

**NEW! UPDATE: JASPERS' PHILOSOPHY (PHILOSOPHICAL LOGIC) AND PSYCHOPATHOLOGY REAPPLIED TOWARD JURIDICAL AND MEDICAL PRUDENCE (1-1-2009)—A CONTINUATION OF JASPERS APPLIED TO THE CRUCIBLE OF THE CRUCIFIXION, RESURRECTION, AND TOMBS (March 25, 2007)**

This update is a continuation of <http://www.karljaspersapplied.net/Crucible.htm> the above Webpage and expands on Jaspers' brief about mtDNA and his critique that goes to the limits of knowledge about mutations and the improbability of the alteration of species over time (GP 512). The update includes a view of a chimera court-case that shows law brings awareness of the limits of common knowledge; the case tends to show that traditional testimony vs. DNA-laden stuff goes to the delimiting of the execution and prosecution of legislation within the three-branch system—legislative, executive, judicial—of government. Item 10. below is a continuation of the March 25, 2007 posting which begins with item “0. Prefatory Orientations” and ends with item 9. The many changes needed and requested corrections can be made at any time and responses are encouraged. My intention is to date significant changes.

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

- 10. Distinguishing the *nescience* side from the *science* side of DNA research's contribution to the biological generation and ethical regeneration of humankind, law vs. freedom (how the law helps to bring awareness of humankind's limits)—**
  - 10.1. Metaphysical play this side of the limits of unknowable ultimate origin—**
- 11. A dying person's testimony about the primordial issue; the Genesis genetic philosophy legislates against incest and bestiality, and parenthood is administered before the throne of God—**
  - 11.1. A pithy bit of Jaspers' philosophical logic applied to some WMSB illogicality (what most scientists believe)—**In this update, I use Reed A. Cartwright's Website <http://dererumnatura.us/>
- 12. Abridged, Jaspers' sees two contradictory and misleading points in “evolutionism” [not his word] (@ 55 Perennial Scope of Philosophy)**
  - 12.1. *First*: One can only propound, I mean, the devil only allows *definite and answerable questions* concerning the *differences* between ape and humankind—**
    - 12.0. This to me is the most reasonable and consistent interpretation of Jaspers'
    - 12.01. Reed only appears to inquire into differences but only by way of similarity**
  - 12.2. *Second*: “...[I]n [humankind's] body we seek after...incomparable basic traits, and in our comparison place [humankind] in opposition to all other living things”.**
- 13. Clarification—It must be made clear that Jaspers position is: “The question of present fact must be distinguished from the question of origin”.**
  - 13.1. My *correctible* effort to understand Reed's research—**

- 13.2. What Reed is trying to demonstrate
14. So Jaspers remains relevant
- 14.1. From morphological differences toward answerable questions about DNA similarity—
15. Dissimilarity and similarity affects the presumption of innocents; spinning into the Lydia Fairchild case situation—(re: Two sets of DNA, one apparently more dominate, another more conjured than real)—
- 15.1. A case of dissimilarity and consequential similarity/no “evolutionary” premise—
- 15.2. Similarity vs. difference in juridical and medical matters, the demand for answerable definite questions, a similarity-case tending toward ultimate and guilt related definite answers about the limits and delimits in degrees of immaculate conceptions—
- 15.3. Similarity vs. dissimilarity—Now
- 

Continued from <http://www.karljaspersapplied.net/Crucible.htm> dated March 25 2007

#### **JASPERS’ PHILOSOPHICAL LOGIC AND PSYCHOPATHOLOGY RE-APPLIED TOWARD JURIDICAL AND MEDICAL PRUDENCE 1-1-2009**

**10. Distinguishing the *nescience* side from the *science* side of DNA research’s contribution to the biological generation and ethical regeneration of humankind, law vs. freedom (how the law helps to bring awareness of humankind’s limits)—**Two recent genetic cases (chimeric, and an alleged codification of special talk, namely “zeta power law” vs. a “traditional geometric model”) point toward the limits of DNA-conclusive-attitudes and tend to delimit the potential for knowledge. A law, i.e., a static certitude, tends to enslave science. To those liberated from laid-down regulation the case-examples can serve the delimitation of DNA knowledge. In the case of chimeric Lydia Fairchild, and a traditional expert-witness, an MD, for the defense of Lydia exposes the negative results of the conclusivity suggested by “what most scientists believe” (WMSB) when such becomes legislated. That attitude of exclusivity is contributing to reducing the term “scientist” to a four-letter profane symbol, WMSB. These cases reinforce Jaspers statement that:

We have to content ourselves with at least a surmise of the dumbfounding complexity of heredity, variation and mutation, so that in psychopathology we do not put our confidence in too simple an explanation (GP 512)... We acquire a sense of wonder and a desire to refrain from making sweeping and precipitate conclusions (513).

“Dumbfounding” still applies now; for instance: because there remains a lot of uncertainty associated with required paternity tests to establish eligibility for public assistance for families in need. A mother in need could have had two non-identical twin zygotes that seemed to have fused and the situation is complicated by the possibility of distinct fathers. It’s a dumb situation that gets dumber when DNA tests points a

prosecutor toward a violation of an oath relative to an application for social assistance; the test's results point toward malfeasance and concomitant guilt is presumed until proven innocent of breaking a fallible law. Our social norms here-to-fore allow only one father and DNA conclusive presumptions fall in line in logical sequence—until now. Until recently the legal systems would allow for one biological father and one mother per child, or twins for that matter. Dumb gets dumber in as much as quite apparently mtDNA can be inherited from both genetic parents (which if the illogicality of mtEve is engaged, the father can be understood as the mother). A chimera, within cloudy areas of clear-cut concepts, can have one and two genetic fathers and mothers. The situation becomes more complex when given the limitations of DNA inheritance knowledge, e.g., that tests can show signs of another DNA set along with the dominant DNA set—and uncertainty growing with the less dominant exponentially decreasing in apparent power, i.e., it becomes a case of the minor being searched for and found amidst the major because it is presumed to be there based on a concept of origin wherein mtEve or motherhood has real-time precedence in a play-like primeval virtual-time model, that mtEve predominates over mtAdam. Much of the above is play at the limit of knowledge, and of course it is play using the extraordinary.

**10.1. Metaphysical play this side of the limits of unknowable ultimate origin**—Play at the limits of knowledge is like saying the biblical Adam and Eve had an incestuous relationship because God, though genderless, was their father, and descendants were of questionable births (and indeed the birth of humankind is unanswerable). The metaphysical play on words in Genesis regarding musings over origins is transcended by the revelation that in the last analysis our dichotomous way of thinking, to which Genesis relates, is a central predicament but is absorbed in the one concept of God. As an article of faith, Jaspers says, “mankind [I prefer humankind] has one single origin and one goal” (Origin and Goal, xv).

**11. A dying person's testimony about the primordial issue; the Genesis genetic philosophy legislates against incest and bestiality, and parenthood is administered before the throne of God**—God is not the earthly father type of lineage, for the concept of ultimate origin is genderless. Jesus told Mary (see 1.3. below on many Marys) in effect that it is not an earthly father that we should worship, rather that we should move away from father-ideologies (as in “father David”) and back to God; he told Mary “I go to my God and your God”. And on the cross while experiencing the full potential of humankind's effort to acquire power through making others suffer, Jesus reminded the facilitators of such empowerment that God is their father and not the source of this inhumanity. During this torturous episode the dying person, Jesus, still clearly saw the issue to be not who is your particular mother and father, but that “If we could grasp where we come from, we would cease to be human (131, Phil and the World, chapter “The creation of the World”). If we would remember (vaguely remember) where we came from we would not be intentionally inhumane.

**11.1. A pithy bit of Jaspers' philosophical logic applied to some WMSB illogicality (what most scientists believe)**—In this update, I use Reed A. Cartwright's Website <http://dererumnatura.us/> to show succinctly the meaning of Jaspers' statement that “man

[humankind] is immediate” and not mediated by a plumage of science-like glossalalia to enforce (powers of probability elevated to law) a naturalistic positivism. Reed’s Website can be taken as representative of the most current state of the art of the digital and metrical embroidering of “research”. The fundamental illogicality of which can be used to elucidate what Jaspers meant by “two contradictory basic experiences [that] are points of departure [in] scientific investigation” (@55 Perennial Scope of Philosophy). Reed seems to circumvent this unavoidable ambiguity in thinking by digital and metrical symbols; it seems to me to be an ontology based on a camouflaged illogicality. The circumvention is attractive enough to receive prestigious recognition through publication of his research in a “journal” for peer review. His argument contributes to an accountability in prosaic form that can be used for the continued bailout of biological fundamentalism via the spirit of a national WMSB academy’s pontifex maximus.

## **12. Abridged, Jaspers’ sees two contradictory and misleading points in “evolutionism” [not his word] (@ 55 Perennial Scope of Philosophy)**

**12.1. First: One can only propound, I mean, the devil only allows *definite and answerable questions concerning the differences between ape and humankind***—i.e., difference is only allowed while ignoramuses wanton for answers trespass on the WMSB (what most scientists believe) turf surrounding their tree of knowledge of what is right and wrong. In effect that leniency toward trespassers hunting for dissimilarity applies only to the unlearned ignoramuses who have lost sight of the out of reach tree of life. Example: Reed faithfully propounds (or smilingly I would say “uses the proper graffiti”) similarities and the research is vectored toward 100% similarity while ignoring the other 100+% difference; he sees only one phylogenetic specialty-tree. And this misleading propagates, propounds, that there must be no serious inquiry into the difference between man and animal; i.e., the devil forbid that an individual should be allowed to inquire into anything but...but...the similarities of the more apparent than the actual real difference. It has to do with what stands out to the masses and little to do with the essential—the essential is, as Jaspers says, humankind is seen as “a product of the world, but in his essence he is outside the world, *now as before* [my emphasis noting how carefully Jaspers avoids “evolutionism’s” ideology and keeps the tree of life in view]”. The biological illogicality in fundamental biologism—which makes this paragraph seem like sophistry—is programmed to allow only the similarities with simian primates, similarities that stand out like regalia-investitured church primates that capture the surface senses of the masses.

12.0. This difference in essence, to me, is the most reasonable and consistent interpretation of Jaspers’ quote: “...I cannot enquire into the difference between man and animal”, it is a tongue in cheek bit of facetiousness. That’s made more clear when read conjunctively with the essence, spirit, of his conversation with the geologist (Perennial, on page 57), and also the amusing antidote about the proverbial (“evolutionary” apocrypha bible, proverbial 1:1 allegedly authored by the Axial period’s Anaximander—my tongue-in-cheek humor) last ape and first man, and especially with his comment that “Man cannot be derived from something else, but is immediately at the base of all things”

(59). Furthermore, if a photo is worth more than more words, the photo of Jaspers, Professor Fano, and Professor Cornelius taking the “Oath to the *Spirit* of Science [emphasis mine]” tends to support my interpretation (168/169 Kirkbright’s Navigations,).

**12.01. Reed only appears to inquire into differences but only by way of similarity** as an ultimate premise (and there is where illogicality emerges fully matured, i.e., it is more than a major premise in a dialectical process, it is the *ontologism*). *The devil forbids* that we talk inquiringly about those differences that make the biological fundamentalist uncomfortable. *God forbid* that humankind should not continue to financially bailout this fundamentalism without a Reformation-like accountability of biblical proportion, a portion of which includes the spirit of the unanswerable (that learned-ignorance bit of wisdom relative to the Axial period). Of human interest: Reed is seeking employment within an education-industry’s “E”-cottage-fundamentalism. So out-front he must bash some communicants, e.g., he introduces derogatorily the symbol “creationists” to justify tuff “evolutionary” talk to demonstrate his commitment to the “evolution” gang. It helps to get some graffiti published for the portfolio. Moreover it demonstrates a commitment to the publishing industry now threatened by the WWW and in-home printers. In reality, more things considered, we can predict that a fourth estate’s collusive corporate form of vanity publishing is only made available democratically until search engines can protect the mass vanity that that industry harvests.

**12.2. Second:** “...[I]n [humankind’s] body we seek after...incomparable basic traits, and in our comparison place [humankind] in opposition to all other living things”. That two-line bit of reasonable ambiguity, so vividly understood philosophically and theologically, Reed seems to dismiss with a cavaliered deferral to the spirit of positivism and certitude. His surface judgmentalism toward others’ philosophical-logic and theological expressions showing learned ignorance is expressed in these words: “Amusingly, humans and chimps are so similar to one another...” and then he spins off the derisive use of hard core science and is enraptured by a mood and mode of unquestionable origin, and thereby avoids questionable matters of origin. For what Reed means by this word “similar” is “origin” in terms of vectored divergences in long time. Vectored time simply means that if humankind exists now, it proves we have found the most recent common descendent of an answerable most recent common ancestor. Reed and the WMSB-cottage take this cavaliered cladogenesis seriously. To this Jaspers’ would not be so indiscreet or unkind as to refer to it as “harping and humorous” (unless retorting in kind) as did Reed, but rather playfulness sneaking into seriousness on the edge or at the limits of “knowledge”—i.e., forgetting not to take origin play too seriously (57 Perennial). At this point Reed introduces his ontological “evolutionism” by setting up “creationism”—as the psyche-void papier-mâché. At this point in his constructions, seen as playful by learned-ignorant observers, Reed gets seriously down to escaping into the infinity of the finite nucleus stuff of ontogenetics’ phylogenetics—though hanging onto intellectual honesty by a finger-nail reference to this “indel” stuff as “nearly infinite”. At the precipice of knowledge, the infinite horizon’s expanse reduces the “evolutionary” origin percentage to nearly 100% improbable, and this is what Jaspers means by: “Even in [humankind’s]

body we seek after these incomparable basic traits, and in our comparison place him in opposition to all other living things” (55).

**13. Clarification--It must be made clear that Jaspers position is: “The question of present fact must be distinguished from the question of origin”.** My position is that presently, *now*, present facts, including “indel” lengths and comparisons, and intimations, must be distinguished from the question of origin; it must be removed from the hubristic of origin-answered conclusions by the elitist. The questionable must be made clearer than Reed can do and still meet initial eligibility biases for the education-cottage. Reed’s position is that his research is to be assented to as not just an apology for, but proof for biological fundamentalism. His research from the start is to prove humankind’s origin is known, whereas Jaspers’ position bears repeating, it is that “man cannot be derived from something else, but is immediately at the base of all things” (59). That’s because fallible humankind, perpetually confronted by ultimate situations (from the mind’s limits to death), is doing the thoughtful or thoughtless research and analysis. But Jaspers is to be distinguished from radical constructivism in that traditional learned ignorance is a humbling constant (and Jaspers would want little to do with Herbert Müller’s budding autocrat-producing zero derivationalism). Reed’s phylogenetic contacts with the “nearly infinite” fits an “almost but lost” hymnal appeal, an appeal to quit specialty talk about metric measurements, quit *conclusive* talk about minimizing differences from 5%, 1.5 to 1.2 to *make light of dissimilarity*—quit arbitrarily finger-tip tipping the sophist-scale closer to 98.8 similarity to distance himself from and distract from the 100%/100+% difference in essence and quality.

**13.1. My correctible effort to understand Reed’s research**—Reed is propounding a neutralized research (and it sounds like pure dichotomous objectivity) researching different genomes (human and chimp) independently, rather than side by side wherein complementarity occurs and distorts to a degree. Reed has determined that his approach reduces the difference to one of similarity; similarity rather than difference is elevated to an infallible static principle. Epistemologically this means that the dichotomy of the reasoning process is suppressed and monasticism or singularity (Gregorian thought chanting) replaces the freedom to think. It amounts to a withdrawal from (at least) the ambiguity of observable reality. His model, a substitute for reality, is designed to show that substitutions, i.e., “indels” (insertions and deletions in DNA strands) do not effect change over time to the point that the truism of “evolutionism” (my word not his) is affected. Reed’s logic begins with an origin-tenet that’s consistently propounded. But his conclusion is that DNA difference from the standpoint of “indels” is not the fundamental ground of “evolutionism” but rather “indel” research promotes a stand-back take a common sense look-see and note the difference between humankind and chimp and that difference proves “evolutionism” by vectored change through (impossible) yet-to-be-discovered mutations over unimaginable time (a nominalism (name only) “evolutionary time” becomes like the ultimate known dimension). In other words, in full circularity of thinking, morphology becomes the fact that proves the “evolutionary” connection. Contrasting with this is Jaspers’ “We see man’s body in its incomparable expression...unique specificity...in opposition to all other living things”. After being immersed in the infinity of the finite Reed can’t quite admit to infinity and still save

rationalism; he admits to “indels” varying lengths as “nearly-infinite” but having no significant argument for his biological tenet regarding “evolutionary substitutions” (gaps), “evolutionary distances” and “evolutionary divergence”; here is a reposing in meta-math, an escape into meta-metriculated-metricology (an mutant ontologism).

**13.2. What Reed is trying to demonstrate** by two lines of metric measuring, is that the complementary conductivity that occurs in the traditional comparison explains what might seem to some (derogatorily classified as “harping creationists”) to add up to an increase in measurable difference or a spreading of probability or the margins of error (error is never admitted to so the ultimate situation of guilt is also avoided). Reed is attempting to take away any non-directional thunders that those might have whom are not committed to biological fundamentalism. But for Reed, consistent with biological fundamentalism, it’s presumed that a mutational process really fills in the difference-gap, though measuring and comparing “Indels” cannot demonstrate it. The illogic is: if humankind now appears as-is, the most morphologically similar must be the source and the mentalism involved in that more apparent common-sense than real essence-sense, constitutes the known mechanism elevated still higher to the verbiage “It’s evolution”.

**14. So Jaspers remains relevant** and remains timely correct, that: “Up to now (nothing truly unique has been found in the physical structure of man)” that changes the fundamental fact that when a “scientist” propounds, one can only with intellectual honesty propound the difference between man and ape—Oliver (Internet search “Oliver chimp”) notwithstanding, including DNA chromosomes, and chimeric matters (items below) considered.

**14.1. From morphological differences toward answerable questions about DNA similarity**--Jaspers at the limit of supposed knowledge, uses philosophical logic (ageless wisdom pack string) in the next statement:

Facts have been disclosed along both lines of approach [*first and second* above] but really decisive ones only in the first [*“evolutionism” ideology can easily misread Jaspers’ use of decisive; decisive here reads like “radically conclusive”*]. Yet answers leading to important fundamental results can be obtained only by following the second approach. [*Out of sight of the cottaged gang, Reed appears, in conclusions, to be looking at the correct line of contradictory experience.*] If something truly unique were found in the physical structure of man, the first line [*First 12.1. above*] of investigation would acquire a more specific meaning.

There is nothing in Reed’s Website and research paper that argues convincingly against Jaspers next statement:

Up to now, this has not been done, despite the many answers offered from the discovery that only man can laugh, to the assertion that the structure of man’s body is physiologically and morphologically open, and that in distinction to all other living things that seem to adhere to rigid patterns, his body somehow embraces all the potentialities of the living (55, 56).

Reed's meta-metrical contributions infringe upon the scientific attitude by presuming only answerables, breaches the open-ended logic fundamental to the question of the origin of consciousness and life-as-such, stultifies just this side of learned ignorance, and evades what Jaspers clearly sees as the unavoidable, i.e., that the "question of present fact must be distinguished from the question of origin" (56).

**15. Dissimilarity and similarity affects the presumption of innocents; spinning into the Lydia Fairchild case situation—(re: Two sets of DNA, one apparently more dominate, another more conjured than real)—** This is the case of a mother being considered for prosecution for not meeting an executed (administrated) bit of legislation, i.e., an established similarity-DNA statute that then, due to the application for entitlement rights, was involved in the judicial branch of the civil system. She was required to establish parental relationship by DNA to meet initial eligibility for public assistance. When a codified DNA-conclusive requirement was applied it concluded that Lydia was not the mother of her first two of three children (boys). There was no DNA match. The MD delivering the babies testified (birth certification, and testimony) as to motherhood, but guilt was still assumed (but disguised as presumption of innocence) by the agency and prosecution, like suspicion of lying about being a surrogate mother, some scheme yet to be proven, an implantation scheme or some criminal activity. Eventually further DNA testing, I suppose it included the mtDNA, showed the family relationship though still not establishing relationship via administration's approved of process. Here we have a case where comparative differentiation led to comparative similarity and established parenthood in a justifiable ontogenetic limited sense. *It is not a case of chimerism that can be wrenched out of judicial context and then used as an argument for "evolutionary origin". That would be ontologically unethical. It is not a case that tends to verify evolutionism's mtEve and cannot be made to argue against the logic of Genesis.* Reference click on

<http://www.mymultiplesclerosis.co.uk/misc/chimera.html>

**15.1. A case of dissimilarity and consequential similarity/no "evolutionary" premise—**A medical case, that of Karen Keegan, a chimera, shows how difference, rather than similarity, is comparable with and complements Lydia's legal case. Karen's situation (click also above) was motivated by health concerns involving the search for a kidney transplant, and not concerned about jurisprudence as such. The cases do not justify loose talk about "evolutionary" research because of the propaganda that life and humankind's origin is known. "Evolutionary" specialization is no more justified than war can be justified because of the medical advancements made from death camp experimentation and battle injuries. That kind of illogic would be similar to the biblical Paul's admonition to avoid the ill thinking that one should disobey the law so that God's love and grace might abound. Nor should one reason that the practice of law-power, even exponential laws, should be discarded so that faith in the judicial and health system might abound unreasonably. Lydia's case serves as an example of an unreasonable faith in the judicial system.



**15.2. Similarity vs. difference in juridical and medical matters, the demand for answerable definite questions, a similarity-case tending toward ultimate and guilt related definite answers about the limits and delimits in degrees of immaculate conceptions**—The usefulness of Reed’s “zeta law power” is more subatomic-molecularly apparent than morphologically real. While riding the wave of probabilistic powers, Reed ends up with an ontological morphology as proof of a vectored “evolutionary law” a law based on unimaginary time spans--regardless of how much probabilistic huge numbers are manipulated into symbols to enhance similarity, and regardless of how much the use of “law” linguistically modifies “power” toward a  $\zeta$  and jump to a capital Z principle. Although correctable I see this as a sophisticated effort to reduce connotative unstructured phenomena (apparent randomness) to law for the sake of answerables, i.e., to make probabilistic base events absolute. Prosody-talk about the law of large numbers contributing to a reliable *central limit theorem* (the search using re-meta-math symbols as plumage to justify the biased search for similarity) contributes nothing toward a responsible leaning toward the presumption of innocence until there’s a need to establish guilt. Alertness to difference can lead to the unanswerables and to beginning of wisdom. Jaspers’ systematic philosophical logic begins with ultimate-base situations, namely that in general the mind is limited until seen as such, and guilt is enhanced if not seen while involved in absolute determinations regarding origin thinking. Marianology involves genetic logic applied to an a-logical unanswerable situation such as the unique birth of Jesus. Guilt is implied in the need for an institutional concept regarding Mary’s origin to maintain the logic of the petrine lineage succession; God is identified with father and if there is a father then genetic logic’s consistency requires a mother. Those concepts are out of touch with current knowledge—as well as the logic of Genesis and the “Axial” (Jaspers’) accounts. On that intervening anachronistic-institutional-logic basis guilt is inherent and unavoidable but necessary for the exponents of the institutional confessionary. The processing of guilt becomes immanent and circularity sets in—good temporarily for propping the individual and perpetually for a static institution’s confessional, but bad for the individuals’ direct access to God.

**15.3. Similarity vs. dissimilarity**—Now, there is a tendency at least a lot of current prosaic talk designed to prove origin by way of similarity (rather than subtle falsification of presumptuousness by noting dissimilarity), e.g., Oliver-experimentation or impulsively curious quests for variety in cross breeding to prove “evolutionism” (Internet search Oliver). Like meta-math-exploitation there’s no limit to the extent “evolutionism” will go to show how mutation experimentation can argue for the funding of “evolutionary research”. The perverted (contra-traditional behavior) creative urge for a variety of attempted gratifications is dependent on similarity-variables in most (probabilistic) cases. The uncivilized perversion-spectrum includes home and lab base-urge or “evolutionary” curious experimentation from incest to bestiality based on degrees of similarities and concomitant methodical techniques involved in hiding the products of perversions within the large religiously maintained established institutions (autocrats covering their tacky tracks). It’s theoretically possible that dispensing with mutants occurs by “UFO” means from either direction (intra or extraterrestrial) to protect the lab or institution from the civilized withdrawal of funds (like using UFO phenomena to argue for Marianism or angels or some other form of power to reinforce a religiously held but concealed

theocracy). There's a difference to be seen between created perplexing dumbfounding situations and actual dumbfounding complexity, and it is philosophy and the history of transcendental revelation that inspire an acuity for seeing the difference rather than succumbing to the quest for similarity—that escape into the micro-macro infinite. It takes a humble understanding, or rather a humble overview, an admission of dumbfounding learned ignorance, to understand Jaspers' meaning when he says:

The basic substance of heredity at any time is the realization of the ground-plan of that species...[and] One can no longer *investigate* hereditary units the absence of which makes life impossible" (GP, 512) [Evolutionism, i.e., radical constructivism spoils the use of the English word "species"]

**Notation: The above is a continuation of from Webpage**  
<http://www.karljaspersapplied.net/Crucible.htm>