Pathological Conscience and Charlie Chaplin Version of Judas

- ··· The Word had lowered Himself to be mortal; Judas, the disciple of the Word, could lower himself to the role of informer (the worst transgression dishonor abides)···

  ··· Nils Runeberg proposes an opposite moving force: an extravagant and even limitless asceticism. The ascetic, for the greater glory of God, degrades and mortifies the flesh; Judas did the same with the spirit. He renounced honor, good, peace, the Kingdom of Heaven, as others, less heroically, renounced pleasure.···

  ··· **With a terrible lucidity** he premeditated his offense.···

  ··· God, argues Nils Runeberg, lowered himself to be a man for the redemption of the human race; it is reasonable to assume that the sacrifice offered by him was perfect, not invalidated or attenuated by any omission.··· To limit all that happened to the agony of one afternoon on the cross is blasphemous. ··· The Redeemer could feel fatigue, cold, confusion, hunger and thirst; it is reasonable to admit that he could also sin and be damned.··· ··· it is a refutation of the beauty which the vulgar consensus attributes to Christ; for Runeberg, it is a precise prophecy, not of one moment, but of all the atrocious future, in time and eternity, of the Word made flesh. God became a man completely, a man to the point of infamy, a man to the point of being reprehensible—all the way to the abyss. In order to save us, He could have chosen any of the destinies which together weave the uncertain web of history; He could have been Alexander, or Pythagoras, or Rurik, or Jesus; He chose an infamous destiny: He was Judas.··· ··· The incredulous considered it, a priori, an insipid and laborious theological game; the theologians disdained it. Runeberg intuited from this universal indifference an almost miraculous confirmation. God had commanded this indifference; God did not wish His terrible secret propagated in the world. ——Jorge Luis Borge, *Three Versions of Judas.*

Let's grant Nils Runeberg all his highly questionable assumptions about Christ and the notion of redemption and his other assumptions **except** that with **no lucidity** Judas premeditated his offense but simply underwent the *disreputable* fate. —— If value is to be excavated out of infamy for the redeemer then it must at the least be excavated in the least psychologically dishonorable way although is to appear and be measured as "the most transgression dishonor abides" nevertheless. —— Because the least psychologically dishonorable way implies Judas' action in identifying Christ to be merely awkward nervous gesture (a comic-tragic behavior of say Charlie Chaplin or Mr. Bean or Jim Carrey character). In fact, not even an action but a mere behavior that happens to the role-assignee, no different than if caused by a muscle twitch or gust of wind—a causally deviant chain—by the belief and desire but **no intention** (Donald Davidson, *Events and Actions*). —— There is the least psychologically dishonorable way means zero trace of bad conscience.—Because, according to Nietzsche, "likewise sinners and bad consciences! the **sting** of conscience teaches one to sting.". **The role-assignee knows no regret**, no sting. —— The least psychologically dishonorable way also means radical forgetfulness. That the redeemer has entirely biologically submitted to the fate. Because the most biologically-veridical psychological is unconscious.

- Observe the herd which is grazing beside you. It does not know what yesterday or today is. It springs around, eats, rests, digests, jumps up again, and so from morning to night and from day to day, with its likes and dislikes closely tied to the peg of the moment, and thus neither melancholy nor weary. To witness this is hard for man, because he boasts to himself that his human race is better than the beast and yet looks with jealousy at its happiness. For he wishes only to live like the beast, neither weary nor amid pains, and he wants it in vain, because he does not will it as the animal does. One day the man demands of the beast: "Why do you not talk to me about your happiness and only gaze at me?" The beast wants to answer, too, and say: "That comes about because I always immediately forget what I wanted to say." But by then the beast has already forgotten this reply and remains silent, so that the man wonders on once more. ——Nietzsche, *On the Use and Abuse of History for Life.*—Radical oblivion of the ascetic.

Contra Nelson Mandela, not that we should forgive but not forget, but that we should forget but not forgive. Forgiveness is ephemeral because one needs to first remember in order to forgive. Any traumatic episode in which the oppressed is incapable of evaluating the precise nature of effects but vaguely but correctly senses that what can be articulated and reported later of the effects of the oppression is by far even further traumatic than what can be articulated at the time of offense. The is no cure only new coalitions of sub-identities until there is no fate for black except white; most ironically. —— If ever one happens to watch live-stream genocide, please stop either the genocide or the live-stream or—if televised genocide is indispensable to the miraculous pressure of marketplace— **procreation**. Watching live-stream genocide only further **pathologizes** one's conscience. —— In the recent presidential election in the US, it is plausible that people subconsciously voted anti-Islamist because only then the voters are relieved of their persistent guilt of oppression committed by the US through finalizing the conflict in the middle-east once and for all in favor of the colonialist (christendom) in eyes of which Islam is but a cult.