

Re: Does Anyone Know what Dolf is on about?

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.lang/2004-08/2820.html>

From: Qolon (telos_at_bigpond.com)

Date: 08/23/04

Date: Mon, 23 Aug 2004 07:40:59 GMT

And we can see from this latest response by "Jacques Guy" <jguy@alphalink.com.au>, he is engaging in self-justification for his own corruption of soul...

As I said previously it is afteral "An integral model—namely, all—quadrant, all—level noumenon (ie. a neural linguistic vMeme / Moment mathematical kabbalistic paradigm known as the Wilber model as deployed within the Spiral Dynamics Architecture)—that attempts to provide a framework in which all of those 'facts', if you will, can be accommodated. The facts, that is, of both interior realities and exterior realities, 'spiritual' experiences and 'scientific' experiences, subjective realities and objective realities. It finds ample room for the traditional Great Chain of Being {ie. as nomenclature: #1 – Seraphim, #2 – Cherubim, #3 – Thrones, #4 – Dominions, #5 – Virtues, #6 – Powers, #7 – Principalities, #8 – Arch—Angels, #9 – Angels} and Knowing—from matter or mind to body to soul to spirit: '...the Lord—YaHWeH God—ELOHIYM (mind) formed man of the dust of the ground body), and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life (spirit); and man became a living soul (soul).'[Genesis 2:7] But it plugs those realities into empirical facts in a definite and specifiable fashion." [© 2000 Ken Wilber, 'A Theory of Everything – An Integral Vision for Business, Politics, Science & Spirituality', Shamhala Publications, Boston p 66–73]

– dolf

Date: Fri, 20 Aug 2004 21:07:40 –0700

From: Jacques Guy <jguy@alphalink.com.au>

Message-ID: <4126CA8C.C0A@alphalink.com.au>

Mike Girouard wrote:

- > *Scientist says numeracy theories don't add up*
- > *By Roger Highfield, Science Editor (Daily Telegraph)*
- > *(Filed: 20/08/2004)*

Lovely garbage.

- > *Language moulds our thoughts so much that we cannot conceptualise*
- > *ideas for which we do not have words, according to an American*

Re: Does Anyone Know what Dolf is on about?

> *researcher.*

Sure, ever heard of a certain chemist with a funny name who dreamt a certain molecule, and happened to be right?

And BTW, how did the notion of "phoneme" ever come into being? We could not conceptualize it when there was no word for it, could we? So, some smart cookie thought: "Pho-neme, pho-neme, hey! that's a nice-sounding word!" And he said unto himself: "Let 'phoneme' designate those little things with the sort of raffia work base, that has an attachment". Now, of, course, it was difficult to get the meaning across to the rest of the world, which had no word for "phoneme" and therefore could not conceptualize it. And there, folks, lieth the origin of modern phonology. On en apprend tous les jours, hein?

> *Dr Gordon's work, reported in the journal Nature*

Ah! Nature, Nature of course!

> *The tribe has words for "one" and "two" – and "one" can also mean "roughly one"*

Oh yes, "roughly one". Roughly one what?

> *The Piraha have little social structure, no art, and they barter instead of using currency.*

Wow! Fancy that! How primitive! Has Arsehole Emeritus Gordon ever lived anywhere real? Has he ever heard of WWII, when city dwellers would barter with country dwellers for food? How the fuck can the Piraha barter if they can't tell "one" from "roughly one", eh?

> *Their language is limited to just 10 consonants and vowels.*

And two tones.

So what? What do you think makes you computer tick? A number system limited to two, count'em, two digits, that's what.

Now let's hear it for !Xu, with some 80 consonants and 24 vowels. What's Arsehole Emeritus Gordon's precious English compared to that, huh?

> *Dr Lisa Feigenson, a psychologist from Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore, Maryland, said that Dr Gordon's study was "fantastic".*

Right. As in "fantasy".

Re: Does Anyone Know what Dolf is on about?

sci.lang: Re: Does Anyone Know what Dolf is on about?

> *"That is, we can have a sense of threeness without having a word for
> three, but we cannot have a sense of fourness and beyond without the
> words to express it," Prof Butterworth said.*

Keep up the good work, Butterworth. The Holy Trinity is right round the corner, and our Pope is famous for canonizing people as if there was no to-morrow. Ave, St Butterworth, ora pro nobis!

> *With compliments to the group,*

Merci! Comme super connerie, ça bat même les élucubrations de Barry Fell! Bravo, encore, encore, encore!

"Qolon" <telos@bigpond.com> wrote in message news:MOcWc.3510\$D7.1629@news-server.bigpond.net.au...
In response to your continuing public abuse as claimed religiosity made at 1022 hrs [#63 *, #58, #48, #7 – Intentional Reversal/ Dimming Radiance, (#29, #53)] as Jesse – gift; oblation; one who is] on 23 August, 2004 [#22 *, #74, #56, #66 – Strategic Reversal/ Putting Oneself Behind, (#36, #46)] as Obed – a servant; workman {(Nature amended in its Nature / Autonomous Nature)}]

"Yi–he–wu–he is not an adaptation of 'Yahweh', but a 'spelling out' of the tetragrammaton, just as if we said 'why, aitch, double–u, aitch'. 'Yahweh' would be Ya–wei, and 'Jehovah' Zhe–hou–fa." [Jacques Guy <jguy@alphalink.com.au> Prohibition on writing the name of God at 04:15:34 hrs [#34, #65, #63 *, #33 – Achievable Goals/ The Virtue of Discrimination, (#16, #66) as Shelah – Sprout/That breaks; that unties; that undresses { 10, 7, 30, = 47, #5} {Nature Contains Nature (Act of Nature)}] on 24 Feb 2004 [#1, #5, #61, #81 – Making the Essence Clear/ Propounding the Essential, (#77, #5 *) as {Act of Nature – Eptiel / Enkyklic} { 1, 10, 70, = 81, #4}]

"This is Shem Hemaphorash [ie. The Divine Name of Extension]. It is the beginning of all the names. The beginning is the highest name and the lowest. Of the secret of male and female [and of] Berash Adam Vochoveh. Of the name of four letters: Yod He Vav Heh. The great and honored name is the knowledge of our existence, the root of the invocation. Change the beginning of all existence. Bind to deliver by the tried and proven essence of truth. Of favorable existence, all was created by the wisdom and desire, according to the decree of wisdom, the desire to bless. Decree the name (which are in Gematria equivalent) of the twelve signs (over chaos), of twelve written words combined {seemingly symbolically related to unity of the 10 Sefirot (Number) as continuum being a 6 dimensional notion of space, time, morality and gender containing opposites}.

YHVH {south – Chesed/Mercy}, YHHV, YVHH {above – Netzach/Victory}, HVHY, HVYH {north – Gevurah/Strength}, HHYV, VHYH {west – Yesod/Foundation}, VHHY, VYHH {east – Tiferet/Beauty}, HYHV, HYVH {below – Hod/Splendour}, HHVY [© 2000 Steve Savedow, The Sepher Rezial: The Book of the Angel Raziel, p 144, 168]

Re: Does Anyone Know what Dolf is on about?

sci.lang: Re: Does Anyone Know what Dolf is on about?

Being further sustained by a symbolic theology derived from the Pythagorean (c. 580–500 BCE) usage of the Triangulation of Number: $n(n+1)/2$ as transposition applied to the Tetragrammaton of 'YHWH' and known as the root of nature or Tetractys, the 'Holy Four–fold Form'.

SWEAR AN OATH AND REVERE {ie. Y + YH + YHV + YHVH}:
Yod (10) as $4(4+1)/2 = 10$ + (Kether – Prime Directive as Sefirot/Number)
Yod (10) + He (5) as $5(5+1)/2 = 15$ + (Chokmah – Wisdom/Throne of Glory)
Yod (10) + He (5) + Vav (6) as $6(6+1)/2 = 21$ + (Binah – Understanding of Angels)
Yod (10) + He (5) + Vav (6) + He (5) = 26 (Malkhut – Dwelling of God in Creation)

As the total of 72 (ie. 472 BCE) [c. 57/58 CE in Romans 2:17–24] and existing prior to the year 457 BCE (72J2W1D) from whence the Hebrews had made several population repatriations to Jerusalem from Babylonian exile [c. 400 BCE in Ezra 2:1–2; Nehemiah 7:6–7; 450 BCE in Esther 9:6–15].

The Dead Sea Scroll fragment '4Q390 as Prophetic Apocryphon or 4QPseudo–Moses' provides an alternate theological view, in that it speaks of these repatriations associated with Jubilee chronology ('in the seventh Jubilee' as 343 or 73 years: the 'oth {sign, signal; a distinguishing mark; banner; remembrance; miraculous sign; omen; warning; token, ensign, standard, miracle, proof} character as $(7^3 - 7^2)$ years) produces a value of 294 [6J] years as a dynamic ratio within its result of 120J (ie. $20 \times 6J$) Jubilees + 120 [2J3W1D] years [ie. Jubilee & Torah @ Sinai in [50J] + $12 \times [6J] + [3W1D] = 6,000$ years {ie.

This notion that Divine Providence is determined by the 'oth {signs} chronological principle as being 6J or 294 years may be associated with the Telos as the Topical year/day solar eclipse Monday 25 December, 2000 + 6 days = 122J3W1D: "For eclipses are a natural consequence of the rules which regulate the divine natures of the sun and moon; and they are indications either of the impending death of some king, or the destruction of some city [or] to such events as the consequences of the omens {oth–signs} which I have now been mentioning. ... For as the sun and moon exist in consequence of Providence, so also do all things in heaven, even though we are unable to trace out accurately the respective natures and powers of each, therefore, reduced to silence about them." [Philo of Alexandria 20BCE–50CE, On Providence II: 50, 52]

}}) transpiring with both Zerubbabel's rebuilding of the 2nd Jerusalem Temple ('those who will be the first to go up from the land of captivity in order to build the temple') under an initial decree from King Darius I in circa 520 BCE [#49, #46, #59, #39 – Achieving Oneness/ The Root of Order/ #57, #25]. And under subsequent decree from King Artaxerxes in 72J2W1D = 457 BCE [#9, #31, #51, #61 – Virtuosity at Using 'Beneath'/ The Virtue of Humility/ #59, #23], allowing the restoration of the Judicatory and Administrative Process in accordance with the Laws of Moses: ('I will speak to them and send them a precept / commandment and they will understand all that they have abandoned, they and their fathers').

Re: Does Anyone Know what Dolf is on about?

sci.lang: Re: Does Anyone Know what Dolf is on about?

If you don't have the spiritual depth to address such esoteric notions, your mimicry is not my problem and insufficient grounds for you to engage in impunity as you do as an alibi for a spiritual life, wisdom and intelligence as understanding.

It is afeared "An integral model—namely, all—quadrant, all—level noumenon (ie. known as the Wilber model as deployed within the Spiral Dynamics Architecture)—that attempts to provide a framework in which all of those 'facts', if you will, can be accommodated. The facts, that is, of both interior realities and exterior realities, 'spiritual' experiences and 'scientific' experiences, subjective realities and objective realities. It finds ample room for the traditional Great Chain of Being {ie. as nomenclature: #1 – Seraphim, #2 – Cherubim, #3 – Thrones, #4 – Dominions, #5 – Virtues, #6 – Powers, #7 – Principalities, #8 – Arch—Angels, #9 – Angels} and Knowing—from matter or mind to body to soul to spirit: '...the Lord—YaHWeH God—'ELOHIYM (mind) formed man of the dust of the ground (body), and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life (spirit); and man became a living soul (soul).'[Genesis 2:7] But it plugs those realities into empirical facts in a definite and specifiable fashion." [© 2000 Ken Wilber, 'A Theory of Everything – An Integral Vision for Business, Politics, Science & Spirituality', Shamhala Publications, Boston p 66–73]

It is a wonder that "Infidel" isn't familiar with it, as they claim to be 'In Christ'—it's otherwise known as the 'Mind of Christ': "Howbeit we speak—LALEO wisdom—SOPHIA {ie. Telos (122J3W1D) = Arch (22/7 as 3W1D) + c²} among them—EN that are perfect—TELEOIS: yet—DE not the wisdom—SOPHIA of this—TOUTOU world—AION, nor—OUDE of the princes—ARCHON of this—TOUTOU world—AION, that come—KATARGEO to nought—KATARGEO:

But we speak the wisdom of God in a mystery, even the hidden wisdom, which God ordained before the world unto our glory: Which none of the princes of this world knew: for had they known it, they would not have crucified the Lord of glory.

But as it is written, Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love him. But God hath revealed them unto us by his Spirit: for the Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God. For what man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man which is in him? even so the things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God. Now we have received, not the spirit of the world, but the spirit which is of God; that we might know the things that are freely given to us of God.

Which things also we speak, not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth; comparing spiritual things with spiritual. But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned. But he that is spiritual judgeth all things, yet he himself is judged of no man. For who hath known the mind of the Lord, that he may instruct him? But we have the mind of Christ." [1 Corinthians 2:7–16]

Re: Does Anyone Know what Dolf is on about?

sci.lang: Re: Does Anyone Know what Dolf is on about?

– dolf

– <<http://www.users.bigpond.net.au/telos/kabbalah/patent.html#AXIOM4>>

----- Original Message -----

From: "Jacques Guy" <jguy@alphalink.com.au>

Newsgroups: aus.religion.christian,aus.politics

Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2004 3:22 AM

Subject: Re: Does Anyone Know what Dolf is on about?

"Jacques Guy" <jguy@alphalink.com.au> wrote in message
news:412A27D5.570F@alphalink.com.au...

infidel wrote:

> *So what's he on about*

> *Maybe he's is just borderline.....*

No, what gives it away is the layout of those
two web pages. The fellow _has_ flipped his lid.
Those people are not uncommon. Adolf Wölfli is an example
("http://www.mam.org/collections/folk_detail_wolfli.htm")
Wölfli has flipped his lid but not, for instance,
Luigi Serafini ("<http://www.almaleh.com/serafini-e.htm>")

The difference is that:

1. One (here Wölfli) is driven by his obsession,
the other not (Serafini was/is an architect
and his "Codex Seraphinianus" did not interfere
with his career: "http://www.futurarium.com/20022003/ls_e.htm")
2. The work of one is without merit (no artistic merit,
no imagination)

This Dolf Boek is visibly driven by some obsession, and
his stuff is just a mishmash of ill-digested kabbalah
and numerology, without merit, imagination, nor interest.
It can only be considered interesting as an illustration of
some mental disease.

"Jacques Guy" <jguy@alphalink.com.au> wrote in message
news:412A8AE2.5B86@alphalink.com.au...

Readers of aus.tv and aus.cars would breathe a sigh
of relief, but they won't know that I've left their
newsgroups out.

We know. The story has been doing the rounds on sci.lang

Stuff and nonsense from a publicity-hungry ignoramus,
nothing new. In fact, we are pretty used to this rubbish.
It re-surfaces periodically.

Re: Does Anyone Know what Dolf is on about?

Blah blah blah. If that Gordon fraud had really wanted to test those Indians' intellectual abilities, he would have taught them to count in the first place. Languages without a number system abound. There are many such languages in South America, and many in Australia. They have managed very nicely without for tens of thousands of years, thank you very much. And they have no trouble learning to count, and no trouble counting like you and me, when the need arises.

So that "The present study" certainly does not "represent a rare and perhaps unique case for strong linguistic determinism" as "Gordon wrote." At best this Gordon is an imbecile who does not know how to conduct a psychological experiment. At worst he is a lying scoundrel.

It is little surprise that madmen such as Dolf Boek should be attracted to the snake oil distilled by the like of this Gordon character.

QOLON NOTE:

You might take note of the recent article in the Washington Post concerning your constraints in thinking and especially with transcendental, metaphysical and esoteric thought of a kabbalistic nature (eg. the idea of inner or absence of soul), being due to an unfamiliarity with the language that might define those concepts: "Does language sometimes define the content of thought? Are there people who cannot entertain certain ideas because their language does not have the words to express them? Are there concepts that cannot be translated into some languages?"

These questions have vexed linguists and neuroscientists for years. The general feeling has been that language does not limit cognition. However, a new study in the online version of Science suggests that the prevailing notion may not be correct.

Peter Gordon, a behavioral scientist at Columbia University, conducted an unusual set of experiments with seven adults of the 200-member Piraha tribe of Amazonian Indians in Brazil.

The tribe's counting system consists of three words -- one that means "roughly one," one that means "a small quantity" and one that means "many."

Gordon asked the Piraha subjects to perform various tasks in which performance would be greatly enhanced by the ability to count. These included laying out the same number of nuts or sticks that he had laid out; distinguishing two boxes whose only difference was the number of fish drawn on their tops; and knowing when a tin can was empty after watching the researcher put nuts into the can and then withdraw them one by one.

Gordon found that the Piraha were essentially incapable of following or accounting for more than three objects. When a task involved larger numbers -- even five or six -- the subjects' answers were little more than guesses, even though they clearly understood the tests and were working hard

sci.lang: Re: Does Anyone Know what Dolf is on about?

on them.

He attributed this surprising finding to the fact the Piraha "have no privileged name for the singular quantity" -- in other words, no one, no notion of an integer.

"The present study represents a rare and perhaps unique case for strong linguistic determinism" -- the idea that language determines thought -- Gordon wrote." [© 2004 Washington Post, David Brown "They Don't Have a Word for It ", Monday, August 23, 2004; Page A06 cf: <<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A25018-2004Aug22.html> >]

I've re-included the follow-ups as the religious vilification which I was commenting on and you are attempting to justify came from there.

Graham W, Go mind your own business elsewhere.

- dolf

"Graham W" <zebedee@alphalink.commercial.au> wrote in message news:41299034@news.alphalink.com.au...
I'm no neo-fascist and I didn't "come out of the woodwork".

You crossposted your nonsense into a newsgroup I read. I removed the crosspost in the followups, yet you've gone to the trouble of putting it back in. If you don't want me to reply, don't cosspost your rubbish into the newsgroup I read. Simple.

QOLON NOTE:

I don't have to wonder when it comes to you, mention neo-fascists as pretension in the greatest degree, and it has a certain resonance or dissonance with their simple minded mates, [who] come out of the wood-work [to] give them a hand at hurling religious values vilification of seventh-day Sabbath observant Christians--it's a form of anti-semitism and un-Constitutional behaviour --Lest we forget!

- dolf

"Graham W" <zebedee@alphalink.commercial.au> wrote in message news:41296df7\$1@news.alphalink.com.au...

Qolon wrote:

> *Here is a buttwipe {'Arsenokoites' as defiler of themselves + 'Malakos' as soft and delicate tissue} for you!*

>

> - dolf

And you wonder why no one will take you seriously???

Date:

18:24:04 = [#54, #19, #27, #28 - Opposites and Primitivism/ Returning to Simplicity, (#56, #26)] as Eleazar - help of God, court of God {Nature

Re: Does Anyone Know what Dolf is on about?

sci.lang: Re: Does Anyone Know what Dolf is on about?

contains Nature / Focus – Olithiel / Orion}

Thu, 29 Apr 2004 = [#18, #11, #78, #58 * – Political Reversal/ Adaptation to Change, (#2, #80)] as Methuselah – Man of the dart/javelin (weapon, missile, sprout)/ He has sent his death {Focus / Transforming Nature}}

From: Graham W <zebedee@alphalink.au>

Qolon wrote:

> *Dear newsgroup readers,*

...

> *As I said previously, it appears the individual zoot suffers from*

> *self-delusions and is now resorting to fabrications, all in an attempt to*

> *escape the moniker of insignificance.*

Dolf, you claim zoot suffers from self delusions.

Clearly if he's deluded he will be unable to properly judge for himself whether he is deluded. Your opinion that he is deluded is just one opinion among the many people who might have read these threads.

So lets take a poll.

Who thinks zoot is deluded?

Now bear in mind, if zoot might not realise he's deluded, maybe you might also be deluded and not realise it?

So, just in case, who thinks Dolf is deluded?

Finally, perhaps I'm deluding myself, and you're all sane? So who thinks I'm deluded?

8-)

(I must be deluded, trying to reason with Dolf, so I vote:

Zoot, Not deluded,

Dolf, deluded

Me, unqualified to vote about myself.

QOLON NOTES:

Its hard to justify why you should participate in continued religious vilification of seventh-day Sabbath observant Christians—it's a form of anti-semitism and un-Constitutional behaviour that only a neo-fascist would engage in, second only to Frank Cole's deliberate with-holding of truth as denial of justice made under the guise of Australian mateship—Lest we forget!

– dolf

"ferret" <microsoft.hell@localhost.microsoft.com> wrote in message news:2ossihFcrosdU1@uni-berlin.de...

Re: Does Anyone Know what Dolf is on about?

sci.lang: Re: Does Anyone Know what Dolf is on about?

rufus wrote:

> *I have spent some time analysing his web pages and I think he is
borderline
> genius.*

WTF, he should hire one of those kids in kindergarden to improve the
web site !. And hire somebody else who is not colour blind.

I would like to nominate it for worst web design EVER.

"She's always looked like the evil stepmother on a jerry springer show. But
looking at her now, time hasn't been very kind to her at all. She could play
the lead in a horror movie, won't need any makeup." [ferret
<nobody@localhost.microsft.com> 'Lindy Chamberlain' at 11:44:59 hrs [#39,
#39, #73, #52 – So What?/ Returning to the Origin, (#42, #40) as Abijah –
the Lord is my father {(Transforming Nature)}] on 09 Jul 2004 [#28, #23,
#55, #54 – Culturing Perspectives/ The Cultivation of Intuition, (#26, #56)]
as Jacob – He takes by the heel, he supplants/ That supplants, undermines;
the heel {10, 10, 10, = 30, #2}{Totality of Nature or Autonomous Nature
(Focus / Nature contains Nature)}]

"Remember that she, and the ex husband, ex SDA pastor, and Qolon (dolf),
belong to the Seventh Day Adventist Church. Eat your WeetBix! LOL!!!!"
["infidel" <somebody@somewhere.co> 'Lindy Chamberlain' at 19:05:06 [#7, #56
*, #60, #60 – Skill at Ruling/ How to Maintain One's Place, (#67, #15)] as
Jacob – He takes by the heel, he supplants/ That supplants, undermines; the
heel {10, 10, 30, = 50, #1} {Ratio / Nature surmounts Nature – Xiphiel /
Xonopnoenax}] on 09 Jul 2004 [#28, #23, #55, #54 – Culturing Perspectives/
The Cultivation of Intuition, (#26, #56)] as Jacob – He takes by the heel,
he supplants/ That supplants, undermines; the heel {10, 10, 10, = 30,
#2}{Totality of Nature or Autonomous Nature (Focus / Nature contains
Nature)}]

```
<vObj iDate="Mon Aug 23 2004 10:37:34 hrs">
  <tx><io telos="706">WTF</io><po>,</po></tx>
  <tx><io telos="13">he</io></tx>
  <tx><io telos="502">should</io></tx>
  <tx><io telos="112">hire</io></tx>
  <tx><io telos="115">one</io></tx>
  <tx><io telos="66">of</io></tx>
  <tx><io telos="373">those</io></tx>
  <tx><io telos="133">kids</io></tx>
  <tx><io telos="59">in</io></tx>
  <tx><io telos="335">kindergarden</io></tx>
  <tx><io telos="260">to</io></tx>
  <tx><io telos="674">improve</io></tx>
  <tx><io telos="213">the</io></tx>
  <tx><io telos="507">web</io></tx>
  <tx><io telos="314">site</io><po> !.</po></tx>
  <tx><io telos="55">And</io></tx>
  <tx><io telos="112">hire</io></tx>
```

Re: Does Anyone Know what Dolf is on about?

sci.lang: Re: Does Anyone Know what Dolf is on about?

<tx><io telos="971">somebody</io></tx>
<tx><io telos="140">else</io></tx>
<tx><io telos="568">who</io></tx>
<tx><io telos="109">is</io></tx>
<tx><io telos="310">not</io></tx>
<tx><io telos="543">colour</io></tx>
<tx><io telos="95">blind</io><po>.</po></tx>
<tx><io telos="9">I</io></tx>
<tx><io telos="894">would</io></tx>
<tx><io telos="64">like</io></tx>
<tx><io telos="260">to</io></tx>
<tx><io telos="415">nominate</io></tx>
<tx><io telos="209">it</io></tx>
<tx><io telos="156">for</io></tx>
<tx><io telos="950">worst</io></tx>
<tx><io telos="507">web</io></tx>
<tx><io telos="175">design</io></tx>
<tx><io telos="500">EVER</io><po>.</po></tx>
</vObj>

Total for Sentence: 11427 % 81 = #6

At 10:37:34 hrs = [#63, #58, #48, #7 * – Intentional Reversal/ Dimming
Radiance, (#29, #53)] as Jesse – gift; oblation; one who is]
On = 23 Aug 2004 = [#22 *, #74, #56, #66 – Strategic Reversal/ Putting
Oneself Behind, (#36, #46)] as Obed – a servant; workman {(Nature amended in
its Nature / Autonomous
Nature)}}]

#1 = [#6, #69, #20, #70 – Difficulty in Knowing How/ Difficult to
Understand, (#76, #6)] {Form of Nature}]
#2 = [#16, #6, #6, #57 – Laissez Faire Politics/ Simplicity In Habits, (#10,
#72)]
#3 = [#16, #6, #6, #57 – Laissez Faire Politics/ Simplicity In Habits, (#10,
#72)]
#4 = [#61, #73, #57, #6 – The Superiority of the Female/ The Completion of
Form, (#37, #45)]
#5 = [#76, #78, #62, #12 – The Numbing Effect of the Conventional/
Abstaining from Desire, (#6, #76) as Kenan – Fixed, (nestlings; figuratively
a chamber or dwelling:–nest, room)/ buyer; owner
{Engendering Nature / Nature amended in its Nature}]
#6 = [#6, #69, #20, #70 – Difficulty in Knowing How/ Difficult to
Understand, (#76, #6)] {Form of Nature}]

– dolf

– < <http://www.users.bigpond.net.au/telos/kabbalah/patent.html#AXIOM4> >