

**— TREASON: NECESSITY {OBEDIENT: BREACHES OF PROBITY / DECORUM}, NORMATIVITY {AIDING: JUDICIAL DISCRETION ON PENALTY} AND APRIORITY {ASSISTING: SECTION VIII COMPLIANCE ON DEATH PENALTY PROSCRIPTIONS}**

(c) 2018 Dolf Leendert Boek, Revision: 30 August, 2018

That SOVEREIGNTY can also be viewed as being a metaphysical philosophical derivation of moral or morality which is notionally a DECOROUS DEMUR (E) where the PRINCIPLE CHARACTERISTIC has an ONTOLOGICAL REALITY which arbitrarily may have embodiment and is therefore a normative presence of \*ONTIC\* necessity as then the factuality of being so without being so.

It is not a personality but similarly has an opulent quality of a tempered integrity from which all imperfection is dispelled: How else can the monarchical French President occupy the Palace of Versailles?

**YOUTUBE:** "Let Them Eat Cake - The Pox"

<<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0LCzi5kaAmE>>

Emmanuel Macron, increasingly compared with Louis XIV, on 10 July 2017 addressed both houses of parliament in a rare session at the Sun King's palace in Versailles. Where France's popular new centrist president charted his government's course and set priorities at the joint session of Congress — consisting of the National Assembly and the Senate.

'It is important that he [Macron] sets a direction,' said the spokesman.

The French media often refer to Mr Macron as 'Jupiter', the king {#34} of the Roman deities and one of the names used by Louis XIV, who moved the seat of power to Versailles in 1682.

Morale which is imbued from this transcendent principle, also known as esprit de corps, is the capacity of a group's members to maintain belief within the dictums of **NECESSITY {LIBERTÉ}, NORMATIVITY {ÉGALITÉ} AND APRIORITY {FRATERNITÉ} AS A CONTINGENT {OU LA MORT} REALITY RATHER THAN A CONTINGENCY OF EXPEDIENCY.**

The implied meaning is that there is no terrestrial king of all humanity, you as a person have the ontological egalitarian entitlement to your own body, life and destiny which is known as the rights of man that is often quantified by a CATEGORICAL IMPERATIVE which is enamoured as an

institution or goal, particularly in the face of opposition or hardship. Morale is often referenced by authority figures as a generic value judgment of the willpower, obedience, and self-discipline of a group tasked with performing duties assigned by a superior.

To those ends, we are building a capacity so as to propose the prudent argument whereby criminal acts accompanying public slander as BOER / ANZAC defamation may be viewed within the quantitative context of a hedonism as pestilent and indolent lifestyle having a self bestowed prerogative entitlement as an immutability of being which is ostensibly obstinate ignorance facilitated by a delusional mind characteristic of psychosis.

In terms of fiscal consequences, we see a greater benefit in the circumstance that the resolution to this dilemma is not a bestowal of a lengthy prison term as decadent outcome that is consequential to protracted and torturous justice facilitated by an economy of the State as sponsored legal aid which is accorded to persons whom have categorically no intention in having any accountability for the \*ONTIC\* necessity as the factuality of their actions being so.

Accordingly we are going to make an exemplar of those persons as a cautionary action made against the predilection of others whom similarly mistakenly believe in such viability of obstinate will as an alternative ontological experience which is entirely absent or feigns any **\*DUTY\*** or concern for civil regard as respect for the law.

By way of a non prejudiced example is the situational context as haughty Islamic practice in refusing to stand before judicial officials and judges exercising their powers and authority under the auspices of DIEU ET MON DROIT as which according to my sensibilities is more adequately addressed by a non contradictory and resolute penalty, an ex-judiciary authority provisioned in the motherhood watch-care of ontological principles which is prudently exercised by the office of GOVERNOR GENERAL.

Categorically such obstinate and adamant will as misnomered pretext to piety ought not exist within the Federation as Commonwealth of Australia.

And under the auspices as gravitas of any indictment for TREASON then proscribe as necessity a normative descriptive penalty as equivalent to eradication of vermin by means of the apriority power and authority accorded by prerogative of LETTERS PATENT, and furthermore that any substantial costs of exorbitant corrective services such as imprisonment

which has no viability within the circumstance of a more direct penalty, is then properly apportioned towards invigorating programs which addresses indigenous disadvantage, their societal declension and disenfranchised autonomy.

## 2.4 THE CENTRAL ARGUMENT IN THE PREFACE

In the central passage of the Preface on the indispensability of a pure moral philosophy, Kant does not simply presuppose that from the "**\*ABSOLUTE\* \*NECESSITY\***" (GMS, 389,13) of moral laws the apriority of moral philosophy follows. Rather he delivers a detailed, even if difficult, line of argumentation. First of all, he announces his aim of argumentation and designates his point of departure: "**THAT IT IS OF THE UTMOST NECESSITY TO WORK OUT ONCE A PURE MORAL PHILOSOPHY**" or "**THAT THERE MUST BE SUCH IS SELF--EVIDENT FROM THE COMMON IDEA OF DUTY AND OF THE MORAL LAWS**" (GMS, 389,7-11). The aim of his argumentation, therefore, is the proof of the apriority of moral philosophy:

— **ESPRIT DE CORPS: 'FLANDERS SOIL' AS EXEMPLAR TRUE #CENTRE OF WILL {INTELLECTUS AS GENITIVE VOLUNTĀTIS}** —

"IN DEAD OF NIGHT. {#1 - MENTALISM}  
I HEAR THE CLARION. {#2 - CORRESPONDENCE}  
CALL AWAKE FOR WAR. {#3 - VIBRATION}  
STEADFAST MIGHT. {#4 - POLARITY}  
MARCHING TO SION. {#5 - RHYTHM}  
AGAINST THIS WHORE. {#6 - CAUSE AND EFFECT}  
ARREST THE BLIGHT." {#7 - ENGENDERING / ENUMERATE}

**#1 - MENTALISM {#260 - Raven (Corax): Mercury}: 1 x #41 = #41 as #INNER {FEMALE (EGO)} / {#1 - Will, free will, choice / VIRTUE: 64 meta descriptor prototypes: Omne Datum Optimum {#1 - Every perfect gift} (1139 CE) / Remember the Sabbath Day} / #13 / #1 - Nature Contains Nature {MOTHER (INTELLECTUS AS GENITIVE VOLUNTĀTIS) - The tongue of decree deciding between them} [#15 / #6 - Form of Nature]**

**#2 - CORRESPONDENCE {#175 - Bridegroom (Nymphus): Venus}: 2 x #41 = #82 as #INNER {FEMALE (EGO)} / {#2 - desire, inclination: Milites Templi {#2 - Soldiers of the Temple} (1144 CE) / TOOLS: marriage / Honour Parents} / #14 / #2 - Nature Rejoices in its Nature [#34 / #7 - Engendering Nature]**

**#3 - VIBRATION {#65 - \*SOLDIER\* (Miles): Mars}: 3 x #41 = #123 as #INNER {FEMALE (EGO)} / {#3 - disposition towards (something or someone): Militia Dei {#3 - Soldiers of God} (1145 CE) /**

**POSITION: Soldier / Do Not Kill} / #15 / #3 - Nature Surmounts Nature [#65 / #2 - Nature Rejoices in its Nature]**

**3 x #41 = #123 as #6, #2, #50, #10, #5, #50 or #773 as #6, #2, #50, #10, #5, #700 = ben (H1121): {#75 as #123 % #41 = #41}**  
**1)** son, grandson, child, member of a group; **1a)** son, male child; **1b)** grandson; **1c)** children (pl. - male and female); **1d)** youth, young men (pl.); **1e)** young (of animals); **1f)** sons (as characterisation, ie sons of injustice [for un- righteous men] or sons of God [for angels]; **1g)** people (of a nation) (pl.); **1h)** of lifeless things, ie sparks, stars, arrows (fig.); **1i)** **\*A\* \*MEMBER\* \*OF\* \*A\* \*GUILD\*, \*ORDER\*, \*CLASS\*;**

**#4 - POLARITY {#34 - \*LION\* (Leo): Jupiter}: 4 x #41 = #164 as #INNER {FEMALE (EGO)} {#4 - favour, affection: Pastoralis Praeeminentiae {#4 - Pastoral Pre-eminence to monarchs} (1307 CE) / **TIME: #CENTRE and #INR / Do Not Commit Adultery (ie. Avoid Heteronomy Against Autonomy)}**, [John 5:39-47 (KJV)] / **#16 / #4 - Nature Amended in its Nature [#111 / #3 - Nature Surmounts Nature]****

**#5 - RHYTHM {#369 - Persian (Perses): Lunar}: 5 x #41 = #205 as #INNER {FEMALE (EGO)} / {#5 - last will, testament: Faciens misericordiam {#5 - Granting forgiveness} (1308 CE) / **CANON: RHYTHM & HARMONY / Do Not Steal}** / **#17 / #5 - Act of Nature {DOUBLE: #5 - Act of Nature {#8 - Transforming Nature}}** [#175 / #4 - Nature Amended in its Nature]**

**#6 - CAUSE AND EFFECT {#111 - Runner of the Sun (Heliodromus): Sol Invictus}: 6 x #41 = #246 as #INNER {FEMALE (EGO)} \*ANGEL\* GABRIEL [Luke 1:19-38] / {#6 - goal, object, purpose, intention: Ad providam {#6 - To Foresee / For Providence} (1312 CE) / **IMPLEMENTATION: HETEROS (binomial / bifurcated) THEORY OF NUMBER / Do Not Bear False Witness}** / **#18 / #6 - Form of Nature [#260 / #8 - Transforming Nature]****

**#7 - ENGENDERING / ENUMERATE {#15 - Father (Pater): Saturn}: 7 x #41 = #287 as #INNER {FEMALE (EGO)} / {#7 - signification, import: Vox in excelso {#7 - The voice on high} (1312 CE) / **LIMIT: #INR AS TERNIO ANAGRAM / Do Not Covet}** / **#19 / #7 - Engendering Nature [#369 / #9 - Autonomous Nature]****

**G316@{**

**@1:** Sup: 1 (**#1**); Ego: 1 (**#1**),

**@2:** Sup: 51 (**#52**); Ego: 50 (**#51**),

**@3:** Sup: 52 (**#104 - I COMMIT NO FRAUD {%7}**); Ego: 1 (**#52**),

**@4:** Sup: 55 (**#159**); Ego: 3 (**#55**),

**@5:** Sup: 75 (**#234**); Ego: 20 (**#75**),

@6: Sup: 76 (#310); Ego: 1 (#76),  
 @7: Sup: 5 (#315); Ego: 10 (#86 - **I AM NOT A ROBBER OF FOOD**  
 {%10}),  
 @8: Sup: 6 (#321); Ego: 1 (#87),  
 @9: Sup: 44 (#365); Ego: 38 (#125),  
**Male: #365; Feme: #125**  
 } // #287

**T'AI HSÜAN CHING {POLAR OPPOSITIONS / INTERPLAY OF OPPOSITES} [4 BCE]:**

**UMBRA: #356 % #41 = #28** - Opposites and Primitivism, Returning to Simplicity; I-Ching: **H24** - Return, The turning point; Tetra: **2** - Full Circle;

**THOTH MEASURE: #28** - Oh thou, hot of foot, who makest thy appearance at even; **\*I\* \*INDULGE\* \*NOT\* \*IN\* \*ANGER\***.

**#VIRTUE:** With Change (no. #28), alterations but sharing smiles.  
**#TOOLS:** With Dimming (no. #68), over a long time, increasing troubles.  
**#POSITION:** With Vastness (no. #50), the infinitely great, but  
**#TIME:** With Barrier (no. #4), the buried and blocked.  
**#CANON: #150**

**ONTIC\_OBLIGANS\_150@{**  
 @1: Sup: 28 (#28); Ego: 28 (#28),  
 @2: Sup: 15 (#43); Ego: 68 (#96),  
 @3: Sup: 65 (#108); Ego: 50 (#146 - **I AM NOT A LAND-GRABBER**  
 {%15}),  
 @4: Sup: 69 (#177 - **I AM NOT GIVEN TO CURSING** {%29}); Ego:  
 4 (#150 - **I INDULGE NOT IN ANGER** {%28}),  
**Male: #177; Feme: #150**  
**} // #150**

**7 x #41 = #287 as [#1, #50, #1, #3, #20, #1, #10, #1, #200] =**  
**anagkaios (G316): {#9 as #356 % #41 = #28} 1)** necessary; **1a)**  
 what one can not do without, indispensable; **1b)** connected by bonds of  
 nature or friendship; **1c) \*WHAT\* \*OUGHT\* \*ACCORDING\* \*TO\***  
**\*THE\* \*LAW\* \*OF\* \*DUTY\* \*BE\* \*DONE\*, \*WHAT\* \*IS\***  
**\*REQUIRED\* \*BY\* \*THE\* \*CIRCUMSTANCES\*;** [LATIN definition:  
**VOLUNTĀTIS]**

#1 - unwillingness

#2 - ill will, negative disposition (toward something) [LATIN definition:  
**NOLUNTĀTIS]**

**\*VOLUNTY\*** (noun):

[ETYMOLOGY]: coined by Robert Fludd (17 January 1574 – 8 September 1637) from Latin voluntās f (genitive voluntātis).

- (obsolete) The positive aspect of God, encompassing light, love, creation, etc.
- \*YANG\*: From early romanizations of Chinese 陽/阳 (yáng), originally in reference to the sunny side of areas { \*IT\* \*IS\* \*NOT\* \*GEMATRIA\* } such as mountains and dwellings.
- (philosophy) A principle in Chinese and related East Asian philosophies associated with bright, hot, masculine, etc. elements of the natural world.

**\*NOLUNTY\*** (noun):

[ETYMOLOGY]: coined by Robert Fludd (17 January 1574 – 8 September 1637) from Latin nōluntās f (genitive nōluntātis).

- (obsolete) The negative aspect of God, encompassing darkness, cold, destruction, etc.
- \*YIN\*: From early romanizations of Chinese 陰/阴 (yīn), originally used in reference to shaded areas { \*IT\* \*IS\* \*NOT\* \*UMBRA\* \*AS\* \*GEMATRIA\* \*MORPHOLOGICAL\* \*SUBSTITUTION\* }, as of a mountain or home.
- (philosophy) A principle in Chinese and related East Asian philosophies associated with dark, cool, female, etc. elements of the natural world.
- Robert Fludd was born at Milgate House, Bearsted and was the son of Sir Thomas Fludd, a high-ranking governmental official (Queen Elizabeth I's treasurer for war in Europe), and Member of Parliament.

} And his point of departure for the argumentation lies in the analysis of our concept of **\*DUTY\*** or of our "idea" of moral laws. How can the individual steps {ie. **#41** - Remember the Sabbath ... **#82** - Honour your parents ... **#123** - Do not kill ... **#164** - Avoid heteronomy against autonomy ... **#205** - Do not steal ... **#246** - Bear no false witness ... **#287** - Covet Not ... **#328** - Transformative Prototype ... **#369** - Reverse Transcriptase Inhibitor with **#164** - Chronological Plane Mapping} of this very dense argumentation be distinguished from each other and ordered?

According to Kant, the starting point, a reflection on our moral concepts {**#41 x n**}, leads immediately to the first intermediate thesis, that **(1)** a moral law "HAS TO CARRY ABSOLUTE [**#41** - \*ONTIC\*] NECESSITY WITH IT" (GMS, 389,13). If this necessity is very narrowly interpreted, that is, in the sense of the previously worked out modal status {

**@1 - Nature Contains Nature [**#328** - Transformative Prototype] ...**  
**@5 - Act of Nature [**#369** - Reverse Transcriptase Inhibitor with **#164** - Chronological Plane Mapping] ...**

#15 (@6 - **Form of Nature: #260 - Transforming Nature [#41 - Remember the Sabbath]**) ...  
 #34 (@7 - **Engendering Nature: #175 - Nature Amended in its Nature [#82 - Honour your parents]**) ...  
 #65 (@2 - **Nature Rejoices in its Nature: #65 - Nature Rejoices in its Nature [#123 - Do not kill]**) ...  
 #111 (@3 - **Nature Surmounts Nature: #34 - Engendering Nature [#164 - Avoid heteronomy against autonomy]**) ...  
 #175 (@4 - **Nature Amended in its Nature: #369 - Autonomous Nature [#205 - Do not steal]**) ...  
 #260 (@8 - **Transforming Nature: #111 - Nature Surmounts Nature [#246 - Bear no false witness]**) ...  
 #369 (@9 - **Autonomous Nature: #15 - Form of Nature [#287 - Covet Not]**)

} of an ethical principle, then two peculiarities of the total argumentation will become more understandable. First of all, it will become clear that in the passage of the text an argumentative progression takes place from the givenness of a modal quality to the proof of an epistemological quality distinguished from it. And secondly, an argument not implausible even from a contemporary viewpoint comes to light for the intermediate thesis **(1)**. For, as shown above, it is the task of an ethical principle to guide our valuations even in the case of counterfactual considerations. If this is correct, then an analysis of our concept of morality can help bring to light the modal status that is responsible for the capacity of meeting this task. The argumentative progression from the point of departure to thesis **(1)**, therefore, appears well-motivated. Through the analysis of our concept of morality we find that moral laws also apply to counterfactual situations, that they consequently exhibit the modal status of necessity.

Kant distinguishes at this point between moral laws and moral duties. From a moral law ("THE GROUND OF AN OBLIGATION": GMS, 389,12) arises a moral duty ("OBLIGATION") to which our actions have to conform. As an example of an obligation, Kant names "THE COMMAND '\*YOU\* \*OUGHT\* \*NOT\* \*TO\* \*LIE\*'" (GMS, 389,13 f.). It is interesting to observe that Kant ascribes the decisive "ABSOLUTE NECESSITY" not to the duty, but rather to the law {ie. **#111 - IMPLEMENTATION: HETEROS (binomial / bifurcated) THEORY OF NUMBER**} that is foundational to the duty. This, too, serves as an indication that the term necessity is to be understood as a modal expression {@1 - **Nature Contains Nature, @5 - Act of Nature, @6 - Form of Nature, @7 - Engendering Nature, @2 - Nature Rejoices in its Nature, @3 - Nature Surmounts Nature, @4 - Nature Amended in its Nature, @8 - Transforming Nature, @9 - Autonomous**

**Nature**} and not in the sense of "NORMATIVITY" or "PRESCRIPTIVITY." Otherwise Kant would speak of the necessity of an action instead of the necessity of the law foundational for obligation.

The point of departure, "ABSOLUTE NECESSITY," may be read therefore as a modal status {#41 ... #82 ... #123 ... #164 ... #205 ... #246 ... #287 ... #328 ... #369} of moral principles. How, then, are the other intermediate steps to be understood? The basis in the text is extremely narrow. One possibility of outlining the continued line of argumentation is as follows:

**YOUTUBE:** "The Weirding Way - Dune (1984)"

<[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=\\_Twmc6jUrNw](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_Twmc6jUrNw)>

In the next step, Kant seems to refer to a counterfactual thought experiment. Among the counterfactual situations to which duties are attributed are those in which not humans but other imaginable rational beings have the possibility of acting. In such a thought experiment, we imagine a world in which there are other beings capable of action. Since the moral laws accepted by us first of all contain the modal status of necessity — that is, they apply to all possible worlds — and secondly, involve a proposition about all actions, it is to be concluded that even those actions of these merely imagined rational beings fall under these laws. The second intermediate thesis, therefore, states that **(2)** the **\*DUTIES\*** arising from the moral laws are also relevant for the action of these merely imagined [as #41 x n = \*ONTIC\* NECESSITY as "NORMATIVITY" being measured / moderated categories or "PRESCRIPTIVITY" by meta-descriptor prototype and ethical value statement by which evaluative % (#41 x n) judgment can be made by] rational beings. In Kant's terms: "EVERYONE MUST ADMIT THAT [...] THE COMMAND **'\*YOU\* \*OUGHT\* \*NOT\* \*TO\* \*LIE\* [is normatively #41 x6 = #246 as NORMA OBLIGANS]'** IS VALID NOT MERELY FOR HUMAN BEINGS, AS THOUGH OTHER RATIONAL BEINGS DID NOT HAVE TO HEED IT" (GMS, 389,11-15).

— **LIONS GROWL OF BUTCHERS FOUL** —

[PUBLISHED @ 0457 HOURS ON 1 OCTOBER 2017]

"GRISTLE AND BUNT.

SNAGS 'N SIZZLE.

DRIZZLE ON SAUCE.

SABBATH DAY CANT. {#312 - **\*SEE\* \*EXPLANATION\* \*BELOW\***}

MUSTARD WEASEL.



VALOUR DIVORCE.  
DO TIGERS GRUNT?"

**YOUTUBE:** "Hebrew National Hotdog Commercial (1977)"

<<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=sOeJ4rmDTvg>>

**YOUTUBE:** "Hebrew National Hot Dog 1990s Commercial Ad on Beach"

<<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=OO2PYAnxQSo>>

**\*CANT\*** (noun):

- hypocritical and sanctimonious talk, typically of a moral, religious, or political nature: he had no time for the cant of the priests about sin.
- language specific to a particular group or profession and regarded with disparagement: thieves' cant.

**ETHICAL\_SPORTS\_SLEDGE@{**

**@1:** Sup: 30 (#30); Ego: 81 (#81),

**@2:** Sup: 12 (#42); Ego: 76 (#157 - I AM NOT ONE OF PRATING TONGUE {%17} / I HAVE NO STRONG DESIRE EXCEPT FOR MY OWN PROPERTY {%41}),

**@3:** Sup: 18 (#60); Ego: 27 (#184 - I PUT NO CHECK UPON THE WATER IN ITS FLOW {%36}),

**@4:** Sup: 39 (#99); Ego: 70 (#254),

**@5:** Sup: 34 (#133); Ego: 58 (#312 - RESISTANCE / TERRORISM as [#2, #100, #200, #10] = qeriy (H7147): {UMBRA: #9 as #310 % #41 = #23 - \*ONTIC\* VALUE {%158} FOR NOVICHOK POISONING} 1) OPPOSITION, CONTRARINESS, ENCOUNTER, CONTRARY OR HOSTILE ENCOUNTER),

**@6:** Sup: 25 (#158 - I AM NOT HOT OF SPEECH {%23}); Ego: 80 (#392),

**@7:** Sup: 71 (#229); Ego: 75 (#467),

**@8:** Sup: 73 (#302); Ego: 69 (#536),

Male: #302; Feme: #536

}

<[\*\*#302\*\* as \[#6, #100, #10, #100, #30, #6, #50\] = qiyqalown \(H7022\): {UMBRA: #5 as #296 % #41 = #9} 1\) \\*DISGRACE\\*, \\*SHAME\\*;](http://www.grapple369.com/?idea:{m,302}&idea:{f,536}></a></p></div><div data-bbox=)

**#536** as [#5, #60, #5, #30, #5, #60, #1, #300, #70] = eklegomai (G1586): {UMBRA: #41 as #184 % #41 = #20} 1) to pick out, choose, to pick or choose out for one's self; 5) so that the ground of the

choice lies in Christ and his merits only; **1a**) choosing one out of many, ie. Jesus choosing his disciples; **1b**) choosing one for an office; **1c**) **\*OF\* \*GOD\* \*CHOOSING\* \*WHOM\* \*HE\* \*JUDGED\* \*FIT\* \*TO\* \*RECEIVE\* \*HIS\* \*FAVOURS\* \*AND\* \*SEPARATED\* \*FROM\* \*THE\* \*REST\* \*OF\* \*MANKIND\* \*TO\* \*BE\* \*PECULIARLY\* \*HIS\* \*OWN\* \*AND\* \*TO\* \*BE\* \*ATTENDED\* \*CONTINUALLY\* \*BY\* \*HIS\* \*GRACIOUS\* \*OVERSIGHT\***; **1c1**) ie. the Israelites; **1d**) of God the Father choosing Christians, as those whom he set apart from the irreligious multitude as dear unto himself, and whom he has rendered, through faith in Christ, citizens in the Messianic kingdom: [James 2:5];

### H7022@{

@1: Sup: 6 (**#6**); Ego: 6 (**#6**),  
 @2: Sup: 25 (**#31**); Ego: 19 (**#25**),  
 @3: Sup: 35 (**#66**); Ego: 10 (**#35**),  
 @4: Sup: 54 (**#120**); Ego: 19 (**#54**),  
 @5: Sup: 3 (**#123**); Ego: 30 (**#84 - I AM NOT A MAN OF VIOLENCE** {**%2**}),  
 @6: Sup: 9 (**#132**); Ego: 6 (**#90**),  
 @7: Sup: 59 (**#191 - I DO NOT STEAL THE SKINS OF THE SACRED ANIMALS** {**%32**}); Ego: 50 (**#140 - I DEAL NOT FRAUDULENTLY** {**%14**} / **I AM NOT AN EAVES-DROPPER** {**%16**}),  
 Male: **#191**; Feme: **#140**  
 } // **#302**

### T'AI HSÜAN CHING {POLAR OPPOSITIONS / INTERPLAY OF OPPOSITES} [4 BCE]:

**UMBRA: #296 % #41 = #9** - Inconstancy of Achievement, Practicing Placidity; I-Ching: **H7** - The Army, Leading, Troops; Tetra: **32** - Legion;

**THOTH MEASURE: #9** - Oh Breaker of bones, who makest thine appearance in Sutenhun; **\*I\* \*AM\* \*NOT\* \*A\* \*TELLER\* \*OF\* \*LIES\***.

**#VIRTUE:** If it is Branching Out (no. #9), it comes, but

**#TOOLS:** If it is Flight (no. #49), it flees.

**#POSITION:** As. to Greatness (no. #45), it is the outside, but

**#TIME:** As to Closing In (no. #58), it is the inside.

**#CANON: #161**

### ONTIC\_OBLIGANS\_161@{

@1: Sup: 9 (**#9**); Ego: 9 (**#9**),

@2: Sup: 58 (**#67**); Ego: 49 (**#58**),

@3: Sup: 22 (**#89**); Ego: 45 (**#103**),

@4: Sup: 80 (**#169 - I TROUBLE MYSELF ONLY WITH MY OWN**

**AFFAIRS** {%18}); Ego: 58 (**#161 - I AM NOT A TELLER OF LIES**  
{%9}),  
Male: **#169**; Feme: **#161**  
} // **#161**

**#302** as [**#6, #100, #10, #100, #30, #6, #50**] = qiyqalown  
(**H7022**): {**UMBRA: #5 as #296 % #41 = #9**} **1**) **\*DISGRACE\***,  
**\*SHAME\***;

"Thou art filled with shame for glory: drink thou also, and let thy foreskin  
be uncovered: the cup of the LORD'S right hand shall be turned unto  
thee, and shameful {**#302 as [#6, #100, #10, #100, #30, #6, #50]**  
= **qiyqalown (H7022): shameful**} spewing {**#302 as [#6, #100,**  
**#10, #100, #30, #6, #50]** = **qiyqalown (H7022): shameful**} shall  
be on thy glory." [Habakkuk 2:16 (KJV)]

**H4687@**{  
@1: Sup: 40 (**#40**); Ego: 40 (**#40**),  
@2: Sup: 49 (**#89**); Ego: 9 (**#49**),  
@3: Sup: 55 (**#144**); Ego: 6 (**#55**),  
@4: Sup: 50 (**#194**); Ego: 76 (**#131**),  
@5: Sup: 60 (**#254**); Ego: 10 (**#141**),  
Male: **#254**; Feme: **#141**  
} // **#546**

**T'AI HSÜAN CHING {POLAR OPPOSITIONS / INTERPLAY OF  
OPPOSITES} [4 BCE]:**

**UMBRA: #546 % #41 = #13** - Status, Loathing Shame; I-Ching: **H5** -  
Waiting, Delay, Attending, Moistened, Arriving; Tetra: **17** - Holding Back;

**THOTH MEASURE: #13** - Oh Eater of Blood, who makest thine  
appearance at the Block; **\*I\* \*HAVE\* \*NOT\* \*SLAUGHTERED\***  
**\*THE\* \*SACRED\* \*ANIMALS\***.

**#VIRTUE:** With Increase (no. #13), the beginning of florescence, but  
**#TOOLS:** With Eternal (no. #53), what lasts to the very end.  
**#POSITION:** With Opposition (no. #8), at court, but  
**#TIME:** With Inner (no. #65), on the sleeping mat  
**#CANON: #139**

**ONTIC\_OBLIGANS\_139@**{  
@1: Sup: 13 (**#13**); Ego: 13 (**#13**),  
@2: Sup: 66 (**#79**); Ego: 53 (**#66**),  
@3: Sup: 74 (**#153**); Ego: 8 (**#74**),  
@4: Sup: 58 (**#211**); Ego: 65 (**#139 - I HAVE NOT SLAUGHTERED**  
**THE SACRED ANIMALS** {%13}),

**Male: #211; Feme: #139**  
} // #139

**#546 as [#40, #90, #6, #400, #10] = mitsvah (H4687): {UMBRA: #5 as #546 % #41 = #13} 1) commandment; 1a) commandment (of man); 1b) the commandment (of God); 1c) \*COMMANDMENT\* (\*OF\* \*CODE\* \*OF\* \*WISDOM\*);**

"Because that Abraham {FATHER OF A GREAT MULTITUDE} obeyed my voice, and kept my charge, my commandments {**#546 as [#40, #90, #6, #400, #10] = mitsvah (H4687): commandments**}, my statutes, and my laws." [Genesis 26:5 (KJV)]

"And said, If thou wilt diligently hearken to the voice of the LORD thy God, and wilt do that which is right in his sight, and wilt give ear to his commandments {**#546 as [#40, #90, #6, #400, #10] = mitsvah (H4687): commandments**}, and keep all his statutes, I will put none of these diseases upon thee, which I have brought upon the Egyptians {THAT TROUBLES OR OPPRESSES; ANGUISH}: for I am the LORD that healeth thee." [Exodus 15:26 (KJV)]

"And the LORD said unto Moses {TAKEN OUT; DRAWN FORTH}, How long refuse ye to keep my commandments {**#546 as [#40, #90, #6, #400, #10] = mitsvah (H4687): commandments**} and my laws?" [Exodus 16:28 (KJV)]

"And God spake all these words, saying, I am the LORD thy God, which have brought thee out of the land of Egypt {THAT TROUBLES OR OPPRESSES; ANGUISH}, out of the house of bondage. Thou shalt have no other gods before me. Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of any thing that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth: Thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them: for I the LORD thy God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me; And showing mercy unto thousands of them that love me, and keep my commandments {**#546 as [#40, #90, #6, #400, #10] = mitsvah (H4687): commandments**}." [Exodus 20:1-6 (KJV)]

At this juncture the decisive transition from necessity to apriority takes place. Since the applicability of obligation is valid for all imaginable rational beings, the cognition of these obligations or the laws that are responsible for them cannot depend on contingent features that arise from the fact that the thought experiment involves different rational beings. The laws, therefore, may solely depend on characteristics that all rational beings capable of action have in common. What all imaginable rational beings have in common, however, is solely the characteristic of

being rational beings. Every other characteristic is contingent. The cognition of laws cannot depend, therefore, upon the empirical cognition of these contingent features.

Since Kant improperly states it is an impossibility for a human being to accomplish this by transcendent sapiential thought and I am capably able to demonstrate it's temporal congruence as coherence by a mathematical theoretical noumenon in being an Intellectual Property by which Immanuel Kant himself calls noumena as the proof of a valid and rational concept attained by pure thought. And theoretically it is technically possible by an analysis of the TELOS HIERARCHY <<http://www.grapple369.com?telos:328&PROTOTYPE:HETEROS>> to then make a rational determination upon the contingent characteristics such as to the nature of the implicit **#328 - Transformative Prototype** or propositions on what prototype might optimally be deployed.

Kant seems to assume that a cognition contains the characteristic of apriority if it is not dependent upon empirical perceptions. Consequently, according to the next intermediate thesis (**3**), the cognition of moral laws must be a priori. Kant himself expresses this decisive intermediate conclusion in the following terms: Among the things to which everyone must admit is the fact that "THE GROUND OF AN OBLIGATION," that is, the moral law, "IS TO BE SOUGHT NOT IN THE NATURE OF THE HUMAN BEING OR THE CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE WORLD IN WHICH HE IS PLACED, BUT A PRIORI SOLELY IN CONCEPTS OF PURE REASON" (GMS, 389,16-19).

At the beginning of the ensuing paragraph, Kant reiterates this intermediate conclusion: "THUS [...] ARE MORAL LAWS TOGETHER WITH THEIR PRINCIPLES ESSENTIALLY DISTINGUISHED [...] FROM EVERYTHING ELSE IN WHICH THERE IS ANYTHING EMPIRICAL" (GMS, 389,24-26). And he continues with his last step of argumentation, which leads him to the concluding thesis (**4**) that there has to be a pure moral philosophy. This step constituted simply by the consequences drawn from the epistemological status of moral laws for the construction of philosophical theories. If moral laws can only be known a priori, then moral theory must have a foundational part that proceeds purely a priori, that is, without reference to anything empirical. In Kant's words, "ALL MORAL PHILOSOPHY RESTS ENTIRELY ON ITS PURE PART, AND WHEN APPLIED TO THE HUMAN BEING IT BORROWS NOT THE LEAST BIT FROM KNOWLEDGE ABOUT HIM (ANTHROPOLOGY)" (GMS, 389,26-29).

This is one of the possible approaches for a systematic reconstruction of the central argument in the Preface. Unfortunately, Kant offers very few

suggestions of how he can assume that the thesis that there has to be a pure moral philosophy is self-evident. Consequently, much interpretation is required. And much of the interpretive work revolves around which systematic concept of necessity is implemented in the interpretation. The interpretation presented here bases itself upon a purely modal-logical concept of necessity, which entails neither an epistemological meaning nor an equivalence of "NORMATIVITY" or "PRESCRIPTIVITY." If one chooses other systematic basic concepts, the structure of argumentation also has to be interpreted in other ways. However as noted a somewhat different interpretation is suggested by SCHÖNECKER/WOOD whom see the [\*ONTIC\*] 'necessity' of moral laws primarily as their CATEGORICAL character. [Horn & Schönecker (eds.) Groundwork, Page 12-15]

- dolf

The various PDF resources being essays as work in progress notations for the prospect of producing a viable syncretism with Immanuel Kant's Ground Work for the Metaphysics of Morals are now available within the directory:

<<http://www.grapple369.com/Groundwork/>>

Initial Post: 30 August 2018

**#OPULENCE #DECOROUS #DEMURE #SOVEREIGNTY**