

# The Symbolic Resonance of Nothing (Edit)

## *-The Dialectical Silence-*

(-The Vague, Subtle, yet Persistent Echo-)

**\*\* #edits \*\***

Oct 7, 2023

[#Nihiltheism](#) , [#language](#)

---

"There is a nagging suspicion that the diagnostics are exploiting Heidegger's exotic language in order to "keep talking," and thus keep calm and unaffected by the horror of the bottomless abyssus humanae conscientiae with which they are incessantly confronted." Tønnessen

"Martin Heidegger is what happens when one believes in one's own emotions, i.e. poetry." Heisman

"I know that I must either find a way to move beyond the theistic patterns of the past in search for a new way to speak of and to engage the ultimate reality that I call God, or be honest about living in a godless world." Spong

The question comes up once more: Is one forced into madness or to relinquish their existence? Can one confront the Other in an authentic way that is not motivated by a purely selfish need for comfort or 'security' within the nightmare of existence? Can a language of Nihilism, having the dual roles of navigating the Nothing of the world while propagating the Transcendental aspect of meaninglessness, as an authentic way to encounter the Other, be developed?

Is there any place for philosophical thinking in this world of contradiction? These questions plague modern philosophy, encompassing more than just the symbolic reasoning behind concepts of God and understandings of Nihilism. The suggestion of a language dedicated to Nihilism raises the prospect of a collective acknowledgment of the deeply discomforting idea of a fundamentally meaningless reality – an acknowledgment we had been avoiding.

Can the human mind, in its evolutionary stress to find meaning, to survive and adapt, ever truly accept such a vast, terrifying void laid bare in front its understanding? Could we actualize an existentialist form of survival, surpassing historical and cultural scaffoldings imposed on the consciousness to cope with the underlying Nothing?

The thought naturally incites resistance. After all, humanity's journey has always revolved around battling this Nothingness -s?

“Nevertheless, this existentially ‘possible’ Being-towards-death remains, from the existential point of view, a fantastical exaction...Does Dasein ever factually throw itself into such a Being-towards-death? Does Dasein demand, even by reason of its own-most Being, an authentic potentiality-for-Being determined by anticipation?” Heidegger

One must first accept that one does not know what one is talking about. There is not one person who knows what is 'going on here'. Underhill expresses, fully, the self-criticism that this sort of project is bound to: “If the metaphysician be true to his own postulates, he must acknowledge in the end that we are all forced to live, to think, and at last to die, in an unknown and unknowable world: fed arbitrarily and diligently, yet how we know not, by ideas and suggestions whose truth we cannot test but whose pressure we cannot resist.”

Could we circumnavigate all this and express the experience of Nihilism in the simplest of terms as: 'all worldly endeavors are futile'. It seems that we cannot. Cliches, as such, will never do, since, as Heidegger points out, cliches are nothing but a form of empty 'idle talk' riddled with 'ambiguity' of a passing off as 'knowing'. This 'passing over' is simply another distraction. There may be a 'message' that is missed when we speak of Nihilism in such cursory ways. If we want to develop a language of Nihilism that is not simply Naturalistic, that is beyond the dead 'solutions' of the worldly philosophies and religions, and moreover, that is not simply idle-talk that contributes nothing more than to a premature suicide, then we must proceed past such banalities.

A main problem with discussing Nihilism is that there are no words that hold a tight enough grasp on the experience itself as to allow the experience to become transferable. St. Therese of Lisieux explains her experience within a Christian structure: “He allowed my soul to be overwhelmed with darkness, and the thought of Heaven, which had consoled me from my earliest childhood, now became a subject of conflict and torture...I wish I could express what I feel, but it is beyond me. One must have passed through this dark tunnel to understand its blackness.”

Is one who has experienced Nihilism, with its essence of 'non-transferability', now left to a Quietist silence? I believe that an honest answer to this question is: yes. Do we stop here? We cannot, because we are still in the theoretical. Most, of the seemingly rare few, who have experienced Nihilism do not have the 'stamina' to renounce the world in its entirety. Experiencing Nothing and renouncing everything are not equivalent (as we spoke of in the section on Naturalism). Beyond renunciation, even the Suicide, who claims to feel a 'brand' of Nihilism, is seemingly misunderstanding the message. The Nihilist is one who uses suicide, rather than commits it; at least for a particular span of time.

Is there then some type of 'affirmative' substance that is found within the experience of Nihilism that allows us to move forward in a task of developing a language that breaks through what could otherwise be perceived as a simple pointing out, or culmination, of the 'world's sufferings'? To quote Cioran once more on the 'affirmative substance' of Nothing: “The initial revelation of any monastery: everything is nothing. Thus begin all mysticisms. It is less than one step from nothing to God, for God is the positive expression of nothingness.”

A language of Nihilism reflects the need to confront the Transcendental yearning as a true confrontation, rather than something that one tries to replace with this or that thing, this or that creed, this or that activity, etc. The need for such a language is demonstrated in the words of Huxley: "...the ultimate Reality is not clearly and immediately apprehended, except by those who have made themselves loving, pure in heart and poor in spirit. This being so, it is hardly surprising that a theology based upon the experience of nice, ordinary, unregenerate people should carry so little conviction. This kind of empirical theology is on precisely the same footing as an empirical astronomy, based upon the experience of naked-eye observers."

A 'new language' of Nihilism is one that must be worked out in order to provide a more adequate account of the Transcendence of and within human experience, as revealed through Nihilism, without specifically holding to either a purely 'religious' or 'naturalist' worldview. With great reservation, I suggest the use of the word Nihiltheism as a word to ground this 'genre' of human experience. This is a language that is not strictly based upon myth, tradition, nor empirical facts. This language must also not ever be taken as 'complete' ('complete' in a similar way in which 'literal' would be used with regards to interpreting a mythical language), but rather as a symbolic language which is always self-critical and therefore always open for re-interpretation.

A language, as any other, may be able to be developed in order to 'navigate' the 'complexities' of Nihilism in both its forms, as the Nothing of the world and its Transcendence. The groundwork for a language of Nihilism, at least up till the present moment, is found in its most 'complete' form in Heidegger's comprehensive language about the human condition described in *Being and Time*.

Within the 'already-made' language of Heidegger we have concepts of anxiety, moments of vision, everydayness, the call of conscience, the situation, authenticity, uncanniness, resoluteness, and so on, already laid out and defined, that capture key insights into the human condition. These insights and concepts allow for an interpretation of the Nihilistic experience on 'non-naturalistic' terms while still being grounded within the naturalistic aspect of the human condition.

There is no need to get bogged down with Heidegger's perspective being essentially 'atheistic' or 'theistic' in itself, since we are specifically looking to interpret and discover a language in which a Nihilist may speak about the human situation as he experiences it. Heidegger himself attempts to avoid such presumptuous terms as 'atheistic' or 'theistic' as they are taken to be ultimately restrictive for a full analysis of the human situation. What Heidegger speaks of 'objectively' must still be experienced subjectively. Therefore, Heidegger's analysis may only be seen as an introductory 'map' with regards to speaking about the Other. This 'map' need not guarantee a 'direct' path to the Other. In other words, assuming there can be such a thing as a 'language of Nihilism', the possible interpretations may vary immensely. This 'Other' is an aspect of the developing language that will have to rest in obscurity, not only in these introductory words, but even within a more developed speech-set.

Without the need, yet, to go into detail concerning all of Heidegger's terms or concepts, a bare-bones laying out of the basic structure may be put down in order to help envision the coherency of Heidegger's

analysis of human existence as a possible foundation for developing a language of Nihilism. Therefore, a very brief summary of what Heidegger refers to as 'Being-Towards-Death' with some of its particularities will be put forth as an example of the foundations of such a language. 'Being-Towards-Death', concisely put, consist of anxiety, in a moment of vision, having a call of conscience that seems to come 'from me and beyond me' (Buber- "It appears simultaneously as acting on and as acted upon"), that 'gives something to be understood' in an 'indefinite', incommunicable way, and which causes the world to 'drop out' due to the entirety of it sinking into insignificance. And yet, one feels a "push" to stay resolute, sitting in this anxiety produced experience, while knowing that death may happen at any moment, which, as a result, allows one to escape the 'everydayness' of the world in order to turn inward with attempts to discover one's True-Self. Without even going into detail, Heidegger's structure is one which should not be difficult to see how his analysis of the human condition explicitly lends itself to the building of a Nihilistic language.

Is Heidegger's analysis, which is commonly labeled as 'atheistic', really at all different from what the Trappist monk, Thomas Merton, has come to accept? Merton also clearly states the bankruptcy of a constant outward-seeking, hectic search for 'meaning' within life. In comparison to Heidegger, he expresses the same idea in this language: "The truly sacred attitude toward life is in no sense an escape from the sense of nothingness that assails us when we are left alone with ourselves. On the contrary, it penetrates into that darkness and that nothingness, realizing that the mercy of God has transformed our nothingness into His temple and believing that in our darkness His light has hidden itself. Hence the sacred attitude is one which does not recoil from our own inner emptiness, but rather penetrates it with awe and reverence, and with the awareness of mystery. This is a most important discovery in, the interior life." Is the use of the word 'God' enough to somehow make any sort of distinction between Heidegger's 'atheism' (which he explicitly denies) and Merton's 'theism'? A Nihilistic language would be one that attempts to reconcile such superficial disparities.

With that said, Heidegger admits that his full conception of 'Being-Towards-Death' is one that is 'fantastical'. That is to say, if we are to develop past a purely Heideggerian analysis of Being, how does one, in fact, proceed in a constant participation with an existence that is drowned in the meaninglessness of the world (this includes oneself, that paradoxically, though reasonably, due to our nature of doubled-mindedness, is washed over with fear and doubt, paralyzed, at the thought of their nothing selves disappearing into infinity {this is just a thought that needs rewriting}) and which faces annihilation at any moment? Is it possible to even proceed with, or in, such a 'fantastical' structure? Further, what is to be meant by a 'True-Self' as interpreted on not 'wholly naturalistic' terms which avoids, in its analysis of the human condition, from falling back into the language of myth and worldly 'religion'? On the other hand, is there any kind of 'positive' substance that stems from the Nihilistic experience which is not to be interpreted as wholly biological, naturalistic, and worldly, as many interpreters of Heidegger have done so far with his language? Heidegger himself dismisses both 'biological' explanations and, seemingly traditional conceptions of 'God' as too preemptive, as they are hindered by assumptions that do not necessarily leave open the mystery of the 'Why?'.

"The ontological analysis of conscience on which we are thus embarking, is prior to any description and classification of Experiences of conscience, and likewise lies outside any biological 'explanation' of this

phenomenon. But it is also no less distant from a theological exigesis of conscience or any employment of this phenomenon for proofs of God or for establishing an 'immediate' conscience of God." (pg. 313)

('The Call' as both from oneself and beyond oneself) "If the interpretation continues in this direction, one supplies a possessor for the power thus posited, or one takes the power itself as a person who makes himself known- namely God. On the other hand one may try to reject this explanation in which the caller is taken as an alien manifestation of such a power, and to explain away the conscience 'biologically' at the same time. Both these explanations pass over the phenomenal findings too hastily." (pg. 320)

This new language must not be seen as 'rescuing' one from the Nothingness, rather it is a language that attempts to bring one 'face to face' with the nightmare of existence. The terror of existence is one that opens up the 'positive' content. The unending questioning of 'why?' opens up something that is not wholly natural, yet must still be experienced and discussed within the world. Even the mystical experience, while a blow to Naturalism, does not defeat Naturalism. One of the few accurate statements that Sartre put forth when describing his particular brand of 'existentialism' was that whether God exists or not, it's all still the same, it makes no difference (regardless if he was using this statement as a 'defense' of his atheistic existentialism). The ultimately empty structure of Naturalism must be experienced as a ladder into Transcendence, not as an obstacle to be overcome. One must not play with the toys of the world that are crushed into dust with every movement. To keep grabbing at new, vanishing toys is but a distraction of unthinking robots that is not grounded in Nihilism.

When one holds to any form of optimism as they speak of the Other, one knows that this person has not been grasped by the Nothing of the world. While we are all damned to some particular idolatry, optimism is one of its lowest forms. The fanaticism of thought that brews in the fear of Nihilism is only a turning away from Nihilism, an illusion of comfort; there is no embracing, there is no participation in the Nothingness. The worldly religions are fundamentally fanatical in nature due to their turning away of Nihilism. Spong, in his desire to 'revive' the dying language of Christianity, says: "We fear that if theism is dismissed, only a bottomless pit remains." and "Many forms of religion are little more than cultural manifestations of the fear of nothingness. That is why people become hysterical when theism is challenged."

One last mention on the falsity of 'optimism' is deserving, if only because it is the overwhelming strain of thought within the current American culture; this 'optimism' shows itself in forms of 'prosperity churches' all the way to some type of foundationless 'humanism'. Quoting St. Seraphim Rose once more will thus prove to be deserving: "And indeed the Christian is, in a certain sense--in an ultimate sense--a "Nihilist"; for to him, in the end, the world is nothing, and God is all. This is, of course, the precise opposite of the Nihilism we have examined here, where God is nothing and the world is all; that is a Nihilism that proceeds from the Abyss, and the Christian's is a "Nihilism" that proceeds from abundance. The true Nihilist places his faith in things that pass away and end in nothing; all "optimism" on this foundation is clearly futile."

A relevant example of this sort of 'unthinking', or lack of search for Transcendence, can be shown within the mindset of a majority of practicing scientists of today. Science, assuming a 'realist' perspective, as describing 'reality' with physical laws, allows one to predict and 'know' what is or will happen within the world. However, to stop at this formal description of reality is unphilosophical. The Philosopher wants to ask why the descriptions of science are the way they are. It is 'understood' that 'particles' and 'molecules' bump into one another in a particular pattern which produce the physical objects that we see around us and even ourselves. To comprehend a description of things is not to comprehend why, seemingly mindless particles and molecules are acting in the ways in which they do. Why are there 'things', why are these 'things' following a particular rational structure, and why is there a 'building' process found within these 'things'? These philosophical questions are shunned by a majority of mainstream scientific 'intellectuals'. This sort of 'unthinking' is what has produced the 'optimistic' scientism of the current times.

There is a similar criticism of 'unthinking' to be made against traditional 'religious' interpretations of the human condition. Many religious interpretations of the human experience are replete with theological assumptions that are not necessarily grounded in human experience; these take the forms of rituals, prayers, moral declarations, metaphysical claims, and so on. However, a language that prepares 'answers' or 'rational defenses' rather than opening up the mystery of the ground of all things must be labeled as a lower form of idolatry. These assumptions, as with many religious languages, are the reason why Heidegger proclaimed that a 'Christian philosophy' was the equivalent of a 'round-square'. Heidegger's thought is that the religious languages that have so far been developed are restrictive of the human experience of the Other. In other words, religions with their theologies contain too many assumptions and 'answers' that shun the mystery of existence. Philosophy, on the other hand, the relentless 'Why?', is what is needed in order to open up the mystery of Being, instead of closing it off and pushing it into a closet. One cannot turn the Other into the worldly, whether that attempt is through reason or myth. These are simple, lower forms of idolatry.

---

## Extra Notes and Quotes (mostly Heidegger)

Much Work Needed on this Piece

"In particular, that in the face of which one has anxiety is not encountered as something definite with which one can concern oneself; the threatening does not come from what is ready-to-hand or present-at-hand, but rather from the fact that neither of these 'says' anything any longer. Environmental entities no longer have any involvement. The world in which I exist has sunk into insignificance; and the world which is thus disclosed is one in which entities can be freed only in the character of having no involvement. Anxiety is anxious in the face of the "nothing" of the world; but this does not mean that in anxiety we experience something like the absence of what is present-at-hand within-the-world. The present-at-hand must be encountered in just such a way that it does not have any involvement whatsoever, but can show itself in an empty mercilessness." 68b

"Anxiety discloses the insignificance of the world; and this insignificance reveals the nullity of that with which one can concern oneself—or, in other words, the impossibility of projecting oneself upon a

potentiality-for-Being which belongs to existence and which is founded primarily upon one's objects of concern."

"That in the face of which one is anxious is completely indefinite. Not only does this indefiniteness leave factually undecided which entity within-the-world is threatening us, but it also tells us that entities within-the-world are not 'relevant' at all."

"The utter insignificance which makes itself known in the 'nothing and nowhere', does not signify that the world is absent, but tells us that entities within-the-world are of so little importance in themselves that on the basis of this insignificance of what is within-the-world, the world in its worldhood is all that still obtrudes itself."

"The question is there in a spell of boredom, when we are equally distant from despair and joy, but when the stubborn ordinariness of beings lays open a wasteland in which it makes no difference to us whether beings are or are not—and then, in a distinctive form, the question resonates once again: Why are there beings at all instead of nothing?"

"In dread, being as a whole becomes untenable."

"That existence is pervaded by nihilating behavior attests to the permanent and indeed obscured manifestness of no-thing that dread originally discloses. But this means original dread is suppressed for the most part in existence. Dread is there. It's only napping. Its breath permanently trembles in existence, only slightly in the apprehensive, and inaudibly in the "Uh hüh!" and "Hüh uh!" of those who are busy; best of all in the reserved, surest of all at the heart of existence that is daring. But this happens only in those for whom it expends itself in order to preserve the ultimate greatness of existence."

"The beholdenness of existence to no-thing on the basis of hidden dread is the surmounting of being as a whole, transcendence."

"As surely as we never get a sure grasp of the generality of be-ing in itself, just assuredly do we all the same find ourselves somehow placed in the midst of the generality of bare be-ing. In the end, there continues to be [besteht]an essential difference between getting a grasp of the whole of be-ing in itself and finding oneself in the midst of be-ing as a whole. The former is impossible in principle. The latter happens all the time in our existence. Of course, it looks just as though in our everyday comings and goings we were holding fast to only just this or that [kind of] be-ing, as though we were lost in this or that realm of be-ing. But no matter how fragmented the daily round may seem, it always maintains be-ing in the unity of a "whole," although only in the shadows. Even then and precisely just then, when we are not especially busy with things, this "as a whole" overcomes us; for example, in genuine boredom. This is a long way off far off when this or that book or play, job or leisure activity, is boring. It breaks out when "it's boring." Profound boredom, like a silent fog insinuating itself in the depths of existence, pulls things, others and oneself into it altogether with remarkable indifference. Such boredom reveals be-ing as a whole."

"Idle talk and ambiguity, having seen everything, having understood everything, develop the supposition that Dasein's disclosedness, which is so available and so prevalent, can guarantee to Dasein that all the possibilities of its Being will be secure, genuine, and full. Through the self-certainty and decidedness of the "they", it gets spread abroad increasingly that there is no need of authentic understanding or the state-of-mind that goes with it. The supposition of the "they" that one is leading and sustaining a full and genuine 'life', brings Dasein a tranquillity, for which everything is 'in the best of order' and all doors are open. Falling Being-in-the-world, which tempts itself, is at the same time tranquillizing. However, this tranquillity in inauthentic Being does not seduce one into stagnation and inactivity, but drives one into uninhibited 'hustle' ["Betriebs"]. Being-fallen into the 'world' does not now somehow come to rest. The tempting tranquillization aggravates the falling."

"Dasein plunges out of itself into itself, into the groundlessness and nullity of inauthentic everydayness. But this plunge remains hidden from Dasein by the way things have been publicly interpreted, so much so, indeed, that it gets interpreted as a way of 'ascending' and 'living concretely'."

"Everydayness forces its way into the urgency of concern, and divests itself of the fetters of a weary 'inactive thinking about death'. Death is deferred to 'sometime later', and this is done by invoking the so-called 'general opinion' ["allgemeine Ermessen"]. Thus the "they" covers up what is peculiar in death's certainty—that it is possible at any moment."

"By this time we can see phenomenally what falling, as fleeing, flees in the face of. It does not flee in the face of entities within-the-world; these are precisely what it flees towards—as entities alongside which our concern, lost in the "they", can dwell in tranquillized familiarity. When in falling we flee into the "at-home" of publicness, we flee in the face of the "not-at-home"; that is, we flee in the face of the uncanniness which lies in Dasein..."

"Original dread can awaken in existence at any moment. It does not need wakening by an unaccustomed eventuality for that. The depth of its sway corresponds to the scarcity of its possible occasioning. It is permanently on the verge and yet only seldom comes into play to hold us in suspense. The beholdenness of existence to no-thing on the basis of hidden dread makes man the placeholder of no-thing. We are so finite that we are not even able to bring ourselves face to face with no-thing by our own will and resolve. So deeply is mortality buried in our existence that it denies our freedom its very own and deepest finiteness." (rare nature of Nihilism, 'difficult' to be 'in' Nihilism for extended periods of time)

"Human existence can relate to being only if it is itself beholden to no-thing. Going above and beyond being is of the essence of existence."

"Perhaps it strikes only once, like the muffling tolling of a bell that resounds into Dasein and gradually fades away."

"The only question is whether we are willing to fall victim to this cheap look of things and thus take the whole matter as settled, or whether we are capable of experiencing a provocative happening in this recoil



of the why-question back upon itself.”

“On the other hand, if such faith does not continually expose itself to the possibility of unfaith, it is not faith but a convenience.” (put this in a section tied to religion or faith, e.g. 'naturalism' or 'philosophy')

“...philosophy is always the direct concern of the few. Which few? The ones who transform creatively, who unsettle things.”

“But—according to its essence, philosophy never makes things easier, but only more difficult. And it does so not just incidentally, not just because its manner of communication seems strange or even deranged to everyday understanding.”

“Does such being attuned in which no-thing itself is brought before us happen in human existence?”

Buber- “The language in which this is accomplished is what it says: anxiety- the stirring of the creature between the realms of plantlike security and spiritual risk.”

Buber- “The eternal You is You by its very nature; only our nature forces us to draw it into the It-world and It-speech.”

Bring Tillich in on symbolism. Also Vivekananda.

No one has anything to say. Listen to a person speak, you can learn a lot more from silence.

A language developed to help distinguish and navigate between the experience of the Nothing of the word which lays the groundwork for not only a 'pushing' through the Nothingness (instead of a 'cure' for the human condition) into its Transcendental forms. Why do these feelings/emotions/experience show up? Is the 'cure' purely something natural? Or is there a 'Call' from within, yet beyond? Instead of fleeing from anxiety, despair, etc. a language that details a description of the human condition and continually asks 'Why?' in regards to their existence in the first place. Does this language allow for a deeper separation from tradition, culture, everydayness? Does it help one navigate authentically through some of the most terrifying experiences and feelings that humans are capable of?

I want there to be a language that allows for a bridge between the Diminished and the Augmented forms of Nihilism. How does one do this? The Augmented experience of Nihilism is beyond language. Is the language simply taking the place of the rituals, ceremonies, dogmas, etc. of the traditional religions?

Shouldn't the language of Nihilism act as a 'map' through the Nothing of the world? Should it lend itself to the Transcendent aspect of Nihilism? Can it lend itself? Is this language a tool? Beneficial (whatever that word means)? Is there a way to navigate without making claims to 'truth'? Is this language simply 'walking' through the experience by only asking the question 'Why?' over and over and over? Does that

negate any notion of 'doctrine'? The language must be tentative. The language must be replete with doubt, rather than 'confirmations'.

Isn't the priority of this language to allow someone to work their way to Transcendence or, maybe more so, to help prepare oneself for Transcendence?

What does this language have to do with quietism, if anything? Does it have anything to do with solitude? It seems that it must if there is 'idle talk'.

"...there are no words really to explain these things. The words will always fall short of the reality."  
Therese of Lisieux

What is this 'language' we seek to develop? Is it a path that demands the taking of one's life? Is it a consolation to the reality of existence? Is there a purpose to create such a thing? Is it a waste? Is anything not a waste?

Nothing is not a negation of God, but an affirmation of the Other.

"What cannot be translated into mystical language does not deserve to be experienced." Cioran

This concept of the nontransferable nature of the experience is essential, yet possibly contradictory, to the development of a language for Nihilism. But then who cares of contradictions? But then what could 'development' of a language possibly mean? Ha! A irreconcilable joke or a logical puzzle to be worked out? Isn't that the question? Ha!

The Universality of the experience of Nihilism- lacks the subjective, yet is so rarely experienced: why?

---

---

# HARPA Complete Rewrite

## The Enigmatic Resonance of Nothingness

### *The Subtle Echo That Persists*

A lingering doubt persists that we use Heidegger's complex terminology as a crutch to continue discourse, avoiding the existential terror of the "abyssus humanae conscientiae" — the abyss of human consciousness — that ceaselessly looms before us. Tønnessen cautions us about this evasion through elaborate language, while Heisman remarks on Heidegger's philosophy as an act of faith in one's emotional reality, akin to poetry. Spong presents a dichotomy: either we transcend past theistic patterns in search of a novel engagement with the divine, or we concede to living in a godless cosmos.

Thus, we confront a perennial dilemma: does the abyss drive us to madness, or do we surrender our being? Is it possible to authentically engage with the Other without self-serving motives, using a language of Nihilism that navigates the world's emptiness and a transcendental meaninglessness?

Philosophical inquiry stands at a crossroads amidst these contradictions. We grapple with the role of symbolic logic in our conceptualization of God and our understanding of Nihilism. The notion of a transcendent Nihilistic language invites us to collectively face the unsettling reality of fundamental meaninglessness — a truth we often avoid.

Can our minds, desperate for meaning, truly reconcile with the vast and terrifying void of meaninglessness? Could we embody an existentialist survival, transcending historical and cultural constraints, and confront the pervasive Nothing?

Resistance to such thoughts is natural; humanity has long strived to negate Nothingness. The question remains, not just how one might "eliminate" Nothing, but whether we should even try.

Heidegger prompts us to consider if we authentically approach death in our existence, or if we shy away from such authentic potentiality-for-Being. We must first admit our ignorance in truly understanding the nature of our existence.

Underhill reminds us of the humility required in philosophical endeavors: we live, think, and die in a world whose truths we cannot verify but whose influences we cannot deny. To articulate the Nihilistic experience simply as "all worldly efforts are in vain" fails to capture its complexity, as Heidegger warns against the emptiness of clichés.

The challenge in discussing Nihilism lies in finding language that accurately conveys the untranslatable nature of the experience. St. Therese of Lisieux describes her spiritual darkness within Christianity, indicating that one must endure such despair to comprehend it.

This leads to the Quietist stance that perhaps silence is the most honest response to Nihilism. Yet, not all who encounter Nihilism possess the resolve to reject the world completely. The experience of Nothing and total renunciation are not synonymous. The true Nihilist employs the concept of suicide as a philosophical tool rather than a literal end, for a time.

Is there an "affirmative" aspect within Nihilism that propels us forward? Cioran identifies the monastic revelation that "everything is nothing," a step from nothing to God, where God is the positive expression of nothingness.

A Nihilistic language must confront the Transcendental, not as a replacement but as a genuine encounter. Huxley emphasizes the clear apprehension of ultimate Reality is reserved for those who are loving, pure, and humble.

I propose "Nihiltheism" as a term to encapsulate this genre of human experience. This language must remain self-critical and open to reinterpretation, not confined to myth, empirical evidence, or perceived completeness.

Heidegger provides a framework with concepts like anxiety, vision, authenticity, and the call of conscience. His analysis is a starting point for developing a Nihilistic language without committing to atheistic or theistic biases.

Merton, in parallel to Heidegger, recognizes the futility of a frenzied quest for meaning. The language of Nihilism seeks to reconcile superficial differences between atheism and theism.

Heidegger's conception of 'Being-Towards-Death' is an example of this language's foundation. It involves anxiety, a call of conscience, and an inward journey towards the True-Self. Yet, the true nature of the 'True-Self' and its non-naturalistic interpretations remain a challenge.

This Nihilistic language should not aim to rescue us from Nothingness but to confront us with it, opening us to the "positive" content of the terror of existence and the unending question of "why?"

Optimism, especially when discussing the Other, often indicates a lack of genuine engagement with Nothingness. Such avoidance is a form of idolatry, as illustrated by the superficial optimism prevalent in certain cultural and religious ideologies.

The role of science and religion in addressing the human condition must be critically examined.

Traditional religious interpretations often rely on assumptions beyond human experience, which Heidegger rejects.

In conclusion, a language of Nihilism must not seek to provide escape but rather to immerse us in the stark reality of our existence, to foster a direct encounter with the Other, and to navigate the complexities of Nihilism in its dual nature as both the Nothing of the world and its transcendence.

---

---

## HARPA Extended Rewrite

### The Enigmatic Resonance of Nothingness

#### *The Subtle Echo That Persists*

Amid the labyrinth of modern thought, there is a palpable tension that suggests we lean on Heidegger's elaborate lexicon not for clarity but as an escape. This linguistic shield enables us to sidestep the existential dread that confronts us — a phenomenon Tønnessen cautions us against, hinting at a collective avoidance through highbrow verbiage. Similarly, Heisman's observation that Heidegger's philosophy is essentially an emotional conviction — a merger of feeling and verse — resonates with this theme. Spong presents a stark choice: we must either evolve beyond traditional theism to engage with divinity anew or confront the stark reality of a cosmos devoid of God.

We are thus presented with an existential quandary: is the human psyche driven to the brink of madness when faced with the abyss, or does it forego its very essence? Is there a path to authentically connect with the Other, unfettered by our innate desires for solace and certainty in the face of existential terror — a terror unveiled through the lens of Nihilism? And is it possible to forge a language that faithfully navigates the desolate terrains of Nihilism while simultaneously affirming its transcendental undercurrents of meaninglessness?

Within the vast expanse of philosophical discourse, these probing questions linger, challenging the very foundations of symbolic logic, the conceptualization of God, and the myriad interpretations of Nihilism. The proposition of a language that is innately Nihilistic yet transcendent beckons us towards a collective admission of our deepest fears — the profound realization of an inherently meaningless reality, a truth we perpetually shy away from.

The human mind, in its relentless quest for meaning amid evolutionary pressures, stands at the precipice of a daunting void. Is it capable of embracing the harrowing expanse of nothingness that reveals itself through Nihilistic experience? Could we, perhaps, cultivate a form of existential resilience that surpasses the limitations of historical and cultural frameworks, thus confronting the void with a newfound fortitude?

The instinctual resistance to such contemplations is a testament to humanity's enduring struggle against the void. Our history is a tapestry of efforts, both overt and subtle, to negate or fill the void of Nothingness. Yet, the enigma persists: how does one eradicate Nothing? And more importantly, should one endeavor to mitigate this Nothing at all?

Heidegger challenges us to consider whether we are ever truly capable of embracing our Being-towards-death in a manner that is unadulterated and profound. It necessitates a foundational acceptance of our ignorance — a recognition that our discourse may be but a crude translation of the fact that none truly comprehend the essence of our reality.

Echoing Underhill, we are reminded of the self-critical nature inherent in philosophical pursuits: we navigate a life enveloped in mystery, thinking and ultimately ceasing in a world whose truths we can neither ascertain nor evade. The attempt to distill the Nihilistic experience into the trite assertion that 'all worldly efforts are futile' overlooks the complexity and depth of this philosophical stance. Heidegger warns us against the barrenness of clichés, suggesting that they serve only as a distraction from a more profound message about Nihilism.

Discussing Nihilism is fraught with the challenge of articulating an experience that defies linguistic capture. The existential darkness described by St. Therese of Lisieux within her Christian context reveals the depth of despair that must be endured to grasp the full gravity of such an experience.

Confronted with the ineffability of Nihilism, Quietism suggests a retreat into silence as the most sincere response. Yet, the confrontation with Nihilism demands more than silent resignation. The journey through Nothing to renunciation is not linear or equivalent. While some who encounter Nihilism lack the endurance to forsake the world fully, the concept of suicide in Nihilistic thought is not an act of termination but a metaphorical pause, a contemplation of existence.

The quest then is to discern whether an "affirmative" essence within Nihilism can catalyze a language that transcends mere acknowledgment of worldly suffering. Cioran introduces us to the monastic epiphany where "everything is nothing," and yet, this very nothingness is a stepping stone to God, the positive expression of the void.

A language that speaks of Nihilism must not shy away from its transcendental quest but embrace it as a genuine confrontation with the Other. This dialect is not a replacement for the tangible but a true engagement with the intangible. As Huxley posits, the clear apprehension of ultimate Reality is the domain of those with hearts purified by love and humility.

In the spirit of philosophical inquiry, I propose "Nihiltheism" as a term to anchor this genre of human experience. It is a language that must persistently subject itself to scrutiny, eschewing the finality of myth or empirical fact in favor of an ongoing dialogue with the unknowable.

Heidegger's ontology in "Being and Time" provides a scaffold for this language, with concepts like anxiety, vision, and authenticity framing the human condition. Yet, we must transcend Heidegger's secular boundaries to explore the full spectrum of Nihilistic experience.

Thus, we proceed with caution, mindful of the paradox of existence — that in the recognition of our own nothingness lies the potential for an authentic encounter with the Other. This recognition is not a negation but an opening to a reality that extends beyond the naturalistic realm, one that invites us to constantly question and seek, even amidst the darkness of the void.

The philosophical endeavor is not to dispel the void but to understand its place in our existence. This understanding is not a surrender but a recognition that the pursuit of knowledge and meaning, even in the

face of Nothing, is an essential aspect of the human condition.

## [#Nihiltheism](#) [#language](#)

[The Religious Experience of Nihilism](#) 

[-Nihilism Preface-](#) [\(Edit\)](#) 

[The Abyssal Experience of Nihilism](#) [\(Edit\)](#) 

[The Uncanny Illusion of Naturalism](#) [\(Edit\)](#) 

[Madness, Nonexistence, and the Other](#) [\(Edit\)](#) 

[The Startling Encounter with Infinite Nothingness](#) [\(Edit\)](#) 

[The Symbolic Resonance of Nothing](#) 