

JASPERS APPLIED TO DOVER, AN AFTER-TRIAL LOGICAL REJOINER—INC.
A BOOK-PREVIEW ON KENNETH MILLER’S JUNE 12, 2008 “ONLY A THEORY:
EVOLUTION AND THE BATTLE FOR AMERICA’S SOUL” see: Wikipedia, and
www.talkorigins.org <http://www.bu.edu/paideia> www.kjf.ca (1-30-08)

Part 6 on my EXISTENZ-KJSNA Webpage

TABLE OF CONTENTS (incorporating the abstract)

(Changes and corrections in this Web Page might be made at any time, and where needed the date of change will be shown)

**Preface: Discovery toward an after-trial logical rejoinder
00 through 07**

**I. A Dover-trial “all are guilty” decision affecting the American soul (theory of
solidarity v. the common-sense diversified American soul)**

1. A reduced 3-pronged American soul-friendly sentence v. the judge’s book-long “liar” complex decision (139 pages) and the ACLU’s extravagant after-trial continued defensive distraction from the parsimonious task of truth

1.1. Heretics, liars, or perjurers, and the Peter-cursing syndrome amidst life-lies’ struggles

1.2. A one-sentence sentencing: All guilty, plaintiffs too

1.21. First of three-prong sentence and reverse charges

1.22. Second prong: Chastising counsels

1.23. Third prong: Ordering Forrest to do unimpeachable research community service

II. Further preparation for seeing Dover as a mental case

2. Comprehending the Dover pathos, un-paralyzing parallels

2.1. Bonobos don’t lie like humankind lie

2.2. Drifting in the field: Subtle change over time via changing names

2.3. Getting back on course

2.4. A profitable compromise: Guessing why Miller and Levine are uneasy about approaching the origin of humankind

2.5. Origin of humankind v. origin of life; a scheme equivocating the univocal

2.6. The power-struggle facts; the Texas compromise, the Kierkegaard/Nietzsche eternal recurrent syndrome

2.7. The label-libel rebellion, the “complex” is irreducibly simple in the information age

III. Contaminates within, beyond, and over Dover Penn-soil

3. Getting a feeling for the defendants’ dilemma

3.1. Forrest’s “monk!” v. gardener slip (botanist in a collar)

3.2. The bad side of seek and ye shall find

3.3. A highly imaginary student’s effort to close the mystic-logic Gnostic-hatch

- 3.4. The coming classroom scene; pledging allegiance to a 9-letter expletive
- 3.5. The recalcitrant rebel tried but true
- 3.6. Imaginative student assigned to Haught-reprogramming
- 3.7. Decisive Haught praxis and prayer; hubris and naughty haughty student
- 3.8. Haught on morals' effects, and student's haughty test
- 3.9. Sit, roll over, and speak "evolution"! Or forgo a morsel of the American dream
- 3.10. Determining initial ineligibility; alexia, a precondition and concomitant impudence and imprudence--referred to jurisprudence
- 3.11. Back to the Dover-bible (transcript); Thompson touches the core issue; due process, protesting is out-timed and out-maneuvered
- 3.12. Opaque-ing the transparent; effect on grants and royalties
- 3.13. Haught's "Jesuit" Chardin idea disqualifies student for special ed; the accountability risk transferred to student and parents at their expense
- 3.14. Coming to inadequate tit-for-tat terms, tweaking bleeps
- 3.15. New! Huckabee, emerging chicanery, and serf-speech enforcement
- 3.16. Seven cipher-days v. infinitely incomprehensible days
- 3.17. The futile effort to avoid human sacrifice for origin sin
- 3.18. QT-ACLU mustering, avoiding another Maryland-like civil war
- 3.19. Undue vengeance and due process

IV. Witold Walczak, solidarity activity; the potential inverse theism

- 4. Unavoidable apparitions of machinations' whispering purpose and meaning
- 4.1. Miraculous coincidentals or conspiracy indicators
- 4.2. Witold's extended activity: Atheism v. theism (AvT), Forrest's orchestration
- 4.3. Poland; Witold's work there and on American soil, the good and the bad
- 4.31. The big sound "eupraxsophy" replaces the voice of God walking
- 4.4. Forrest and the immortal "big beep" from here to eternity (Day 6, PM, p2); Federal Rules of Evidence, Rule 610
- 4.5. The beep explicated, beep or bleep
- 4.6. No ruling on the Rule 610 objection to the immortality question
- 4.7. The more real than apparent religion/philosophy issue
- 4.8. The appropriateness of the immortality question
- 4.9. The Francis of Assisi yield-clause
- 4.10. Any reasonable person's understanding of religiosity
- 4.11. The "theos" charge, Forrest "slips" evolutionism in with religion
- 4.12. Some American church history Berry Lynn relegated to pure title of "distinction"

V. JASPERS, WITNESS FOR THOSE BEING MENTALLY DEPECIALIZED

- 5. Jaspers, Religion and philosophy not definable, not subsumed in naturalism**

VI. JASPERS: EQUITY COURTS AND MENTAL STATES

- 6. Dover trial more psychopathic life-lies than liar stuff**

6.1. Jaspers' ambient qualifications, and the Dover ambient qualifying preconditions

VII. 7. A wishful sabbatical conclusion

Preface: After-trial logical rejoinder: "liars" v. life-lies and Miller's coming book

00. This narration about the Dover trial is posted on my paidiea-existenz webpage partly for philosophical and theological reasons. There is much academically enhanced potential for the mishandling of philosophy and abuse of theology to be seen in the Dover situation. No one is immune from such misuse; mine made potentially harmful due to a Bachelor's degree in sacred literature, a Masters of Arts majoring in philosophy, and a Bachelor of Divinity thesis on Karl Jaspers' Existenz philosophy applied to counseling each from "non-denominational" schools. Popular trial participants include the following: The ACLU attorney for the plaintiffs, Witold Walczak. He had graduated with a BD in philosophy—Colgate College. He also graduated cum laude from Boston College Law School—Boston College (it having a Jesuit history--not to be confused with Boston University). He is experienced and potentially adept in the art of executing solidarity activities. Kenneth Miller, John F. Haught, and Barbara Forrest come with credentials showing no less adeptness at the potential use and misuse of metaphysical/philosophical thinking and the capacity to relate such advantageously to a parochial historical context.

01. The attorneys for the defense come from the Thomas More Law Center. Although it does not go to the impeachment of these attorneys, it is historically significant for grasping "life-lies" to remember that Thomas More was canonized a "Saint"; later he was declared the "patron Saint" of politicians and statesmen by Karol J. Wojtyla ("Pope John Paul II"). Thomas More was instrumentally involved in the burning of the bible-translator William Tyndale and his mission-associate John Frith. More, beheaded, in effect for treason, is portrayed as "Saint" by orthodox doctors of "the Catholic Faith" whereas Tyndale and Frith, are memorialized less systematically by doctors of the biblical faith—the latter are considered rebellious by the former, the former considered apostate potentates by the later. Already one gets an informed feeling for an in-depth religiously intense struggle for souls. Simply put, there is more to the Dover trial than meets the eye. The insight for seeing translucently, I affirm, is enhanced by an in-depth familiarity with the works of Karl Jaspers, but mistakes I make here are not to be attributed to his works.

02. Witold's team's star witnesses were well orchestrated. A major biology textbook author, and a theologian, also a book-author, both tried to resolve a logical contradiction in the same way. Duly sworn, confronted with the illogicality that humankind conjured up God and then believed God to be real, Both Kenneth Miller (Miller--"I'm Roman Catholic") and John F. Haught (Catholic with Ph.D. in theology) deferred to vatic "Encyclical" sources thereby affecting, in my view, absolution for misconduct in logic—logic to which defense was inadequate to object (a Haught-logic that judge Jones found appealing enough to intervene without objection and note for the record—but that's my dis-ambiguous but I think informed interpretation). Barbara Forrest, another of ACLU's

star witnesses, reinforced the bad logic involved in the deferral to vatic authority--for that matter, in like fashion, so did Michael Behe, a Catholic, the star witness for the defense.

03. The intervention of vatic instruction and authority should be obvious to reviewers of the transcript. Currently underway is a prototype paradigm switch from bad-logic language and will probably be central in Ken Miller's coming book. That prediction is based on the trial's bad logic. I mean it is too obvious to not rectify. The new talk is about establishing "co-evolution" in the space and time of life's origin—to give the appearance that on the horizon there's an absolute resolution to the dualism inherent in the "evolution of life" and "evolution of humankind" paradox. To distract from the inhibiting dualism it appears some new linguistic signs have to be propagated until a more engrained prefixed vogue-level of word-use is reached. The elemental ambiguity (polemic) that sparks individualistic thinking is a threat to vatic authority, i.e., centralized ontic authority. That polemic charge, spark of individuality, is described in Jaspers' *Von Der Wahrheit*. The work there is an effective protest to the doctrine that truth cannot be tolerated to contradict a vatic "church of evolution" truth. The "cipher" work relates critically to the new symbols being verbalized and universally forced upon all through the education industry:

04. Talk about origins is now taking the mental form of once upon a time the "co-something" and "co-more-or-less-nothing" ("co-evolution" and "co-development") coeded in the universes' University of Earth, and the COE (chief officers of execution) describe the mechanism with quantum technical-linguistic inverse-predictability. One can wonder if upon the successful propagation of "co-evolution" the COE will be a "c" priest somewhere to fill in the petrine succession gap between the "Big Bang" priest (a George Lemaître stealing Moses' thunder--and Haught, testified in the trial to an embroidered scene of Einstein humbling himself seeking pardon) and the yet to be revealed discoverer of the Big-Silence origin of consciousness. But in reality the agent is "mind" even though it only appears like a micro spark of enlightenment on the horizon of the encompassing origin-frontier—it is still the major part of the whole infinite series of theoretical eternal bangs and contra-silences, i.e., literally the voice of God walking. One could say that a priest is vatic-credited with discovering origin's single illusive Big Foot. One medium in position to being misused for this propagation of vatic-church truth is the blog-like "Karl Jaspers Forum"--see target article 103 www.kjf.ca. Herbert Müller's reactionary comments are inadequate and poorly depict Jaspers' views (see his "1-26-08" Comment). His efforts are too little Jaspers and too much Nietzsche.

04. Although I have no "inside" firsthand experience about what transpires in the "post-modern" or "post-individualistic" "confessional"; Miller's new book, to be available around June 12, 2008, might be in part penance for his and Haught's talking about origins in defiance of the spirit of vatic authority per "encyclical" instructions. I mean proponents of Catholicity don't have to talk about it once the vatic authority has said that one must leap the ontological leap of faith per instructions—which "naturally" means go take an anti-logic pilgrimage. If there's hesitancy and too much origin-sin (my phrase) talk and walk on the edge of the finite/infinite borderline, gregorian base-tones must be sung to cover the ill logic—a solidarity movement via "after-trial findings", new-books, echoes

throughout ACLU chapters, and via Catholic blogs. The purpose is to solidify the western hemisphere's American diversity of souls, with souls genuflecting in subservience whenever a vatic approved "word" is heard whether uttered with preapproved prefixes or suffixes—"anti" would not be prior approved). The purpose is to compete with the emancipation proclamation about individualistic common sense--those common paths bypassing the road to serfdom. (Regarding a new "post-individualistic" reemphasis, see G. Walters Chapter Eight, Jaspers and the Role of "Conversion".) The alternative to unifying and imposing low-frequency noises are the more enlightening reformation styled Sprechstimme solos. That alternative is a threat to a universal solidarity movement--that movement could precipitate a western-hemisphere type of a manifest destiny, with opponents positioning to head it off at the southern pass.

05. Now if the reader is not yet getting streetwise conspiracy legs, and eyes emerging all over the head (encompassing), there is no need to go on. The more apparent than real conspiracy of the defendants (see below "all are guilty") will be so obvious that the more real than apparent greater covert conspiracy will be missed—especially to the one wanting to repose in the comfort of thinking a universal authority is localized somewhere. Now, there are so many testifying as to their Catholicity, including even defendants' deferring to the deferring toward vatic authority, that for one to note it makes one appear like a haranguing bigot.

06. The participation of so much Catholic direct and indirect representation and the deferring to Vatican vatic-authority makes clearer that there is no avoiding the fact that Chardin's prophecy regarding the church of evolution is being fulfilled via interfering in the American state. During the trial John Haught opened that door and introduced the "Jesuit" Chardin while testifying. The 1996 Papal proclamation predictably meant that the English word "evolution" and prefixes and suffixes must be imposed because that Anglo-Saxon word has been fossilized by ecclesiastical decree, i.e., "evolution" has become a holy relic that has an anti-oscillating affect on the dichotomous machine of reasoning. That "pontifical academy of sciences" and consequential illogical ontic "complex" extends to the federally chartered American Academy of Science making it a collaborating agency to cement that intervention and by enforcing the use of what the minority hear as a nine-letter bit of profanity.

07. The ill logical "complex" calls for a referral to a professional with expertise in the psychology of worldviews or the pathological "life-lies". Life-lies can cultivate a hybrid American soul and cause the extinction of special distinctiveness—the dissipation of [humankind's] fantastic powers lost to the metaphysical solidarity of "science" ("pseudologia phantastica"--General Psychopathology, Meaningful Connections). This is where Jaspers enters as an expert witness in this task of truth where a court has made a decision and discovered the liars--but in the rush to conclusiveness, the overwhelming life-lie was missed. Looking for it requires inner encompassing eyes.

I. An after-trial decision affecting Americans' common-sense soul; verdict: all unequivocally guilty (Note: The similarity between this subheading and that of Kenneth Miller's upcoming book is not accidental and amounts to a pre-view of the book.)

1. A reduced 3-pronged American soul-friendly sentence v. the judge's 139 page book-long "liar" decision and the ACLU's extravagant after-trial defensive distraction from the parsimonious tasks of truth—Before introducing Jaspers' applicable ideas more discovery is needed. It is assumed the reader is somewhat familiar with the transcript of the trial. Prior to getting into the body of philosophical and theological matters, to get a feel for what was not considered, let's take a very general overview of the judge's decision. Law-blinders removed, and the more encompassing incidental and coincidental things considered, the judge's decision is seen from this greater historical perspective as a miscarriage of justice. Given the preparatory dynamics described above and hereafter (Preface--and more later), an activist judge's equity decision would be, by comparison, a one liner rather than judge Jones' 139-page decision that seems like a defensive rationalization—an apologetic to avoid peers' viewing him as an "activist" judge. In it he referred to two defendants as liars, i.e., he wrote that they "lied" (in reality a mild form of the precedent-setting defensive Peter-cursing-syndrome). In effect the decision was an effort to reduce the Dover-complex to something clear and distinct. In due time and due process, the clear and the distinct is suspect and can be uncovered to be clearly conspirators' constructs. The defendants, by not being adept at consistency, provided the judge with the evidence necessary to impeach them as liars.

1.1. Heretics, liars, or perjurers within life-lie worldviews--One might be tempted to think the judge should have called the defendants "perjurers" rather than "liars". Actually, in this Dover trial "liar" is a judgmental term with maybe some Canon Law or inquisition-court-like precedent; it's comparable to "heretic". For a judge sitting in equity the choice of the word "liar" was uncouth and carried an intended life sentence—unless defendants recanted by lying. The ad Hominem distracted from the plaintiffs star witnesses' argumentum ad Baculum, i.e., their credentials and "above reproach" vatic deferrals. The decision's style revealed a lack of appreciation for the "complexity" of the situation. For example, I first heard about the trial's outcome through the news media, which flash-fleshed it in terms that two religious sectarian defendants had lied! It was the unscrupulous emotive response the decision's ad Hominem would predictably provoke. I mean in New England history, since the Maryland civil war, the witch trials, and in American history since the revolution, one would hope that the American joinder of the Law and Equity court system would result in decisions that tended to avoid rejoining such men-of-the-cloth remnants from the Canon Law courts. Though it is a trend in TV courts, a judge like a psychiatrist should not diagnose a patient in moral terms—it shows a deficiency in objectivity.

1.2. A one-sentence sentencing: All guilty and the cost--Thanks to the information highway, anyone if not everyone now knows or potentially has access to the judge's sentencing (decision). *No reasonable person would disagree, that, the defendants' reactionary efforts tended toward reestablishing religion or faith. Moreover no reasonable person should disagree that the plaintiffs, attorneys and witnesses, also were involved in the active establishment of religiosity via anti-religion, the phenotype mirror-twin of the genotype faith.* But a single less complex three-prong sentence would have sufficed rather than 139 pages. Such as:

1.21. First of three prongs--Rather than a decision unfriendly to the diversity of the American-soul and common sense, a reasonable decision might go like this: *“Regarding the charge of using a tax supported educational industry (directly and indirectly involving students of compulsory age) to establish religion the defendants are found guilty, and the sentence is that degree of embarrassment already served, and the defendants are ordered to participate, along with the equally guilty plaintiffs, in an intensive course in the limits of reason and exercises in sensitivity, and a comprehensive course in the greater historical standard v. vatic authority ...”*

1.22. Second prong—For the reasonable person concerned about the covert contempt for justice, one could compound the sentence to further read: *“...; defense and plaintiffs’ lawyers must be chastised, apologizing for bringing irrelevant charges, not using rejoinders competently to the point of nonfeasance, and for avoiding the broader and deeper current-and-past historical perspective, the encompassings of the complex, i.e., for avoiding focusing on the origin of life, as taught by logicians of “evolutionary” biology and making clear that it de facto includes the origin of humankind and that it logically follows that the resulting humankind organism conjured ideas of god and then extrapolated gods or God as reality; and that ill logical consistency, being the essence of a humanism-holism religion, in testimony clearly shows that plaintiffs’ expert witnesses propagated and establishes anti-theism though morphed into deism terms or an interim surrogate “god-system” as manifested by star witnesses’ deference to Roman Catholic authority, with all witnesses’ avoiding speaking disapprovingly of the deferral...”*

1.23. Third prong—One addition parenthetical extension (to be consistent) might go something like this: *“...(The ACLU of Pennsylvania appears complicit, more party to than counsel to plaintiffs, in this effort at establishing through an undercurrent of solidarity an inverse religion (ersatz) and contempt for and interference with reasonable perceptions and honest thinking; therefore further consideration should be given to determining that degree of complicity, to be determined by some greater in-depth research but under high-quality supervision in the form of punitive public service for Barbara Forrest, who in the equity court affirmed being an activist member of interdisciplinary organizations with a mission for establishing substitute religions, and community-known as a teacher of epistemology, [whom judge Jones decided was a “hybrid” scientist in “blazing new territory”]; the research to include not only the ACLU but also the Thomas More Law Center’s attorneys, looking for some form of Constitutional malfeasance contributing to the establishment of anti-theism”).*

II. FURTHER PREPARATION FOR SEEING DOVER AS A MENTAL CASE

2. Comprehending the Dover pathos, un-paralyzing parallels: The Dover Pennsylvania situation can be compared to an iceberg in the ocean of being displaying a fraction of its mass but getting the attention of the masses. Our attention needs to focus on the less obvious but more real. Think doverberg rather than Dover. The case was a bench trial, i.e., the judge sitting in equity, as a jury of one involving a Constitutional issue. I understand that while it is technically available, advisory juries, or some spirit

thereof is never officially used in Constitutional cases. It was not a jury trial. The judge's decision largely pivots around the word "liar". That is comparable to a sinking ship's captain calling the tip of the iceberg a "liar!" In his decision Judge Jones referred to defendants as liars, i.e., they "lied". In as much as perjury does not customarily apply in equity cases like it does in criminal cases, perhaps the judge thought the label would pacify the ACLU and its plaintiffs and the larger establishments of the religious community. Nevertheless, it would have been less uncouth if the judge had written only that "the testimony was not credible" especially in such a multifaceted case. A judge in Dodge City once wrote in his decision that: "I think so little of [defendant's] credibility that if he were to testify that the sun was shining, I would have to look out the window before I would believe him". Unlike Jones, this judge came close but resisted the label "liar".

2.1. An aside—Only humankind are liars. The critical thought process necessary to judge this situation involves understanding why "bonobos" know better than to judgmentally sit on the tip of a "complex" and why an "after trial logical rejoinder" needs to include the counsel of a qualified pathologist who knows how to use a mental detector.

2.2. Drifting a field--Excuse the drift, but "Bonobo" was once in English referred to as the Pygmy Chimpanzee. The name changed in 1954 apparently because in the Bantu language the word means "ancestor". "Ancestor" sounded consistent with the emergent tenet of "evolutionary naturalism" so it's apparently being colloquialized to bridge the genetic ill-logic gap. Rather than using the Bantu language as an argument for emergent thinking, the alternative argument could be that humankind has always had the tendency to look at someone else's behavior and wonder about their lineage—or excuse animalistic urges that threaten civility.

2.3. Steering back on course--The balanced thinker does not jump to conclusions or stand awe-struck at a report that DNA mapping of the human and other animal genome shows similarities. The critical thinker does not yield hastily to the trendy thinking that similarity points to a law of nature that establishes a morphing principle assuring an ascendant/descendent ancestral connection. That is a proneness toward genetic-fallacious thinking stretched to critical limits. Without drawing conclusions, the critical thinker is not surprised that similar physiological forms should also have similar, dark matter, quantum-physic, molecular, and chemical, substrates but that does not establish the kinship for or origin of humankind.

2.4. A profitable compromise: Guessing why Kenneth Miller and Joseph Levine don't approach the origin of humankind--Humankind is still in a qualitative wholly independent specialization class of its own even if DNA measuring and comparison might appear to approach 100% similarity (origin being indeterminable, i.e., not reducible to terms, or mental phenomena, or cognitive processes). The dissimilarity on the quality spectrum is still 1000%+infinity. The real lab-like situation that would reduce (falsify) that dissimilarity, that morphed cause-effect connection, would involve observing "bonobos" performing outside their specialization in the role of judge, plaintiff and defense attorneys, biologists, a "hybrid" epistemologist, degreed philosophers, and

theological representative of established religious primates—that classical still-effective Anglo/Catholic Wilberforce argument. There is little chance in infinity of that happening, but it would be a lab-like test to see if the positive proposition could be falsified. The humankind mind cannot falsify itself without losing itself nor know its origin with realizing its end. But it can illuminate for itself the necessity of being conscious of its necessity of being while vaguely feeling its infinity. This kind of thinking involves the process of transcending actual encompassing experience and realizing a greater encompassing.

2.5. Origin of humankind v. Origin of life, scheming to equivocate the univocal--A lot depended on litigants' performance, a lot in the form of continued grants for "evolutionary research" and royalties for "evolutionary biology" textbooks. This was not just a trial about a Constitutional matter; it was a struggle for fiscal power—good intentions not wholly discarded. It is nice to hear oaths about the authors' textbook-motivations, and theoretically those can be given the benefit of trust as a theory, but the facts sometimes speak too. The facts vary in use. It would be expected that the DNA argument would make a primary showing in the Dover trial. Grant money would not be forthcoming if there were comments made about origin odds being one-to-infinity, so the talk must leave the impression that the "origin of life" is on the verge of being discovered. That of course means that exponentially humankind discoverers must advance too regarding the self awareness of the mind's origin—it has to be nearly but not yet quite wholly known by "Evolutionary biologists" to qualify the mind for being able to lift itself by itself. But "almost is but lost" if fiscal aid is cut off, and as that threat materializes we hear more and more about the amount of suffering that can be avoided if we but can do more research—and the unarguable need for research to eliminate suffering hides "evolutionism" as pork ridding piggyback for it is grant proposals with the appellation "evolution" that receive the funding—the peer review system has a mindset for it. Research is morphed by the modifier "evolutionary" which is like saying old species parts can be recycled to fit the humankind specialization—and this is suppose to prove that grants and royalties are excusable like excessive oil profits are excused on reinvestment grounds—like to finance wars and suffering in the powers' competing for oil. One fact cannot be ignored; the main mission is to find things to measure that will enhance a position of power. The struggle for power using insufferable logic, i.e., the origin-fallacy is no less obvious today than when Moses address it.

2.6. The power-struggle facts, the Texas compromise--The power struggles are undeniable and are facts that begin to dye-stain theoretical motivations. Nietzsche knew it well, and so did Jaspers. But in a democratic republic, political forces require compromises if funding is to meet the educated critical public's demand for accountability. In Texas the need for political compromise was understood when textbook authors revised their biology textbook to meet such political requirements. In that case, authors being adept at grant proposals, and covering mistakes without going into the public confessional, easily met Texas' legislated wording requirement by protecting themselves from the pretentious hubris position that the mind's infallibility is dependent on the assumption that its origin is known. The almost meaningless subtle biology textbook revision is another example of a conscience deficit so prevalent in

constructivism: if there are biology textbook editions out there that later editions corrected, don't draw attention to it but circumvent it. Don't draw attention to what might have been corrected by issuing "recalls" for it might affect book sales and future grants. It amounts to protecting hubris, or maintaining a position of vatic force amidst rebellious forces. To protect this force, one verbalizes and seems to agree to not critique the origin of humankind, but only speak to the origin of life as something more certainly known than anything. What a premeditated perversion of logic, what a designed bit of intellectual dishonesty, what hypocrisy to litigate a protestation in-kind reaction!

2.7. The label libel—No local body is going to get away with placing graffiti on a "scientist" and publisher's products. Financial investment must be protected. Authors of "textbooks" cannot be expected to issue riders to correct deficiencies because sciences' scientists do not make mistakes for that would be close to being publicly displayed as "liars". If the mistake is a serious one, like, "change over time is essentially random and chance" and if that infringes on the magisterial of vatic authority, one need not put out a rider after 1996 to be attached to the textbooks. All the sinner needs to do is remember the spirit of the confessional and confess the error to that principle's principal, and protect that in-house disclosure on grounds that confidentiality is interpreted to mean the investors are beyond public scrutiny. In this information age it is inconceivable (this side of royalties) that a corrective recall label couldn't replace the alleged need for "new" books. I mean Charles Simonyi might even forgo another space excursion and donate to the cost of admitting errors—and he has a friend in Oxford's primary chair with influence--and Oxford's publishing wing could use the donations for printing corrective labels. Oxford built the "chair's" science building using profits from publishing bibles and has been paying for it ever since by tithing to vatic authority through compromising appeasements. The precedent of revising the OT by a NT is not an argument for an old science book requiring a new science book to update information. If a textbook author does a recall or disperses corrective or updating labels, it would be embarrassing, and if the public should label a textbook it would be defamation. If the public is informed about theory and research that shows the textbook failing to address an issue, the public has to wait for the new book—or be taken to court. If the public becomes impatient then litigation against labels can postpone corrective action on grounds that under oath it was recorded that the revisions are being prepared and preparation for new books are always in a state of continuum due to natural science's inevitable constant great ontological leaps. (Here, it takes a different science to see this natural science fallacy—and it goes to motivation. It also shows that due process is a common law phenomenon that encompasses the legislative, executive and judicial processes.)

III. CONTAMINATES WITHIN, BEYOND, AND OVER DOVER SOIL

3. Getting a feeling for the defendants' dilemma—Community power struggles use anything from the health care industry to education plants (those most often employing the most with largest unionized voting blocs), chanceries including volunteer fire departments, and the autocratic infiltration of churches—the greatest being the education industry; all systematically harvested to gain higher ground. There are public employee union blocs (teachers, healthcare), and even unions protecting the country's soul, i.e.,

unions to keep secularity and religiosity unions divided while exploiting emotive titles such as “American”, “civil”, “liberty”, “protection”, “academy”, “science”, “separation” and “ecumenical”—a contemporary harmful sort of nominalism. Avoiding blindfolds, that is, shunning lying to ourselves that such critical talk is merely folderol, at least some horse-like blinders are necessary for a meaningful dialectic or to maintain some reins on common sense to steer clear of paranoia or reality denial. So, those absolutely imposing physical realities and metaphysical speculations set aside, the cultural-historical inheritable atavistic conflict oozes through in terms of a theistic thoughtfulness v. atheistic thoroughness. Here unions such as the ACLUion, humanism unions, Catholic union and catholic protestant unions intervened. So, with blinders less shaded than the Dover trial’s blinds let’s look for subtle and obvious facts:

3.1. Barbara’s “monk!” v. gardener slip--The plaintiffs’ star philosophical expert, Barbara Forrest, though perhaps unaware of the great controversy between parish and county and caught up in the historical conflict, got it right that there is no evidence that anyone on the Dover school board knew anything about conspiratorial movements somewhere out there. Giving Barbara the benefit of trust over doubt as a meta-physician more than philo-physician, one could even see this person as a victim of greater less obvious conspiratorial processes, but a none-the-less effectively harvested entity. A methodological weakness manifested itself in a slip: When Barbara was asked if she knew who Gregory Mendel was, the immediate response was, “Gregory Mendel, the monk”. It was not Mr. Mendel the gardener, scientist, or geneticist but something methodical to a fault, all of what uniformed religion entails on the edge of the great protestant/Catholic divide where Mendel worked his garden—that mason/knights-of-columbus line. Barbara slipped on it easily after the “theologian” John Haught introduced Chardin as a “Jesuit” first and only then as “paleontologist”. Those slips alert the normal common-sense person to the need to be alert for slippery places due to the trespasses of those gone before. When Mendel as genetic researcher is replaced by Mendel as “monk” then it is clear that a force is interfering with objectivity.

3.1. Seek and you shall find--Some Dover Pennsylvania citizens with an aboveboard mission reacted systematically to what was perceivable as the systematic establishment of anti-theism in the local public tax supported education plant. They were reacting to the teaching that the origin of life was such that any reasonable person could see that it included the precept that involved a logical consistency, that humankind was a new form of life inherently dependent on and developing out of earlier and simpler physiologically measurable forms. Any reasonable person could sense that unless protested it meant, regardless of efforts to nominally circumvent it, that humankind’s psyche at least co-emerged exponentially consistent with that precept. The “origin of life’s” “phylogenetic” classification is seen logically as univocal in the Aristotelian-thomistic sense and could only mean human thinking conjured the idea of God. It is a tenet of “modernity” that even the “now” “church of evolution”, once having opposed it, now, in the wake of “post-modernity” trends, collared primates have slipped into the front of the line of the “phylogenetic” procession and try to lead arrayed in fiesta distracting iconic regalia. Jaspers, in his times, saw that what was at stake was the protestant standard v. the vatic standard—in the occident. It is not shocking that anybody can also get a feel for it, and

react in ways including searching for easy to find forces already activated. So it is not surprising that a researcher would make discoveries about that which is more forthright as a mission, just as the defendants did--but the defendants did not realized they had stepped on the tail of something surreptitious.

3.2. Satire: A highly imaginary student's effort to plug the mystic-logic hatch--To the common-sense person it is apparent that "evolutionary" biologists are leaving an escape-window open, that the "origin of humankind" is distinct from "the origin of life" was being used as a convenient ambiguity. It's that old practical Apache lesson: when the big bear gets too close run between the singularity of two narrowly spaced trees—exploit the effectiveness of polarity for the survival of Catholicity and then discredit the natural polarity by taking all the credit for having outsmarted the bear. It means that an intuitive and logically consistent and critiquing student, alert to whole life experience, could ask a teacher: "Doesn't this origin-precept of research mean that my theistic idea exists only in my mind (subjective) and that it was (objectively) merely handed down to me by my near and remote ancestors or by more recent forceful charismatic figures who continue this apparent figment of imagination?"...or the student has an empty or puzzled demeanor to that effect. To which "the" teacher, more than a facilitator, feels the need to respond: "Let me stop you right there!"...or, the student's demeanor is ignored, or, the teacher goes on to explain the misdemeanor: "There will be no grieving of the American diversified soul in my classroom, no violation of the United States of America's First Amendment, no abuse of free speech, and no religious protection from "evolutionary" logic!" And so a negative solidarity called "evolutionary" science circumvents the dynamic polemic for the sake of an ontologism (singularity) begged by revealing a piece of linguistic canon-cannon fodder, i.e., "the scientific method, i.e., method-logical naturalism".

3.3. The coming classroom scene, pledging allegiance to an expletive--The facilitator of bios-thinking can flash civil-service credentials, teacher vestments authoritatively reinforced through court conclusions and those of the U.S Chartered American Academy of Science, and say: "I must only answer that in this room we use the word "evolution" and "evolution" refers to a fundamental tenet of biology that says new species emerge because of genetic changes to organisms that overtime favor their survival, and in this room you must speak, think, and answer accordingly using some linguistic form of the term 'evolution'. Where that tenet speaks we speak and where it is silent we are silent, and there is nothing there about the origin of...ah, the s-s-s-species man!"

3.4. Adamant rebel student is tried and true--After acknowledging and confessing this creed and sizing up the student (suspecting some quality-control agent or concerned family ideology has infiltrated), a more defensive facilitator might defer to the US courts saying that the question, the matter about which the student wondered, has been addressed and the court in the Dover trial has come to conclusions and you and yours can review the transcript outside this room, which has been posted by the ACLU with an "after trial" wholly conclusive ACLU review many pages long with links.

3.41. Or the legalistic and activist teacher could even discard textbooks and read verbatim the ACLU's after trial "Finding of Fact and Conclusion of Law"—end of any further reasoning! Well, the teacher makes one more off the cuff reminder that in that ACLU after-trial "conclusion of law" article, it is written that those opponents of "evolution" had repeatedly "lied outright" and that clinches the moral status of the opponents—with whom the student is accused of associating. The student replies that it might be more than outright lies in response to being outwronged. The student still dissents and says the word is emotively charge and univocal, i.e., the origin of life and the "evolutionary tenet" includes humankind and is anti-theistic, and the student refuses to use the "e" word.

3.42. Whenever the "e" word is used the student reacts saying: "objection! The word tends to establishes anti-theism and Chardin's church of evolution; it's a nine letter expletive and both have nine letters and I think 'e' for 'expletive' is an effective substitute for the ill-logic of the other 'e'". The facilitator then retorts: "overruled, your objection tends to establish theism and evolutionary blasphemy, let's move along". If the student continues to object to the use of the word the teacher can order the student out of the room on grounds of blasphemy against the "evolutionary tenet", referring the student to the vice-principal who must take disciplinary action toward reprogramming purposes. The student is sent to Haught Hall for trial.

3.43. Any reasonable person can see a process here of overtly establishing anti-theism as an inversed religion—even though religion has not been and cannot be defined, Barbara Forrest notwithstanding. Even though Barbara would identify this student as a biased creationist, a rejecter of "naturalism to juxtapose it as the opposite of theism, and for that reason...see[s] evolution as inherently atheistic"--that is hardly a logical rejoinder though reinforced and enforced by a uniformed "Amen" from Miller, Haught and plaintiffs.

3.5. Dissenting students assigned to Haught-reprogramming—Satire continues: Haught reprogramming is justified by the world's viewing the Dover trial as conclusive. So the student presents the same argument in Haught Hall: "Evolutionary" naturalism and methodical naturalism results in the logical consistent conclusion that God is not, and is also not imageless, but rather is merely epiphenomenal, that is, a figment of imagination. It sounds like to not accept that anti-theism means I have to be out of my mind, but if I accept it I have to step out of mind too. The student has made the necessary link between "evolutionism" and anti-theism as a religion for it espouses with sophistry the origin of mind, the seat of the worldview of worldviews. The student's religious orientation is such that the potential for phenomenological methodical thinking includes the necessary gestalt steps involved in the reasoning process and the pitfalls of holism, i.e., the reason stoppers. The student has also participated in a systematic inner disciplinary epistemic but has independently hit bottom in reason and emotion—maybe even used the "e" word just to pass Barbara's epistemology class.

3.6. Decisive Haught praxis and prayer, haughty and hubris--John F. Haught in the Dover trial does not have a practical logical-rejoinder to the logic that from the simple comes the complex and eventually mind, then God, and God then reduced to a collared primate leading the phylogeny pack--from phylogeny to the hubris of a collared

ontogeny. Confronted with this student's logical consistent connection made between "evolutionary" naturalism and anti-theism, by all appearances a sidwinder atheism, a religion, the Haught-facilitator hesitates, waffles and begins to do a vatic waver, and says that the logical anti-theism, must not be seen as religious atheism because there exists a linguistic ditty that is syntactically consistent: "atheism is not a worldview, No, it's not—it's a negative term. It's a denial of a world-view. But in itself, atheism has to espouse some other ultimate for it to be a world-view. But in itself, the word "atheist" is simply a negative term. It's a denial of theism." (Note the ontological isms.) But when Thompson for the defense asked Haught, "if I don't believe in God as an all powerful being, then that would impact all kinds of decisions that I make, moral decisions, family decisions?" Haught answered, "Yes, it sure could". The ditty reveals ineffable confusion, one ism is beset against another ism, but one is not religion and the other is, one affects morals but the other doesn't; it is folderol fodder to protect ill logic while retreating and deferring to a vatic authority. (Day 5, PM, Part 1)

3.7. Haught on morals' effects, student not haughty--Logical consistency is unavoidably impacted. So, based on the trial-transcript one can imagine what Haught's approach would be to the student's talk about the ill logic involved if the mind conjures God and then pretends objectivity—the logical consequence of "evolutionism". Note: The student is not haughty, but rather already culturally endowed with an awareness of the infinity of the finite whether microscopically as in quantum or macro-telescopically as in cosmic—all fundamentally quantum. The encompassing of the alpha and the omega is not foreign to the student's natural thinking. But now, some men in bishopric attire interpret the official statement from Rome and from the "National" Academy of Science, to be in line with the soul of Americanism's nationalism and catholicity (the one universal soul). The student is unduly pressured into appropriating a systemically flawed logic that the mind's origin is so nearly known that hubris, given the name colleague, can be celebrated. After all, the academic expectation is that the student will take up the primary mission of defending the ontologically flawed logic, will talk the talk as though the ill logic does not exist and honor it by continuing the life-lie--or else report to the authorities everywhere as a registered anti-evolutionist.

3.8. Sit, rollover, speak! "evolution", for a morsel of the American dream--The reprogramming approach and technique does not allow for the student having come into the world with logical critiquing unfolding. But this student must be saved from phenotype inheritance so the federal, state, and local funds will continue. Besides the fiscal benefits, the reputation of the school is at stake, for, using the "e word" (the new "logos") is a college preparatory prerequisite. If one wants to fit in, one must cheat intellectual honesty, neglect personal integrity, so that peers-of-science reviewing the transcript of credits will find the one word that stands for compliancy toward complicity. So the Haught approach to the mental complex exhaust itself in authoritative silence or a stare, before sending the student to an Oxford type "Exeter Hall", or slips the student an Oxford Tractarian tract to numb the pain from intellectual dishonesty. The corrective action plan is noted in the educator's defensive-department log, which postpones expelling the student as being incorrigible and having pathological aberrations. A negative reflection against the productivity of the education plant has been postponed.

The Haught approach might include one more effort to reason with the student. It worked in the Dover trial so it should be all right here—it is hoped. The student is reminded that there's a precedent for ill logic symbols, and the historic case of transubstantiation is cited—a classical example of still established ill but “true” logic. But this is a student from beyond such reason, and retorts: “But in history there was a logical reaction to that ill logic. It is known as the “test act” requiring all officials to declare their disbelief in the doctrine of transubstantiation and it is common sense de facto. The “test act” is my precedent for reacting against the tenet of...the ‘e-word’”.

3.9. Determining initial ineligibility; An alexia precondition compounded by impudent imprudence—A Haught Hall answer goes like this: “I can say this, and that should conclude the matter; Judge Jones said the logic appealed to him, and we will not go there any further. If thinking your origin is included in ‘the origin of life’ and you cannot study ‘evolutionary biology’ without leaving theist attitude out of bio-logic then the price of such imprudence is that you cannot be a peer-accepted success whether as a farmer or a Woods Hole researcher, not even an unpaid volunteer. Your ineligibility is similar to a precondition known as alexia and you do not qualify for benefits. Now that you know this, and still refuse treatment such medical neglect is imprudence morphed into impudence and that means you will not fit into a dehumanizing group effort. It is impudence because the judge agreed with me that any logic going to theism is ‘unappealing’. And history shows that the Vatican has ordered us to stop talking about it. The student then says, but if now I stop talking about it I have yielded at least to deism and allowed the centralized order to become a surrogate God or intermediate authority. I cannot be that type of catholic being born into and with this protesting “disability”. If that disqualifies me for special education under an American disabilities act, the imprudence argument is unfair and hardly qualifies for ineligibility due to a mental predisposition. Imposing your vatic authority by citing it in a court of law is all the more reason why “evolution” can be epidemiologically contributing to word-blindness and all the more reason for rebellion against this sort logical dark matter and good reason to look to the greater historical tradition for guidance.

3.10. Thompson touches the core issue, due process, protestant out-timed—That Haught-answer was a response to a question asked by the defense attorney, Thompson; he asked about origin-sin (my depiction) thinking. Thompson had almost touched the critical core, the best logical rejoinder involved in the Dover situation, but the logic was not allowed to go there via the judge's intervention and concurrence with vatic logic. Right there was the core but it could not be touched. The trial was ad hoc fixed (for this purpose) and carte blanche holism prevailed (complete freedom is permitted only if one uses the “e-word”). The question Thompson asked goes to whether “evolution” is religion by virtue of papal intervention. But it could not be pursued because the defense had the low ground. The only way to get to the core issue was by inverting the charge in an appeal process, due process. And that is what is going on now in the public arena, especially to be seen in Miller's loudly announced coming new book about the battle for the American soul. Meanwhile solidarity and conspiratorial efforts continue and opposition is supposed to be muffled but protesters play unfairly in spite of all the ACLU

“after trial stuff”. It is new AVLU whimperings for childish cries: ““We have piped unto you, and ye have not danced; we have mourned unto you and ye have not lamented.””

3.11. Opaque-ing the transparent--The effort is made to avoid transparency regarding the origin of humankind because that especially is where mind’s common sense reigns. It is universally accepted on a feeling level that we are using the mind and the mind is limited, hits bottom and has to depend of consciousness which feathers off into vagueness, and at best leaves primordial feelings too that can lead us awry. It is felt that facing the limitations of the mind openly would be a travesty for grants. But more than that to face up to the limitations of the mind one must clearly admit to yielding to vatic authority in some form; it would be like opening admitting that a clearly established religion is intervening in and exploiting science. It would mean surrendering to a comelately presumptuousness regarding consciousness. As Jaspers reminds, referring to the methodology of knowledge mixed with vatic authority, it is men that are making the decisions not God.

3.12. Disqualified for special ed., risk transferred to student and parents--The ill logic preserved in deference and silence, the risk and the education plant’s incompetents have been shifted to the student and parents. The student has learned how Oxford’s Tractarian movement works and what is meant by being told to take an ontological leap of faith and repeat aloud that part of Francis of Assisi’s prayer that pertains to accepting the logic of “evolution” as the wisdom to accept what God gives to the elect. The student, following the leadership of the theologian, Haught, must simply accept the authority of the “Church and Court”, i.e., the “Jesuit paleontologist Teilhard de Chardin’s view that consciousness increases in the universe in direct proportion to the increase in ordered complexity of matter.” (day 5, PM part 2) In effect, the student can’t avoid all the publicity about the most complex religious institution and how easily it fits into logic of “evolutionary naturalism”. Miraculously it appears to coincide with the complexity of consciousness. Of course this is one of those exceptional students that Jaspers refers to at the beginning of his General Psychopathology. The adamant student who refuses to use the new “logos” must forgo a science vocation because the “e” word is uttered as a nine letter expletive and insist on bleeps. Even if the student should someday land a job in a Woods Hole research plant, if refusing to become signatory to the use of the new “logos”, such becomes grounds for dismissal, and probably disqualifies one from unemployment benefits. The employee stands no chance of winning an UB appeal for refusing to use the “e” word. Now, the student is from a high tech successful farming family, but yet is told to be a successful farmer the word has to be used in almost every sentence. The student is told if a physician vocation, or a position with Google, or even the priestly vocation is desired, though brilliant and unique, the new “logos” has to be sworn to.

3.13. Coming to inadequate tit-for-tat terms— Some concerned citizens set about to balance the situation to establish the inverse of “evolutionary anti-theism.” The organized forces with which some citizens were contending, to which they neurologically reflected, reacting in-kind to the force of the stimuli, retaliated in a blitz of litigation—as though the electoral and recall process had been exhausted. The rush was on for due process to beat the electoral process. Defendant litigants had to become pro-testants to this obvious

solidarity movement. One can interpret the defendants' less than philosophical and theological terms to mean they wanted to preserve not an "ism" but rather theistic thinking—which is in keeping with William Penn's attitude toward diversity of the soil, the soul of Pennsylvania, and Thomas Paine's Common Sense out of Philadelphia (the forces contributing to the thirty years war, and the Maryland civil war were not that distant). The protestors to ill logic that seemed at best un-differentiable and ineffable complex, were forced to become deponents and then defendants, and then got blamed for instigating the litigation. Note that the complex exploded like a big bang soon after the 1996 vatic "evolutionary" announcement that was being interpreted by Church prelates that now sincere Christians everywhere must accept, use, and be subject to hearing the word "evolution". The complex was compounded by the sanctification of the word which now is as much a canonized "Saint" as Thomas Aquinas. Students everywhere are expected to think, if not use "Saint Evolution", without smirking and bleeping. It might come to busing non-bleepers and bleepers back and forth across the Delaware River (Penn's protestant/Catholic line) in some integrating manner.

3.14. News! Huckabee, emerging chicanery, and serf-speech enforcement—While preparing this article, ABC News with Charles Gibson has just announced the probability that Huckabee will triumph in the Iowa caucus. At the start of the broadcast listeners are reminded to stay tuned for news about the National Academy of Science report on the need for teaching "evolution". Then during the NAS segment a presumably home-schooled child of perhaps 8 was shown speaking affirmatively about seven days of creation. It was presented as though the child's mind had been neglected. It is not hard to see the machination forces mustering and already firing, targeted now on home-schooled students. Forces like the ACLU touting general consistency will be pushing to enforce atheism (anti-theism "evolutionary naturalism" into the home curriculum. An internet search of the ABC's website account of tonight's newscast led to Ned Potter's page, where the concluding sentence reads that the National Academy of Science's report "...is only one salvo in a debate that dates back to Darwin". How interesting it is that nothing on the site could be found of that child giving voice to symbols about those seven ciphers of time. On that same page, reference (and a link is included) is made to a Jacksonville Florida school board's current policy that uses "change over time" rather than the word "evolution". Partly to comply with the National Academy of Science's findings that "evolution" must be taught, there is a movement to change that policy to require the vocal and written use of the word "evolution" on the grounds that without that sound, that vocalization, teaching about changes over time amounts to pedagogical neglect. It is worth noting that the star witness for the Dover trial plaintiffs (complaining against those giving vent to something distasteful about the concept of, and users of the term "evolution") is Ken Miller who is also a reviewer for the Review Committee of the National Academy of Science—and probably one of the co-authors of the biology textbook students are required to purchase as the infinity of the finite serves as excuses for updated books.

3.15. Seven cipher days v. infinitely incomprehensible days—As the usage of the symbol "evolution" is enforced, seven Hebraic, seven cipher classifications of creation and the NT cipher language "a day is as a thousand years to God" will no longer

contribute to critical creativity in protestant students. That biblical ambiguity, the cognizing process resulting from that stimulating polarity which reinforces protestant pedagogic techniques and critiquing attitudes, will be forcefully replaced with a disambiguous millions-to-billions materialistic measurement span. A span of an impractical unimaginable gap is created in the mind of a student who is expected to stand in compliant awe at the chief executives that have measure it. The gap between student and the heavenly father, the estrangement from God will be imposed as the polarity of critical thinking is pedagogically pushed out of the meaningful and purposive dimension of historical and normal thinking so characteristic of occidental (Western) thinking. The consequence is that the familial mind disrupted by the absent-parent syndrome leaves room for only the “Church of evolution” and its uniformed “Fathers” serving as the interim standard and replacing the protestant’s biblical standard.

3.16. The futile effort to avoid human sacrifice—The responsibility thus transferred to the student and parents, in an effort to level the field, the protestors tried to avoid the individual sacrifice of parent and/or student, and reverted to what appeared to be organized forces hoping for some balance of power. They used personalized words floating about that had the emotive force comparable to the intensity of the emotive academically and government approved words “evolutionary biology”. Like Haught, they used the term “creationism” naively, not aware of the significance of the “ism”. Without the research expertise of Barbara Forrest they easily found that reactionary efforts were already in place in the country providing the only apparent conventional (not revealed from beyond) alternative expressions to “evolutionary” origin-logic, i.e., that anti-theism. So they started using the terms “intelligent design”. Its development was easy to intuit and to rationally trace for the evangelical movement is not as sophisticatedly refined as the methodology of the covert activity of established ecclesia. Regardless it was made to appear that a new frontier of methodical investigative research had been originated for discovering conspiracies. But the ease with which anyone could see the terminology change does not mean there was a conspiracy “evolving”—except mostly in eyes of the beholder who sees everything through that term and those not using it are accused of inverse profanity by default. I mean there is no question about the mission, nor is there a question that the mission was reacting to an ill logic being imposed religiously. To that “breaking new ground” researcher, if the term “evolution” is not uttered, any compromising efforts to resolve the expletive-sensitivity must be associated with the bible. In that methodology, if the new “e-logos” is not used it surely cannot show a sincere effort at accommodation; it becomes another clear case of the bible causing a conspiracy. (See Jaspers’ political methods of the “Church” @45, Philosophical Faith and Revelation.)

3.17. QT-ACLU mustering—The ACLU colleagues began mustering. The Dover theistically-concerned citizens, some then elected as officials, were being set up and setting themselves up to be taken to court, the complaint being that the words were in violation of the separation of church and state, the no-law establishment of religion clause of the Constitution. With some sensitivity about recent court decisions regarding the word “creation” the compromise use of “intelligent design” was conveniently interpreted as contempt of court. And implied in plaintiffs initiated action is a freedom of speech

issue, that, the old objection to the “e” word is a violation of the clause too. The plaintiffs struck first again and took the high ground by initiating litigation, a well calculated act that suggests those taking the initiative are not conspirators. It was easy ground, for Barbara Forrest had already done the groundwork for her Trojan book, which had already made the case for a bible type of conspiracy. Interestingly even Barbara seems to wonder why it was so easy to see an evangelical eagerness for a test case. Rather than pursuing whether it was in fact a conspiracy, it is now being dismissed as a retired elderly attorney’s need to keep busy. It was not as much of a conspiracy as it could be made to appear so.

3.18. Undue vengeance and due-process--Pointing to the tip of the doverberg (iceberg) conspiracy, no reasonable person could think that an anti-religion religious effort was well concealed behind the outstanding litigation initiation, which now became front and foremost distracting from the broader conspiracy. Only the anti anti-religion side of the complex was outstanding—a kind of religious positivism was induced by the anti-logic. There was no way the anti-theism group could lose for there is no way an anti anti-theistic movement could be shown not to have theistic motivations. And when even a defense attorney verbalized about the futility of the defense, it was taken to mean that comeuppance would be the test of evil. The trendy common-law status involved in “evolutionary life” is a pretentious primary premise and is the other prong of the dichotomous common-sense historical complex—a complex that only due-process over time can comprehend. The other prong is that humankind is distinct and incomparable as a specialization, a thinking agent—but a specialization indeterminate. Incompetent, designed or not, defendant representation barred logical rejoinders. There was no way the Court could rule otherwise, and in this case the court did excitedly rule against the defendants with an unbalanced vengeance. I would have thrown it out and back to the electorate rather than allow publishers, book authors, and local autocrats exploit the judicial system.

IV. WITOLD WALCZAK, SOLIDARITY ACTIVITY, AND MORE POTENTIAL INVERSE THEISM

4. Looking for machinations suggesting purpose and meaning—Again, Jaspers-Applied to Dover is included on my Paideia-Existenz Webpage; as such it’s assumed that a reader has no aversions to seeing not only the outstanding behavior in terms of good works, but also the high potential for machination involving a renown Boston College cum laude graduate, Witold Walczak. Witold is obviously a valuable hybrid packet of energy planted, cultivated, and harnessed. He had served as associate director before becoming the first legal director of the ACLU Pittsburg Chapter in November 2002. The Dover trial indicates that on Jan. 9th of that year the Dover Area School District superintendent had made note of hearing an elected official use the “c-ism” word (“creationism”)—which in itself points toward the misuse of civil servants’ religious-like “retreats” from transparency. It would come to be a notation about someone using the freedom of expression clause as a license to use language that sounded biblical. It doesn’t take much cottage-talk street smarts to fill in the gaps, i.e., to flesh-out the agendas with informants’ passing reports along the common off-record spiritual information highway

to those who share kindred purposes and meanings (including organizations' missions carried out religiously by some associates of the ACLU, atheism organizations, and large historically established cults, and some small sects with infiltrate-able top-down systems). Through cross examination it was Barbara Forrest's testimony that showed how this cottage-talk worked—a note here to the ACLU, and there a peer-pressuring note to Simon Blackburn, only this was not conspiracy but rather depicted as “professional courtesy” and friendly warnings to a “member of [our] discipline [philosophy]”. It declared simply as innocent cottage talk, and if Blackburn reneged it was proof of a conspiracy and further distracted from the conspiratorial professional warning. The argument that this mystic-movement and anti-theism mission was not imposing its ideology into the public school system is faulty for the ill logic was already established and all that was needed was to reinforce it and maintain the status quo.

4.1. Miraculous coincidentals-- At least coincidentally just prior to the 2005 Dover trial Witold was named director of the entire ACLU of Pennsylvania. A similar coincidence occurred in Louisiana: In 1994 Barbara alerted the ACLU about a “creationist” agenda in the home parish. In 1995 Barbara became a member of the board and in that capacity decisions were made as to which cases to pursue. This is simply a glimpse at the bigger staging going on encompassing the Dover tragedy of justice. These few of many facts becomes like dots with experienced reason filling in the gaps. With Judge Jones' assurance that no “intelligent design” determined the trial's 40 unit time-length (it lasted 40 days), one still has the right to wonder aloud about the miraculous abiogenesis (spontaneous emergence) of the broad outline, script, and then the possibility of a designed stage upon which the Dover board was set. The transcript fact that a Thomas More Law Center attorney's 40-day gibe does not mean it wasn't designed to add a miraculous tint to the obvious winner. It is doubtful that it was part of the scheme, but the fact that it came to mind at all makes it a possibility so that it would come across as a fulfillment of the biblical mystic about 40 days. And it offered the Judge the occasion to separate himself, like a third denial, from anything appearing biblical. The wondering justifiably extends to the kinds of aberrant psyches that might participate in such collusion. The wonderer is ridiculed for thinking that the purpose and meanings screened from such forces could be anything other than a biblical coincidence or a lucky accident—either providence or fate become the subconscious name of the plaintiffs' archangels. Witold's star witness was Kenneth Miller who remains an ongoing star. His idyllic testimony that his textbooks are designed without purpose and meaning is pre-fall superciliousness, for it's an epistemological impossibility. I'd venture to guess that his June 2008 book is designed largely to fix that inconsistency. The last I read, Witold executes and administrates the entire ACLU of Pennsylvania, overseeing relative litigation throughout the state using three staff attorneys.

4.2. Witold's extended activity: Atheism v Theism (AvT), Barbara Forrest's orchestration—Our review takes up again with Witold's past involvements, particularly his participation in the atheism v theism fracas in Poland (“solidarity movement”). The review of the outstanding theism v. atheism worldviews phenomena is relevant to the Dover trial for a couple of reasons (and a Jaspers-application is pertinent, Jaspers being a significant therapeutic authority on the value of biblical theistic religion). The same AvT

(both are iconic isms) pathos is manifested in the Dover trial in the atheistic logic of Barbara Forrest and the volatile logic of the Witold team's other star expert witness Ken Miller. Both Barbara's logic (philosophical naturalism [by the way; there can only be a metaphysical naturalism, i.e., philosophical naturalism is an oxymoron]) and Miller's testimony was an attempt to show one could have an "evolutionary" well paid vocation and remain either a "philosophical" materialist or a verbalizing God-maker proponent in the parish simultaneously, the latter only worthy of a hearing if backed by those wearing mitered caps—with John Haught tilting a cap and tipping the scale further toward vatic authority as a "Doctor" of theology--and a book author! Behe can be seen, though supposedly a witness for the defense, in effect as the vatic's sacrificial scapegoat.

4.3. Whether Communist Poland, or Witold's work there or here--The appearance is that "conversion" schemes or chicanery, good or bad, are again employed. It's that old Kierkegaard v Nietzsche or Christian and anti-Christian "complex", that which occidental philosophy majors are aware of and can misuse—a dualism made clearer thanks to Jaspers' philosophical, psychological, and analysis of Nietzsche and Kierkegaard. Witold could have this ability for the docket shows Witold has a degree of philosophical expertise and probably most capable of utilizing this established paradox (either transcendental deism or immanent a-theism—emphasize the isms). Witold's witnesses were weighted toward an immanent theism counter balanced by Barbara's logicity taking the form of a non-denominational atheism (normally not accepting labels). The defendants attorneys' deprived performance worked well to distract from the plaintiffs' attorneys' machinations, e.g., by confusing humankind's stable consciousness with a fully developed nominalism (words with emotive value) sort of worldview: Consciousness supposedly came about through the use of language in some latter-day stage of change over time, and with the force of "papal" authority and one single classroom-word, "evolution", continues the momentum of consciousness overcoming the primordial conscience. But the continuum constant changes:

4.31. The big sound "eupraxophy" become the voice of God walking--A new sound, "eupraxophy!" is the postmodern nominalism out-reverberating the theistic sigh, that historic dichotomous learned ignorance that eschews hubris, i.e., the more I know/the more I know I don't know. That dichotomous polemical mechanism is reduced to a euphoric singularity, a "now it is fully known"; origin of change over time is reduced to the emergence of language and the certitude of the now known emerges with "praxis" and euphoria and become another new word, "eupraxophy". The voice of God walking in the garden becomes fully understood as merely humankind laughing at how the origin was so clearly overlooked. And as the hubris deepens the school becomes reflected in another new word, "eupraxophy" and that neo-sound is suppose to replace philosophy. That mindless singularity in the logical premise stands out so vividly in the trial that I see Miller scurrying to publish his new book in order to vindicate his self-image from the inane logic—and rescue his Church and the easily exploited judicial system from embarrassment too. What Witold knew, Miller knows now, i.e., the weakness in the final cross and redirect is now information for the world to subject to fine filament critical screening. The ACLU's Internet posting of "Plaintiffs' Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law" are solidarity machinations that probably can sway some of the democracy some

of the time but it must not be allowed to fool the republic all of the time--again, thus, the defensive need for Miller's new book regarding the "e-logos" snatch for the American soul.

4.4. Barbara Forrest and the immortal "Big Beep" intervention (Day 6, PM Part 2), Federal Rules of Evidence Rule 610—Mr. Thompson for the defense zeroed in on the issue but then passed on by because of the difficulty of making it relevant to the immediate case—but it was and is not exempt from due process. Barbara belongs to the New Orleans Secular Humanist Association, but claims no label, apparently careful to avoid the ism is secular humanism, which would make a religious smack in court; but then steps back into the religious role by saying, "My thinking is in line with secular humanism"—note the ism. Barbara held the same views as the Council for Secular Humanism, including the promotion of the mission. Barbara describes "movement" as a program that carries out the mission of being critical of religions' conduct within educational programs for all age levels. That determined, Barbara unequivocally affirms a disbelief in the supernatural ("I do not [believe in the supernatural]") to Thompson in hopes of avoiding being identified with religion. The next question is: "You don't believe in the immortality of the soul?" No answer was recorded before the Judge said: Wait! The court reporter's apparatus apparently beeped and the judge's "wait" precluded Barbara's answer. But there was no objection at that moment.

(4.5. The beep explicated: Court reporters' shorthand typing machines are equipped with electronic lights and digital computer memory. Tape recorders are used as a back up for accuracy. The typewriters are equipped with clocks, which print the exact time line by line in their transcripts. The beep we must assume was the reporter's apparatus signaling either that its battery was low or about to run out of paper. Everybody is supposed to stop and wait when the beep is heard.)

4.6. No ruling on the Rule 610 objection to the immortality question--The transcript shows no objection was made before the judge interjected "Wait" into the cross-examination. And when the counsel for plaintiffs, Rothschild, did object there was an almost too convenient bit of confusion about what was being objected to, and in the apparent disorder the objection was not ruled on, the question was not answered, and not repeated. However this much can be deciphered: The counsel for plaintiff, Rothschild, belatedly objected to the immortality question and argued referencing Rule 610, and the defense retorted, but no ruling was made. The beep was coincidental to the real cause of the awkwardness of the situation. The source of the confusion was the fuzziness of the "science and religion" or "philosophical naturalism and methodical naturalism" question, i.e., whether science can appear as religion and religion can appear as science. In the apparent confusion the judge asked that the question be read back by the court reporter. Rothschild, counsel for plaintiffs, had a question read back to him, but implied that there was another question that was not transcribed (which is doubtful and if so it still would have shown up in the transcript)—as though fault was transferred to the court reporter or the apparatus. It appears "Wendy" the court reporter and her apparatus became plaintiffs' Rothschild's the "woman made me do it".

4.7. The more real than apparent religion/philosophy question--But what is most revealing is that the defense (Thompson) made an important point relevant to the greater historical complex though the question did go to or make it to the fact that Barbara's definition of a movement (working toward a goal) amounted to espousing a religion. His question was referring to the statement that her thinking was "in line with secular humanism [ism sic.]" Though it has nothing to do with whether the defendants got caught up in the counter conspiratorial process, it pertains to whether methodological naturalism (ism) and/or materialism amounts to an anti-theistic movement, and whether a logical rejoinder should be considered. It is this confusion over the meaning of religion that now becomes the grounds for seeing a miscarriage of justice.

4.8. The appropriateness of the immortality question--Under Rule 610 the question would be appropriate if the answer to the immortality question could show that the witness was biased or had interests in an agenda relative to the situation being tried in equity. It does not change the reasonable view that there was an organized effort to put religion into the classroom but it was a reactionary effort to the intensified news heralded out of the centralized vatic authority and its conspiratorial effort to harvest "evolutionary naturalism" as one more collective force to reinforce that religion. Scheming was and remains systemic, and remains engrained in the ill logic religiously contributing to anti-theism in the classroom. Remember, Catholicism only needs vatic authority but protestant survival depends on whether their standard can survive against Catholicity's staking a claim in "evolutionary biology" and with open arms offering to become the church for anti-theists and confessional for ill logic guilt. Protestant attitude and thinking can compete and by emphasizing the critical scientific attitude that initiated a reformation's fearless confrontation with authority and experience in general. So it can be rejoindered that Rule 610 can be applied to show that something going by the name of science could in fact be an imposing substitute for religion, an ersatz holy universal religion to correspond with science being the most universally popular complete knowledge. Any reasonable person can see that any form of the symbol "evolution" amounts to a rallying call for a crusade against the biblical standard in the defense of vatic authority.

4.9. The Francis of Assisi yield clause--Now, no reasonable person can think that the symbol "evolution" is going to be placed on a list marked for extinction or that teachers and students are going to be issued beepers. It would increase the "e" use as one of the seven most agitating low frequency noises of "post-modernism" in the great conflict of serfdom verses individual freedom. But there is no reason why a theist's taxes should go to an onto-logic that can only conclude in anti-theism. The prayer to God for help to accept what cannot be changed does not carry any conclusive "Saint" like presumptions. Even if one must accept the death of a loved one, it does not mean immortality does not kick in to support hope and maintain specialization as an eternal constant.

4.10. Any reasonable person's understanding of religiosity--If a personage had stated a disbelief in the immortality of the soul any reasonable person would take that to be an anti-religious response indicating bias against religion—even though "religion" is not defined. If the response were, "Yes, I believe in immortality" that goes to a religious

expression for any reasonable person. Either answer goes to whether “evolutionary science” as in “methodical natural(ism)” tends to establish either side of the religious phenomenon, i.e., the words have always superimposed and pulsated, because it is an organized program that carries out the mission. This side of reasoning about origins, and now being stretched beyond reason’s capacity for origins, it propagates that the mind emerged late, and religion as a byproduct, including theistic thinking, and that such is purely epiphenomenal, that is, a product of the imagination.

4.11. The “Theos” charge, Barbara links evolutionism with religion--What is certain is that Barbara’s definition of philosophy and theology (both consumed in the word philosophical naturalism) is historically insufficient and that deficiency results in a radical aversion for the word “theos” and biblical John’s “logos”, which she speaks to in the trial. The great historical conflict over humankind’s origin is skirted rhetorically. Part of Barbara’s mission is the enforcement of the theos (word) and logos (logic) inherent in “Evolution”, enforced as the star teaching cipher, while others must be prohibited from using that “theos” (word) unless it can mean “reverend” materialism de facto. The biblical John’s “theos” and “logos” must be locked up and the key tossed, because, as Barbara said to “reverend” Berry Lynn (revered because contributing to the mission’s enforcement) that when the word logos is used it “leaves out a lot of people” and then speaks of the Dover plaintiffs being “good Christian people” as though they were called Christians first in Dover because they fell in line and used the human de-specializing word “evolution”. That interview with Lynn reveals that Barbara makes the link between evolutionism and anti-theism and establishes evolutionism as a religion. When one hears that word, it becomes a word-reasoning stopper and one must simply take what one sees, for, what one sees is all one gets. Logos, biblical style, has a root in the Hebrew word breath, spirit, and an animated specialization from beyond mental conception. If a truth were faced, the aversion to John’s article is a defrocking of John because it distracts from the Petrine genetic-fallacy procession of reason-stoppers to distract from Peter having not written the first biblical “encyclical” of the New Testament.

(4.12. Berry Lynn relegated to pure title of “distinction”--I can be easily corrected if wrong: Berry’s Lynn is associated with the Reformed Church of Christ, not to be associated with the non-denominational label-less wholly independent and unconventional church of Christ otherwise referred to as the restoration movement, a movement on the frontier of the American experience confronting and legally exploiting, in a good sense, the separation of church and state. Also, the restoration movement must not to be confused with a contemporary contra-movement, the LDS, and the theocratic tendency thereof as an understandable counter-reaction to the separation clause. LDS (mormonistic “history” on American soil) can be seen as a anxious reaction to the ratification of the separation clause throughout the States and the fear that European catholicity or Islamic forces might step into the void. If there was going to be a theocratic reaction it was felt that it should be grown on American soil with an American history equal to that of the occident. The miraculous appearance of the Archangel seemed to have been competing with the miraculous appearances to a Native American in Mexico.)

V. JASPERS, WITNESS FOR THOSE BEING MENTALLY DESPECIALIZED

5. Jaspers: Religion and philosophy is indefinite, not subsumed by naturalism—The circumstances surrounding the beep alarm amount to a defining moment like other bangs heard around the world and it is important for the grasp of a more than provincial historical context. Jaspers in speaking of philosophy and religion (Perennial) says,

Neither religion nor philosophy is a clearly defined entity; we cannot take them as fixed points from which to start on our historical transformation, but both conceive of themselves at all times as vehicles of eternal truth, whose historical garb at once conceals and transmits the truth. I cannot speak of the one eternal religious truth [meaning he could not speak to it from personal experience, and also because there is no one ‘religious’ truth]. 76

With this we approach the beep and the Rule 610, that averted “objection” and confusing discussion that followed. It fulfills to the letter the meaning of:

...[D]iscussion with theologians always dries up at the crucial points; they fall silent, state an incomprehensible proposition, speak of something else, make some categorical statement, engage in amiable talk, without really taking cognizance of what one has said... [C]ommunication requires listening and real answers, forbids silence or the evasion of questions; it demands above all that all statements of faith...should continue to be questioned and tested, not only outwardly, but inwardly as well. No one who is in definitive possession of the truth can speak properly with someone else --he breaks off authentic communication in favor of the belief he holds. 77

In fairness to Barbara, all three litigant-facilitators provided a means of escape from the question. The Judge intervened apparently prior to any objections, the defense did not pursue the question, and allowed the plaintiff’s attorney to intimidate with irrelevant comments about Rule 610, and the Judge did not rule on the objection and all took advantage of the confusion surrounding the beep (see Day 6, PM, part 2). But for sure it was Thompson being outnumbered by amiable beep talk, shallow tip toeing 610 vacillations, windy distractions, and disordering jurisprudential conduct. The impeachment of the witness depended on the answer, and either answer would assist in determining whether “evolutionary science” could be viewed as a religious movement by the “any reasonable person” common sense test.

VI. JASPERS ON COURTS ON MENTAL STATES

6. Dover trial more psychopathic than “liar stuff”—The defendants were not pathological liars. What makes this case a mental case is the bigger life lie. The need to conceal the greater elaborate lying was the underlying context that was deceptively avoided. The judge’s decision to use name-calling is what contributes to the pathological situation. The Dover trial involves more psychopathic phenomena than Judge Jones’ “liar” stuff. A psychiatrist of the caliber of Jaspers could have been an important expert serving in an advisory capacity. It might have resulted in something like a

recommendation that all especially the expert witnesses, for sure the plaintiffs, defendants, and attorneys of both, including the judge submit to Existenz counseling including a pharmaceutical regime that would not merely depress the conscience like booze. The medication to aid in withdrawals from transcendental and immanent ontological addictions; enforced teetotalism and the sobering penalty of heavy fines imposed upon respective ACLU (evolutionary union, union equals cultic religion) attorneys and on the Thomas More Law Center for exploiting what in reality was a mental case and not making proper referrals during the discovery phase. In this vein I hope to show that Kant was right and Jaspers is still as correct now as when he wrote:

According to Kant expert opinion in the Courts on mental states should fall within the competence of the philosophical faculty. From a purely logical point of view perhaps this is correct but in practice of course it will not do. [e.g., Barbara Forrest and Witold Walczak, mentioned because notorious exploiters of philosophy—Wood's brackets] No one but a doctor can treat mental patients because somatic medicine is indispensable for this. Consequently only a doctor should be concerned with the collection of factual data necessary for the Court. [Under this condition Witold, as litigator instigator, should have abjured himself due to one having a degree in philosophy--he should have known better.]

(It should be noted that the quotations are from General Psychopathology's Introduction, and has a footnote reference to "my Psychologie der Weltanschauungen", which seems to indicate he had adapted and modified some editions due to that work. I mean, having displayed for general consumption worldviews as life-lies, not only psychiatrists but also philosophical psychologists could qualify for court witnessing. But it is doubtful that Barbara, Witold, and least of all John Haught, would qualify. Jaspers continues:)

Kant's dictum stands, however, in that the psychiatrist's competence is really commensurate with how far his education and knowledge would qualify him to belong to the philosophic faculty. This goal is not served where (as has occurred in the history of psychiatry) he learns a certain philosophical system by heart and applies it automatically. This is worse than if he had learnt nothing at all. But he should acquire some of the viewpoints and methods that belong to the world of the Humanities and Social Studies.

In fact the methods of almost all the Arts and Sciences converge on psychopathology. Biology and morphology, mensuration, calculation, statistics, mathematics, the Humanities, sociology, all have their application....The essence of psychopathology as a study can only emerge clearly from a composite framework. GP36

6.1. Jaspers' ambient qualifications, and the Dover ambient conditions —Jaspers' psychopathology developed under purely ambient conditions. His GP was the product of clinical-institutional experience. The clinical experience and his expertise were extended through a change of milieu during which time he produced the Psychology of Worldviews. The conditions were the trying times leading up to, during and after WWI.

Later another change of milieu involved WWII when while in hiding he prepared *Philosophical Logic*, Part I being published after the war in 1947. The quote above was taken from one of several GP editions and can be read as including all three arenas of experience. The varied experiences provided the occasion for reflecting deeply into logical positivism, naturalism, i.e. materialism, and what can and can't be made to conform to biology, morphology, measure, calculation, statistics, mathematics, the Humanities, and sociology. Thus it is reasonable that his court-view above includes worldviews as being pathological even if not strictly speaking all of them psychopathological. One does not have to be a psychiatrist so much as philosophically and psychologically well adjusted agent—an adjustment now enhanced (but impossible for some) by data accessible via the information highway. His democratic leanings spoken of in his *Reply To Critics* shows he did not limit competency and success to peer-review processes; that makes his works independent of peer-review critics and comes loudly with what seems like a new objectivity in contrast to the old peer objectives lauded in the trial by the ACLU attorneys and the “evolutionary biologists” peer cottages who look in the beginning for the “e” word.

7. A wishful sabbatical conclusion: Any reasonable person can see that “evolution” as taught is religion regardless of the filing of a claim and the public praying for and the aggressive begging for non-denominational and non-profit status.