

## Kainurgesic transcendence, with special reference to Gnosis

‘the Dasein in human being’ is nothing human<sup>1</sup>

All things are deconstrained.<sup>2</sup>

The physiologist Walter Cannon titled his autobiography *The Way of an Investigator*. He devotes chapter 5 to ‘The Role of Hunches.’ Hunches are “sudden revelations—really, unearned grants of insight.” (*Was ist das, daß Einfall gewährt?*) Cannon observes that among the conditions favorable for “the appearance of hunches” are “a great interest in the problem to be solved, a clear definition of this problem, and an eager desire for its solution.” He goes on to note that “A large store of related information already acquired is another prerequisite. The greater the number of facts which are pertinent to the urgent problem and which can be combined in novel ways for explaining the puzzle it presents, the more likely is the puzzle to be solved.”<sup>3</sup>

April DeConick’s preferred term for ‘a large store of related information’ is ‘buffer,’ a word she adopts from computer technology. Gnostic spirituality first emerges, she writes, “within the ‘religious buffer’ that had formed in Egypt by the turn of the first century CE.” She explains that the religious buffer “is a collective assortment of information about a variety of religions, revelations, spiritual sensibilities, religious experiences, and metaphysical speculations.”<sup>4</sup>

DeConick’s religious buffer plays the same role as Cannon’s large store of related information:—the inventory of materials available for combination in novel ways to solve an urgent problem. For, DeConick says, “Innovative structures that emerge from the religious buffer, such as Gnostic spirituality, are about the creation of a conceptual blend that is totally

---

<sup>1</sup> *Aber das Wesen (verbal) des Menschen, »das Dasein im Menschen« . . . ist nichts Menschliches.* Martin Heidegger, *Zur Seinsfrage; Gesamtausgabe Band 9:397*: <https://www.beyng.com/gaselis/?vol=9&pg=397> . See also GA 6.2: 377: *Dieses Wesen ist nichts Menschliches*: <https://www.beyng.com/gaselis/?vol=6.2&pg=377> .

<sup>2</sup> Πάντα ἔξεστιν, ἀλλ’ οὐ πάντα συμφέρει. πάντα ἔξεστιν, ἀλλ’ οὐ πάντα οἰκοδομεῖ. 1 Cor. 10:23.

‘Deconstrained’ for ἔξεστιν per this: “These conserved processes have, we think, facilitated or deconstrained evolution because of their special properties of robustness and adaptability, their modularity and compartmentalization, their capacity for weak regulatory linkage, and their exploratory behavior. These properties make regulatory change efficacious and phenotypic variation copious and varied.” John Gerhart and Marc Kirschner, “The theory of facilitated variation” (2007): <https://www.pnas.org/doi/10.1073/pnas.0701035104> .

<sup>3</sup> William Bradford Cannon, MD, *The Way of an Investigator: A Scientist’s Experiences in Medical Research* (1945) 66-6, 64: <https://archive.org/details/b29977708/page/n5/mode/2up> .

<sup>4</sup> April D. DeConick, *The Gnostic New Age: How a Countercultural Spirituality Revolutionized Religion From Antiquity to Today* (2016) 59. At 348-349 she also uses the term ‘reservoir.’ Cf. “the enormous pool of nonaptations [*sic*, technical term for “a character whose origin cannot be ascribed to the direct action of natural selection”] must be the wellspring and reservoir of most evolutionary flexibility. We need to recognize the central role of ‘cooptability for fitness’ as the primary evolutionary significance of ubiquitous nonaptation in organisms. In this sense, and at its level of the phenotype, this nonaptive pool is an analog of mutation—a source of raw material for further selection.” Stephen Jay Gould and Elisabeth S. Vrba, “Exaptation—a missing term in the science of form,” 8 *Paleobiology* 4, 12 (1982).

unique yet entirely contingent upon the matrix of the religious buffer. In this case, the whole is not the sum of its parts but something altogether new.” This something altogether new is “an emergent structure, an innovative concept that some ancient people began to use to describe a new way to be religious.”<sup>5</sup> A new ‘how.’

For example, under the rubric ‘The Gnostic Cure’ DeConick writes,

“With the emergence of Gnostic spirituality came a reorientation of religious ritual drama to the human spirit and its God nature. The central focus of Gnostic initiations became the purging, recovery, and integration of the fallen spirit. Because of this shift in focus, the initiations were novel in their therapeutic orientation, an orientation unknown in the initiation ceremonies of the other ancient mystery religions. This reorientation of mystery initiation likely emerged from a religious buffer that blended what Gnostics knew about Greek shamanism and temple healing practices with what they knew about mystery religion rites.”<sup>6</sup>

David Litwa explicitly attributes religious innovation to entrepreneurs, writing that “If the human brain naturally blends things, it’s no surprise that religious entrepreneurs mix religious ideas from different religious domains, along with different organizational structures, rites, and so on.”<sup>7</sup> That is, religious development (*Entwicklung*), like economic development, originates with entrepreneurs, just as Schumpeter said. The function of the entrepreneur, in Schumpeter’s view, is the carrying out of new combinations. As he writes,

“To produce [*produzieren*] means to combine materials and forces within our reach [*vorhandenen Dinge und Kräfte*]. To produce other things [*anderes*], or the same things by a different method, means to combine these materials and forces differently. In so far as the ‘new combination’ [*die neue Kombination*] may in time grow out of the old by continuous adjustment [*kontinuierlich anpassend*] in small steps, there is certainly change [*Veränderung*], possibly growth [*Wachstum*], but neither a new phenomenon nor development [*Entwicklung*] in our sense. In so far as this is not the case, and the new combinations appear discontinuously [*diskontinuierlich auftreten*], then the phenomenon characterising development emerges. . . . Development in our sense is then determined by the carrying out of new combinations [*Durchsetzung neuer Kombinationen*; sc. of materials and forces at hand; that is, of beings, *Seiende*].”<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> *The Gnostic New Age* 59, 11.

<sup>6</sup> *Id.* 173.

<sup>7</sup> M. David Litwa, PhD, *Understanding Gnosis* (2025) 66.

<sup>8</sup> Joseph A. Schumpeter, *The Theory of Economic Development: An Inquiry into Profits, Capital, Credit, Interest, and the Business Cycle* (2nd ed. 1926 tr. Redvers Opie 1934; repr. 1983) 65-66; <https://www.schumpeter.info/quellen/Theorie%201926.pdf#page=2> p. 100.

In Milsom's work on the history of common law the same theme appears as the proposition “the law is a free-enterprise business.”<sup>9</sup> That is to say,

“The life of the common law has been in the abuse of its elementary ideas. If the rules of property give what now seems an unjust answer [i.e., adverse to an interest, client’s or King’s], try obligation; and equity has proved that from the materials of obligation you can counterfeit the phenomena of property. If the rules of contract give what now seems an unjust answer, try tort. Your counterfeit will look odd to one brought up on categories of Roman origin; but it will work. If the rules of one tort, say deceit, give what now seems an unjust answer, try another, try negligence. And so the legal world goes round.”<sup>10</sup>

So again: a store or buffer or archive of elements (ideas, materials, rules) from which enterprising persons select and combine (counterfeit) to solve an urgent problem. And for the same reason—its novelty—Gnosis looks odd to those brought up on other categories, the “traditional forms of servant, covenant, and ecstatic spirituality.”<sup>11</sup>

In the course of introducing her text DeConick tells us “It is the transgressive power of the Gnostic to innovate and revolutionize religion that I expose in *The Gnostic New Age* and explore as a distinctive feature of Gnostic spirituality.”<sup>12</sup> As the texts from Cannon, Schumpeter, and Milsom suggest, we can read DeConick’s work as analyzing a particular instance of the general phenomenon:—the transcending power of *Existenz* to innovate and thereby revolutionize its way of life. In other words, DeConick presents yet more evidence that ontodelic generation of *das Neue* is our superpower, καινούργησις our specific ἀρετή:—that human being is the dreamwork of nature, its most deconstrained plasmatisit.<sup>13</sup> (That we are also thereby *das wahnwitzige Thier* is the correlative ἀμαρτία; our superpower its own kryptonite.) In Heidegger’s formulation, *Sein ist das transcendens schlechthin*.<sup>14</sup> Human being ex-sists as *Transzendenz überschwingend in Möglichkeiten*.<sup>15</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> S. F. C. Milsom, *A Natural History of the Common Law* (2003) 71.

<sup>10</sup> S. F. C. Milsom, *Historical Foundations of the Common Law* (2nd ed. 1981) 6.

<sup>11</sup> *The Gnostic New Age* 83. The specific mishuga here is the “revelatory message of Hermes Trismegistus.” “People outside the Hermetic circles called the Hermetics crazy and ridiculous.” *Ibid.*

<sup>12</sup> *Id.* 7.

<sup>13</sup> Irenaeus’s text suggests this term: Ὁρᾶς, ἀγαπητέ, τὴν μέθοδον, ἣ οἱ [heretics] χρώμενοι φρενατατοῦσιν ἑαυτοῦς, ἐπηρεάζοντες τὰς γραφὰς, τὸ πλάσμα αὐτῶν ἐξ αὐτῶν συνιστάνειν πειρώμενοι.

<https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=njp.32101074938950&seq=286>. Translated by Pagels in relevant part: “to demonstrate the method which they use to deceive themselves, abusing the scriptures, trying to support from them their own invention (*plasma*).” Elaine Pagels, *The Gnostic Paul: Gnostic Exegesis of the Pauline Letters* (1975) 4. ‘Abusing’ as in misappropriating—plundering, pirating, ‘hacking,’ robbing. *Die jeweilige faktische Entdecktheit ist gleichsam immer ein Raub*. Martin Heidegger, *Sein und Zeit* 222:

<https://www.beyng.com/pages/de/SeinUndZeit/SeinUndZeit.222.html>.

<sup>14</sup> *Sein und Zeit* 38: <https://www.beyng.com/pages/de/SeinUndZeit/SeinUndZeit.038.html>. MH’s emphasis.

<sup>15</sup> Martin Heidegger, *Vom Wesen des Grundes*, GA 9:175: <https://www.beyng.com/gaselis/?vol=9&pg=175>.

Litwa emphasizes the combinatory moment, the mixing and blending:

“People mix things. When toddlers fingerpaint, they mix the colors to test out combinations. Marketers mix and match email campaigns. Chemists combine chemicals.<sup>16</sup> To mix is human. Our very brains are natural blenders. Mental combination is the mother of creativity—and the key to human flourishing [*adaeque* withering] on this planet. The brain naturally blends different things, framing and reframing ideas without our conscious intention. Thousands of new ideas are the results of blending different concepts from different domains.”<sup>17</sup>

The disclosive moment is to **have** things for mixing; to have colors, emails, chemicals, ideas, concepts, *Dinge und Kräfte*, show up in reach, *vorhandenen*, ‘in the there,’ and in the buffer, the reservoir, *das Erbe*. As Heidegger puts it,

“the beings that surround us are *uniformly manifest* [*gleichmäßig offenbar*] as simply *something present at hand in the broadest sense* [*Vorhandene im weitesten Sinne*] . . . We board the tram, talk to other people, call the dog, look up at the stars, all in the same way [*in einem Stil*]*—humans, vehicles, human beings, animals, heavenly bodies, everything in the same uniformity of what is present at hand* [*alles in einer Gleichmäßigkeit des eben Vorhandenen*].”<sup>18</sup>

Present because of—to borrow Gerty MacDowell’s phrase—‘the wondrous revelation’:

“With the existence of human beings there occurs an irruption [*Einbruch*] into the totality of beings [*in das Ganze des Seienden*], so that now the being in itself first [*jetzt erst*] becomes manifest, i.e., as being [*das Seiende an ihm selbst, d.h. als Seiendes*]

---

<sup>16</sup> “Chemistry is the study of what? . . . *Change*. Chemistry is the study of change. . . . Electrons change their orbits, molecules change their bonds. Elements combine and change into compounds. That’s all of life, right? The constant . . . The cycle. Solution, dissolution, over and over and over. Growth, decay. Transformation.” Walter White’s foreshadowing address to a high school chemistry class in *Breaking Bad*, pilot episode (2008).

<sup>17</sup> *Understanding Gnosis* 65. I read ‘thousands of new ideas’ to imply there may be new ideas that are **not** the result of ‘blending’ in the broad sense. I’m with Shubin here: “Looking back through billions of years of change, everything innovative or apparently unique in the history of life is really just old stuff that has been recycled, recombined, repurposed, or otherwise modified for new uses. This is the story of every part of us, from our sense organs to our heads, indeed our entire body plan.” Neil Shubin, *Your Inner Fish: A Journey into the 3.5-Billion-Year History of the Human Body* (2008) 201. So I stand with the Antichrist: *dass etwas Vorhandenes, irgendwie Zu-Stande-Gekommenes immer wieder von einer ihm überlegenen Macht auf neue Ansichten ausgelegt, neu in Beschlag genommen, zu einem neuen Nutzen umgebildet und umgerichtet wird; dass alles Geschehen in der organischen Welt ein Überwältigen, Herrwerden und dass wiederum alles Überwältigen und Herrwerden ein Neu-Interpretieren, ein Zurechtmachen ist, bei dem der bisherige „Sinn“ und „Zweck“ nothwendig verdunkelt oder ganz ausgelöscht werden muss.* <http://www.nietzschesource.org/#eKGWB/GM-II-12> .

<sup>18</sup> *The Fundamental Concepts of Metaphysics: World, Finitude, Solitude* (tr. William McNeill and Nicholas Walker 1995) 275; GA 29/30: 399: <https://www.beyng.com/gaselis/?vol=29.30&pg=399> . MH’s emphasis.

*offenbar wird*], in varying degrees, according to various levels of clarity, in various degrees of certainty.”<sup>19</sup>

And these now-manifest *Seienden* are henceforth variously accessible for dicing and splicing to make *anderes, neuer Kombinationen*.<sup>20</sup> As Aristotle says, we make use (*χρώμεθα*) of *der Bestand* (πάντων ὑπαρχόντων) as if it’s there for our sake (ὡς ἡμῶν ἔνεκα).<sup>21</sup> Which use-making is ontologically obligate: “Dasein is in itself *excessive*, i.e., defined by a primary insatiability for beings.”<sup>22</sup> The recipe for world-building is therefore simple: “you need only add beings,” *man braucht nur Seiendes hinzubringen*.<sup>23</sup>

DeConick observes that “much of the Gnostic message has become mainstream spirituality”<sup>24</sup> and consequently shows up in artefacts of popular culture. To illuminate Gnostic spirituality for us DeConick draws on the buffer of motion pictures. She shows that a certain set of films are the dual of the Gnostic vision, or aspects of it. Thus her examples confirm the adage, ‘If you want a myth of deliverance, go see a Hollywood movie.’<sup>25</sup> E.g.,

“In the Gnostic world, there is only one way to deal with the monsters, the dark lords [bad archons] who rule us. A divine emissary or savior descends to earth from the great realm of power in order to guide and save humanity. The Christian versions of Gnostic stories feature the emissary Jesus, not just as the revelator of the truth but also as the power who takes on the monsters and defeats them in a cosmic struggle. . . . So, in

---

<sup>19</sup> Martin Heidegger, *Kant and the Problem of Metaphysics* (tr. Richard Taft, 5th ed., enlarged 1997) 160. GA 3:228: <https://www.beyng.com/pages/de/GA03/GA03.228.html> .

<sup>20</sup> And for *Neugründung*. “A science does not develop [*entwickelt*] because some scholar discovers something new in a specific situation. Rather, in each case the sudden jolt [*der Ruck*] by which any given science moves forward consists of a revision of basic concepts. From then on, a science develops by taking the heretofore available stock of propositions and concepts [*der bisher vorhandenen Satze und Begriffsbestände*] and putting them on a new foundation [*Umlegung auf neue Fundamente*].” Martin Heidegger, *Logic: The Question of Truth* (tr. Thomas Sheehan 2010) 4; GA 21:16-17: <https://www.beyng.com/gaselis/?vol=21.00&pg=16> .

<sup>21</sup> *Physics* 194a, last line.

<sup>22</sup> *The Metaphysical Foundations of Logic* (tr. Michael Heim 1984) 192. (MFL) *Das Dasein ist in sich überschüssig, d. h. durch eine primäre Ungenügsamkeit an allem Seienden bestimmt*. GA 26:248: <https://www.beyng.com/gaselis/?vol=26.00&pg=248> . MH’s emphasis.

<sup>23</sup> GA 29/30:285: <https://www.beyng.com/gaselis/?vol=29.30&pg=285> .

<sup>24</sup> *The Gnostic New Age* 75.

<sup>25</sup> Actually, the character in *Crimes and Misdemeanors* (dir. Woody Allen 1989) says, “If you want a happy ending, go see” etc. Cf. “Everybody loves a redemption story. And you know why? Because everybody’s done shit and they wanna be redeemed.” *The Morning Show*, Season 2, episode 8 (2021). *Tonner contre*: “And I have a responsibility, as I see it, not to put garbage in the world. I’m not going to do that. If you start trying to figure out what it is that people want, you are doing what AI does. The idea of AI precedes AI itself because that’s the Hollywood machine. It’s why they remake the same five movies every 10 years. It’s why they have a formula for what a movie is.”

Charlie Kaufman, as quoted here:

<https://www.theguardian.com/film/2025/sep/12/hollywood-has-everthing-to-do-with-the-terrible-state-of-the-world-charlie-kaufman-on-artificial-intelligence-eternal-sunshine-and-toothache> . It’s why Monotono-Theism has a formula for what salvation is, and *Zwei Jahrtausende beinahe und nicht ein einziger neuer Gott!* (*Der Antichrist*).

scene after scene, Superman takes on Zod and his militia, and one by one they are eliminated. . . . Superman saves the world.”<sup>26</sup>

Again:

“The dark city in Proyas’s film, where alien demons control a world of darkness in which humans are bound, and where an extraordinary human, John Murdoch, wields alien powers to conquer the demons, is not unlike the dark cosmos portrayed in the Gospel of John. In the fourth Gospel, the world is depicted as a realm of falsehood and darkness . . . . Jesus and the demons duke it out throughout the Gospel, as Jesus wields his superhuman power, overcoming the darkness with his light and, in the end, casting out the demonic world ruler.”<sup>27</sup>

Okay, but these motifs descend from the dragon-slayer myth: ‘Indra smashes Vrtra with his vajra and frees up the waters of life’ sort of thing. Sadly, “It is a basic feature of the [Indo-European] hero that he is a killer.”<sup>28</sup> Happily, this is not a basic feature of the gnostic, whose distinctive feature is transcendence. In gnostic myth the serpent is not the blocker (Vrtra means ‘Obstructor’<sup>29</sup>) but the helper.

In *The Truman Show* the serpent-helper takes erotic form in the actress Sylvia (Natascha McElhone) playing the role of ‘Lauren,’ who catalyzes Truman’s quest to know. When Truman’s search uncovers the truth of his life, that it’s a TV show, he does not smash and kill—instead he travels to the edge of the sound-stage and simply steps outside. He transcends the deception that was his former life. DeConick comments, “How did the Gnostics think we go about finding the holy wholly Other and escaping chaos? In the same way that Truman Burbank figures he can. You have to journey out of the world.”<sup>30</sup>

DeConick’s 380 pages of text contain 102 tokens of *transcend-*, a keyword of her exposition. (A second keyword, *transgress-*, appears in 84 tokens.) Likewise Litwa, after recounting the standard meaning of ‘gnosis’ as “a special kind of knowledge or insight that brings salvation,” emphasizes that transcendence is the condition of the possibility of gnosis: “Without experience of the transcendent at least on some level, there is no gnosis.”<sup>31</sup> Jeffrey Kripal explains that “The gnostic authors consistently saw something essentially divine and immortal deep within human nature, a hidden spark or lost pearl, that could manifest its true nature and

---

<sup>26</sup> *The Gnostic New Age* 104-105; re *Man of Steel* (dir. Christopher Nolan 2013).

<sup>27</sup> *Id.* 137; describing *Dark City* (dir. John Proyas 1998).

<sup>28</sup> M. L. West, *Indo-European Poetry and Myth* (2007) 454.

<sup>29</sup> Calvert Watkins, *How to Kill a Dragon: Aspects of Indo-European Poetics* (1995) 298.

<sup>30</sup> *The Gnostic New Age* 67; alluding to *The Truman Show* (dir. Peter Weir 1998).

<sup>31</sup> *Understanding Gnosis* 129.

glory only through a return back into the primordial Pleroma, the Fullness of the Godhead that constituted for so many of these systems the ultimate origin and goal of all creation.”<sup>32</sup>

The gnostic version is another instance of **ontic** transcendence. As Heidegger describes that structure, “the quite common sense [*vulgär verstanden*] of a being (Dasein) rising over to [*steigt hinüber zu*] another being [*Seienden*] (Dasein or something on hand [*Vorhandenes*]), crossing over in such a way that, in transcending, that to which Dasein transcends is disclosed for it [*für es enthüllt ist*] in a rather broad sense.”<sup>33</sup> And that’s also the structure of epistemological transcendence, as Heidegger sets it out:

“Hence the subject is thought of as a sort of box with an interior, with the walls of a box, and with an exterior. . . . and what belongs to the very conception of the transcendent is that a barrier between inner and outer must be crossed. . . . Transcendence, then, is taken to be the relationship that somehow or other maintains a passageway between the interior and exterior of the box by leaping over or passing through the wall of the box. So the problem arises of how to explain the possibility of such a passage.”<sup>34</sup>

Heidegger distinguishes this epistemological conception of transcendence from the theological one ‘in the widest sense’. For transcendence can be considered as

“the opposite of contingency. The contingent is what touches us, what pertains to us, that with which we are on the same footing, that which belongs to our kind and sort. The transcendent, on the contrary, is what is beyond all this as that which conditions it, as the unconditioned, but at the same time as the really unattainable, what exceeds us [*das Überschwängliche*]. Transcendence is stepping-over in the sense of lying beyond conditioned beings. . . . Being-beyond, in this case, expresses at the same time a difference in degree of being, or better, the infinite difference of the created from the creator . . . . Insofar as the transcendent, in this second concept, always means the unconditioned, the Absolute in some form or other, and the latter means predominantly the divine, we can speak here of a theological conception of transcendence.”<sup>35</sup>

Heidegger remarks that both these conceptions of transcendence, the epistemological and the theological, “can be conjoined—something that has always happened and always recurs.”<sup>36</sup> Exhibit A for this proposition is Gnosis. Gnostics not only believe in the transcendent holy

---

<sup>32</sup> Jeffrey J. Kripal, *The Serpent’s Gift: Gnostic Reflections on the Study of Religion* (2007) 60.

<sup>33</sup> MFL 135; GA 26:169: <https://www.beyng.com/gaselis/?vol=26.00&pg=169> .

<sup>34</sup> *Id.* 160-161; GA 26:205: <https://www.beyng.com/gaselis/?vol=26.00&pg=205> . Coincidentally with the *Being and Time* years, 1926-1929, there appeared the transcendish notion of quantum tunneling: [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Quantum\\_tunneling](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Quantum_tunneling) . Priest describes a kind of ‘logical tunneling’—out of the Inclosure schema via the mechanism of diagonalization—whereby the paradoxes are transcended. Graham Priest, *Beyond the Limits of Thought* (2nd ed. 2002).

<sup>35</sup> MFL 161-162; GA 26:206-207: <https://www.beyng.com/gaselis/?vol=26.00&pg=206> .

<sup>36</sup> *Id.* 162; GA 26:207.

wholly Other, the Pleroma, the divine Absolute, etc., they also believe the divine spark trapped in the human body must transcend its corporal prison-cell and cross yet further cosmic barriers in order to reunite with the aforementioned divinity. In DeConick's words,

“Conventional religions, they thought, mask the true God of worship, a transcendent God who is the ultimate reality and the primal source of all existence. This God of goodness and love transcends all gods and all religions. . . . According to the Gnostics, the essential human self, our authentic being, is nothing less than God's very own life essence, his own spirit captured deep within the human soul, where it lies dormant, unexpressed, and forgotten. It lies there pained, waiting to be awakened, cultivated, and reunited with the divine source of all. For the Gnostics, religion is not about obeying the conventional gods but about transcending them in order to find spiritual union with the ultimate God, the supreme source of all existence.”<sup>37</sup>

Yet even *Hokuspokus*—the mythical means of divuncular transit into or out of a body<sup>38</sup>—is only conceivable because of what Heidegger calls ‘primal transcendence,’ ‘neutral Dasein,’ “the primordial positivity and potency of the essence.”<sup>39</sup> “Neutral Dasein is never what exists; Dasein exists in each case only in its factual concretion.” E.g., neutral Dasein “is neither of the two sexes.” Rather, it's more of an ontological stem cell: “neutral Dasein is indeed the primal source of intrinsic possibility that springs up in every existence and makes it intrinsically possible. . . . As such, Dasein harbors the intrinsic possibility for being factually dispersed into [*birgt die innere Möglichkeit für die faktische Zerstreung in*] bodiliness and thus into sexuality.” “The metaphysical neutrality of the human being, inmost isolated as Dasein . . . is the authentic concreteness of the origin, the not-yet of factual dispersion [*das Noch-nicht der faktischen Zerstretheit*].”<sup>40</sup>

---

<sup>37</sup> *The Gnostic New Age* 4.

<sup>38</sup> “And one resists this primary determination of the subject as spatial because of an old dogma that still dominates philosophy—the doctrine (whether we admit it or not) of the immortality and the so-called ‘spirituality’ of human being. Some say that in their real, true being, humans cannot be in space; otherwise they would not be immortal. That is, they prejudge the case from the beginning by claiming that human beings are or must be immortal. In other words, they ground a specific thesis about the ontological structure of human being on what they believe. . . . But making a clean start at questioning clearly means tracking down all such dogmas that underlie these determinations of person, spirit, and the like—and getting rid of them. And so we see that underlying an apparently bland and uncontroversial problem like the being of space are theses like the immortality and spirituality of human being; and that these theses implicitly or explicitly prevent us from seeing things the way they are. We begin with an ego that is not spatial and then use some kind of hocus-pocus to work our way into space.” *Logic: The Question of Truth* 241-242. GA 21:292: <https://www.beyng.com/gaselis/?vol=21.00&pg=292> .

<sup>39</sup> *MFL* 137; GA 26:172: <https://www.beyng.com/gaselis/?vol=26.00&pg=172> .

<sup>40</sup> *Id.* 136, 137; GA 26:172,173: <https://www.beyng.com/gaselis/?vol=26.00&pg=173> . Embryonic stem cells “have the potential to differentiate into multiple different cell types found in the body.” In 2006 Shinya Yamanaka discovered “that it was possible to obtain pluripotent stem cells from adult, differentiated cells . . . to ‘de-differentiate’ specialized cells into stem cells; to turn back the clock of development.” The cells obtained in this way are called ‘induced pluripotent stem cells.’ Michel Brahic, *The Power of Prions: The Strange and Essential Proteins That Can Cause Alzheimer's, Parkinson's, and Other Diseases* (2024) 80-81. Heidegger's pedagogy aims at *de-faktischizing* so as to induce insight into neutral Dasein's pluripotency, its *Seinkönnen*.

Heidegger denies this is Pleromatoid gnosticism: “We are not dealing with the notion of a large primal being in its simplicity becoming ontically split into many individuals.”<sup>41</sup> We are dealing instead with primal transcendence:

“what Dasein surpasses in its transcendence is not a gap or barrier ‘between’ itself and objects. But beings, among which Dasein also factually is, get surpassed [*überschritten*] by Dasein. Objects are surpassed in advance; more exactly, beings are surpassed and can subsequently become objects. Dasein is thrown, factual, thoroughly amidst nature through its bodiliness, and transcendence lies in the fact that these beings, among which Dasein is and to which Dasein belongs, are surpassed by Dasein. In other words, as transcending, Dasein is beyond nature [*über die Natur*], although, as factual, it remains environed [*umschlungen*] by nature. As transcending, i.e., as free, Dasein is something alien [*etwas Fremdes*] to nature.”<sup>42</sup>

*Das Evangelium vom fremden Freiheit* kind of thing:—the message that in their real, true being—neutral Dasein, the ontunculus—humans cannot be in nature; otherwise they would not be transcending, free. So the problem arises of how to explain the possibility of such a freedom.

Well, evolution has proved that from the materials of nature it can counterfeit the phenomenon of *überNatur*, of metaphysical freedom. (*Auch ein Kunststück des Lebens.*) What materials?

In a perspective article titled “Evolvability,” Kirschner and Gerhart contend that “The [physiological] properties of versatile protein elements, weak linkage, compartmentation, redundancy, and exploratory behavior . . . confer evolvability on the organism by reducing constraints on change and allowing the accumulation of nonlethal variation.” These core features have been conserved over evolutionary time because “they deconstrain phenotypic variation in other processes, and hence facilitate evolutionary change.” Exploratory systems include angiogenesis, nerve outgrowth, neural crest cells, microtubulin-based morphogenesis, “and even behaviors such as ant foraging.”<sup>43</sup>

Twenty-five years after “Evolvability” Wong *et al.* conjecture a “hitherto-unarticulated law” “to characterize familiar macroscopic phenomena of our complex, evolving universe;” a law to account for “the evolution of varied systems, including stars, minerals, atmospheres, and life.” They point out that these systems “appear to be conceptually equivalent in that they display

---

<sup>41</sup> MFL 137-138; GA 26:173: <https://www.beyng.com/gaselis/?vol=26.00&pg=173> .

<sup>42</sup> *Id.* 166; GA 26:212: <https://www.beyng.com/gaselis/?vol=26.00&pg=212> .

<sup>43</sup> Marc Kirschner and John Gerhart, “Evolvability,” 95 *PNAS* 8420, 8426 (1998): <https://www.pnas.org/doi/10.1073/pnas.95.15.8420> .

three notable attributes: 1) They form from numerous components that have the potential to adopt combinatorily vast numbers of different configurations; 2) processes exist that generate numerous different configurations [of those components]; and 3) configurations are preferentially selected based on function.”<sup>44</sup>

Long ages of descent with modification have selected a process pre-eminently *überschwingend in Möglichkeiten* which thereby generates vast numbers of different configurations of combinatorily protean elements, *Dinge und Kräfte*. The core process of exploratory behavior is conserved in the form of self-interpretation and self-articulation; foraging for meaning, for *das Neue*.<sup>45</sup> ‘Exploratory’ in that beings—versatile elements and components—are disclosed to us as such, and we have an open-ended capacity and drive to recombine them to make others.

What’s the point of a pan-metabolizer? Only with a certain reservation can I assent to Michael Russell’s thesis that the purpose of life is to hydrogenate carbon dioxide.<sup>46</sup> The claim is Earth-chauvinistic. If life exists elsewhere, why would it necessarily be carbon-based? It would, however, just as does our planet’s form of life, “serve to augment the rate of entropy production over what it would be in the absence of biota.”<sup>47</sup> Rather than ‘anthropology’ or ‘biology’ we should speak of ‘entropology.’<sup>48</sup> In Bradley Layton’s word, living things entropicize their environments, and none more effectively than human beings. He explains that “One hundred percent of our 500+ exajoule-per-year technological diet becomes thermal.” (exa =  $10^{18}$ ) Using this figure Layton puts the contemporary rate of entropy generation by humanity into its cosmic context:

“The average temperature of the atmosphere, where our technologies convert chemical, and nuclear energy into thermal energy takes place, is 15°C (288 K). Thus the entropy generation rate of the technosphere is  $\dot{S}_{\text{earth}} = 5.53 \cdot 10^{10} \text{ W K}^{-1}$ . Normalizing both the universal and the terrestrial rates of entropy generation by their respective volumes results in  $\dot{S}_{\text{universe}, V} = 2.14 \cdot 10^{-32} \text{ W K}^{-1} \text{ m}^{-3}$  and  $\dot{S}_{\text{earth}, V} = 4.33 \cdot 10^{-9} \text{ W K}^{-1} \text{ m}^{-3}$ . In other

---

<sup>44</sup> Michael L. Wong, Carol E. Cleland, *et al.*, “On the roles of function and selection in evolving systems,” 120 *PNAS* No. 43 (2023): <https://www.pnas.org/doi/10.1073/pnas.2310223120>.

<sup>45</sup> *das Dasein selbst ist sichauslegendes, sichaussprechendes Seiendes*. GA 20:418: <https://www.beyng.com/gaselis/?vol=20&pg=418>.

<sup>46</sup> “That’s easy,” he replied with a nod. “The purpose of life is to hydrogenate carbon dioxide.” Sean Carroll, *The Big Picture: On the Origins of Life, Meaning, and the Universe Itself* (2016) 260. This Michael Russell: [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Michael\\_Russell\\_\(scientist\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Michael_Russell_(scientist)).

<sup>47</sup> R. E. Ulanowicz and B. M. Hannon, “Life and the production of entropy,” 232 *Proc. R. Soc. B, Bio. Sci.* 181 (1987): <https://royalsocietypublishing.org/doi/10.1098/rspb.1987.0067>.

<sup>48</sup> *Plutôt qu’ anthropologie, il faudrait écrire «entropologie» le nom d’une discipline vouée à étudier dans ses manifestations les plus hautes ce processus de désintégration*. Claude Lévi-Strauss, *Tristes Tropiques* (1955) 496.

words, on a volumetric basis, humans entropicize their environment at a rate  $1.80 \cdot 10^{23}$  times greater than the ‘background’ entropy generation rate of the universe.”<sup>49</sup>

As an example of our contemporary power to entropicize, Layton estimates that we are consuming the earth’s chemical energy stores, fossil fuels, at a rate ten million times greater than their rate of deposition.<sup>50</sup>

Layton’s estimates put a metric to Heidegger’s trope that technology “rages about in the ‘world’ today like an unshackled [*entfesselte*] beast.”<sup>51</sup> *Aber die jeweilige faktische Entdecktheit ist gleichsam immer eine Entfesselung*, so to speak. And insofar as *Entfesselung*, deconstraint, serves to increase the local rate of entropy production it is, in that sense, the point. To rejigger another Heideggerism,<sup>52</sup> *der Stoffwechsel die Transzendenz des Daseins ausmacht*. Our transcendence is metabolism. We change—in the widest sense—beings into other beings, ever faster burning the world to build our *Welt*. *Bis die wahnwitzigen Tiere mussten sterben*.<sup>53</sup>

DCW 10/06/2025

---

<sup>49</sup> Layton cautions that “To the author’s knowledge, this is the first published estimate of this value [the universe’s rate of entropy production] and thus should be treated as a ballpark estimate.” He derives the estimate using rate of entropy generation in the form  $J s^{-1} K^{-1}$ . One joule per second,  $J s^{-1}$ , equals one watt, W. So to find the entropy generation rate of the sun “we simply divide the sun’s radiant power of 383 YW [yotta =  $10^{24}$ ] by its temperature (5600 K) and arrive at  $\dot{S}_{\text{sun}} = 6.84 \cdot 10^{22} W K^{-1}$ .” Next, “Assuming that to a first approximation, the sun is an average star, multiplying its power by the total number of stars ( $6 \cdot 10^{22}$ ), then dividing the result by the average temperature of the universe, 2.73 K, results in an approximate value for the entropy generation rate of the universe of  $\dot{S}_{\text{universe}} = 8.4 \cdot 10^{48} W K^{-1}$ .” B. E. Layton, “Anthropogenic entropy acceleration and its relation to Shannon information in the context of socioeconomics,” 186 *WIT Transactions on Ecology and The Environment* 313, 314-315 (2014): <https://par.nsf.gov/servlets/purl/10039440> .

<sup>50</sup> *Id.* 314.

<sup>51</sup> MFL 215; GA 26:279: <https://www.beyng.com/gaselis/?vol=26.00&pg=279> . Can’t help recalling ‘the creature from the Id’ of *Forbidden Planet* (dir. Fred M. Wilcox 1956), the story of a planetary civilization’s self-destruction by its newest technology.

<sup>52</sup> *die Transzendenz die Grundverfassung das Daseins ausmacht*.  
<https://www.beyng.com/gaselis/?vol=26.00&pg=213> .

<sup>53</sup> <http://www.nietzschesource.org/#eKGWB/WL> .