spared of the caterpillar's grinding mandibles.
Your touch soft though no longer here
to see the past pout through eyes that witness
only simple things. In a land where news-
men no longer report news, it's time to let go.

ONE NOTE ONE SONG

It's shameful writing poems no one reads,
broken strands, trapped in a lost hairpin bend.
Side-walked on streets back home, waiting on wind
to blow me across the pavement, head crammed
with stanzas to celebrate your life.
At last, we begin again on the note
you discarded favouring foreign songs,
in middle C, played on your guitar.
Estranged, the pick tangled in strands of hair
emits pizzicatos, you alone can hear.

A west wind blows through a keyhole, the sound
close in timbre to the sea's voice, it mocks
your creed. The bird's freedom song echoes
in the conch-shell's ear. This poem will not
trust you to set it free, and feel for once
raindrops on the face that was all yours once,
before your pitch soured to deny me joy.

YOU

For P.C.D. June 26, 1976

I cannot ask for more. To ask the rose
to be a rose, a diligent flower
mailing its scent; the odour of oceans,
the lame smell of intimacy,
a fortunate wind blowing heat
through the corridors of power,
blowing steam on my starch-ironed suits.

I watch you dawn with the itch rising.
In a season when the sun burns
all is golden, a golden face smiling
on my poems. I must not dream, faces
mould from fabric when lanterns dim.
Those forgotten friendships flirt and flicker,
while your flame burns on my pillow.

Dreams hold back tears that blot on cotton:
A short night dress peeling a pot of yam,
hands bleeding on the red snapper's brittle
fin... In the kitchen, your art is supreme,
acknowledged always, but seldom in words.
I will not speak the language that paper
burns, a quiet stammer, for your ears only.

To understand feelings of the heart
I must first understand myself.
Why all those wasted years were learning,
yearning for the poem's touch, and you.
You are morning, at dawn, sleep trembles,
excites a dumb hand that ignites paper,
and everything I write becomes you.

Becomes an inlet with its unrocked beach,
a flap of scissor-bird wings, a slap
of oars - the lively melody from man
and beast. I see these poems through your eyes
only, what flows in these veins cannot
be blood; cannot be flesh where hills are flesh,
cannot be life when the sea's white splurge

Outlives this mortal sinew and will live
on beyond the nervous heave of time.
Forever morning you are, the dew,
a Beaujolais Nouveau, its stain on your lips.
The devil in the groin raves while Christmas flutes
announce the New Year's blood... You take shape
from silence, towering above the dream...

Above this inextinguishable flame.
I will not alter these poems for you
to enter them, they flow like our silt-bound

rivers bearing vague memories
to the ever-welcome sea. The sea
and my first metaphors refuse to be drowned
in you. You, morning to my canoes -

Dawn on my grass tracks, traipsing through a narrow
mountain ledge, a gulf of clear water freed
from the blonds' reflected stare. Freed from
the thirst that craved your body's humour,
but found its heat. Let me write poems
to you both, women I have loved
and hated as the moments heave.

POEM BY THERESE WANECK (GENIUS OF THE YEAR FOR USA)

STOPPING AFTER MIDNIGHT

The lamps are stationary
By stopping obedient wheels
Turning and turning the days
Fly off the handle screeching
At the dogs prancing through
Wilted wanting gardens
The nights ripen with curses

ART BY ANJA JAENICKE



© Anja Jaenicke



© Anja Jaenicke

The Spectre Sudoku

James Bond is in (as he put it) 'a spot of bother' - he has been captured. He has been placed in a cell with no windows, but Spectre have left the light on. The cell door is impenetrable, yet Bond has his phone.

He contacts you because he has been drugged and only a box cemented into the wall of the cell can give him the means of escape. It is pictured below.

The nice Spectre agents told Bond that inside the box was his Walther PPK, a key to open the cell door, the antidote to the poison they had just administered, and crucially, when he opens the box, the bomb inside will cease ticking.

"You have 30 minutes to work out which letters are represented by the numbers on the lid, then place those letters in the lid of the box, in the correct place, like a Sudoku," one agent said, smiling.

He duly gave Bond a container with nine sets of the 26 letters of the English alphabet.

"One letter is 'A'. Good luck with the rest, Mr. Bond." He shut the door and locked it.

As Q's assistant, 'G', you gaze at the title of the box:

The 1, 5, 9, 12, 14, 18, 19, 21, 22 Puzzle.

You know that Spectre agents have a sense of humour. For sure the word represented by the numbers will be familiar to Bond. It seems like it is connected with the company you work for.

You look at your watch: you now have 29 minutes to complete the task.

Identify the letters and work out the anagram in the puzzle title. Then put the letters in the grid below and save Bond. As the Spectre agent said:

"Good luck!"

21			22		12		18	
1		22				14	21	
	18	5		14			12	
12		14				5		
9		21	12					1
	19	1			5			
22			19					9
14			1			22		18
	21			9		19		12

BIOGRAPHY OF SHARON WEIL HORNSTEIN

A graduate of the University of Pennsylvania, Sharon Weil Hornstein left the corporate world following a 13-year multinational marketing career to raise her boys and pursue her passion for photography. Working primarily in color, she strives to capture images of strong yet simple subjects at a unique moment in time.

She first visited Turks & Caicos in 2012 and immediately fell in love with the beauty of both the islands and its people. She has returned over the years, camera in hand, working on her collection of images. She hopes they will serve as a striking reminder of the unique beauty of the Turks & Caicos Islands.

She happily partners with designers. Also, she works with private and corporate clients directly to help them infuse a unique coastal living vibe into their spaces. Sharon currently prints on eco-friendly bamboo as well as aluminium (Metal Prints). Limited edition series on paper, numbered and signed, will be offered starting Fall 2021 as well as NFTs. Her images can be found in collections worldwide. Her work has appeared in magazines and been shown in galleries, museums, libraries in the US and beyond.

Her work can be found here:

Web: www.sanddollarimages.com

IG: @sanddollarimages

FB: Sand Dollar Images

SHARON'S PHOTOGRAPHY



Moon Jelly



Abstract



Balance II



Cactus



Stormy Days I

Heidegger on Aristotle's *Metaphysics* Θ 1-3

- by Paul Edgeworth

Aristotle's Metaphysics Θ 1-3: *On the Essence and Actuality of Force* is Volume 33 of Martin Heidegger's *Gesamtausgabe* and is based on a lecture course offered at the University of Freiburg in the Summer Semester of 1931.¹ The volume presents Heidegger's translation and original commentary on the first three chapters of Book Θ of Aristotle's *Metaphysics*. As the subtitle indicates, Heidegger's detailed interpretation of these chapters deals with the essence (Wesen, τὸ τί ἦν εἶναι) and actuality (*Wirklichkeit*, ἐνέργεια) of force (*Kraft*, δύναμις). The phenomenon of force is discussed thoroughly in all its variations, e.g., potentiality, force, power, and capability. As can be seen, Heidegger often finds it necessary to render the Greek in multiple alternatives so as to allow his German to express Aristotle's philosophical thought.² While the present volume represents an English translation of a German rendering from the Greek, it is nonetheless clear that Heidegger has a good sense of what Aristotle is about, and that he demonstrates this by opening up and making vibrant whole areas of thought that have lost life in our tradition. Heidegger's

¹ Martin Heidegger, *Aristotle's Metaphysics* Θ 1-3, trans. Walter Brogan and Peter Warnek (Bloomington: Indiana Univ. Press, 1995), ix.

² *Ibid.*, xi.

own original unveiling of what was comprehended by Aristotle thus helps keep alive "Aristotle's unresolved innermost questioning."³

The present volume is divided into four parts: an Introduction entitled "*The Aristotelian Question about the Manifold and Oneness of Being*," and three chapters entitled respectively, "*Metaphysics Θ 1. The Unity of the Essence of Δύναμις κατὰ Κίνησιν*, Force understood as Movement," "*Metaphysics Θ 2. The Division of Δύναμις κατὰ Κίνησιν for the Purpose of Elucidating Its Essence*," and "*Metaphysics Θ 3. The Actuality of Δύναμις κατὰ Κίνησιν or Capability*."

It is beyond the scope of this endeavor to discuss each of these chapters in complete detail; however, some of Heidegger's innovative ideas that capture the originality of Aristotle's work will be presented in the passages that follow.

The Aristotelian Question about the Manifold and Oneness of Being

In his Introduction, Heidegger asks us what is being sought in Aristotle's inquiry into δύναμις and ἐνέργεια? What prompts his investigation of potentiality and actuality? The question of potentiality and actuality is a question about beings (*Seiende*, τὸ ὄν). The inquiry concerning beings is fundamentally an inquiry concerning being (*Sein*,

³ Ibid., 39.

τὸ εἶναι). Being is the primary one that has to be said of beings, and precisely then the reason that being itself is the one. But Heidegger points out that at the same time being is said in various ways, for it is fourfold (and even tenfold with respect to one of its categories). Already much has been said and clarification is required.

Heidegger translates the first sentence of Book Θ as follows: "We have thus dealt with beings in the primary sense, and that means, with that to which all the other categories of beings are referred back, *οὐσία* (ousia)."⁴ Heidegger goes on to say that the relation back and forth of the other categories occurs as a "gathering" in the *λόγος*, that is to say, a laying open and laying forth occurs in recounting and speaking—a spreading out, an articulating. The meaning of *λόγος* as relation (a unified gathering) is therefore something more primordial than its meaning as discourse. The gathering of discourse thus makes things accessible and manifest. What Aristotle calls category is then that saying which is involved in every assertion in a preeminent way. The essence of the categories is rooted in *λόγος* as a gathering and making manifest. The other categories then are always, in accord with their essence, co-saying the ousia.

⁴ Ibid., 2.

But, Heidegger tells us, we do not find "possibility" and "actuality" in any of Aristotle's listings of the categories. Thus for Aristotle, the question of possibility and actuality is not a category question. Rather, says Heidegger, it revolves around the general realm of the question of beings, which is the only question that fundamentally interests Aristotle, and this questioning of what beings are insofar as they are beings is the most proper form of philosophizing. Thus the treatise on potentiality and actuality is one of the ways of questioning about beings as such.

Being, as stated above, is fourfold. Chapter Ten of Book Θ begins: "The terms 'being' and 'non-being' are employed firstly with reference to the categories, and secondly with reference to the potency or actuality of these or their non-potency or non-actuality, and thirdly in the sense of true and false,"⁵ and in the beginning of Chapter Two of Book E we find "But since the unqualified term 'being' has several meanings, of which one was seen to be accidental"⁶ Being with respect to the categories, potentiality and actuality, truth and falsity, and the accidental shows us that there is a quadruple folding of being. However, Heidegger also points out that being in the

⁵ Aristotle, *Metaphysics*, trans. W.D. Ross in *The Basic Works of Aristotle*, ed. Richard McKeon (New York: Random House, 1941), 833.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 779.

sense of the category is not only one among the four foldings, but is in itself a "What is said in many ways,"⁷ that is to say, in as many ways as there are categories.

If Aristotle says that being is manifold and indeed multifarious, does he then no longer understand the insight of Parmenides that being is one? Heidegger answers that Aristotle does not renounce the truth of Parmenides, but rather first truly comprehends it. How does Aristotle comprehend the unity of being as a manifold? If being is not a genus, then it cannot be comprehended as a concept. How then are we to understand the relationship of one to its many different ways? Following a discussion of healthiness of different kinds, we see that all the items to which the word "health" applies are healthy with reference to some one item, or as some scholars like to say the word "health" has a focal meaning.⁸ They have then a unity. The carrying back and forth of the meanings to the first meaning is different; however, the first is the sustaining and guiding basic meaning. This is the unity of analogy (*Analogie*). Being then signifies in a way to the way "health" signifies. Heidegger can now read Aristotle's first sentences from *Θ* with a more refined meaning as "We have dealt with

⁷ πολλαχως λεγομενον, see Heidegger, 12.

⁸ Jonathan Barnes, "Metaphysics," *The Cambridge Companion to Aristotle*, ed. Jonathan Barnes, (New York: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1995), 76.

the sustaining and leading fundamental meaning of being, to which all the other categories are carried back."⁹ Thus Heidegger in his Introduction has not provided us with a solution to the being question, but he has nevertheless provided us with significant insight not the least of which has been a glimpse into the multifarious richness of being cascading from and related to the sense of ousia.

Metaphysics Θ 1. The Unity of the Essence of Δύναμις κατὰ Κίνησιν, Force understood as Movement

In Chapter One, Heidegger shows us how *δύναμις* and *ἐνέργεια* extend further in their meaning than the corresponding expression κατὰ Κίνησι—with regard to movement. When we speak of forces and activities in the plural, we mean that there are many kinds of forces and activities. But the *δύναμις* and *ἐνέργεια* in the singular mean an extending "further" in the sense of something higher and essential, and this Heidegger calls the "decisive basic discovery of the entirety of Aristotelian philosophy."¹⁰

The essential meaning of *δύναμις* and *ἐνέργεια* is not rendered only with regard to movement. How is this then to be understood? The horizon of questioning for such an inquiry, says Heidegger, is being

⁹ Heidegger, 35.

¹⁰ Ibid., 42.

and its unity in "what is said in many ways." All the meanings of "force," have the character of an origin which rules over and reaches out, and are addressed by referring back to the first way of being a force, that is, as an origin of change in another.

Heidegger arrives at this by first asking how we discern a force. Forces are not directly discerned. We always find only accomplishments, effects. Nor do we ever experience something immediately as an effect. After a circuitous discussion of causality, we find that the access to force then must be co-determined by what force in itself is. Force has the character of being a cause (*Ur-Sache*), an originary thing (*Sache*) which allows a springing forth. This insight, Heidegger tells us, Aristotle saw in a decisive and essential moment.¹¹ It is this essential Aristotelian insight that Heidegger says must be set free in its essential content. What is at issue here is not a cause and effect relationship, but rather much more: force is an origin, the from-out-of-which for a change, and in such a way that the origin is different from that which changes.¹²

Heidegger advances the guiding meaning of force by discussing two modes of the from-out-of-which for a change—bearance and

¹¹ *δύναμις* is ἀρχὴ μεταβολῆς ἐν ἄλλῳ ἢ ᾧ ἄλλο. Ibid., 67.

¹² Thus the reality of the potential is revealed. The network of potentiality, becoming, change, etc., can be said to come to terms with Parmenides.

resistance. One way of being a force is namely a force of tolerating. The other way is the behavior of intolerance against change for the worse. The from-out-of-which for change now is that from out of which change is allowed, or else that from out of which change is resisted. Heidegger then is able to say that being an origin is for a doing, that is, a transposing pro-ducing, a bringing something forth or about.

Again determining the guiding meaning from a new perspective, Heidegger says that having the power for something means having in the right way the power to do the task at hand. The power for something properly is force when it is in the right way. Force then implies the moment of being on the way toward something. Hence, there belongs to the inner structure of force the character of "in such and such a way,"¹³ in short, the how. Being, as being an origin for, does not mean a thing from which something proceeds, instead being an origin for something is in itself a proceeding to the other. In the essence of force then, there is the demand upon itself to surpass itself.

Heidegger next poses a question. When one speaks of the *δύναμις* of doing and of toleration, are two modes meant or only one? What follows is a discussion which distinguishes between ontological

¹³ Ibid., 85.

and ontic being-force. In the ontological sense, being-force does not consist of two present-at-hand forces, but rather, there is in a force as present, an outward directiveness toward the corresponding opposing force. In the ontic sense, it does not mean force-being as being, but rather a definite being. We do not mean then force-being itself, but rather that which shares in it. Heidegger wants us to see that Aristotle is telling us that it belongs to the essence of what we call force, that it be understood in this ambiguity. To reiterate, force does not consist of two forces; instead, if force-being is in a being, then that being is split into two forces. This, says Heidegger, represents Aristotle's successful entrance into the ontological interpretation of essence.

In concluding this Chapter, still another version of *δύναμις* is explained—force in the sense of unforce. This unforce, in turn, is seen as a withdrawal. Does this merely mean that in addition to force there is unforce as well? No, says Heidegger. Rather Aristotle tells us that every force is unforce in relation to and in accordance with the same thing. Every force delineates a realm for itself within which it dominates that for which it is. Every force has a character of possession which is this delineation of its realm. Every force, then, if it becomes unforce, is the loss of its possession. Thus the proper

possessive character of force is constitutionally bound up with withdrawal.

Metaphysics Θ 2. The Division of Δύναμις κατὰ Κίνησιν for the Purpose of Elucidating Its Essence

Chapter Two opens up with a division of force into what is without discourse and what is directed by discourse, without conversance (*Kundschaft*) and conversant (*Kundigsein*).¹⁴ What does discourse have to do with force? λόγος is discourse, the gathering, unifying making something known. λόγος is thus discourse in the broad sense of the manifold making known and giving notice. Without conversance is to be without the possibility of taking notice, or of giving notice. Conversance is then the possibility of taking and giving notice, and thus the possibility of exploring and becoming conversant.

Aristotle achieves this twofold division of force by going back to a division of beings into soulless and besouled. When we speak of the besouled being who has λόγος, we do not mean that conversance is merely added on; rather, this having has the meaning of being. It means that humans conduct themselves in the way they do on the basis of this having. Whenever this conversance addresses itself to things

¹⁴ To be conversant is to have expert knowledge of something, and to be able to speak of it in terms of its surroundings. See Heidegger, xii.

and discusses them, it is a conversance which debates with itself and calls itself into account. Language is understood here as a conversant gathering. The human being is the living being who lives in such a way that his life is defined in an originary way by language.

Next follows an interesting discussion on the inner relation of force and conversance which Heidegger uses to draw our attention to conversant force or capability. What is characteristic of the latter, in turn, is that it is directed at contraries. All of the foregoing no less comes into play in a discussion of production (*Herstellung*). Heidegger tells us that the being-gathered-together of production is at play in the gathering of the discussion and of the cognizance that discusses what is or is not suitable. Production is a doing of something and leaving its contrary alone. What is produced is the work (*Werk*, ἔργον). The work is always that which must appear in such and such a way. The outward appearance is already seen in advance, and it is seen precisely in what it comes to in the end. The end is in its essence boundary. To produce something is to forge something into its boundaries. It is the outward appearance which says what is to be produced. It does so in a way that excludes the other, but this other is constantly with it, that is to say, the contrary is there and manifest in the very fact of avoiding it. Producing as Heidegger sees it is essentially a talking to oneself.

To tell oneself something means to want to proceed in a certain way, and in effect to have already gone there in advance. Production then is a fundamental posture toward the world, that is, the enclosed openness of beings. Based on the preceding, Heidegger is telling us that when Aristotle uses λόγος it primarily means in its essential character: conversance and openness. Our understanding will be blocked then if we take λόγος in the current sense of the term to mean judgment, assertion, and concept.

Metaphysics Θ 3. The Actuality of Δύναμις κατὰ Κίνησιν or Capability

Chapter Three finds Aristotle involved in a confrontation with the Megarian thesis. The Megarians hold that the ability to do something is present only while a force is at work, but when it is not at work, there is no such ability. For example, a builder who is not building is not then able to build, unlike the builder who is building. Their question concerned the essence and possibility of movement. The Megarians denied the possibility of the actuality of movement, according to the Eleatic principle of being wherein only being is and non-being is not. What is at issue then is a capability. The Megarians, Heidegger tells us, looked for the being present of a capability in the actualization, that is, in the enactment (*Vollzug*) of the capability. If there is no

enactment, then the capability simply does not exist. Both the Megarians and Aristotle are united in their general conception of actuality. Both understand it as a presence. According to Aristotle, capability is present, is actual, if it is possessed. According, to the Megarians, capability is present and actual if it is enacted.

For Aristotle, it is manifest that the being present of capability may not be immediately taken as the presence of work, or of producing. Rather he sees the presence of capability as possessed, available, as a having. Enactment is never only the emergence of something which before was completely gone. On the other hand, non-enactment is not simply the disappearance of something which was there. For Aristotle, enactment is practicing. It is the presence of being in practice. Because of their narrow comprehension of presence, the essence of enactment escapes the Megarians, which, as a being at work, has the character of practicing. The insight that non-enactment as not practicing in itself is a way of being in practice, and therefore the presence of something, is closed off to them. Thus Aristotle brings into view for the first time the proper manner of being actual of a capability.¹⁵ A non-enacted capability is actual such that a not-yet-

¹⁵ That is to say the reality of the potential.

beginning belongs to its actuality.¹⁶ Accordingly, Aristotle does not deny enactment as one way in which capability is actual. But he does deny that this is the only way in which the actuality of a force is. To reiterate, the being present of a capability is being in practice. This expresses precisely the innermost actuality of capability as capability.

The inadequacy of the Megarean conception lies in that they see incapability only as the mere negation of enactment as presence. They comprehend that which is negated, enactment itself, only as the presence of something, rather than as transition. "And so these teachings brush aside movement as well as becoming."¹⁷ Thus the Megarian thesis must collapse. The being present of capability as capability cannot be sought in enactment. One sees that being capable of something, and being at work, are in each case something different.

That the Megarians relied upon being at work or actualization does not prove that they had a proper notion of it, for they did not see that actualization *qua* actualization is actualization with regard to movement. To account for the difference between capability and actualization means not to replace immediately the actuality of

¹⁶ In utilizing such nomenclature, Heidegger is not trying to improve upon Aristotle, but rather to begin to understand what he has said.

¹⁷ ὥστε οὗτοι οἱ λόγοι ἐξαιροῦσι καὶ κίνησιν καὶ γένεσιν (1047a14). Heidegger, 180.

capability with being at work, thereby eliminating capability. It means rather to see that capability has its own actuality and to see how this is so. What Aristotle is saying is that the being present of something capable as such and actuality in the sense of enactment are *modes of being in movement*, and are only to be comprehended on this basis.¹⁸ Thus Heidegger can say the "actuality of the capable is co-determined by a capable actuality, which shows up in enactment."¹⁹ Heidegger impresses this upon us by the example of a sprinter who has taken his mark in a hundred-meter race. What we see is a human who is not in movement, but whose pose is that of being already off and running. At the word "go," the runner's execution is not the disappearance of the capability, but rather the carrying out of that toward which the capability itself drives. The one who reacts leaves nothing undone in relation to his capability. This implies that the runner is in a position to run, that is, in full readiness. He lacks only the releasement into enactment. Thus it becomes clear how the actuality of capability is to be comprehended through possession, namely as holding the capability itself in readiness. The being held is its actual presence.²⁰ As Aristotle says, "That which is in actuality capable, however, is that for which nothing more is unattainable once it sets itself to work as that for

¹⁸ Ibid., 186.

¹⁹ Ibid.

²⁰ Ibid., 186-88.

which it is claimed to be well equipped" (1047a24-26).²¹ With this insight, Heidegger tells us, the greatest philosophical knowledge of antiquity is expressed.

Heidegger's Reflection of Aristotle's Originary Experience of Being

The importance of Heidegger's present work is that it enables us to see Aristotle with a new pair of eyes and to listen to him with a new sense of wonder. For Heidegger, the primal disclosure of being was granted to the early Greeks as a kind of manifestness which shortly thereafter congealed into a kind of static presence.²² The original experience of being was covered over by ontological structures of actuality, causality, and permanent presence.²³ By probing and questioning Aristotle's text, Heidegger shows us how to do philosophy, and in so doing, illuminates the dynamic and fluid processes that lie behind "ousiology" or substance ontology. Although Heidegger's interpretation is a daring and innovative one, it is one which captures the spirit of Aristotle.²⁴ Heidegger's interpretation also shows us that it is necessary to surpass Aristotle—not in the sense of progression, but rather backwards in the direction of a more original unveiling of what

²¹ Ibid., 188.

²² John D. Caputo, *Heidegger and Aquinas: An Essay on Overcoming Metaphysics* (New York: Fordham Univ. Press, 1982), 84.

²³ Ibid., 90.

²⁴ Both Heidegger and Aristotle would agree that the ousia of something involves an unfolding (becoming) from being potential to being actual.

is comprehended by him.²⁵ If we are to appreciate what Aristotle was the first to achieve, we must then regain an active understanding of the questioning posed by him. Perhaps the most important thing that Heidegger has done for us is that he makes us want to go back again and again to the *Metaphysics*, so that we too can experience, in our own way, what Aristotle was able to experience in those same, few questions. This then remains for each of us to do, in our attempts to make the ineffable effable.

²⁵ Heidegger, 69.

Ricorso: A Poem Complete with Explication and Discourse

THIS IS NOT A POEM! THIS IS NOT A POEM! THIS IS A PRODIGIOUS EVENT!

Yet Again - I think Poopahs, Tortollenies, Grand-Exhorbitant Lima-Beans
Chuckling down De-constructive mythfollogies (Oh the cleverness of this)
Endless angsts of influence More than a were-dog has flies (Rhythm fooled
you not I) Kicking the bedding out-of-the wedding Putting the bend in the
knee Et tu familias humanis

NADA IN RECOMENSIONI GET YOURSELF BLOAT-BELLIED ON AIR IT'S SO
ETHEREAL!

Whipawhirled dervish Man your ars Kickakickakick A will-aimed sole/ (In
the)soul Is what you lack! Smack-a-whack!

All lost live again Grand-Exhausted Limba Beans, Tortillinis, and Poopays So
on and so fort Cycle swing Poopies, Grand Lamarines, Totulenies command
To the end (of the) Dumb plodding Thing march Go!

O be joyful Kalou kalay All will be told When it suits well Emotes that would
Be Thoats Dugongs ahoy Awash afloat Tis you and ye And me Sanscullottes,
sans doute

Sanhyas! Sandhyas! Sandhyas! Vah! Suvarn Sur! Dah Be! Doo Dah! Dixi
(Rigorously logical it has been So some say)

O, the thunder of the predeceased Epprepffftaph! Pfrwritt! Pyrrpffrrppffff!
Begin. Yet again. Time enuf to cease

Explication and Discourse re Ricorso

FORE-STRUCTURE

An explication is possible only to the extent that it is prepared for in advance by an anticipatory Abschattung. Thus the explication can appear under the condition that it can insert itself within a frame of expectations. An explication must not be merely apprehended, but in order to be apprehended, must be construed or apprehended in advance (Aufgefasst in voraus).

EXPLICATION

Since it is explicitly stated that the poem is not a poem but purportedly a prodigious event, an explication is warranted. We know that something is happening. Since it is encrusted in information, we do not know what it is. Coincidentally, this brings to mind the Berkenstein Bound. Didn't know what Jabberwocky was saying till Humpty spelled it out! Relevant and/or paradigm? Dumpty egg by way of expoundation ezras that some equals are above equals because 1)older and 2)possessed of ubiquitous, rotund intellect. For cycle swing, see S. Weinberg, et al - as to how this might occur. You and ye and me are the three blind musketeers disguised as yank and yin. And two let be makes even three. The impossible still seems possible. The rest is more albeit less. A pyncheon more, but lesser still. Tis Eliot I see. Thanks be to Boom'n Bloomen! Ah, Abelard, Ah, Heloise - the mind is a forest dark! I'm only hear for the sexual nuance and the ambiance. Strange, I have this craving for. I can hear the sea! I always believed that. See how they run. A herd of philosophers in flight! Revolutionary aphrodisiac or ultimate borification. They flee from what? Grothendieck forsoothe us not!

DISCOURSE

Common-sense understanding and description involve a grasp of the relation of things to us. Theoretical understanding and explanation involve a grasp of the relation of things to each other. Everyone understands the notion of going faster, but few understate that acceleration is going faster, generalized to include going slower and enriched with all the implications of the second derivative of a function; hence, the distinction between description and explanation and between common-sense and theoretical understanding. I gained this insight while in the Asylum, by way of Lonergan, good old Bernie, a rigorous metamatheologist.

LAGNIAPPE PRAYER

Oh ye gods of sky and earth and two and ten dimensions, deliver us from mechanistic doltification! Make more effusive the hereafter. Hence and thence. Amen.

A Final Note in Passing - One fleeting image, if you will, before the grand narrative resumes. "Far better to be young and foolish than old and wiley," said Zarathustra to the aardvark. The latter knowingly winked and replied, "But you would agree, however, that we owe an 'in order to' to Aristotle!"