

## **JASPERS' WORKS APPLIED TO RICHARD DAWKINS' (JUNE 5, 2006)**

**FIFTH CONTINUUM OCTOBER 17, 2006—EPISTEMIC POSTURING OF DISEASED EMOTIVE AFFECTIVE STATES, CONSCIOUSNESS AND MIND: further preparation for handling objective research through epistemic triangularity; a special application of epistemology to torture-trends (scroll to 20)**

**FOURTH CONTINUUM AUGUST 2, 2006—DAWKINS' APPROACH TO AND WITHDRAWAL FROM THE UNCERTAINTY OF KNOWING THE ORIGIN OF HUMANKIND; Evolutionism's real issue: Oxford's High Church v. Martyrs' Memorial (scroll to 17)**

**THIRD CONTINUUM JULY 20, 2006—PANDERING TO DAWKINS' "MEME" MARTYR-SPOILER (scroll to 12)**

**SECOND CONTINUUM JUNE 23, 2006--RICHARD DAWKINS V. KARL JASPERS ON CONSCIOUSNESS, FAITH AND MENTAL DISEASE (scroll to Item 8)**

**FIRST CONTINUUM JUNE 13, 2006--INTENTIONAL PROGRAMMING IN 1860-OXFORD (scroll to item 6.)**

**Acknowledgements:** I'd like to acknowledge that Richard Dawkins and Charles Simonyi make this Web Page imperative. They have contributed like twilight and darkness contributes to the dawning of a new day's appreciation for yesterdays' legacies. That...*kudus*...should be sung as a dithyramb to attract search engines rather than a bit of witty ditty. On the more enlightenment side I can't really thank Karl Jaspers enough since he has taking on immortality but his...legacy, the theistic spirit, is hardly squashable.

**Prefatory Statement:** I'm wholly independent of any organized group in this Web Page endeavor. It's a work in process. Correction can be made at any time. Utilizing iconology will be kept to a minimum while avoiding being iconoclastic. Today books by popular scientists might have offensive cover illustrations, such as making a Sistine Chapel Adam appear to be giving a finger at God, or a "John the Baptist" the same to the second coming. Uncouthness to impress the majority-bass will not replace reasonable pugnacious but punctilious words. This Page is a no-holds-barred reasonable critique of a powerful force and Richard Dawkins is an out-front point-person for its offensive.

### **1. My qualifications for this Web Page**

**1.1. First,** my ad hominem credentials are above reproach. I have the distinction of having been censored from Herbert Muller's "Karl Jaspers Forum" with the cooperation of some preeminent notables. The honor is equivalent to an excommunication for individualistic conduct beyond fixed duty by an institution with a questionable total universal aspiration. It amounts to a Dishonorable Doctorate. Richard Dawkins cannot equal my credentials for lack of reverence for positions and titles of distinction. But that

is only because he might be restrained due to his earldom-legacy. That legacy includes a tradition of effective publicity that some could see as propaganda. That effectiveness strangely is restrained due to Charles Simonyi's approval and support. Richard has an unofficial reputation for being arrogant—though I take that to be partly due to the stress that accompanies the Chair he occupies. Our confrontational style differs. His appears to be... intentional... misbehavior to avoid confrontation. Mine is a technique derived from professional Existenz/philosophical counseling. My thirty-second pause of pensive silence is more tactic than a militant stare and smirk. One of us is probably more honest than kind. One is more hostile than honest. Both of us are deficient in discretion but well matched in the worser part of valor. He might show up announced, and I might make unannounced visits to avoid contaminating the experimentation.

**1.2. Secondly**, Richard must genuflect with more sincerity than he gave to what he called an honest “creationist”. Wait, no, not genuflect but bend to pick up on the gauntlet. I've tried hard in the past and in the name of objectivity to avoid the word creationism, creation, and creationist; and to the word “evolve” or “evolution” retaliated with the word “evolutionism”. Moreover, I cannot be identified with evolutionism but with antievolutionism once the dichotomous arch is struck and thinking polemically begins. However, once polarity is first recognized straight out of consciousness, responsible decisiveness leans toward the means most conducive to freedom than bondage—unless lasciviousness and pathos epidemiologically overcomes the capacity for making reasonable connections.

**1.3. Thirdly**, there are no pecuniary ties here. I have no reputation to defend or establish. But I have the support of Simonyi's product. I guess that is what the Word Program is that is used here. I don't know whether this is ironic or intentional.

**1.4. Fourthly**, I've seen the light. I've arrived at the seat of infamy, i.e., Cranmer's eternally flaming body at Oxford. His martyrdom has made it the safest place in the world for the most controversial figures and ideas. Anything goes for fear of raising the past and the dead. Dawkins would probably agree that there is no level of court higher than Simonyi's Chair that Dawkins uses. It is the throne of last appeal, the D-Dayton of the Internet where the trial cannot be dismissed by judge or consensus. The gavel that can dismiss and end the dialogue is an intentional program.

**1.5. Last but not least**, I use Jaspers' works but substantially with his approval in so far as I can determine. Jaspers is the epitome of humility regarding the limits of science. He is the one who elucidated the harm that can come when meaning at the limits of knowledge is forgotten and medium and purpose then make up a godhead.

## **2. Internet research results on Simonyi/Dawkins**

**2.1.** Other than hearing the Bill Moyer's interview with Richard, until several days ago I knew next to nothing about him other than there was at least one contributing to Herbert Muller's blog “Karl Jaspers Forum” who deferred or referred to Richard as an authority on origins.

2.2. So I did a little Internet research and scooped up the following image: Richard judgmentally occupies a static chair inside a “necker” cube at Oxford University. The University allowed billionaire Charles Simonyi to buy it. Charles has also purchased a chair on a Russian rocket to the “International Space Station”. He is president and CEO of *Intentional* and has acknowledged being focused on the development of software to, it seems to me, sniff out words’ intent with the biblical acumen of dividing asunder thoughts and in-depth intentions.

2.3. The general impression given is that there’s a collaborating force with which one must come to terms. Richard encourages the popular view that his militant atheism is equal to and conditioned by the intensity of his evolutionism. Money means quick power and if a militant atheist is found to be too overbearing, Charles’ can carefully designate a gift to a Jesuit school. That’s hardly contrite enough for absolution from the billions earmarked for the propagation of a fundamental substratum essential to establish evolutionism as catholic enough to be...the...ersatz church. Still it was small cents for a bit of religious publicity propagating an exemplary humanistic ideal while propounding the selfish gene’s urge for power.

2.4. If consciousness-conceptualization interface-thinking is here correctly applied, it would be a program for programming capable of categorizing this paragraph and excluding it due to, say, the name Karl Jaspers, God, unless the words “evolution” Dawkins and Simonyi dominated. It conceivably propagandizes that there are two phyletic trees in the encompassing complexity of being. But the interface-biosphere tree only is accessible as the “absolute” discernment of truth, while excluding the winds of legacy whispering through the tree of being—which is in reality without beginning or end. Hopefully it is wrong to say that Charles’ metaphysical use of metaphoric language leaves philosophical wisdom and faith in an inaccessible area and humankind at the mercy of immanent tooth-and-nail absolutes. The suspicion though seems warranted due to the appearance of a conflict of interest in dropping the name of an anti-theist equal to the intensity of a dogmatic evolutionism that welds influence from a position Charles has invested heavily in.

2.5. From my critical perspective, it sounds, looks, scrawls suspiciously like a phylogenetic enticing programming. But according to Charles it is “absolutely” not programming language. To me it sounds like “P Programming” with the detection intensity of a canine-tracker determining which tree or pole of the fundamental primordial dichotomy to be predetermine as infectious. I’d like to be shown more wrong than right about what appears to be the singularity, the catholicity intent of *Intentional*’s programming. The free and protesting world waits for good news that the Anti-reason has not wholly yet corporealized—as in the form of artificial intelligence.

### **3. The Issue: The Legacy of Philosophical Faith is excluded by the Legacy of Evolutionism’s Revelation**

**3.1.** One can wonder if Richard and Charles have presupposed the basis for an interface that excludes the predispositional and preconstitutional side of conception and conceptualization, the greater part of historic reality. The exclusion is built into the interface explicitly...revealed...in Charles' description of "Intentional Programming". It seems the intentions are to create the ecology for abstractions. Right away the program is based on epiphenomenalism, i.e., abstraction is the extrapolation from a materialistic and profane doxology to a polluted disregard for the limits of thinking. Charles' intentional programming's special language is simplified for the masses by charismatic means. That is, he uses the personage of Richard. Immediately we have an ecological intentional disruption of communication's ecology. The medium is poisoned. It's programmed to exterminate theists and antievolutionists in the U.S.A.

**3.2.** Richard is popular at least for three things: First, propagating that evolutionism is confirmed by a European consensus and disdain for lingering abjuration and protestation in the U.S.; second, a preeminent bully-like atheism because he has the backing. Third, he is known for occupying the most influential Oxford chair, the ghostly historic ecological center of post modernity where the ecological imbalance of communication occurred; the atmosphere there is purified with the dust of unselfish genes, cells, and molecules (when it rains). The ghost's smoke and aroma occupies the "necker" cube in the University's square.

**3.3.** For Richard and Charles, U.S. recalcitrance, theistic bent, and constitutional caution regarding Chairs of distinction, are mere abstractions for immanental perspectives. By making light of them they can be generalized into an emotionless singularity for economic force, or generated into power for a "special purpose" or religious like vocation. The exclusion of the transcendental side is accomplished by ecological cleansing, i.e., through devaluating the individual by way of pheno-geneticism. The appreciation for the limit of science, for which Jaspers is known, is not found in Charles' intoxicating meta-positivism that "all sciences of complexity are making big forward strides." Of course he is not referring to meaning at the limits of science, but in context excluding...meaning...intentionally from the interface. The key idea here is the potentially dangerous supercilious use of the vatic/vectored faith in a manifest divine destiny. It is immanental catholicity at the level of intentionality rather than transcendental conscientiousness at the edge of consciousness. And Richard's repulsion toward Catholicism's intervention into his specialty may be more apparent than real; as the visit (**5.** below) to historic Oxford may show. When Catholicism uses the word "progress" one must ask if forward may be interpreted as backward--"necker-cubic" speaking.

#### **4. The Appalling Concord**

**4.1. The Shock of finding points of agreement--**I've not read Richard's books, and will not purchase and thereby contribute to a well-propagated, well financed program bereft of historical uncommon sense. Nor will I be shamed into it, though not too proud to accept them as gifts. (The Library system is another taxing problem.) So, searching the Internet you can imagine my surprise upon learning that his criticism of the vatic

“Proclamation” of 10-22-96 was measurably comparable in intensity to mine. I saw it as interference with the separation of church and state through mandatory education. He sees a problem too but he perhaps does not see that it is a dogmatic mess for which the Dawkins’ syndrome is largely responsible. Unwitting negligence respecting the political tactics of religious prelates and clergy is a prime sign of irresponsibility regarding the meaning of knowledge for the good of humankind and the environment. The thrust given to the momentum of catholicity-science (evolutionism) tends to show the unreliability of his oversight. His type of evolutionism-glossalalia precipitates stuff like the 10-22-96 proclamation.

**4.2. Richard as militant witness to intentional programming**—What Richard finds so distasteful about the infringement of vatic authority is in fact what tends to verify the plausibility of my proposition. That, the more dogmatic scientific certainty becomes the more dangerous it becomes as forces vie for harvesting. The methods of clergy and prelates of the established politicized church can make the tactics of Richard and Charles look amateurish. Before Charles and Richard get the “intentional programming” in orbit there’s already an infiltration force circling waiting for the corporealization. That’s the way things are but hopefully not meant to be.

**4.3. There’s another 10-22-96 critical agreement**--He looks at primates, and finds logical conduct repulsive when the primates of church history revere “evolution”. But I find it logically harmonious that evolutionism’s glossalalia can so easily be adapted to a Gregorian chant.

**4.4. Primate Concerns**—Somewhere I have a record of expressing, several years ago, concern over the simian mistreatment (and gerbil too). In that essay a causal connection was suggested between HIV and SIV due to experimentation (lab or otherwise) but from the perspective of sexual perversion with humankind taking the initiative. Nietzsche and Jaspers’ wondering is still as justified today as ever, i.e., there are as many playful arguments for humankind’s simian descendancy as simian ascendancy. But on the serious side of disease, the wondering is whether HIV is the cause of SIV or visa versa or just a principle of it-takes-two-to DNA tangle. Richard seems to want to grant not just humane rights but human rights to simian preservation. Perhaps he would build laboratories-habitats for simians for the preservation of whatever mutation might be genotyped through phenotypical cohabitation (the two forms of thinking here involve epi- and phenomenology). One wonders if and when overpopulation drives the team into an international space station, the decision to render theists into simian food would at least be joked about but with the intention that the suggestibility would be carried out by want-to-be team leaders clamoring for social position down on earth’s serfdom.

**5. An aphoristic metaphor--The Oxford environment and we, here now, are there then**

**5.1. Thomas Cranmer is burning at the stake**—Henry the VIII is dead and no longer able to continue to protect the protestant inclined Cranmer. Henry’s first living recorded child, bloody Mary, is burning Protestants. Remember, Henry’s marriage to his brother’s

wife Catherine of Aragon was arranged when he was 12 through the efforts of his father obtaining a special dispensation from “pope” Julius II. It had to do with political connections with Catholic Spain. To fully appreciate the dynamics one must have a virtue historic worldview of forces--comparable to that of a weather-person’s map.

5.2. At Henry’s powerful urgings Cranmer and like academicians (during a protesting interlude before academia became Catholic again) at Oxford had made their decisions on the matter of a reasonable standard to determine the morality of the marriage, and in effect, it was confirmed that the “pope” had no authority in that domain. It was the time of the plague spread partially due to the immorality of the lenient prelates and lascivious clerics, the immorality of which led to easily seeing the need for a standard of behavior, thus the reformation. At the time of the plague Henry was actually in the area of Oxford as was Cranmer. What had started to replace Roman authority were the records deemed reliable as a standard and made reliable ironically to some degree by Rome’s capitalizing tactics.

5.3. As Cranmer burns, think this: shortly, Oxford will be under Catholic control and through a spin on events (look at the Internet history of Oxford University) Cranmer’s burning will be used as propaganda, i.e., a terrible price for one to pay for contributing to the rift in catholicity and preventing the one-world Church. Though there may be documents with his signature relating to his recantations...but now back to the scene and notice how he stretches out his hand to the burning flames and holds it there where all can see while repeating “unworthy hand.” ...

TO BE CONTINUED—This experience on the basis of here and now thinking applied to the past has far more aphoristic appeal and much more virtual reality than Charles’ description of a proposed “intentional programming” being too professional and therefore he thinks visual aids are needed to teach it. The visual aid chosen is the religiously charismatic aphorism “Dawkins”. The metaphysics of his evolutionism constitute the metaphors to make the complex dogmatically clear. My purpose is to show how the phenomenological method applied to meaningful connections and their specific mechanisms are conceptual tools that easily adjust to elitist Oxford-phenomena, and assist in making reasonable connections between forces.

-----

## FIRST CONTINUUM

### INTENTIONAL PROGRAMMING IN 1860-OXFORD

6. **The relevance of Cranmer’s burning to Dawkins’ “Nice guys finish first”** (and at this point I’ve only a guess as to what he means, for I’ve intentionally not pursued it on the Internet) is only to be determined if a more whole than partial Cranmer is examined. Guilt, limited thinking, limited feelings, suffering, conflict, and death are all involved to the degree that they are ultimate situations unavoidable but not sought by a nice guy. Cranmer’s guilt involved avoidance, i.e., avoidance at all cost even others suffering and

death, and he sought life unconditionally too, i.e., others were expendable but he was not as archbishop of Canterbury. He was a nice catholic guy amidst the growing spirit of protesting. But his participation in the burning of “heretics” was insufficient to compensate for failing to kiss the big toe of the bishop of Rome when he was sent to plead on--biblical grounds--the King’s case regarding his arranged marriage with strings attached to Spain. When the big toe was extended for kissing, a beagle playfully bit it. The popularity of the anecdotal intervention in itself was sufficient to burn Cranmer. Whether Dawkins can get away with snipping at a vatic’s ontological leap of faith will depend on how useful he continues to be to the cause of “evolution’s” catholicity. *(Catholicity has come into vogue within the last half century by intentional design along with the Catholic Church definition of “modernism”, and is propagated, like the word “modernism”, to appear less dogmatic than the word Catholic as associated with its historical stigmas. In popular current use “modernism” serves as a host carrier of the idea that the Catholic Church has been updated and therefore must be revered more reliable and not responsible for the past, and can be relied on to not repeat anything stigmatic. I use the word catholicity with the stigma defensively remembered including the designed intention. I use it to mean any commitment to something universal enough to be imposing by whatever means including legislated duress with designs on those protesting. But if Catholic appears with high case “C” it specifically means what is thought of as the historical Holy Roman Catholic Church. Any form of the word catholic is therefore meant to mean a mission of a universal nature that proceeds from some dogmatic fundamental truth humanly conjured epiphenomenally speaking and material in nature and in application. The need for this parenthetical clarification is a good example of how nominalism v. realism can be made sense of.)*

*(I use high case P on protestant only when referring to the historic group that still clings ideally or really to the Bishop of Rome with hopes of its reforming to be such that membership can be regained.)*

**6.1. As one with protestant leanings, he was more a “nice” Catholic guy** for he had previously participated in the burning of several others for views he himself leaned toward until under pressure from catholicity. When bloody Mary began cleansing the domain he had waffled back and settled out of fear of burning. He recanted in writing, but upon learning of bloody Mary’s determination that he burn, he then publicly verbally rescinded. On a previous occasion he had advocated leniency toward a young man, Frith. Frith was guilty of having written an essay against transubstantiation, but in the final analysis Cranmer had participated in his burning. Cranmer had been promised by Oxford elements that he would not be burned if he recanted. While Henry was alive he was able to protect Cranmer from scheming prelates who conjured charges to burn him--during this time Henry understandably began embracing the protestant spirit.

**6.2. The reality of propaganda by torture turned into a firestorm.** The standard determining reality from nomenclature was raised to the level of demonstrative protestation. Propaganda, the tool of nominalism, was reverted to again to draper (pun-reference to John Draper below) the reality of the inhumanness to not only the special but the genus of humankind. In other words sophisticated nomenclature was used to draper over the realism of the flame. Nomenclature was back in the saddle fully knighted and

overtly manifesting itself in Oxford—carried over from the Paris school due to the efforts of the Dominicans and Franciscans who were given to nominalism and against realism. What counted were the creedal words to control realistic protesting.

(The Paris and Oxford school arose during the scholastic arguments of 11<sup>th</sup> century Nominalism v. Realism. It is the argument whether genus humankind is different enough to be not only an abstract concept but also participating in something real and unique. The realism/nominalism conflict was a consequence of a primordial comparison of phenomena and causal connections determined more from the perspective of either difference or similarity. The conflict is primordial, but emphasizing difference can be found in Plato, and emphasizing similarity in Aristotle, and both deteriorate into the doctrinaires of the Platonism of Augustine and the Aristotelianism of Aquinas, and supposedly dogmatized by iconolatry when the latter two were canonized saints. Then by a profanely sanctimonious sort of meaningless reversal Plato is made Orthodox for the East and Aristotle for the West but both incorporated in the Occidental dichotomous continuum through the reformation in Germany and the reformation in England. The nominalism/realism conflict has now come before the Simonyi Chair at Oxford where sits Dawkins.)

**6.3. Selfish v. unselfish predispositions**—The normal and quick response to burning alive those forces categorized as heretical (never the real reason), is that Catholics were also persecuted. But there's a predispositional difference, such as with Tyndale who was multilingual and merely guilty of innocently translating the New Testament into English. Catholic prelates were in collusion to influence and obtain Henry's approval for burning Tyndale. In-depth pressure and scheming was applied. But Tyndale was mercifully strangled before being burned, but the sentence was carried out near Augsburg more in the heart of protestant country where the executioner had discretion to protest the suffering. How much this mercy or proneness to inflict suffering is disposition and predispositional and how much the constitution is preconstitutional participates more in the unknown than known. But a bird's eye view of as much as can be known raises suspicions. The disposition that would establish a policy of burning alive for suffering intentions and mass coercion, and cutting off the feet of American natives tends to show there's been a shearing of consciousness, especially conscience if there ever was any properly inherited or properly taught.

**6.4. Cranmer's burning was paradigmatic**--The burning of Cranmer was the historical gross-event determining whether England would be Catholic or exists autonomously. The concentration point of suffering was the pinnacle of the inhumane violation of the ultimate situations (an act devoid of any awareness of the limits of the mind, shaving off of any empathy, as though nominalism had finally triumphed over reality). Inhumanity to humanity was designed to maintain the force of catholic solidification. The public shame drove the catholicity force into only apparent remission. In the academic field the religious force of catholicity went underground where it was well acclimated. In the religio-political field, direct evidence of the force was known as the Anglo-Catholic movement. The movement identified as the Church of England (Episcopalianism) was the Catholic element's overt effort to keep a foothold during England's reformation

movement. Though overt and nominal it was a sidwinder effort to make the Church of England allegiant to the Bishop of Rome. The backlash to the effort occurred within the spiritual continuation of the reformation movement in the form of the Low Church (High Church is Episcopal) in the Methodist movement in the south and Presbyterian movement in Scotland, and finally the Evangelical movement out of London. The Evangelical movement, some 800 ministers and laity, can be seen as an organized effort to break away from the conflict between nominalism and realism by concentrating on the practical application of the biblical standards of moral and ethical behavior. The side effect though gave free range to the dogmatism and catholicity of “evolutionism” which included the potential for harvesting by Catholicism, as it has done. It also gave the Oxford sophistic academicians the occasion to consider as mentally and intellectually inferior those not participating in the nomenclature game, and along with it came a disregard for biblical values. The disregard for biblical values as a standard was a boom for Catholicism for the bible was dispensable anyway. The disregard and disrespect fed upon itself and by being carried over into whatever vestiges of religious inclination remained at Oxford and comparable schools of established elitists. The forces against biblical values as a standard and substitute for vatic authority were already well underway before 1860 through the underground academia. New students were immediately disillusioned and shocked by the conduct and profane language of theological students. Darwin himself was one disillusioned from continuing preparation for the ministry (if I recall correctly).

**6.5. The Cranmer-paradigmatic-punctilious event had to be decentralized** by think-tank tactics. It had to be circumvented. Nomenclature was hurled into the effort. Huxley made absurd unrealistic written comments about his willingness to go to the...stake as Darwin’s disciple, verbalizing about his willingness to suffer for dogma like Cranmer and others. It was bravado in the face of the security paid for by those who were burned unwillingly. If empty bravado bluffs didn’t work then the Cranmer event had to be secreted by commotion. Prelates can be best and worse at such. Anything might be tolerated for Catholicism if it draws attention away from the Cranmer shameful situation—even making a secret pact with science if it could be dogmatized enough to be brought in sync with the dogmatism essential to sustain catholicity. It would take refined shrewdness, reverse psychology, parametric manipulations of dogmatic forces, and even creating a polarizing situation where science could be remolded and reduced to a heavy toothed metal gear for synchronization. But there had to be a ring of friction, well oiled to avoid squealing and smoke, an interface situation for synchronization of a slow gear here and a high gear there, a idler gear too and one for overdrive if needed. There could be none better to be used than Huxley. Huxley had already shown the need to prostrate himself before “Darwin’s doctrine”. Owens though was out of sync, and out of the ring and minimized Darwin’s doctrine—the “doctrine” was a theory he had thought of ten years earlier than Darwin. (Actually it’s a theory playfully entertained primordially.) Wilberforce was an orator and had also nominally committed himself to the subtle terms of the instigation. And he occupied an inhibiting reconciliatory position between the growing spirit of Romanism and the Anglo-Catholic Church of England. These three persons could be predicted. *A catalytic but predictable guest speaker was needed; it would be someone who would solidify reactionary forces.* A guest speaker should be acquired, a protestant of sorts, who could not speak the Oxford language and who could

not be interrupted as a guest speaker. It would have to be someone who was inclined toward speaking his open-minded expressions on sensitive issues, someone like Draper.

**6.6. The John W. Draper Bomb**—Draper hailed from an area where Catholics in the 18<sup>th</sup> century were restrained by limits on property inheritance but by 1829 they were allowed to sit in Parliament and join the army (in a 2001 census Muslims were the largest non-Christian religion—Christian being Prot. and Cath.—but Mus. still at 2.78% --Jewish was 2%). Next to the Church of England, i.e., Episcopalian, the largest group in 1851 was the Methodist, and the Church of Scotland, i.e., Presbyterian of no consequence). Draper had studied at Woodhouse Grove, a Methodist school, then studied at University of London, and moved to America in 1832. Surely he needed no introduction and known to be an appropriate personage at a dedication of the bible-built science museum (plus the honor of being invited might mean a foothold in America, so a good show had to be made). He could be predicted to say things that would embolden Wilberforce in turn to say things with a dogmatic ring while leaning toward the protesting spirit in reaction to any dogmatic nomenclature that sounded like scientific dogma. Wilberforce could have been predicted to compete on Darwin/Huxley terms safely from the pulpit. But Draper could not be limited to predetermined rules of a conjured issue. Wilberforce could be predicted to make an attempt to disprove on material grounds by comparisons and similarity or differentiation that humankind's origin is known, and by Darwin/Huxley terms prove it was not known, but known not to be materialistic because of differences. The uncertainty principle of humankind's origin had not been established at Oxford, and the certainty principle at Oxford was being maintained and the metaphysics was showing itself in the growing arrogance of the natural scientists. The principle that needed to be maintained was that the origin of humankind, the thinker, was utterly unknowable, but the good cheer in face of uncertainty was part of that principle, and it was being ridiculed because biblical rather than vatican, though it was in fact as historical as Sanskrit verses. Draper had seen some light of reason, and he could be depended on to polarize the religio-politico complex because his reputation, real or not, preceded him. And...his vital role and meaningful philosophical wisdom could be dismissed as a boring and long speech that left everyone restless and irritable. Jaspers, via Kierkegaard and Nietzsche, had not yet made philosophy exciting and systematically meaningful again. Meanwhile, Huxley was lying in wait to ambush the unprepared and handicapped Wilberforce.

**6.7. The point of mentioning Draper's environment** is to show that the early 19<sup>th</sup> c. census' fractions were as available to the Oxford factions that were influential in determining who would be the guest speaker at the ceremony celebrating the new museum to house all of science from medicine to chemistry. It was a museum built with surplus funds from the University Press's bible sales made possible by the high price Tyndale paid. The fractions of the census are nominal but yet indicators of the real and immeasurably charged atmosphere. There is relative certainty that the level of scrutiny (i.e., analyzing Draper's image) was no less capable then as now, and if it needs to be argued, then it's evidence for humankind's current retardation compared to humankind's past.

6.8. The decision to arrange Draper as guest speaker did not occur out of the void but in the midst of the conflagration still as hot as ever and therefore in need of distractible nomenclature. Only inexperience due to removal from the times and spaces would be the excuse for the naïve view that the issue was that dogmatic science's time had come like the second coming. The philosophical issue was the implication involved in the dogmatic nomenclature that the origin of humankind had been found. Only nomenclature and an air of aristocratic concord could propagate that the fundament of ontological certainty now stands (like an abomination) in a bible-built building. If effectively machinated, dogmatized science could overcome the essence of science and religion: that truth cannot be localized in Rome or Oxford.

6.9. Draper saw the problem and could express it more objectively, i.e., that the conflict with science was coming from Romanism not from the force protesting the forces demanding compliance.

**6.10. Huxley and Jaspers on Baer—Huxley “prepared to burn” for Darwin’s doctrine**--Let us get it clear. In the *Way to Wisdom*, Jaspers lists “K. E. von Baer” and Darwin as suggested readings for a philosophical *grasp*, to comprehend the place of unavoidable philosophical involvement. The wisdom is involved in seeing that Baer’s exploratory research created a “magnificent vision of the world in its fundamental characters”. But Jaspers says of Darwin that he was Baer’s “diametrical opposite” because Darwin reduced this vision to a system of causalities, “which implies the destruction of any sense of authentic life”. Huxley also studied Baer with similar appreciation but became as one dissatisfied with being in a critical mode and needing to be a proponent of something materialistically simple and absolute, so Darwin was interpreted as something definitive enough to curtsy before, and in preparation for inspiration just before the debate with Wilberforce. Needing a submissiveness to doctrine, having the willingness to be nominalistic, being dialectically alert, and adapt at nomenclature, Huxley could have occupied a Chair for the propagation of the scientific fundament whose job description was to make sure this dogma was propagated effectively enough to be the base from which all science must proceed.

**6.11. Huxley’s testimony establishes the Cranmer Punctilious event**--What an interesting comment. Huxley used the likes of Cranmer’s suffering to show his attraction for Darwin’s doctrine. The attraction though was expressed nominally for he knew there was no chance he could burn. Prior to his public defiant reaction, i.e., the interruption of Wilberforce’s lecture, in the same note to Darwin, Huxley stated that he was preparing for the confrontation with Darwin’s opponents. Neither Huxley originally, or Owens, or Wilberforce thought that the origin of humankind was known, but Huxley was leaning toward similarities rather than differences for it was the prevailing winds of doctrine and dogma vortexing at Oxford. It was a display of a prey’s weakness that could catch the predatory eye.

**6.12. Draper drops the Conflict-Thesis bomb on Catholicism**--John W. Draper now from remote New York University presented his *Conflict Thesis*. It was a complex thesis with which only simplism could compete. As reality is complex, it is most representative.

The invitation to speak at Oxford must have been taken as a compliment and perhaps the belated recognition of the value of his views. He failed to see that to speak at Oxford meant every other breath must be from the Catholic atmosphere. To only exhale protesting breath was sure to bring polemic response. The undercurrent was such that the last thing you could suggest is his thesis that “the intellectual development of Europe considered with reference to Darwin and others, that the progression of organisms is determined by law”. His paper at least showed how the Darwinian metaphor of adaptation and environment had entered what we call social and political science. *The thesis included the argument that science and religion have always been in conflict, but that Roman Catholicism was most out of sync with science and protestant more a harmonizing attitude.* It was time for Huxley to create a commotion of distraction, but it could hardly be used against a guest speaker from America, and it must appear to be only a science issue.

**6.13. The Islamic fall out--**Again, the real issue is not nominalism, not “evolution” or evolutionism’s nomenclature but rather the struggle of forces, real complexity v. the clearly reduced verbalizations. The issue, historically, involved the force of a written standard v. a foreign centralized vatic authority. But Draper’s views were threatening from another angle. His thesis tended toward not only the protestant but also Islamic friendliness toward science, and Catholicism served as a retardant to science. Oxford had now become the geocentric court of last appeal for the Inquisition with its seat in Spain to control the spread of Islam in an unbalanced tit for tat fashion. Heretics could no longer be legally crucified. But that law could be circumvented. After all, there’s no law against frying, only crucifying. Prolonged suffering was reflected in the Cranmer paradigmatic event.

6.14. Now the issue of authority begins to take more vivid form. If “evolution” can be effectively propagated, the general population can be talked into getting ducks in a row and the most “evolved” authority is the “evolved” institutional standard that has “evolved” the longest that counts as an argument, albeit a mistaken argument. The disputable reputable oldest “evolving” institution can also be further dogmatized by punctilious bouts of “modernism”, which is “evolving” too. Note! These previous forces are first-class theorists, no less subtle, but only less dangerous due to the current technology. But now due to technology, the forces are more dangerous because technology is such that dogma through intentional programs coupled with the speed of light can overcome the due process of normal protesting. If catholicity due to technology can keep ahead of the right to protest, only suffering paradigms can bring about a restoration of a healthy state of rights.

**6.15. Draper’s “Conflict Thesis” meets the falsification test--**If Draper had need of more substantiation of his thesis, he could leave confident that Oxford had provided some proof that catholicity was a hindrance to science in that the polarization into dogma was an undeniable experimentation producing results. In other words, the debate was proof pudding of his thesis, for without catholicity there would have been no dogmatic conflict. What perhaps he did not see was that the issue was not the limits or absolutes of science but rather the issue was secondary to the need to distract from the paradigm, i.e., the

Cranmer burning (and others) and the paradigm-shifting force of the New Testament and the spirit of the Old (especially the deaths of the prophets and Jesus). He would have to ignore the debate, as we must, in order to see what the distraction was all about. “Evolution” has never been the issue; it is a spin to distract from the historical conflict between something even more basic than vitalism and materialism. The issue is: acquiescing to the creeds of others or protesting the loss of freedom. Draper could now return and publish his book on the conflict thesis, “The History of the Intellectual Development of Europe”.

**7. Recapitulation—Intentional programming**--I’ve not yet read any book by Richard Dawkins nor searched anything on the Internet by Dawkins regarding “nice guys finish first”. Two nice guys, Cranmer and Tyndale, have been considered. The burning of Cranmer is a case of a nice catholic not being Catholic enough. He was burned for participating in burnings with too much restraint and showing signs of empathy for protesting victims. Catholicity could only be realized if real burning or enforced nomenclature could put down protesting. When poor publicity regarding the Cranmer event prevented retaliation, “nice guys” with intentional programs went undercover and manipulated other guys into conflict over a doctrine in the name of science. Prelates instigated the burning of Tyndale and had no part in the mercy-killing tactic when he was at the stake. His apparent innocent purpose had nothing to do with the conflict of forces. He simply wanted, at first, to make the New Testament accounts available to all. What he made available in English were the accounts pertaining to crucifixions, biblical paradigms. Henry VIII had been under extreme pressure from clerics to intervene and put an end to the translations that could cause turmoil. Regardless of the best-laid intentions at programming, the Oxford University Press surplus funds from bible sales built the natural science museum and the programming continued to manipulate the ceremony, and it continues today. In 1529 Cuthbert Tonsal, Bishop of London, with Thomas Moore, schemed, purchased the books and burned them. The money they paid for the books, made it possible for even more books to be printed, thanks to whatever part Tyndale contributed.

7.1 Corrections to the above are welcomed for consideration.

-----

## SECOND CONTINUUM PREPPING FOR A RICHARD DAWKINS’ PERSONALITY EVALUATION

**8. Dawkins v. Jaspers on biblical faith**--The conflict between vatic authority and the biblical standard continues. Richard Dawkins has, in part, said: “People believe in evolution...because of overwhelming, publicly available evidence”, “faith cannot move mountains...” and he refers to Doubting Thomas as “the only...admirable...apostle...” (330 Selfish). There is enough said here for at least a preliminary hearing to determine what is meant by an apparent commitment to overwhelming propaganda, a committed challenge to Jesus’ meaning, and an apparent debasing reference to martyrs. We can consider this enough for a prep-hearing to determine whether there are sufficient grounds

for Richard's belief that this faith is "a kind of mental illness", and to hear also my counter-claim that his evolutionism and personality present phenomenal material for psychopathology. It should be emphasized that my counter-claim predates any awareness of Richard's charge, and it was part of the reason pressure was exerted which led to censoring by Herbert Muller on his "Karl Jaspers Forum" (an inappropriate title exploiting Jaspers).

**8.01. Anthropogenesis**--Nearly a half century ago while a seminarian at Lincoln Christian Seminary through independent reading I became familiar with the notable Catholic evolutionist Teilhard De Chardin. He was predicting and promoting a Roman Catholic Church of Evolution. I had not yet started reading Jaspers. I found Teilhard's musings not unlike my own at that academic point with regard to possibility thinking—except for my engrained protestant conscience. Shortly thereafter I began reading Jaspers and saw then but more clearly now that the Catholic institution treasured Teilhard as a potential personage that could be harvested for institutional enhancement. But, as a representative of Catholicism, an institution with compunctions not limited to burning heretics, he got caught up in that Piltdown scandal. When offered the chair of Paleontology at College de France, he deferred to his religious superiors and declined. Though declining the position occurred before the announcement about the fraud, questions had been in the air for sometime and it may have been thought that the time was not best for a Catholic's direct involvement in "evolutionary" propaganda. Perhaps it was thought that such propaganda would best come through not only a non-catholic, but a militant atheist and one who could do all that Chardin said needed to be done relative to promoting "a science of anthropogenesis". What I am saying is that if one were committed to a definitive prime cause relative to the development of humankind's consciousness, that determining cause is bound to show up in the form of a rationalized "god" and then exploited by a similarly immanentially orientated religious institution. It is not an unworthy hypothesis to entertain that it is in the best interest of Catholicism to vatic-vector all popular facts through propaganda. The history of Catholicism is such that one can think that once evolutionism reaches a point of no return from pop culture, it will be collected as a force and by covert and overt means. It has reached that point and has been collected. It is my preliminary opinion, falsifiable of course, that Dawkins serves Catholicity to that purpose. But, it needs to be said, that I've not studied the Dawkins' phenomena, and my first impression might be wrong. Ongoing phenomena might reveal adjustments in his thinking. He has admitted errors, which is to his credit, but whether awareness of limits will reach fundamentals is hard to imagine given his public confession for evolutionism. He seems prepared to go to the stake for evolutionism and in that sense could be considered dis-eased. At least that is what he is being paid for.

**8.02. Emergency-alert and statement—Beginning book reviews:** I went to the local library to see if someone might have donated one of Richard Dawkins' books. I was disappointed to find that tax-money had already paid for promoting "evolutionism". The disappointment was not due to any aversion to individual-free-speech rights. A much earlier check revealed that the library had none of Jaspers' works. There were four books by Dawkins. So, already on a local level and at taxpayers' expense Jaspers was not

allowed to compete. I mean, only a “nice” guy was allowed a handicap of four unites while Jaspers none.

8.03. So, I checked out disingenuously *The Selfish Gene*, New Edition, 11:21 AM, 6-15-2006 #510 receipt.\* It is obvious that the title has gross urge appeal--firing for effect so to speak. After a brief review, paying special attention to the last two chapters added in the New Edition, and the defensive End Notes, I found that the title would have been less deceptive if changed to something like “*non-selfish gene*” or “*amoral genotype process*.” But “selfish gene” is a designed title (like Radical Constructivism) suggesting a certain content that would foster the impulsiveness of base urges. It seemed Oxford-designed to appeal to youthful and unruly urges. But, again these are first impressions.

8.04. The next day at 11:19 AM I got *The Ancestor's Tale*. It has a Jacket design--obviously with Richard's approval--depicting a split DNA spiral in the shape of an oval with some DNA unites penetrated by the spirochaete-like tale of the K in the Kins of the name of DawKins. “Martha Kennedy” was listed as the artist of this bit of Freudianism. Richard is not so objective that he can avoid the temptation of being robustly suggestive. To bring home the mystic-interplay of “evolutionary” organisms Richard compares it to the foreplay and orgasms in love affairs (p. 264, long reach of the gene). These seem like telling subjective signs of more than just a declared lack of moral objectivity in the name of unadulterated science.

8.05. Nothing suggestive like this is to be found in the works of Jaspers. But with Richard the a-moral deficiency continues. While comparing gene behavior with love “affairs” he states that historians must avoid stringing together narratives to avoid even the smallest degree of homing in on a “human climax”. He means of course, anthropomorphizing, but as we can then see, he does the same thing misanthropically—that is, reflects negatively on responsible conduct. I mean there are school children referred to Richard's works. The phenomena Richard manifests makes for data, and if the phenomena were counted it makes for statistical data, i.e., data for wondering about connections to personality complexes bordering on disorders. The title of the latter book could have no less academic affect if it had been named “Grand and Great Genes' true confessions, and your place or mine”. Because there is an a-moral standard involved here, it seems fair to include Richard's efforts to discredit the biblical standard that occasioned Catholic reaction at Oxford. It is tempting, without further study, to relate what Richard says about Darwin's Termites “*Mastotermes darwiniensis*” to spirochaete pallida (syphilis) and Nietzsche's symptoms and possible diagnoses to something inherited. But that later perhaps.

**9. Richard's anti-bible symptomatic exegetical exclamations**—Neither inspiration or revelation is involved at this point with regard to Richard's exegesis of the bible. I don't need to speak to it...yet. But Richard's elation over some research he did suggests unwarranted aside-conceit, a groundless self-confidence carried over when he departs his chair and does some exegetical research. He does what anyone can do with any word; he shows the meaning can be ambiguous. The Hebrew word, he didactically declares, for “young woman” can mean virgin or not. Richard wants to be the one to determine

whether “young woman” is virgin or whatever. What he’s trying to show is that NT authors are unreliable and make OT words subject to prevailing mythical NT thinking. Of course there’s a Judaic faction needing this sort of friendliness. What Richard overlooks is the contextual and dichotomous cultural milieu. “Young” woman has to be read in the context of “old” woman. Sarah and her spouse were too old to have a child, but the testimony is that they had one; and the Messiah comes from one too young and effectively without a spouse, i.e., both due to something outstandingly abnormal for special humankind. Next, Richard overlooks meaningfulness in his effort to impose meaninglessness onto the virgin birth concept, whereas it is a matter of testimony, and now a technical possibility and appropriate for falsification. It is almost as though he--more so than Henry VIII--must show that the biblical standard for proper behavior is questionable. For Henry the standard was to be found outside vatic authority. For Richard, if needed at all, the standard must be found anywhere but the bible. With Richard, the standard must be rejected unless it can be made complicit with his evolutionism. This excludes the bible but includes a “Vatican”. Biblical exegetes who think unavoidably in dichotomous terms and out of consciousness-conscience have no sudden amazement respecting the ambiguity of words, such as with the Genesis author’s meaning of the word for “forming” in Genesis 1:1 and “reforming” in Genesis 1.2ff.

9.01. Richard must know, or has forgotten, or doesn’t think others can notice that he sort of denies his vatic cake and has his vatic authority too; he defers to vatic influences that have infiltrated the Tübingen School. The bible-force v. vatic-force has not overlooked the Tübingen School, or any other competitive school at large. Both forces can be found there with dominant traces of Catholicism in the name of catholicity and concordia. Richard can, with sources from the School, say with usual disquieting certitude, that Matthew is not the author of the first Gospel (p. 270 in endnotes *The Selfish Gene*, New Edition).

9.02. However, Origen, the Didache, Epistle of Barnabas, Ignatius, Hermas, and Justin Martyr etc. thought Matthew was the author. Perhaps the greatest argument is that the early church unanimously ascribed this Gospel to the biblical apostle Matthew, and this was before the Catholic Church needed documentary support for its “evolving” system of force—before it needed to capitalize apostle for apostolic succession. If Dawkins is finding support for casting doubt, it could easily be coming from the Tübingen School’s Catholic influence which has now a vested interest in promoting doubts about the early witnesses if the doubts tends to discredit the protesting standard, the bible, over the inherited tradition. What we have here is that “Darwinian evolutionary” form of thinking that modern critics can be more advanced in there thinking than earlier observers--if it is convenient for Richard. But, he has shown verbalizing signs of moving away from the idea of progression as a construed or traditional value. I mean one cannot believe evolutionism and believe therefore that consciousness and the mind have evolved and not get the feeling and idea that there has been some progress over animal states, and over those simply accepting what is without getting serious about ultimate causes—except where mental and/or somatic illnesses are concerned.

9.03. Richard's research abilities are at least questionable relative to biblical exegesis, and his vatic authority should be taken as an indication of probable infiltration by forces into his research sources. That his bias carries over into other fields of research seems an appropriate affirmative proposition. He is indubitably referring to the Tübingen School and to theologians, those he prefers because they see scribes copying originals and doctoring New Testament history to conform to Old Testament prophecies. Here again he manages to squeeze in the bias that the "gospel-maker...lived long after Jesus's (as is) death" He says that if the predictions don't specifically say Jesus was born in Bethlehem, then the scribe would add the detail to fulfill the prophesy (p.19 *The Ancestor's tale*). Richard seems to need to establish this fallibility in the limited minds of others to make room for his own infallibility regarding his anecdotal descriptions. The biblical milieu leaves open a window for transcendental intervention, and Richard wants to close that window. Well...except for what use he can make of the window from space.

**10. A special UFO myth and evolutionism, extraterrestrial fundamentalism**—In *Ancestors* p. 4 Richard states that historians must avoid linguistics homing in on human climatic ideas. He demonstrates an awareness of how this is done, and then because he thinks he has been the first to see and state it, he has earned the license to abuse the principle. He then demonstrates the type of love affair that evolutionists have in the very next paragraph. Out of uncharacteristic regard, special regard is offered to a fellow evolutionism-member, and perhaps out of tit-for-tat fear, he alludes to a book the title and author of which he does not mention because it is a "good book", and then criticizes correctly the basic errors regarding confusing science with progressive subjectivism. The book is good, he says, in effect, because it uses the word "evolution" but bad fundamentally. But where it is bad Richard will use any word but a form of "evolution". He could have used evolutionism, or said this is not "evolution". Rather, a qualifying phrase is used like "the conceit of hindsight" but not "evolutionism". It's possible that acoustical gratification was a decisive factor. The abuse of humankind's origins and goals is further demonstrated by the use of unidentified foreign officials (UFOs) who evaluate earth-human progress and worth in terms of whether they know they evolved. It seems to me this amounts to a UFO's search for the master race. Richard assumes a transcendental deistic position telling us what an alien would look for; that advanced, evolved alien would see who believes in evolution and who does not, a "darwinian evolutionary" style of a second coming and great judgment day.

**10.01. Why I'm reading Dawkins**—So here again is a competition that Karl Jaspers is the only nice guy not permitted to participate in due to propaganda and money. My tax money is going to Richard Dawkins, The Oxford Press, and other pheno extension kickback arrangements with schools and publishers, and one way or another to...others not in need. There are no books by Karl Jaspers but several by Richard Dawkins. That library score is predetermined; it is Jaspers "0" to Dawkins too many, and it all totals up to no triangularity—except for me. Most disturbing is that there is no responsibility assumed by, for instance, Richard, i.e., he can excuse it all on the grounds of a principle of "evolutionary" parasitism. That is not to say he has no feelings, for he can take criticism by S. Gould, total misunderstanding even, so long he does not become entirely dislodged from the thickening shell of the "evolutionary"-time's snail's slithering. He

accepts what he thinks is unjust criticism from Gould and uses the occasion to point out that they are both members of the same gang, i.e., evolutionism.

**10.02 Dawkins not recommended—Orientation imperative:** Einstein once did not recommend Jaspers because he could not understand him. Without an orientation, that anecdote could be misunderstood. On the “Karl Jaspers Forum” J.S. Johnson stated that he did not read Karl Jaspers because Einstein could not recommend Jaspers. In effect Mr. Johnson was saying if Einstein would not recommend reading him why should he. This is a convenient misunderstanding. In that instance, Jaspers was asking Einstein for a recommendation so he and Gertrude could immigrate to America. Einstein was not saying he could not recommend reading Jaspers, but rather he could not recommend him to authorities because he knew nothing about him from his writings. Richard should not be read unless the reader is properly prepared to be critical, and aware that Richard’s possible weakness is epistemic, that his treks into consciousness might be woefully lacking, and that I might be wrong to right to some degree.

## **11. How to approach Dawkins—**

11.01. *First*, approach Richard’s writings with the idea that the more we know the more we know we do not know. Approach with a consciousness and conscience regarding intellectual and emotional, limits. It’s called learned ignorance. It’s a familiar concept in philosophical and theological thinking and in quantum physics too. Though it’s learned ignorance, it’s earned humility. Though the mind has limits, anything conjured (wholly this side of inherited tradition) as the source of mind’s ground is a mind’s invention, especially the mind’s definitive source. Target Article 70 (Under Extracts) on my Website is designed to prepare one to systematically hit bottom rationally, thus preparing one for the limits of thinking. It is free, wholly at my own expense. It is based on Jaspers’ concepts of the ultimate situations of life. Without preparation one can get in a rut walking Richard’s primrose or sweet pea path. It’s good to keep in mind that Richard, so far to me, seems uncomfortable with consciousness. Consciousness is the mysterious ground of mind, but yet it is mind and consciousness that Richard uses. For this reason we will start with applying Jaspers’ works’ like General Psychopathology to Richard’s manifested phenomena. Before trekking with Richard we need to know how balanced he is.

11.02. *Secondly*, be prepared to substitute “nothing” or some other word not emotionally attached to the primordial conflict between the dichotomous forces, vatic or biblical-like faith, whenever you see any positive form of the word “evolution” or “Darwinian”. Suspect it to be a substitute for “I don’t know but look at the big guy and Big Ben (big time factor) next to me”. And remember that like in psychopathology where no genotype connection can be made, reposing into causality tends to short circuit thinking. Jaspers once said that psychopathologists must learn to think, to which his superior facetiously stated he should be spanked. Don’t let Richard lead at any point. He is not colorblind and should not be point person (color blindness can detect differences in foliage and see camouflages in military maneuvers). Beware of adverbial and adjectival expletives. Perhaps Richard distracts from parasitically overreaches even the phenotypical

cantilevering off Darwin. Perhaps Richard has to pheno-ontic off someone; i.e., he has to start, origin-rationalizing off a personage and with a fundamental nomenclature. For instance, with regard to time, look for him to use some matrix, or immanent linguistic reductionism to make sure that the in-vogue turf-gang language is being used. Time is always “evolutionary” time when out of touch with real conscious time, and it could be used like one would use a four-letter word to let others know there are no moral limits restraining tat for tit retaliation. Darwinian or Darwin-“evolution” is like a double expletive, like using a name of a personage and gross stick-throwing-fitful movements to show one’s willingness to violate anything that is valuable enough to restrain. “Over evolutionary time” can be used as a cuss word to emphasize aggression if one should question one’s domain of comfortable chronic certainty

11.03. *Thirdly*, never read Richard without reading the psychopathologist, philosopher, and theist Jaspers. If one cannot read and grasp Jaspers’ General Psychopathology, such as Chapter 10 on Heredity, then put off reading Richard’s works. Jaspers is more difficult, but more challenging and more realistically in touch with the complexity of reality. Jaspers has trekked consciousness and mind.

11.04. *Fourthly*, one should remember that Richard has at his disposal state of the art cybernetic technology and probably some about which the public is unaware; it means that the infinite phenomena of complexity is at his...disposal, but most of all, remember that the nomenclature is ever qualifiable and quantifiably by novelty. In Selfish Genes (278) he admits consciousness is a “deep problem”. He admits it is unclear to him whether the brain can simulate models of itself, such as with regard to computer simulation, serial and parallel processors. He deserves credit for that intuitive and honest judgment. Cybernetic language can be a new wolf in old sheep formal.

11.05. *Fifthly*, Richard must not be allowed to set the terms of engagement.

CONTINUED....

-----

\*The documentation here is meant to preclude the claim that ideas may have come from Dawkins’ works.

### THIRD CONTINUUM PANDERING TO “MEME” THE MARTYR SPOILER

## 12. Richard Dawkins’ Thomas Beckett v. Oxford’s burning Thomas

**12.1. Correction Notations**--Attention is directed toward some Second-Continuum corrections—other than misspellings. Revisions involve concepts: In 11.02 I used “Big Ben” to show the misuse of a time-concept as a tool with regard to meanings; the limits of thinking cannot be escaped through big or small time units. (It has nothing consciously to do with Sir Edmund Beckett the Clock’s maker; or Richard’s *The Blind Watchmaker*, which I’ve not seen.) When “evolutionary time” is used it becomes a substitute for the

thinker's uncertainty that escalates the farther one departs the here-and-now conscious base of individual thinking. So I've revised "certainty" to "chronic certainty" as an abstract indicative of relief from acute existential uncertainty. Uncertainty grows with knowledge in the way that learning humbles the learner through increased awareness of ignorance. Humankind's ultimate limits have been moralistically misunderstood and misnamed "original sin". Also, the reference to Richard not being a point-person because he's not color blind; I've clarified that by parenthetically stating that a point-person in military maneuvers might detect camouflages designed for normal sight. My father was color blind in one eye. I am also. This THIRD CONTINUUM should tend to show the grounds for being forewarned about what initially appears to be Richard's foresight and public-leadership deficiencies.

**12.2. Notation of caution**—It is recognized that some deficiencies might be quite circumstantial; Richard and his researchers laboriously condescend to condense specialized information into common language to propagate evolutionism. In an inverted sense this evolutionism is origin-sin thinking in that it is the sin of origin groping and holding, a violation of infinitely complex being. The sin is propagated infectiously to the masses through emulation. But that is what he is being paid to do. He can hope to be excused for being too simple to meet the mass need for certainty and also escape into specialized linguistics relative to the being's phenomenal complex. And if something is not quite simplified enough one is advised to read his other book, e.g., his first book *The Extended Phenotype* about which he's proudest. So a taxpayer is obligated to acquire...the other book (it may be on-line now or soon thus avoiding accusations of profiteering in the name of education). Humankind's phenotypic phenomena have to be infinitely complex, and that leaves plenty of room for the imagination--infinitely complex where humankind is compared to the drosophila. The difficult and meaningful historic paradigms, those that stand out of the complex, can be reduced through the use of distracting and lesser paradigms (comparing the strengths of martyrdoms) to support one metaphysical dogma. Anecdotal language or parables can be utilized to camouflage the propagating of a meta-scientific certitude that vigilantly fails to humbly admit that the essence of humankind's origin, such as consciousness, is unknown. Certitude and attitude can be mistakenly correlated. Under different circumstances Richard might exhibit a theistic preference and manifest the capacity for thinking out of the evolutionism box. Signs of this potential can be found in his writings. Judgmentalism must be withheld. He might be a protesting-type under the cover of a clerical parochialism while disclaiming it—a prevaricating scapegoat. We will have to wait for the UFO's great judgment day—the unidentifiable foreign officials Richard has referred to.

**12.3. Richard's vulnerability is his underestimation of prelate forces**--Let's be clear that we are more vulnerable to our limitations while hiding behind magistrates or epistemic dichotomies or penetrating them to ontological certitude: cooperatives v. defectors, similarity v. difference, unification v. diversification, catholic v. protestant, Darwinian-evolutionism v. inspiration-revelation, within v. beyond...these represent partially the polemic dichotomy of mentality that can easily be forgotten. Phenotype relates to immanent conceptualization or epiphenomenology, and genotype cannot avoid the dichotomy and limits of the phenomenological approach and method. We will

see that Jaspers handles both forms through the use of “anlage” to soften the genotype/phenotype dichotomy for the proper use of facts in the field of psychopathology. The dichotomy is softened philosophically by the use of his word *periechontology* to avoid the rigidity of meta-ontology. We are dealing with forms of thinking as tools that manifest strengths and weaknesses. Prelate-predators detect the vulnerable.

#### **12.4. Richard perhaps rests too long in certitude and gets predator’s attention--**

Richard settles too soon and too long in one of dichotomy’s spots. He becomes a victim of catholicity due to his overt but misplaced protesting of dependable historic lessons while underestimating the forcefulness of more “evolved” (pardon my language) institutionally established authority. In his world where all roads lead to unification, kin-like solidarity, he is thereby handicapped and marked as a scapegoat for predators. His weakness is resting too long on the presumption that “I doubt if the priests were that clever” at “meme” expertise. He is more wrong than correct, or he wants the reader distracted from possible priestly influence upon his works. Priests can be both clever and subtle, and great pretenders. Cleverness is not as generally needed but prelates have to be good at taking their orders seriously, for without obedience or faithful replication, vatic catholicity loses its “evolutionary stable strategy”. Richard places this stability-idea and fixates it in the formula form of “ESS” as though it is a desirable principle to be propounded. To not fall into that trap, the formula symbol will not be used. Prelate-strategy-thinking outmaneuvered and overcame Richard’s better more critical moments, for then, in another place he says: “Perhaps we could regard an organized church...as a co-adapted stable set of mutually-assisting memes”. Without the profane cult-like word “meme” he might have seen the deceptive process. It was a priest that shocked Jaspers into realizing that his philosophical logic was in effect theology, and one has to be an in-depth psychologist to see that, and subtle enough to hope it would sway Jaspers toward Catholicity. What Catholic prelates can be no less good at is preying on others’ brilliance and harvesting ripened amyloidoses-like superciliousness through honorific machinations. But, back to the phenomenon describable as a manifestation of the historic invisible church of inspiration, e.g., Cranmer’s burning at Oxford.

**13. Thomas Cranmer’s Burning v. Thomas Beckett’s Murder—**The Second Continuum ended with a forewarning about allowing Richard to set the terms of involvement. Curiously, he provides a good example by his own description of how the title “The Ancestor’s Tale” unfolded. Richard says, in effect, that he was talked into using the Thomas Beckett milieu—though only Chaucer’s name is used. Chaucer also used the highly charged Beckett situation in his *Canterbury Tales*. The exploitation of its popularity contributed to the particulate-air, the psyche-atmosphere (suggestibility) that inspired or conspired some “pilgrim’s” miracles, which were used to support Thomas Becket’s canonization. “Saint” Thomas was judged, kin-selected, to be a paradigmatic for the catholic cause. Richard uses Chaucer’s work as a popular enough title for his “pilgrimages” in the unification-search, the grasping hold of humankind’s origin. It’s doubtful that Richard would object to the accusation that he was being parasitic. He considers it a quite natural process in his “evolutional” time scale and something to be replicated in the time/spacelessness of the moment. The use shows how something

natural like “evolutionary” thinking can justify any urge to quit being critical and get on the way toward singularity.\* Parasitic “evolutionary” tactics can justify the search for hosts upon which to get attached and he obviously swayed toward capitalizing on the emotional word “pilgrim”. The choice would immediately capture the informed Catholic reader, and normally avert the informed protestant.

(\*Richard Rhodes, in his book *Deadly Feasts* uses the Darwinian-struggle idea to show how two mad-cow-like infectious strains might have struggled over a host’s nucleic acid, i.e., DNA/RNA. The use of the popular name “Darwinian evolution” can distract from research; it can short-circuit on a correlation of research-events that may not be connected.)

**13. Richard’s questionable holy pilgrimage**--The other choice for a title would have alienated Catholic readers. Richard’s first urge was to use Bunyan’s *Pilgrim’s Progress* but changing it to “Pilgrim’s Regress”. Even good Catholics, who claim modernity-reform, would object to such overt and open persecutions reminiscent of the persecuted Huguenots. And of course it would bring attention to the embarrassing Conventicle Act. Peripheral influences vectored Richard’s decision. Remember! *Pilgrim’s Progress* was written from a protesting, i.e., protestant perspective. The author began the work while imprisoned for participating in religious services in violation of the Catholic King’s imposition of the Anglican’s Church’s allegiance to bishop of Rome (the Conventicle Act). What is surprising, if not revealing, is that Richard devoted a few lines as more of an excuse than his personal reasons, or he wanted to get off that shot about *Pilgrim’s Progress*. The decision, made under influence, has meaningfulness for it involves the difference between protestant and catholic cultural mimicking, a real banner-waving conflict that fans the flames of reformation. To distract from those bellows, or at least regardless of them, Richard had already laid claimed to having introduced the word “meme”. He introduces the word similarly to the way--in the first decade of the 20<sup>th</sup> century--the words “genotype” and “phenotype” were introduced. The two words were then used by Jaspers in his *General Psychopathology* in his in-depth critique of heredity, but concluded by returning to the word “anlage”. The significance of *Pilgrim’s Progress* as an analogue is that protestants ideally don’t make geographic treks in seeking anything like a holy DNA grail, a localized holy site somewhere else other than the inward transformation of thinking. A protestant pilgrim can stay at home, right here in Oxford where a protestant Thomas Cranmer still smolders within consciousness.

**13.1. Pilgrims’ holiness**--So, as a saint continues to burn, the molecules of smell-information are collected in nerves at the back of the nose and those nerve fibers, the axons, transport the particulates to the hippocampus for the brain’s deciphering for the encompassing transcendent mind. It is no wonder that there’s so much distraction away from the focal-locale. The *Canterbury Tales* are Catholic. The power is not the popularity of the phonetic/semiotics of the title, but rather the historical context of the great controversy over the standard of faith, practice, and feedback-history v. a vatic “evolved-evolving” established and organized church. The matter is central to the restoration of understanding what has primordially existed though forgotten, i.e., an awareness of consciousness/conscience lessons--not an updated mind-brain interest, not the nearly

grasped conclusiveness resulting from consciousness studies and highly functional computer models.

**13.2. Pilgrimages and crusades** are more a Catholic phenomena than protestant, though the tendency toward geographic localization can be found in both Protestantism and Catholicism. The difference rather than the similarity between Beckett and Cranmer is equal to the difference--rather than similarity--between *Pilgrim's Progress* and the *Canterbury Tales*. Bunyan emphasizes individual transformation of the mind or spirit, and fits into the history of reform and religious freedom. It is not regressive as Richard wanted to say, but inwardly progressive for it recognizes that conversion begins within and does not emphasize the regression-psychology of pilgrimages. So, in analyzing Richard's excuses or reasons, it is important to look for differences rather than accept or mimic unquestionably what appears at face value something overtly innocent. Just as Richard indirectly uses "St. Thomas" as an item for mankind's unification, I more directly exploit Oxford's Cranmer, the more real burning saint--ecologically emphasized for the sake of the conservation of energy rather than quietly permitting the phenomenon go to waste.

**14. Saddling and symbiotically simulating the singing saddleback; s's hissing uniformly in the Oxford school-kin choir**--In the beginning of this Web Page I did not intend to make a comparison of Thomas Cranmer and Thomas Beckett. Finding it difficult to swallow, I ruminated on Richard's title-tale for it was one of those saddleback bird-songs too unbird-like with too many an "s" and when mimicked too clearly and distinctly, it was like a killdeer's fluttering too much, causing the more alert empathetic critic to look around for the real meaning behind the outstanding phenomenon. Richard writes interestingly about the bird and the "s" phenomena in the "meme" Chapter in the Gene book. It tends to show how intone he is to the catchiness of "meme" and its potential for dissonance.

**14.1. Extended prelate influence cashes-in on Richard's vulnerability**—The limitation of Richard's thinking is important to see for it easily lends itself to manipulation. What encompasses DNA experience within and without is consciousness, and should include the conscience to admit it. Seeing and admitting it is the first line of defense against being subjugated. He is aware of such manipulation potential for there's plenty potential for it in his own mind; he adeptly suspects that historians can revise history (and lineage information can be revised and perhaps the potential inherited). His waffling between dogmatic certitude and functional attitude may tempt clerics to approach while in the altruistic stabilizing mode. His 1979 work *The Selfish Gene* did not leave enough room for institutional "Saints" and could have been folded toward the protestant ethos; hermeneutic experts, honed with a sharp eye toward loose protesting, could expose the logical, informational, descriptive, and stylistic weaknesses. He would need all the catholic forces claiming universality that he could get. The protesting ethos too is well exercised in detecting strengths and weaknesses for institutional mimicking. So, by hindsight we might find that Richard's 1989 revisions were designed to make his reputation and money-backing fiscally responsible, his "evolving" fidelity more accountable and amenable for a vatican's parasitic proclamation (like in 1996). Richard

has propagated effectively enough to acquire universal appeal (that's called catholicity). His popularity helped Catholicism to appropriate evolutionism to the point that Richard's fellow-in-arms, Stephen Gould, declared that "[S]incere Christians must now accept evolution...as an effectively proven fact". If one saddleback imitator in a choir, Gould, (who had grasped the importance of injury-plus-parasitic harmonizing on the back of genus to mutated species) sank further into certitude from the weight of this authority, surely so could Richard—but by voluntary replication.

**14.2. Where Richard's road leads unless detoured to Oxford's Cranmer--**So, metaphorically speaking, though Richard wants to get on the road to the eternal city (a major source of the replication-ethos), it seems fair to protest not stopping by Oxford again to see if Cranmer is still flailing the arm that has not dropped off. 'No, look the other arm is now stuck to the chains'. It is no wonder that it is more tempting though less repulsive to make a pilgrimage to where a Catholic was swiftly made unconscious with a sword-blow to the head. Four knights did the killing. They literally fulfilled the words of King Henry II (12<sup>th</sup> c): "Have I no one who will relieve me from the insults of this turbulent priest?" Perhaps Richard should be quoted with less realistic embroidery: "All roads lead to the origin of life" (Tale, p. 8). I insist on turbulent detours rather than mimicking another's route. Mimicking involves intentional and unintentional performance relative to the terms "genotype" and "phenotype" (*and is considered with up-to-date worthwhileness by Jaspers especially in the section on heredity in his General Psychopathology*). Richard considers the words too but he has been placed in that compromising position of distorting exemplary conduct by warping the fabric of time/space so that acculturated biblical imitating is swooped into the black hole of a Huxley/Dawkins' Darwinian evolutionism. Our pilgrim, Thomas Cranmer, having failed to mimic prelate-emphasized nominalism, is too strong a mimicking force for evolutionism. That sort of suffering human-scapegoat tends to distract from the updated science-jargon--such as that surrounding DNA findings, which, if catholicity is encouraged, could usher in a new-world enlightenment and include the synthetic church of evolution. The support for the spirit of catholicity guaranteed getting away with the introduction of the new sound "meme", mimicking's ersatz. "Meme" becomes less meaningful than the imitative force of the martyrs of the inquisition. Photographic memory and responsible mimicking is where Draper now reenters this scenario. He had made significant contributions to the science and art of photography.

**15. Dawkins did not introduce the "Meme" ethos; John Draper contemporarily applied the historic idea—**The "Karl Jaspers Forum" Web Page and this "Jaspers Applied to Dawkins" Web Page are correlated. In the former, such as UPDATE 27, reference was made to leading back to the application of Jaspers to Dawkins' ideas, including his "meme"-thinking. My position is that Jaspers position is healthy enough to mimic without one's loss of selfhood. He has said and means that humankind's origin is...utterly...unknown, and that position amounts to one of the poles of the eternal ethos-conflict. Again, it should be remembered that Jaspers is known for forearming us by forewarnings about the limits of science; he pulsates between unlimited research and the limits of the findings. That conflict thesis, rather the conflict of theses, has been historically expressed, most extensively biblically, and in the Sanskrit-quote Jaspers

would repeat, that “I come I know not whence...” and ends with “I wonder why I am of good cheer”. In *The Ancestor’s Tale* Richard prefers to begin his first page with denigrating words some pilgrims would find offensive.

**15.1. John Draper’s protestant limits**--John Draper embarrassingly reemphasized limits but only in a kin-selective mimicking and contradictory manner. His conflict thesis was clearly anti-Catholic and included a reactionary pro-protestant meliorism with little critical thought that the latter would easily slip into catholicity and then into Catholicism’s grasp. With Catholicism in mind he said: “Whatever is resting on fiction and fraud will be overthrown”, and that confidence in human will-power resounds with rationalism with ample disregard for science’s limits. It was said within the Wilberforce/Huxley charged atmosphere. Each personality polarized into respective forces, science-catholicity and conciliatory Catholic catholicity—in this situation, catholicity meaning two forces with claims on universality (though Wilberforce was more Sanskrit-correct but outflanked). The conflict poles are: *one*, the thinker thinks, and the thinking schemes can be imposed on others in some form of vatic infallibility; *two*, parallel to it in reactionary intensity is Draper’s vatic-like scientism, that “evolution and development” is absolutely on the verge of certitude and beyond protesting, and therefore the Vatican (Draper said “papacy”) might as well do nothing more than “cast a parting shadow”. Draper’s historical representation of science, his replication of universal history, did not properly focus in on the limits of reason. The uncertainty sides of certain technical advancements such as nuclear physics were not in vogue. But it seems clear he took a good picture of catholicity from one perspective, and then a dangerous and negative one, which excluded a smart degree of the protestant attitude. Mimicking the latter would become certitude with a proneness to catholicity and an easy victim for Catholicism’s infiltration and appropriation—its re-emergence. Draper is known for contributed to the science of photography; photographic representation remained subject to meaning for critical mimicking. Draper yielded to a known origin of humankind in talking the talk essential for an Oxford invitation and presumes “...the savage condition of prehistoric man” but the greatest argument for the presumption, which he emphasized, was Catholicism’s conduct –the inquisition and the...then...papacy’s reaffirmation of its continued need.

**15.2. Imitating and ethos forces, conjuring a self-image to be imitated**--Because of the tendency to imitate one or the other ethos, the poles above, it seems appropriate to have started and now continue to analyze “meme”. Richard, in endnotes to his “meme” Chapter, takes credit for the characteristically-protestant ideas that Draper had delivered just prior to the Huxley/Wilberforce confrontation. My argument is that the essential meaning of “meme” was not something mysteriously in the wind as a natural law waiting for a couple hybrid personalities to emerge, like E. O. Wilson and Dawkins, to filtered it and make it explicit, excessively simplifying it metaphorically for mass consumption. Richard seems to claim that he and Wilson had come to terms about the phenomenon (replication in the “meme”-mutated progressive sense) independently as though inspiration whirled through a cosmic parallel universe’s germ-hole. Richard goes to some length and finds a paper he did earlier enough to suggest no correlation and heroically supposedly rescues both hybrid self-images from public humility. If there is an

encompassing dimension escaping comprehension but fundamental to DNA-fingerprinting, and if Wilson and Richard were identical twins, which DNA could tend to substantiate, neither could be DNA-proven guilty of plagiarism—under the condition that simultaneity is practically improbable even in the other dimension—and unless they knew enough to cooperate and not incriminate each other. If one or both confessed, guilt or innocence would still be unproven and they would be considered innocent until proven otherwise. That would be called giving each other the benefit of trust rather than doubt, and irrelevant to theistic thinking enlightened by the biblical golden rule. They both knew better than introduce or admit any Draper-evidence. Both could appear as having plagiarized Draper’s snapshot of cultural replication, i.e., mimicking, emulating. (The twin-tale needs refining and extending. My first wife was and is a mirror-twin though one twin is deceased.)

**15.3. Draper plagiarizing--**It is clear that there is good reason that they both caught the hither side of the Draper-hurricane’s eye. (See 6.12 above on the Draper talk during the dedication of the science building built by bible funds from Oxford Press’s bible sales.) What the Dawkins/Wilson thing affected, intentional or not, minimized the anti-Catholic pole of the Draper “conflict thesis” and exaggerated the pole of scientism’s disregarding the protesting critical attitude of uncertainty restored through nuclear physics. There are many paradigmatic precursors, and if a later precursor is needed but still prior to Dawkins and Wilson, it would be relatively easy to show how Jaspers has used “anlage” to encompass “genotype” and “phenotype”; and uses *Existenz* to avoid mimicking Richard’s misuse of the God concept (see p. 192-3, *Genes*). The novel sound of “meme” does not resolve the Draper-call for not mimicking Catholicism; it does not resolve the catholicity of imitating “evolutionism’s” certainty about the origin of humankind. The call for imitating the latter is a call for an equally conjured institutional yoke for the sake of a “evolutionary stability strategy”. The only proper reference Draper made to the Bible was a comment about its call for tolerating private interpretations of the Bible to leave room for the “evolution and development” argument. But what the Bible says is that it is not subject to private interpretation, meaning there is no interpretation that should be imposed by counsel or convention. But the expression of certitude about knowing humankind’s origin amounts to an unreasonable private interpretation being imposed in the name of its universal validity.

**15.4. My mimicking “meme” mistake--**I publicly and shamefully admit to aiding and abetting the propagation of Richard’s “meme”. I cannot deny that I had a relationship with that “meme” and I repent (and I had no idea “meme” rhymed with “cream” as Richard emphasized). I’ve been guilty of violating meaningfulness by using...that...word, which now must enter the domain of the profane. The remedial course is to not use it. To not protest it would mean that due to well-financed propaganda Richard would have won a round against a meaningful ethos already in vogue. I first saw the word in 1997 or 8 in a cartoon on the desk in an office where my daughter worked. It might have been a “Farside” calendar, my daughter now says. The cartoon depicted a pedestrian hit by an auto. The driver says to the concerned passenger “it’s ok, it was only a meme”. I could not find “meme” in any dictionary and at the time was more computer-illiterate than now. I returned to Truth Or Consequences, NM, with the word on my mind.

I had made some meaning of it without knowing its seminal-hybrid-hybrid questionable source, and used it in a newspaper article for a Sierra County newspaper. The editor, unfamiliar with it too, correctly questioned it, and I said it was a word that seems to be coming into vogue on the West Coast and carries a meaning of imitating. I was being smartly modernistic, having no idea I was fostering evolutionism. The cartoon could be interpreted as referring to a protestant or catholic pedestrian, a sort of “necker box” dichotomy—another word needing extinction. (I apologize for using the word “necker” too.) I told the editor that it simply meant mimickers are expendable compared to thinking outside the box. I had no idea the word was a test to measure the retardation or advancement of an atheist’s growing popularity and a measure of how well he was fulfilling his job-description--the propagating evolutionism. In retrospect, the word as I used and applied it to the local situation, at least could have left the impression that I was currently aware of things in the wind. That was my intention.

**15.5. Forcing the Oxford Dictionary to consider “meme”**--At the time I was wholly unfamiliar with Dawkins’ dominating efforts. Richard considers it a plus that the Oxford Dictionary now carries the word. I’d not developed a preference for the Oxford Dictionary since receiving one free for joining a book-of-the-month club a half century ago. But Richard, an Oxford establishmentarian, found occasion to boast earlier that it had been added to the prestigious list for future consideration. He is subtle, for now having included that comment in an Oxford Press’ “The Selfish Gene, new edition”, if the word should not thereafter be included, it would be like saying the Oxford Press’ reputation is tarnished by having allowed Richard’s invented word to be published, and in the end-note-comment, republished. Mimicking is a word that should now be restored to former dignity, and “meme” recalled on the grounds of a Dawkins/Oxford Press’ conspiracy—at least an appearance of evil that should not be imitated.

**16. The Anlagen complementary affectation upon “phenotypic” and “genotypic”**—Microbial bombardment through molecular biology’s substratum; i.e., nuclear physics’ quantum-qualifying effects is less protestable than the inheritable possibilities of chemistry. Jaspers speaks to the reality of this possibility as early as 1913 and in his last work on *Philosophical Faith and Revelation*. But first, Richard, so far as I have researched, expresses it in the “meme” Chapter of *Genes*: “Man may well have spent...the last several million years” with “kin selection...in favor of reciprocal altruism” that “may have acted on human genes to produce...basic psychological attributes and tendencies” (p. 191). Richard correctly has trouble correlating this mutation and its source with the complexity of Culture. He cannot escape a serial dimensionality, a natural leaning toward uniformity, and wants to go back to first principles, his first principles. In other words, he does not...know...and then relapses immediately into publicly confessing his perpetual rededication to the Darwinian stance which suddenly becomes too big a principle to fit the complexity of reality. To Richard it appears it is not Darwinianism that is limited but rather complex reality. What is meant is that inspiration is needed but the problem is how hybrid egocentricity can afford being caught in a compromising position with its evolutionism and rationalism exposed, and subject to protests.

**16.1 The revelational milieu for inspiration**—If Richard is to maintain rational and emotional balance; the revelational milieu for such inspiration to occur must of course be correlated to his popular premise, evolutionism (which boils down to replication). He substitutes for the possibility of revelation, i.e., a transcendental intervention into humankind in some parallel sense. He comes back to a form of deism, which is simply another parallel rationalization to mystify and metaphysically justify serial rationalization. It takes on the anthropological form, a vatic-like canonization of a system of thinking by kindred consensus. He does this in endnotes on page 280 where he makes the comparison of consciousness’ “evolution” using D. C. Dennett’s computer models. He also cites Nicholas Humphrey “evolutionary” explanation that postulates (in a protestant-like slip--my comment) some sort of an inner self-critical eye. Richard correctly senses the protestant and theistic window this leaves opened once the evolutionism verbiage is penetrated. Richard moves from being intellectually honest enough to see it, to immediately closing it before any appreciation ascends beyond kin. He does this by admitting he embellishes Dennett’s (then) unpublished works that might explain the origin of consciousness (by means of consciousness out of unconsciousness—my comment). He wants to understand consciousness comprehensively from a purely immanence perspective and grasps for something substantial in Humphrey’s consciousness processes. Like a kin-selected scapegoat, Richard absorbs the honest intellectual uncertainty of the inner eye of self-inspection by admitting it might not help understand consciousness, but then in more than tit for tat fashion possibly to avoid retaliation he cordially says that Humphrey is a graceful and persuasive writer. Then, in *Tales*, to repay the kindness that Dennett shows by fostering the “meme” word in the, then, published work, Richard honors him by quotations that contain...that...m-word. Susan Blackmore is repaid also in kind for “her audacious book *The Meme Machine*”. Lighthearted talk about sky-hooks (something my granddad sent me to fetch from the barn—my first immanental-transcendence lesson) there is designed to absorb the awkward reliance on state-of-the-art cybernetic neural-nuclear metaphysical talk. Talking the talk masks the enhancing effects of uncritical human companionship that stultifies while it edifies. The kin-selectivity is obvious and of course evolutionism is what the sky-hook hooks to. The suggestibility of such personal fellowship is strong but it doesn’t substantiate that the source of consciousness is any more gene-like than nuclear-quantum-like or any “thing” else. Conservative historical imitation, mimicking, of the great paradigmatic individualistic performers should not be lost to “replication” and “meme”. That nominalism yet fails to settle the nuclear radioactive ghostly mist of Cranmer’s immeasurable suffering...at Oxford.

**16.2. Richard almost persuaded except it sounds too evangelical**--Of course he doesn’t admit that no thing helps to establish the known or knowable origin of humankind; it is suppose to be enough that the gang agrees that “evolution” is the answer, and that turf-talk...simply...confirms Richard’s description and popularization of DNA as the analogue, i.e., simian base for metaphoric up-side-down pyramids. That’s like when faced with inimical questions to avoid despair, one says: “God did it” or else “I am fooling myself”. The nearest to that sort of verbalizing is the way he opens Chapter 2 “*The replicators*”: “In the beginning was simplicity” which is meant to henceforth replace Genesis 1:1’s “In the beginning God”. In reality Richard does not know, but he

knows Darwinian “evolution” knows. In other words all things being equal Dawkins thinks it is possible that an organ’s genes can be affected by individual thinker-thoughts and possibly even transmitted, i.e., genetically inherited but he cannot put it clearly for it does not sound enough like darwinian slang. Richard’s argument rests on and proceeds from reductionism, reducing consciousness to genome’s ultimate uncertain substratum. Genes 1:1 sounds too much like humankind’s thinking--about genes and DNA units--is encompassed and dependent upon consciousness. And Richard is at a loss for words regarding the origin of consciousness, which he uses without question until after its use and when it is too late. He can ask denizens to trust him as a guide to humankind’s origin, while he has not trekked immediate consciousness. In a fleeting humbling moment Richard is almost persuaded by the consciousness side of “in the beginning God”. When not influence by the “acknowledged” crowd, in a moment of me-me-solitude, he said: “The evolution [as is] of the capacity to simulate seems to have culminated in subjective consciousness. Why this should have happened is, to me, the most profound mystery facing modern biology.” Other than the expletive, that is close to having the mystery of being revealed as the mystery, and close to the emotive meaning of Gen. 1:1. But the inspiration is lost as he slips back into superciliousness: “Perhaps consciousness arises when the brain’s simulation of the world becomes so complete that it must include a model of itself” (p. 59 Genes). Other than the transcendental reality behind the sky-hook bit of blasphemy, Richard does not seem to have found anything more certain in Dennett’s works—from what I so far can determine by spot-checking his “Tale” by an unpredictable approach.

**16.3. Jaspers muses about transmitting mutations--**Jaspers position on transmission when superficially evaluated indicates an awareness that individual potential by mutation might make one more susceptible to reading the “cipher” language of complex reality, but that...known...mutation is rarely transferable, except morbidly, and includes genetics but there are too many variables in genotype and phenotype, and encompassing anlagen to determine it to be genetic only—for there’s no such thing as genetic only. And there is no such thing as loadings or unites (though he does not mention DNA) alone without encompassings (a far better description of reality than parallel and/or serial). But what looks genetic seems also to lie dormant over long periods to appear suddenly in performance under certain milieu. Myself, I wonder, at this point in the research, whether quantum physics is seriously involved in Richard’s thinking, but it could be in Jaspers’ musings. Jaspers considers Heisenberg’s contribution. Myself, bombarding RNA/DNA by energetic neuronal waves of packets must have some effect if not only on inheritable details than in inheritable potential. Inherited potential seems biblical and consistent with the need to train up a child and the continued need for the proclamation of the gospel, and prophets, seers, and reformers popping up unpredictably. It seems reasonable that not knowing that there is some effect does not alter the historically demonstrated need for the written well preserved worded accounts of lessons learned by others’ consciousness and experience. I mean the suffering by burning fully conscious and conscientious saints must have timeless and spaceless rippling effects that also affect affective emotive states. In effect the whole cosmos groans as the biblical Paul says.

**16.4. Jaspers on avoiding sweeping genetic-heredity conclusions--**Richard probably would appreciate Jaspers' statement that "most mutants are changes that are morbid and maladaptive to life and disappear" due to what's commonly natural (the translator uses "natural selection" but that sounds too much like Darwinian evolutionism which Jaspers opposed...so I changed it to "what's commonly natural"). "But there are positive deviations which may lead to an alteration in the species if in the course of time their frequency increases." Jaspers then emphasizes that the basic substance of heredity has a general inviolable ground plan with only the slightest proneness toward modification, and warns that genetics is limited to hereditary units that can be distinguished and defined. Though he does not mention DNA, the form of thinking could not be more updated. Jaspers would probably rule that Richard's fallback and edifying refrain "Darwinian evolutionary replication" is an overly simplistic answer. Jaspers says 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." At this point in my research of Richard's works it appears that with regard to genes and inheritance, though he can see something of a miracle there, he falls far short of agreeing with Jaspers that "at present we are quite unable to grasp" the gene arrangement, that the refinements of heredity in humankind are infinite. That's a far cry from 'in the beginning was simplicity'. The "we" in Jaspers' next quote should include Richard: "We acquire a sense of wonder and a desire to refrain from making sweeping and precipitate conclusions."

**16.5. Richard's psychopathological charge--**Psychopathology is relative to this analysis of Richard's performance in that he has with too little forethought and insight compared theistic belief to mental illness, whereas I have said that evolutionism is pandemic and fosters the disease now with the backing of a vatic authoritative certitude, a sense of obligation within and without science, and moreover through Simonyi's funding. There exists the appearance of a conflict of interest here and Jaspers foresaw that force:

It is not the business of the natural sciences to create obligation but to *find facts*. Its only business is to *communicate these facts*. Decision for action based on these facts and in the knowledge of the consequences never rests with the sciences but with individual personality alone and with those forces to which he gives his allegiance and which spring from his ultimate philosophies.

My intention so far has been to separate personality traits and forces from facts. It appears Richard's ultimate philosophy of evolutionism has compromised science and made the presumptive correlation of facts vulnerable to vatic intervention, and his personality made a special impression on the spirit of simony. But the research has only just begun. Hopefully this is an impression that can be shown incorrect--ultimately.

**16.6. With swollen lips and tongue Cranmer takes on nuclear now-clearer immortality--**

-----

#### FOURTH CONTINUUM

DAWKINS' APPROACH TO AND WITHDRAWAL FROM UNCERTAINTY: THE UNKNOWN ORIGIN OF HUMANKIND--EPISTEMIC LIMITATIONS—Evolutionism's real issue: Oxford's "High" Church v. Martyrs' Memorial

### **17. The forces' struggle over the dimensions of consciousness, conscience, and pain**

#### **17.1. Consciousness as the primary (not preeminent) dimension of thinking--**

Thinkers who are inclined to put first things first, i.e., we "second-order cybernetic" tinkerers, remember finding ourselves in this world via consciousness. One then thinks at least dichotomously and moves in at least bi-polarized fashion through at least the four popular dimensions. Familial conscience is accepted as given and inviolable or accepted as given but provisionally protestable. It is inherited in the sense of something revealed, i.e., lessons not needing to be learned again by normal hard knocks and disease. Richard seems uncomfortable with coming to terms with consciousness as an unavoidable and unsought constant. Coming to functional terms though is essential to a research attitude.

**17.2. Darwin was right, but then left**—My review of Richard's comments about consciousness shows a certain leaning within this dichotomous predicament of polemic thinking; he seems to lean more toward the comfortable acceptance of given forces, but not without some painful bottlenecking of consciousness. The freedom-of-consciousness is squeezed out of mental constructions in deferring the uncertainties of complex reality to Darwin, Wallace, and "evolutionary" artificial intelligence "experts". There's the managing of external forces by cow cowing while verbalizing otherwise. Other than subjecting consciousness to the infinity of the finite, he fulfills the felt need to "sop to the religious lobby" while complaining about it. The excuse for doing so is popularly labeled but means accepting without protesting the inevitability of "evolutionality"—a conjured dimension, a sort of supernatural sapper of freedom from the decision making process (see below, item 19.3. on his "evolution of evolvability"). Richard points out that Darwin regretted such sopping, i.e., Darwin used the word "creation" rather than simply saying-- as he did later in private--that the ultimate origin of life is better put by saying that it appeared by some wholly unknown process. He exercised quietly some of the protestant polemic rather than catholic, for Catholicity was still charging the atmosphere with threats of discomfort. He momentarily universalized the unknown rather than the known in an atmosphere charged with Catholicity. Here we have the consciousness-dimension admitting that its fundament is unknown, but the mind suppresses the unknown further by thoughts regarding causes and effects. Incoherently consciousness is assumed inviolable enough to substantiate that the origin of humankind is known enough to show that the imposing vatic authority is superfluous and can loosen its grip on consciousness, conscience, guilt, and pain. He deferred to one certainty to ward off the certainty of religious catholicity.

**17.3. "Sop to religious lobby"**--That quote by Richard shows the pressure to defer to vatic authority. It is taken from Richard's Canterbury chapter (Tale, p. 560). Though he doesn't know it, or hides it by sophistry, the religious lobby Richard must pacify is defined as "the Church [his high case 'C']" on the next page. However his high "Church"

is more covert than those located openly in lobbies. He should be conscious that the attitude he is referring to is that same succession on a roll that burned the martyrs. Richard really wants to be understood as referring to any religious thinking, which he dubs fundamentalism, or what I would refer to as those not boxed in by established or high church types. He does not like the pain of being approached by unpredictable protestations. Dealing with established religion is highly predictable but highly uncontrollable from the outside.

17.4. The discomfort is understandable for the issue is not clearly seen. This confusion is seen in the quote from *The Guardian*, 3-9-02: “Creation as literally depicted in Genesis is indeed supported by faith (and needs to be, since it is not supporting by anything else, certainly not the Pope, nor the Roman or Anglican hierarchies).” His parenthetical statement is a sidewinder’s off-the-cuff major premise; it is not minor for it is catholic of equal intensity to the dogma of his scientism. Without arguing for or against a private interpretation of Genesis, which Richard literally does here, I only want to point out a vulnerable attitude and a clear manifestation of Richard’s fidelity toward vatic authority. A...literal...syntax-reading here shows he offers both hierarchies—that he finds worthy of mention—as itemized exhibits of supporting evidence against “creation as literally depicted in Genesis”. The exhibits are the Anglican and Roman Church beginning with his greatest exhibit, the “Pope”. And they are exhibits from epistemologically deficient edifices of infallibility not subject to cross-examination. He does not place a comma between Anglican and Roman Church. This sort of catholic thinking is not unusual. It is immanent—immanentalism--thinking in terms of beginnings propped up with extra conscious transcendence. He uses vatic authority, as fact to support evolutionism...that “evolution” he claims to be the most certain fact, meaning it is factual enough. He is meaning we can be more certain of humankind’s origin than anything else, though institutional authority is used to literally clinch the argument. That’s mad cow cowing.

**17.5. But, he also says, we are uncertain about the origin of life**—as we will see. We will see though how he backs cautiously away from a...literal...meaning of the origin of humankind. He backs away from admitting that consciousness is the seat of his thinking and defers to others’ consciousness. The motivation is obvious; he wants to enter as evidence the testimony of his...preferred...authorities. So it is reasonable to cross-examine the motif’s connectivity. Remember; he has chosen to backtrack by way of one of two archbishops of Canterbury. Intellectual honesty is compromised and natural observation and experimentation is not the issue. It is not the issue now anymore then at the time of Anaximander or Moses. Seeing what issue has come to the forefront is essential before seeing through Richard’s metaphysical coloring of his description of natural phenomena. Admittedly, I’m exploiting and using the dimension of pain as seen in the more outstanding martyr compared to his, but I’m doing so explicitly and would like to think forthrightly.

**17.6. The scaffolding at “St Mary Magdalene Church” and an Oxford chair**—On the way to the “St. Mary Magdalene Church” one can pause at an embarrassingly insufficient memorial to three protestant-type martyrs, including the defrocked archbishop of Canterbury, Thomas Crammer. While in full consciousness and bare neural sensors fully

exposed to pain they were burned near that spot. But an altar dedicated to “St Thomas Beckett” is central inside the Church-building. There is the dichotomy, and the cry for decisiveness; one can adapt to and replicate one Thomas-type or the other Thomas-type. Replete with high-fidelity replicable symbols demanding adaptation, a scaffold was constructed before the altar and a chair placed for Rome’s legate, Bishop Brooks, arrayed in pontifical regalia--visual aids to enforce the abominable show-trial of Thomas Cranmer. From that defiled locale he was taken and burned--an unpardonable violation against cyber-sensitive consciousness. Today its caretakers refer to that building as “Catholic Anglican”, but it does not distract from that display of compulsory catholicity and its failed enforcement upon the three martyrs. Moreover the church building does not depict the protestant consciousness and conscience. Standing in contrast, for instance, is the Episcopalian “Christ’s Church” in Little Rock, Arkansas; at least it displays a stained glass depiction of the martyr’s burning. The mystique of consciousness and the concomitant violation of the protestant conscience is revealed somehow there, for, Little Rock is the City where another “evolutionism” trial took place and S. Gould participated as an expert witness having a few years previously been invited to Rome, thereafter writing that Christians could no longer protest “evolutionism” (my word). Like Gould, Richard is capable of exploiting religion while generally castigating it—castigating the genus but milking the highbred species. Darwin, like Draper, did not have the foresight or hindsight-advantage of witnessing how data when given universal status, can be selected, adapted, and sanctified--consummated by Catholicism’s evolutionism. Richard is without excuse and presents himself as an expert on hind sighting.

**18. The uncertainty of thinking and evolutionism--**Richard in principle and via metaphysical definition cannot escape the limits of thinking. The limits can be systematically shown, as Jaspers has done with the ultimate situations of thinking and life. Thinking is limited as such and in itself. *It is most dependable when limits are clearest.* When unclear the error-rate potential is compounded, for the restraints on consciousness are dependent upon limited ideas, the fixating ideas from a brain supposedly understood as “evolved”, then the mind “evolved”, then consciousness “evolved”, and then “darwinian conscience”. Then, on course, the final manifested destiny of origin-thinking takes to the highway toward serfdom. Like ideas and thinking as such, there is nothing more uncertain than a principle of “evolution” when applied to life and to the seat of limited thinking, that seat being humankind with its indefinites. There is nothing more certain than the need for protesting the certainty of humankind’s origin.

**18.1. Uneasy contrition about origin-sin--**Richard reaches the point that the restraint becomes intentional-control through the constraints of assumed logical-correctness—mass popular correctness via the frequent mention of “Darwin” and the multitude of acknowledged others in a tit-for-tat dance, a rapturous bebop. The search for the origin of humankind--though misapplied to the search for life--continues without recognizing the limits of the logical handling of the infinite data this side of and removed from the consciousness of consciousness. However, to his credit, the search for the origin of life reaches “a patina of mystery” and “life itself is not clearly defined”. Such belated expressions of uncertainty hardly constrain certitude and barely put a dent in

superciliousness. (Restraint is distinguishable from constraint in that the prefix “con” has to do with impositions of a cognitive sort.) Uncertainty is ageless and expressed by the biblical Paul. Fully aware of consciousness and understanding the limits of thinking, he said, “we see through a glass darkly”. I perceive Richard as avoiding the primordial conflict, and uncertainty is presented as something pertaining to modernity and therefore useful as something “evolving”; it therefore becomes something to be confiscated by Catholicity and categorized with the soul as something that also “evolved”. Richard’s “patina” of uncertainty, and his reference to something not clearly defined is another way of saying “soul”. To further avoid the primordial conflict, he quotes another’s poetic ditty at the beginning of chapter 27 giving some indirect homage to “uncertainty”. But unlike Paul’s personification of being as reflected in the modals of the suffering son of man and son of God, Richard reverts to his charismatic immanentist; he begins and ends with pop-darwinianism. He slips back, but not into the protesting and falsifying principle of science, but into simply violating complexity with a disturbing amount of certitude. The nearest he comes to a falsifying principle is the indication that “Sir” Karl Popper made reference to something about Richard’s idea that the brain might be somehow mimicking the world. Of course Karl was probably simply saying the brain emphasis is something at least falsifiable. Karl mentioned it in a *Darwin Lecture*; he could hardly not refer to Richard for his works have been enforced upon the world, as has his reputation for occupying the Oxford chair on a neo-darwinian bulldozer.

**18.2. Vicariously he touches Wallace’s consciousness**—He touches the edge of consciousness in another of Darwin’s contemporaries, Alfred Russell Wallace; but Wallace is minimized because he disagreed with Darwin on the directional search for the origin of life. Wallace did not ignore consciousness. Unlike Richard, I have not approached this question of origin without a definition of life. It is defined as the origin of humankind. Not the origin of species, for that begs the question. We have to start with the thinker and this means we have to deal with the consciousness of consciousness, the epistemic locality. So, continuing the bipedal dichotomous trek, we can take flight winging it in consciousness and conscience, and my winging is depicted in that Oxford memorial to the martyrs. It was constructed to appease some Evangelicals who were objecting to the lack of regard for the contribution that the burned martyrs made to the reformation of the protesting spirit. It seems Richard would rather distract from the memorial because Evangelicals dared to protest. Not that he is opposed to protesting; he wants to say what cannot be protested. And if all else fails, he hopes that forces will be such as to establish a consensus about the origin of life. Mind you, he already wants to think he knows the origin of humankind. So he criticizes Wallace for not yielding to the conviction that the origin of consciousness is known; one cannot know the origin of humankind and not know the origin of consciousness.

**19. Conscience can be the preeminent dimension; and neuro-scientific cybernetics and artificial replication**—Richard may have allowed himself to be fooled but he is not fooling protesting consciousness. Nor should the protestant conscience be desensitized to the collaboration and collusive tactics inherit in institutions at large. Such tactics are also unavoidable in local independent groups, but more democratically controllable. Nor is the protestant spirit unmindful that if Richard did not include “the Church” by implication

and “churches” by explication in his critiquing, he might get an invitation to one of Rome’s science conferences. That would compromise the façade of objectivity that even a bogus science must exhibit. Convening personalities with bad faith in clerical collars constitute that personality and metaphysic that can proclaim the arbitrated meaning of facts, and thereby infect factual details. When Richard writes that details of life’s origin are perhaps buried “beyond recovery, at our ancient Canterbury”, the “our” must be protested and the “ancient” modified into some continuum, some constant replete with replicated conscientiousness—as in the suffering Cranmer modal. His “Archbishop” of Canterbury is not the spirit of my archbishop of Canterbury. Great care needs to be taken to make sure that titles of distinction here are avoided—such as the metaphorically used Canterbury. The ordained office, the institutionally confirmed superior status of “archbishop” should be dropped immediately to prevent the High Church of England, and the Anglo-Church from leaping on the martyrs and emphasizing their Catholic dependent status by establishing and maintaining selected politically correct memorial effigies. It is of course understood that on the surface it looks like Richard is simply inundating the Canterbury metaphoric implications with explicit natural details. In this case the mischievousness is not only in the details.

**19.1. Crisis Diversions v. lest we forget**—Coming to terms with the aftermath of Thomas’ torturous loss of consciousness at Oxford can include “cybernetics” but of an abnormal dimension. Cybernetics is another word being appropriated like “evolution” by the spirit of catholicity. Cybernetics in the mode of artificial intelligence is becoming the missing link by “evolutionists”. Neural phenomena are presumed to “evolve”. The infant is thought to be neural under-“evolved”—that’s the origin-form of thinking. But an infant subjected to burning is as neural developed with regard to pain. Early or late, the cultures of crucifying and burning were as neuro-scientifically informed as we are though they could not technically reproduce or create an artificial scapegoat. The screams that artificial intelligence would produce would be ineffective. Prolonging consciousness and suffering by crucifixion was a knack--designed to last for days, and decaying bodies would prolong the social effect. Prolonged consciousness while burning was perhaps not as refined as with crucifixions in the cybernetic-informed sense in part due to the loss of medical information during the dark ages, the loss of biological information and technology. Burnings carried out by civil authority could mean consciousness would continue for nearly an hour, and the social-conscience effect minimized due to the fact that the remains were reduced to ashes. Therefore, lest-we-forget becomes all the more imperative. A diversionary tactic could be something like organizing a pilgrimage to Canterbury in search for the “origin of life” even though “the details [are] perhaps beyond recovery [interesting ersatz for discovery] at our ancient Canterbury” (Tale 561).

19.2. Of course Richard will say and maybe even think that he was not referring to or exploiting anything but simply preparing one’s mind for the “evolution” pilgrimage. It is hoped that this critique amounts to an in-depth bit of preparation to make sure that Richard and others have not forgotten that the miracle-causing relics of his Canterbury’s Thomas is an edifice conjured and exploited and it is no miracle; it is a sidewinder intentional programming of conscience. There are no relics at Oxford! No miracles except through consciousness and conscience. There is only the dust of memory, the

vortex of lest-we-forget. I am going to attribute to Richard the normal potential for intellectual honesty, and in the spirit of a fair degree of trust rather than doubt, it is assumed he is not independently responsible for distractions from...lest-we-forget. So, without going backward or forward in search for the origin of life, we don't presume an unconscious point in time or space where consciousness departed or was imparted. Humankind in its searches cannot overcome or escape consciousness. Richard's consciousness ends up at Canterbury, and does not return to Oxford, though the fire of suffering at Oxford is replete. But there's more distraction:

**19.3. Richard escapes DNA origin-thinking through metaphorical fires of heredity, RNA fries better**—It seems almost like the spirit that encompassing conscientiousness had used the fire-metaphors while Richard struggled with life and said “When we die, the fire of life goes out”. He then attempted to show that the influence of any lesson from fire must be seen in terms of selection and adaptation in the darwanian “evolutionary” sense. He is avoiding talk about the variety of fires that a human body can color (p. 562f, Tale). Then the metaphor sparks this statement: “The origin of life was the origin of true heredity; we might even say the origin of the first gene. By first gene, I hasten to insist, I don't mean first DNA molecule. Nobody knows whether the first gene was made of DNA, and I bet it wasn't. By first gene I mean first replicator.” So Richard ends up again in uncertainty but yet with only a dichotomous feeling, i.e., the single replicator. And certainty amounts to a quick two-step dance between one pole and the other of the forms of thinking, the replicator being one pole and the not yet replication the other. So we are back to the mind's limits.

**19.4. My Retrospective-prospective consciousness v. Dawkins' epistemic error “evolution of evolvability”**: I was surprised to find the word “prospective” being used by Richard in a context where readers are reminded that he coined a few other words, other than “meme”. “Meme”, it should be remembered, is a pop-profanelly secular “Darwinian” misuse of imitation or mimicking others. It is neo-darwinian in as much as classical learned-ignorance is untaught, and a “nothing-more-certain-than-evolution” supercilious-ignorance warps the base of personality's authentic selfhood. Leading up to “prospective” he relates how the phrase “evolution of evolvability” came about. I must say he uses it in a quite fitting way; he first most publicly used the phrase in a conference on *artificial life*. Since then, he alleges, students of biology and artificial life have discussed it. But then there's a cautious attempt made to dilute any claim for its popularity, which he says is “probably not because” he used it first in a document. What he apparently means is that the phrase represents an explicit abstraction from implicit complexity and upon this presumption it is being used as representative of reality, which by a circularity of thinking proves its truth--a truism with which Dawkins then identifies. The alleged truth is established when he lionizes the “visionary physicist” who published his “Evolution of Evolvability”. It is implicit because of the uncertainties involved in origin-of-life thinking. The uncertainty is replaced with the certainty of a sound and its echo. The phrase does represent a miniscule bit of empirical reality but limited to the semiotic, i.e., an artful impressionistic bit that diverts attention from introspectively critiquing the consciousness of consciousness (see 605 f, Tale).

**19.5. Dawkins' reversed evolutionism and biblical modes**—Richard shows the improbability of conditions being identical enough for exact retracing, what he calls “reverse evolution”. But, of course, that reversal is based upon the presumptuousness of having found the origin of humankind through retracing to points of convergences, i.e., evolutionism. He only stops short of origin-sin (a scientific blasphemy) in the admission that though he knows the origin of humankind he does not know the origin of life but holds unto hope: the eventual revelation that it is something simple enough to warrant a...consensus (something like a Freudianism/Darwinianism complemented through Dawkins' inspiration). There's an interesting biblical form of thinking involved here; it is a distinction in two modes of thinking: that the sin against the son of man can be forgiven but not the sin against the Holy Spirit. There's a tolerance for making mistakes in thinking but not as much regarding consciousness without irreversible consequences. Richard's “evolution of evolvability” appears to represent a picture of grieving the spirit of humankind and especially its source and consequentially the potentiality. When one musingly says there is as much evidence for the reverse of “evolution” as for “evolution”, one is not presuming evolutionism as a truism. One is saying that metaphysical physics can lead to philosophical deterioration and the consequences can be legion and unpredictable--and the variety of life, extant and extinct, can playfully tend to suggest the viability of inverting causal and effectual abstractions. But one is playing without the constancy of humankind-consciousness. Richard's “evolving” “evolvability” is reverse “evolution” and pathologically coheres with his ontologism (p. 346 Tale). He is saying that humankind might re-evolve but might not be quite as attractive as the best looking hairy ape, making a less hairy ape more attractive—to him.

**19.6. “Prospective”**--He finds room to identify his phrase “evolution of evolvability” with “prospective adaptation”. That word “adaptation” (Darwin, selection, and “evolve” too) should never be used around Richard. It would be better to use a word like “acclimatization” or “roll with the situation” or “dress appropriately”. The phrase “prospective adaptation” is used by an Ichthyologist (fish researcher) as descriptive of some factual data. The word “adaptation” clicks Richard into a defensive and poetic mode, and in effect he propounds that “prospective adaptation” does not use evolutionary talk dogmatically enough. He apparently senses quite accurately that “prospective” requires some sort conscious dynamic with a fair degree of mystery which he considers unfair for it is getting too close to sounding like something super naturally threatening to his vitalism's naturalism, something he can't squeeze into his meta-logic. He likes evolutionism's traditional words, for when consciousness stuff get too close he can jump behind a nominal darwinian tree or slip inside a freudian trunk. Richard can defer to the consciousness of Mr. Darwin or Mr. Freud. So, though “prospective adaptation” and “evolution of evolvability” are octaves apart they still harmonize, only one is closer to the proper sound of...his...preferable chant. I like the phrase “retrospective-prospectivity” for it gets to the place of thinking immediately within and still around consciousness simultaneously. Richard's talk about “evolution of evolvability” and its relation to a 1973 “prospective adaptation” work appears to be an attempt to avoid the appearance of mimicking something prior to his 1976 work that introduced “Meme”.

**19.7. The phrase “retrospective-prospective” thinking is not original**—For details about retrospective-prospective thinking, go to Site Map and click on *How To Understand Jaspers*, especially beginning with item 1.1. In item 1.7 there’s a reference to retrospective and prospective cognizing. Upon reflection about consciousness, pain, experience, language, and relative thinking in reference to an early encounter with a Singer sewing machine, I needed words to somehow describe phenomena. The words retrospective and prospective came to mind because of my familiarity with a federal-state-county methodic means of determining an individual or family’s initial and continued eligibility for public social and financial assistance. One might be in immediate need based on retrospective determination, but if a history of meeting one’s needs could be used to predict ineligibility, then the case could be referred to the township or other agency for immediate help. So, though my sewing-machine cognizing was perhaps unique the words were taught to me and I cannot claim responsibility for them.

**19.8. Jaspers: No animal was predecessor of humankind**—At this point I continue to suspect that whatever we can learn from observation and experimentation is lost in Richard’s infinite and exhaustive similitude-of-assimilation, i.e., animated metaphoric and emotively charged poetic language—darwinian/Canterbury glossolalia. Conjuring “phantasies of the genesis of man” do not ‘evolve’ into facts by “such figures of speech as ‘a gradual process of transition’”; such expressions of certainty “merely serve to obscure” the deepest enigma of all, humankind’s origin (Jaspers, *Origin*. p. 34). In protest to such certain obscure expressions, Jaspers says that there is much to learn from animal life itself “...we see that none of the animal forms were the predecessors of man but are all, like him, branches of the great tree of life. From such contrasts we learn to understand the exact implications of specific human existence” (*Psychop.* p. 9). The motivation for research and experimentation ought not be to establish through well financed propaganda the certainty regarding humankind’s origin, i.e., a dogmatic and extended ontology, but rather to help resolve what is peculiar to humans but not specifically human, e.g., the “morbid biological predispositions, such as the psychoses, that only occur in...all races...” of humankind (*Op. Cit.* p. 37).

**19.9. Remembering Jaspers as psychopathologist using phenomenology**--Comparing my current perspective on Richard’s darwinianism with my perspective on Jaspers’ works, it appears that meaningfully directed differentiation has more tractor-pulling potential than the assimilation presumed in an ultimate singularity (see item 31.1 below). That’s the phenomenological method applied to phenomena. The method is violated when the mind is at rest in singularity, which is where Richard ends up just the other side of RNA and consciousness on one end, and artificial intelligent modals on the other; he gets to singularity as a result of his reversible evolutionism. Assimilating singular-similarity out of unconsciousness, and without the givens of inherited conscience, can get the consciousness tools of thinking bogged down in the quagmire of reality’s complexity. Where similarity converges it no longer lays within the realm of falsification, that is, critical differentiation. Richard’s evolutionism is hardwired cybernetics, an artificial intelligence without the sensation of martyr’s pain but designed to always default into darwinianism at the first sign of discomfort. But, perhaps there is much to learn from the

natural data he attempts to address, but not because he approaches with a conjured certitude already seized by religious and secular educative institutionalism.

**Notation:** The above is subject to correction regarding information, description, and style.

CONTINUED AFTER FURTHER RESEARCH AND AT AN INDEFINITE TIME

---

**FIFTH CONTINUUM OCTOBER 17, 2006—EPISTEMIC POSTERING OF DISEASED EMOTIVE STATES, CONSCIOUSNESS AND MIND: further preparation for handling objective research through epistemic triangularity; a special application of epistemology to torture-trends...opacity and transparency illuminated.**

**Notation: 2.5. has been revised with the addition of “—as in the form of artificial intelligence” at the conclusion.**

**20. Gnostic Tales, Huxley’s coining of “agnostic”, (Glaserfeld’s “agnostic” stance, triune certitude)**—In approaching Richard’s *Ancestor’s Tale* there is one more useful use of “tale” to be considered. This tale amounts to a continuation of mysticism through the penetration of nominalism affecting, in a complementary sense, the reality of determinable basic epistemic building blocks (the reduction of poetical expressions, i.e, de-termining, or coming to the transparency of terms). This other tale is what is known within Church-doctrine history as the Clementine tale. It’s a bunch of writings using Clement of Rome similarly to the way Richard uses Chaucer’s Canterbury Tales. It is used to establish a theocratic way of thinking also similar to Richard’s religiously indoctrinating evolutionism. The Gnostic form of thinking is found in Richard’s works, mixed with a bit of the guarded agnosticism of Huxley. Huxley claims to have coined the word “agnostic”, but all he did was use the biblical Paul’s reaction to a contemporary Gnosticism. Agnosticism is a system of thinking that substitutes contemporary technical state of artful expressions of certitude for revelational and philosophical faith. Richard uses a triangularity procedure to establish direction. In this Fifth Continuum triangularity thinking is used with regard to Clement’s Tales, Richard’s Tales, and to Chaucer’s Tales. The Tales tend toward religiously establishing knowledge at the expense of faith--taking on a Triune-Gnosticism. Richard’s triangularity works like a sneaker wave inundating by means of revelation wholly dependent on institutionally--religious and secular--confirmation of what constitutes epistemic truth.

21. This Fifth Continuum will observe Richard’s leap within special knowledge to other transcendent (abstracted, extrapolated) knowledge. It’s Gnosticism. It is a Gnostic-cosmic or “origin-sin” way of thinking such as Richard’s constant metaphysic of certitude that is something about which he is so certain it must be propagated and imposed on the world by way of technically advanced vanity-like press processes purchased by affluence. A manifested smirking arrogance adds to the danger that the Simonyi-Oxford-Chair poses. That “there is nothing more certain than” (Dawkins’) the origin of humankind (the

thinker) is a waffling between science and Gnosticism (See Jaspers in Ph. Faith and Rev. p. 118f). Gnostic and agnostic thinking needs to be seen historically. There was an effort on the part of Huxley to establish a competitive dogma that was based more on knowledge than the loose ascent to authority in the form of institutional religion, that is, vatic authority as represented by the attitude of the Catholic forces encompassing Wilberforce. Huxley invented the word “agnostic” within a deeply involved historic context; so, whenever the word is used its historical significance should be considered. Images of the origin of consciousness are “merely metaphoric tautologies for nonknowledge” (Jaspers, *Perennial* p. 62). We can see such tautologies in the recent poetical contributions of Weedon to Herbert’s “Karl Jaspers Forum”. Herbert propounds such tautologies too, first by misusing Jaspers’ concepts of encompassings regarding the encompassings. He reduces the mystic of the encompassings with talk about the certitude of “experience” rather than the freedom inherent in boundless consciousness. Richard metaphysically trails off his tales in tautological fashion. The aberration from philosophical logic to metaphysical logic occurs when the research of natural phenomena exhausts into oblivion and then the void is filled by mental-shoestring flights of fancy regarding the origin of consciousness using evolutionism’s terms (i.e., Richard’s defaulting constant is the nominal expression “Darwinian evolution”).

**22. Richard’s gene-origin bias might be genetic in a phenotype and a genotype sense**—Pheno here is used as in phenomenology and geno as in something more generic and presumptively generatively more subject to objectivity. I am here cultivating, i.e., nurturing a constant protesting attitude in preparation for entertaining Dawkins’ metaphysics of physics. A general protesting attitude is applied toward natural phenomena enlightened by phenomenology as method. I want to zero in on what seems to me to be predispositional bias (see p.47, *Tale*) but what Richard refers to in terms reflecting that he is being intellectually fair regarding sober cognition. It’s questionable whether he takes seriously the thought that he might be wrong for it would reflect upon his public image, neo-darwinian leadership, and the need to be accountable while avoiding simony. The word “predisposition” here carries the meaning that his upbringing, that is, his inherited conscience is phenotypic, e.g., having an affinity toward the use of alcohol to anesthetize or numb oneself against intellectual honesty. Reference here is to chemical-social lubrication through the “convivial bar”. Such is more than hinted at in “Tale” where he states that some might wish they had “evolved” greater tolerance for alcohol. On p. 34 of *Tale* he propounds: “It is known that certain genetic alleles make our livers less capable of breaking down alcohol than we might wish.” In other words a reduction in tolerance for alcoholic anesthetization is not preferred. This apparent penchant might involve a commitment to social-chemical lubricants to limit guilt-restraints toward developing multiple superficial companionships. It is questionable that socially inebriated scientists contribute to humane and sober science. The bias for anesthetizing consciousness and conscience is seen in his dedicatory remarks about a personage and the importance of the convivial bar. Alcohol misuse can loosen inhibitions, including sexual, and inhumane conduct. In the absurd extreme, refuge can be found in pass-out or even blackout states to help one cope with uncomfortable feelings resulting from, for instance, subjection others to torture. Take for example Richard’s description of alleles (p. 26 in *Genes*) to describe the gene pool (convivial bar?). Here he

uses a sexual analogy, a variety of sexual encounters: “In particular, something like the detaching and interchanging of pages and wads of pages from loose-leaf binders really does go on...” It is not easy to own up to bits of suggestive game playing and confess to its appeal in capturing the attention of the youthful students. The older one gets, the more verbal but less careful and more objective one might become about wishing for a return to being subject to base procreative urges. His expertise in the use of suggestive scientific verbiage increases as the base urge diminishes—an urge that seems like a constant in his origin-sin.

22.1. One hears this sort of phenomenological gesturing in group-therapy sessions where one patient will envy those who have greater tolerance or those who have not lost toleration for a drug’s effect. Richard verbalizes the possibility of bias, or what he considers insignificant and harmless guilt feelings toward his Gnosticism, but this could be but a selfish-gene gesture to sustain the popularized selfish-gene concept, and might include an opportunity to slip into a conscience-statelessness. My continued efforts here on this Web Page amounts to a holding action against militant anti-reason, anti-humane and anti-life thinking. It involves is a stand against the hordes of pilgrims whose pathway is maintained, i.e., paved and paid for by those given no anesthetics during prolonged suffering. Pre-paved pilgrim-routes exist outside responsible consciousness and in opposition to inherited conscience and conscientiousness—whether these are pathways paved with blood to a literal Jerusalem, literal Rome, or literal early Canterbury literature, or literal origin-sin, i.e., holy ground painlessly experienced due to the painful experience of others.

**22.2. Epistemic seat--**The evangelical reaction to the Oxford controversy avoided confrontation on the evolutionism-gang’s turf. It extends to German protestant thinking in the form of Luther’s reformation and English enlightenment and includes Jaspers’ criticism of Darwin. It did not confront the epistemic-complex presumed as simplistic by the more domineering and loud naturalists. The evangelical collaboration short-circuited due in part to the lack of the epistemic ingenuity needed to react to the presumptuousness of the painless mystical vitalism of the naturalists. Epistemic ingenuity was sacrificed to Peter, and Paul’s ingenuity was suppressed in the sense that pseudo-Petrine (Roman) authority replaced the Pauline admonition to be prepared to give answer for what one knows untrue, and what one believes true. It was thought best to simply preach the gospel without having to personally go to Athens (Paul’s mission to Mars’ Hill) and confront metaphysical forces with philosophical wisdom. Even during recent evolutionism trials, those with evangelical fervor--appearing inadequate to deal with physics, chemistry, and biology--interfered with the holding action of others in such a way as to support evolutionism by default. Their efforts inadequately attempted a holding action against evolutionism by compounding the violation of the separation of church-and-state by the tactics used by evolutionism, i.e., dogmatic religious certitude. The Evangelicals had used natural revelation apologetically as proof for biblical revelation, but with too little protestant attitude and too much Catholicity. Rather than show how evolutionism is a violation of the separation-clause of the US and States’ Constitutions an effort was made to intervene by way of another reactionary violation but with less technical glossolalia and less understood science (the learned ignorance side of science). Again, such

modernistic glossolalia is seen in Richard's bias because without it his first and most popular book would be affected; its nominalism (the verbalized "selfish gene") compromised. But he was and is more wrong than right; the general impression offered to the epistemologically uninformed is that modern state-of-art genetics prove that life's origin and thinking-humankind's origin is the most certain thing known and knowable even though dependent on time-space tools of measurements. In contrast: the ground of consciousness cannot be temporally or spatially located or allocated (see Glasersfeld's recent Oct. 7. 2006, TA79, C44 on "time flow" on Herbert Muller's Website) for such confinement begs the epistemic question—the question of mind's limits within consciousness. The source of humankind's consciousness cannot be known without restraining consciousness. If the source becomes known, freedom of consciousness flounders on the shores of experience. Richard uneasily avoids floundering by a protestant's hint of humility in the clause "maybe I am biased..." Biblical theology and biblical philosophical wisdom is encompassed by timelessness and spacelessness.

**23. Beware! Richard's move toward biblical concepts to establish personal credulity, an origin-sin of biblical proportion--**In 1976--revised in 89--Richard published his popular book *The Selfish Gene*. He includes on the cover of the revision the New York Times' kudos "the sort of popular science writing that makes the reader feel like a genius". That dogmatic statement preconditions the mind of the non-technical but want-to-be biologist and encourages an unwarranted feeling of confidence. The truth of this quote is in its fallacy; an inferior feeling-state within complex reality is not resolved by a fixed feeling of superiority. Remember, the statement is on the cover of his revised edition and any humbling effect is ineffectual due to the extant that it's a reinforcement of the first edition's evolutionism (that humankind's origin is known) and he wants credit for a universally acceptable description. It is going to take some in-depth understanding to comprehend how, after speaking with such authority on genes, that in 2004 in *Tale* he zeros in on the fundamentals of genetics. Turning to the back cover of the paperback *Gene* (again the revised) he says "the selfish gene is also the subtle gene...and...holds out the hope that our species—alone on the earth—has the power to rebel against the designs of the selfish gene...this book is a call to arms." This call by Richard is too little due to his immanentalism, and too late to avoid a charge of plagiarizing the author of the biblical Geneses. Richard's immanentalism takes over and restrains his holistic potential, for humankind is not of earth alone, but has fulfilled some fragment of human potential seen in the ground of that potential by being an occupant on other celestial bodies. He would consider such celestial accomplishments as evolution in a reversed sense of progress but not regression, for the pilgrimage into the past cannot follow the same steps—exact theoretical steps being as impossible as Achilles and the tortoise is impractical. Note that Richard's power-to-rebel could be a manifestation of the power to protest; the call-to-arms quote above is a statement without quotations marks and no clear author, but regardless it represents Richard's approval. I suspect he wrote it, for I am familiar with the tactic. The point is that he reveals his mission. It is a call to arms in a great leap of rebellion against...the selfish gene that is also a subtle gene. There's nothing new here except a well-financed grab for unmerited credit. The effort to take credit for the subtle-gene concept smacks of a manic complex. It's imperative that he is seen, and photographable as both selfish and smirking. But mostly now upon reflection in *Tale* he

sees himself as rebelling against selfishness, as though he has authored a Golden Rule, and all not in the name of the imageless God but Richard's technical nominalism, his neo-Darwinism.

23.1. He seems to bog down in a paragraph on p. 47. Here he belatedly admits the need to "clear up a possible confusion over the meaning of the word gene." He should have started with that allele of thought (like Jaspers says that Kant might have been more effective if he had started with the antinomies) so that readers would know his and Simonyi's apparent mission: the violation of the unavoidable dichotomous nature of thought and gene, and the allele involved. Moreover it neglects the allele of consciousness and conscientiousness. The reader should beware of the exploitation of parallel thinking to enforce the serial ontological fixation process to establish some non-epistemic but absolutely artful singular definitive truth regarding origin. Such is a forewarning about artificial intelligence. Like atomic energy, artificial intelligence can be a tool for good and evil. Artificial intelligence might uncover terrorists' plots or become the instrument of terror, or could increase reactive terrorism. Richard's language about a "call to arms" when complemented by his "evolutional" progressive singularity amounts to dangerous serfdom-terms and implies that there now exists a grand inquisition chair finally occupied during humankind's "great leap foreword". Artificial intelligence not only cannot mimic pain, the Oxford chair intentionally minimizes it in its tales.

**24. Factoring pain into the gene-allele definitions**—Richard first defines gene from the molecular geneticist perspective, which he considers a strict meaning. By strict I think he means empirical in the somatic medical sense, and...less...useful to him for escaping empirical limits via metaphysics. The molecular biologist definition is similar to Jaspers' from the psychopathologist perspective. It ideally (motivations to aid and comfort the diseased) involves the sympathetic and empathetic attitude; the molecular biologist, ideally speaking, is concerned with the cause and alleviation of pain and suffering regarding the individual and not social ills except in so far as individuality is distributed, i.e., individuals considered collectively. That perspective is mostly medical and individual even though infectious and affecting pandemics. The perspective is not so much the social dimension of, say, a more-than second-order cybernetic artificial-intelligence programming—except in that computer technology, like the atomic bomb, can be harmful to civilization as seen in the struggle and need to stay ahead of its misuse. Richard bemoans the deliberate viral infections by computer hackers, while he does not see that what he considers "proper use" can be in effect hacking at individual freedom, e.g., imposing evolutionism, a socialism imposed through the use of first and second order cybernetics. The microbiologist might be more prone to seeing that the individual needs to be healthy and finely tuned for immediate handling of complex reality and the responsible use of artificial intelligence. The tinkering thinker needs to be attuned psychopathologically, especially when handling individual and social-programming proposals. *The factor of pain must be fundamental.* Pain seems to be woefully disregarded in Richard's Darwinism. In Jaspers, pain is an ultimate situation: it is not to be sought though unavoidable and revealing as well as inhibiting. Case in point: the ideological and artificial "St" Thomas compared to the greater suffering of the real saintly Thomas burned at Oxford.

**25 The gang's gene-terms, the development of graffiti demarcation ("MRCA")**--In my view, comparing the microbiologist's definition with Richard's social school of thinking, genetic microbiology is good for direct contact with the infinitely complex reality and is essential to protesting despair and fatalism in the form of secular or religious vatic control. Richard compares genetic microbiology with his school's definition, i.e. "sociobiologists, behavioral ecologists or ethologists"...and he says, "a well-established habit with my kind of biologist and I shall occasionally follow them." Here we see again how microbiology can be...less...useful to Richard's shallow epistemological scholasticism. Here metaphysics is held in reserve as a window of escape though it sounds like altruism. One can interpret this to mean that one or the other definition will be employed, especially the latter for it represents the "kind [of biologist] to which I belong" he says. I say that the distinction needs to be made clearer by comparing attitudes and the threat to individual freedom. I have seen, so far, that Richard *does not approach pain and suffering and even directs pilgrim traffic away from suffering pilgrims and their transforming powers.* And that is where the socio, eco, ethos coheres with Richard's mission to impose a system of evolutionism that distracts from a primordial issue—that issue being the diversifying effects of protesting the pain of a unionizing catholicity. Disease, discomfort, insufferable pain, is easily avoided by his "evolutional" fundamental ontology, though he occasional uses language invoking some concern as a concerned individual member of humankind, but the concern easily defaults into his evolutionism, e.g., darwinianism is clerically radicalized by "Darwinian evolution". Perhaps we can see where this radicalization shows up in another avoidance of limits through a presumption of some principle designated as "MRCA" (most recent common ancestor). In this formula, research and data is not the mission, but rather the shaping of a universal conscience regarding...the...origins of "species"—of which one, he holds, is humankind but mysteriously a species not by "chance" he says. After a diminutive origin is pseudo established, he proposes a solution based upon the problem--see 16.4 above regarding his identification of miracle with what is genetic.

**26. Consumer beware of Richards' sidewinder biblical spins**—If one remains sensitive and in the protesting mode, hints can be found that Richard is giving elemental (fundamental) expressions to biblical concepts in such references to miracles. It is also opening a door for Canterbury-Catholicity via "St" Thomas Beckett. His realizing rationalities' limits (reason's limits), if true intents and purposes were confessed, could be the a mimicking of the biblical uncertainty about reality, including its high degree of reverence, and including the awareness of fate or chance, and the need for an attitude, a providential acceptance come what may. Or it could be simply rationalism clerically clothed in a collar of certainty unbecoming to science. Unbecoming to science it might be, but couched in modern technological terminology, a neo-nominalism that deceives the masses into thinking they are geniuses if they mimic the group's sounds and make mention of an authoritative name (Darwin) or look with adoration upon a special priesthood—Richard being the chief. The nominalism can result in waffling of biblical proportions to the extent that Catholicity would re-file artificial claims about "evolving" the bible. Contributing to the claim is the later-Richard's subtle but explicit expressions, but perceived in terms friendly to biblical conceptual meanings. The twist would be a

phenomenological sort of literalism set on a roll through atheism (mystic terms substituted for biblical terms) and evolutionism (the miracle of “evolution”) for which Richard has gained notoriety--but only because of the use of prestigious name dropping (the personage side of nomenclature). In other words the protestant standard would be subject to vatic-recall due to faulty logos. It is the one danger involved when phenomenology becomes less a method and more a principle. Personage jargon continues:

**27. Richard’s “First Rendezvous”: Origin-indulgences toward consciousness, a genetic presumption toward “the” blossoming of consciousness**—I think Richard violates individual conscious potential and avoids consciousness by taking established freeways of escape designed to lead to some central authority—and bypasses the epistemic questions. He does this specifically on p. 35 of *Tale* within one sentence; it is also a single paragraph that one might refer to as the “great escape saint-clause”: He defers in two ways; first to an author that Richard thinks considered the “whole question of Upper Paleolithic cave art, and what it can tell us about the flowering of consciousness...[my ellipsis] in *Homo sapiens*”. That “whole question” is something any well educated and balance artist can play around with—even those with injury to one side of the brain and yet not take it too seriously unless given religiously to an agenda. Second, he defers to Big-Ben time-thinking when poor little Richard is feeling too inadequate for the occasion such as when inferences are made just the other side of where statistical probability ends while engaged in tracing genes to the singularity (his MRCA=most recent common ancestor).

27.1. The personalistic-escape is attempted through yet another personage who speaks about the emergence of a “Great Leap Forward” that pilgrims find themselves converged upon within in the great trek backward. Keep in mind that Richard has spoken with fairness about how “evolution” should not be confused with what is normally thought of as progress. His caution regarding the concept of progress is similar to mine as expressed in my debate with J.S Johnson and with Herbert Muller. The latter admitted in effect that no one using the mind would be in a right frame of mind if not presuming an attitude of progress. J.S. Johnson, being more of a realist was more open to process and talking less about progress while using mental tools assumed to be the result of progress. But his progress is implied in his knowledge about the origin of society’s golden rule. Richard later puts a spin on genetic processes, redefining progress as cell replication in some selfish probable move toward sustaining a direction. What Richard and J.S. Johnson cannot avoid is the necessary presumption of having...progressed...to the point where one can see the absolute truth of their evolutionism and its justification for being propagandized as tested and standardized truth to students of life and anthropology. The alternative is that humankind’s origin when thought about is a question immediately absorbed in the dichotomous thinking process--and the method of phenomenology applies. Singularity and its absolute certitude is then immersed in the swirl of complex reality where only the abnormal stands out and becomes subjected to cause-effect/effect-cause circular thinking. So, the so-called “Great Leap Forward” and consciousness participates more in the mysterious than those individuals Richard used to start the backward trek—those few most recent common ancestor lineage whose probable

connection is quickly lost in critical empirical thinking. The illogic is that because I can trace my lineage to a single parent or parents before it feathers away into obscurity, when extrapolated absurdly (Absurd reductionism--reductio ad absurdum p.40) it somehow means I have unusual looking cousins beyond the Big-Ben first chime. Gang howling conduct occurs then when Richard gets further authority from the “many archaeologists” who call it an “event”. Note how this cantilevering into metaphysics is easily elevated to a principle in the great backward leaping formula “MRCA” (most recent common ancestor).

27.2. The great leap forward is not to be confused with Jaspers’ views on the phenomenal simultaneity of his “axial” period. Jaspers is more empirical (relies on extant records) and relevant to recorded history. The alternative thinking here includes the view that humankind has always been uniquely different, and this seems reasonable in as much as without the freedom to think there would be no question. But the whole question is resolved for Richard when the whole question is considered by the personage he defers to in 27 and 27.1. above. Note the slip behind a “personage”.

27.3. Note again Richard’s affinity with nominalism. It is that respect for the title “many” that should not be questioned. The Great Leap Forward capitalized, opens the door for a nominalism’s capitalizing on the “soul” in the Vatican sense at some space and time, thinking’s basic empirical tools. To take another leap beyond consciousness--an easy escape from individual responsibility--Richard and the gang, cantilever off consciousness via nominalism; i.e., Darwinian evolutionism mysteriously spoken results in language coming into being simultaneously with consciousness while spinning in circularity—a swirl of primordial soup made from a pigeon that starved to death (to use one of Abe Lincoln’s anecdotes to point at superficiality). *The leap supposedly took place at the great first Rendezvous “around 40,000 years ago” a conjured apparatus upon which to attach the tool for unit measurement by the mind of consciousness, and the mental form of space-time.* And it is a leaping dependent on the mystique surrounding the origins not only of language but agriculture. This theoretical anthropomorphizing is not that impressive: My Grandfather Wood who arrived in Michigan from Pennsylvania by horse and buggy with a mussel-loading rifle and two pistols, survived in part first by hunting, planting, and herding eventually—depending on the availability of other conventional tools (and occasionally finding a place in the industrial revolution). Farming techniques included identifying guns and cows with peculiar names, but that does not represent a great leap forward. It is not a cow cowing to an evolutionism, or a transformation from process to progress resulting in undue feelings of certitude regarding consciousness development. He was a hard working person but could not in fairness lay claim to a great leap forward for general humanity. There were humbling events: we have family photos, and a newspaper document of two milking cows that were called “twins” because that is what they were biologically, and because there was no mistaking them from other cows for their horns grew downward and crowded their eyes. I could distinguish them by differentiation: one hand-milked easier. Richard’s easy reliance on cave art or images amount to presumed precursors of language. Here we have nominalism again clod hopping complex reality. This nominalism can lead to a point where Catholicity can

reclaim the transforming influence of the bible as part of its own “evolved” system after its “evolution” is established along with state mandated education.

**28. The “MRCA” Formula—The fallacy of the most recent common ancestor and unrelated cousins**—Richard claims his backward tracing of ancestry is more reliable than the traditional foreword method for it begins in the here and now with genetics and goes backward rather than forward, e.g., to what he refers to as our “cousins the apes”. It is strange that my cousin might not be my neighbor or one of another race but yet it is permitted for Richard to think forwardly to establish a cousin-relationship while showing how quickly biological kinship feathers away or is lost going backward. As a matter of selfhood-conceptuality and honest introspection, one cannot really establish relationship with either the one to the many or all the individual self-images one might have of oneself. Epistemic honesty supersedes bios and logistics (biology). Richard assures the reader that he begins with genetics serving only as an analogy and nothing more. He starts here and now because of the need to admit consciousness as the primary dimension of scrutiny, i.e., cognizing. He does not start with the limits of thinking about consciousness, but with the assumption that thinking is dependable as such and with too little self-scrutiny. The reason he uses genetics in a parallel sense is because the linear or serial inherited factors reach a kissing-cousin state quite quickly, and guesswork is launched into with some degree of conscious disregard for the limits of thinking. So a first rendezvous does not occur 40,000 or even 5,000 years ago but at best only within several biological generations. From the gene perspective, as in microbiology, cousin interbreeding is more familial than primordial. The first meeting with our ancestors is in the degree of conscience at the periphery of always-immediate consciousness.

28.1. But, Richard’s bias is not prone to contrition when he refers to apes as our cousins as well as all forms of life, and this conclusion is not arrived at in the same way as the miracle formula (“MRCA” which ought not be properly repeated as though it is a principle). The most recent common ancestor is almost immediately dissolved as an argument in the same way that I can trace my own genetic lineage back only a few generations. Jaspers once wrote that “man cannot be derived from something else, but is immediately at the base of all things” (p.59 Perennial Scope) and mentions anecdotally that it would be interesting to see the ape that first noticed that it wasn’t an ape any more. If one looks at a photo of Richard, such as on the back jacket cover of *Tale*, one can see the look of one who thinks he alone best propounds the idea from a novel-nominalism perspective.

**28.2. Comparing “constructivism” with Richard’s neo-darwinianism**--Richard is more correct than incorrect in starting from the current empirical base of the vivid side of consciousness and brain activity. One difference with Richard’s view and Darwinian thinking about the origin of species is that Richard is approaching the epistemic ground of legitimate questioning with the advantage of current state-of-art technical apparatuses and language—which he exploits. But he understandably minimizes, as a popular and well-financed “Oxford” author on naturalism and vitalism, the epistemic question. Whatever constructivistic tendency he seems to display amounts to a defensive rationalism, a systematic logic, and his defense’s offensiveness is due to a constructive

harmless and ethical biblical principle though he does not want to admit it. He shares in the extremism of radical constructivism when couched in terms of evolutionism, but departs from the immediacy of Herbert's fundament of experience except the latter's departure from experience occurs in his evolutionism too. Herbert's default on encompassing on-going experience is a wholly insufficient understanding of what Jaspers means by the Encompassing of the encompassing and the Transcendent and the biblical imageless God.

**28.3. The Humboldt humanist/naturalist tradition**—As previously mentioned, Jaspers states a preference for naturalists who do not get bogged down in origins, such as Darwin did says Jaspers (and I say as Dawkins does). Herbert has a ...feeling...for such a need to avoid pitfalls inhibiting to reason but cannot describe or monitor the staggeringly difficult program properly—without assuming some judicial force (such as explicit in his formulae). He has recently proposed a new critical program that is not new except in an implied need for closer screening via the hierarchical classification of the authors and critics. He proposes that certain authors' (specialists) could be critiqued *apparently on his "Karl Jaspers Forum"* but preeminently by authors who publicize in journals, and conditioned by an arbitrated sort of interdisciplinary example, then it is to be opened to public criticism. It appears to me there's a continuation for a potential for undisciplined arbitrariness in the proposal as real as Herbert's misunderstanding of Jaspers' science and philosophical logic. The proposal amounts to an uneasy marriage of a republic to an ill represented democracy, a dismissal of the meaningfulness of opacity and an easy permissiveness that is talked about in terms of...transparency.

28.4. Alexander Riegler, an apparent "constructivist", comments on Herbert's proposal (see his Short Note 70, a response to Herbert's Short Note 69). It seems to me Alexander is uneasy too from his special constructivistic perspective and properly asks how authors' contributions are going to be determined or valued. His comment takes the form of a question though he probably means it in an affirmative manner. I suppose the question proceeds from a constructivistic perspective, i.e., a forgotten primordial thinking that leans toward individuality and begins with at least the human if not humane. I am spinningly continuing a train of thought with regard to pain and suffering (depicted in the inhumane recurrent trends toward torturing or at least the careless use of the word). His question to Herbert refers to the Humboldt tradition. The Humboldt tradition, as I brought to understand it, includes the efforts of the Humboldt brothers, Wilhelm and Alexander, the former humanistic and the latter naturalistic. The tradition involves an objectivity that surrounds both the subject (human) and object (human and humane observation, research) in as pure an educative environment as possible. It involves the traditional environment that is constructive and should not be seen as an unfolded development of thinking, that is: It should not be associated off the cuff with what is known as the "constructivist" school. Alexander Riegler's comment to Herbert's proposal may point to their mutual view that *commercially oriented education (as being gradually implemented even in European universities) focuses on a rather goal-orientated curriculum and that commercially oriented research makes the necessary luxury of interdisciplinarity impossible* (the italicized words here are not my own and the source is not cited for fear of my misapplication). The italicized words are to distinguish them from any assumption

of agreement with my position regarding the Simonyi-Dawkins' collaboration, that; it is not only commercial and inhibiting to research and humanity but now is in a forced-collusion with political-economic forces in the name of God and religion. My position is that it is doing harm both to objectivity and faith (e.g. atheism, anti-religion, and now humankind's provincial-origin vatically sanctified--as Rome is a social-political State of questionable sorts and economically engaged internationally, (and with Islamic States' ambassadors responding to "papal" beckoning in full-dress regalia).

28.4. I am uncomfortable with Herbert's proposal due in part to the constant exploitation of the name of Karl Jaspers and the limited comprehension of his philosophical logic relative to faith and revelation. The discomfort is due to Herbert's emphasis on experience; it rings familiar with some of Jaspers' words (and some of John Locks') but only when superficially considered. Constructivistic thinking by some "constructivists" is subject to the same criticism, but no reference to Jaspers is made except in so far as Alexander is carrying the discussion into Herbert's "Karl Jaspers Forum". It seems to me Alexander is experiencing some discomfort from his special constructivistic perspective and properly asks how authors' contributions are going to be determined or valued. If this is not a serious question, but only a collaborative effort to subject Jaspers to "constructivism", my objection is that Alexander makes no link to the structures of Karl Jaspers on a so-called "Karl Jaspers Forum" and that void suggests that Karl Jaspers and "constructivist" are on the same level. His question to Herbert refers to the Humboldt tradition, which participates in the humanities.

**29. The danger of Dawkins' use of biblical concepts**—Richard says "nobody knows whether the first gene was made of DNA, and I bet it wasn't" (*Tale* 563) and then he defines progress as: each change tends to continue in the direction of its predecessors (501f) and is not a matter of luck. Here one can find the replication idea in the biblical inspired idea of God making Adam (a possible general term revealed to mean the first or origin-thinking about self-hood in a special sense and humankind in the general sense), replicating more of the imageless than what can be imagined, and in the New Testament second Adam that Paul refers to regarding Jesus' suffering and immortality we have the imageless fulfilled in so far as imaginable in the situation of pain in the potential transformation of humankind's conscience. The visiting UFO officials Richard frivolously refers to might be looking more for the behavioral results of the pain suffered by the son of man and God, rather than whether one agrees with Richard's evolutionism. Perhaps it will be found that Richard against his will has been drawn to the biblical view, the view expressed by Jaspers, that humankind

...has one single origin and one goal. Origin and goal are unknown to us, utterly unknown by any kind of knowledge.... All...are related in Adam, originate from the hand of God and are created after His image. In the beginning was the manifestness of Being in a present without consciousness. The fall set us on the path leading through knowledge and finite practical activity with temporal objectives, to the lucidity of consciously manifest (p. xv, *Origin and Goal of History*).

When that agreement with the biblical view is made clear and its connection to the biblical ground becomes something seemingly universal by the intellectually honest, its truth will be compromised immediately through vatic authority; the bible as a fundamental modal reflecting a distinctive cultural standard for the protesting of Catholicity will be another spoil-of-victory, but it will be a victorious untruth. Taking biblical literature literally is to be clearly distinguished from taking one catholic interpretation for literal truth. The conflicts will continue to take the form of whether individuals have greater potential for the meaningful grasping of the biblical lessons or whether conventions and consensus determine its value. That is not “constructivistic” as much as biblical.

**30. Epistemic stemming of ill-affective state’s of consciousness and mind**—This fifth continuum will include warnings about psychopathic borderline thinking relative to intentional programming such as exhibited by the Simonyi-Dawkins team. It is important to not take too early a leave from the epistemic category of critical thinking in preparation for handling data as strained through consciousness and the mind. The importance is enhanced strangely by a Comment (TA 90, C 7) by Bill Lyon, posted “8-19-2006” on Herbert Muller’s “Karl Jaspers Forum”. Bill mentions how in dreams the observer and the observed are “inextricably intertwined and how minds are susceptible to reality. He states that kicking a stone to determine reality is “exceedingly naïve”. Bill may have always worn shoes, but myself as a growing child might get one pair of shoes for the winter while going barefoot all summer. Remembering several painful toe-stubbing events clearly demarcate fanciful discomforts from painful fact. Bill does say that his background, and I take it his specialty, may be distressful to some readers, or words to that effect. Bill’s Comment shows clearly the dichotomous situation with regard to distinguishing one reality from another. *But the pain factor is given too little consideration.* The same form of differentiation is seen above respecting intentional-programming regarding the painful death of martyrs. There’s a modifying difference between prolonged agony and limited misery (Richard’s Canterbury Tales vs. the burning of martyrs). There’s a difference between imagined discomfort and enhanced raw cybernetic pain, artificially anesthetized neural system compared to a nervous system fully exposed. Pain and suffering is systematically handled in Jaspers evaluation of ultimate situations: Pain is unavoidable but not sought, has a dual aspect--as seen in the difference between Thomas of Canterbury and Thomas of Oxford; human unkindness can be illuminating for humankind, and its unavoidability can be seen as necessary for balancing existence—i.e., must not be ignored but seriously scrutinized and confronted.)

**30.1. Cybernetic pain and consciousness gets us to Jaspers’ General Psychopathology.** Here Jaspers makes a comparison between normal painless states of general reality with the “painful” intellectual data regarding the “extreme poverty” and “difficulty” the pathological have in functioning in normal reality. Jaspers refers efforts to compare schizophrenic patients’ complaints with the sort of thinking that occurs during fatigue or while falling asleep. He points out that such are indeed only mere comparisons, and by saying that, one grasps how easily and inadequately understood comparisons can quickly deteriorate into absolutes regarding origins and disease. He warns that in the case of fatigue or falling asleep there is a primary change of consciousness and compares this

with “archaic thinking” which involves a development of the mind—not as an ultimate singularity of predetermined origin; he includes one of those parenthetical imperatives: “([the human mind] as a product of culture not as biological inheritance)”. Jaspers is making sure it is understood that schizophrenia has an empirical dimension unlike that of dreams and cannot be compared though there’s some shared value in treating other diseases. One may be a disease and the other not a disease of empirical intensity (existential discomfort, i.e., normal anxiety). Jaspers is also being cautious about the fallacy of using the disease or any disease as something biologically inherited and not treatable or changeable in the sense that culture can change minds and be mindfully modified.

**30.2. Epistemic triangularity**—Epistemology involves the sort of triangularity needed before confronting data the way Richard depicts data. There is the normal compared to the abnormal compared to the ground. It is an archaic, or primordial, or historical triangularity, whether comparing the first point in Genesis (Being in a present without consciousness) with the second (manifest consciousness) and third (disease, suffering) whether thinking or working foreword or backward. Singularity is reached safely when the ultimate ground is invisible but temporal and spatial objectives are lucid due to acknowledged limits.

**31. How does an admitted and balanced infinitely-complex orientated realist deal with inter-epistemic empirical triangularity**—First, it seems to me that quantum-mechanic triangularity involves fundamental forms of thought, forms of thought as the building-block substratum in nature as more basic than biological triangularity. Regardless it, quantum-mechanic-triangularity is an absurd reduction of reality’s unknown complexity. But even biological triangularity is in principle an absurd reductionism in an approach to the origin of life; and humankind’s playfulness regarding origins is a substitute for a non-cognizable absolute. The pathological deviations from uncertainty regarding ultimate origins and goals is a serious epistemic study. As many spins can be made of triangularity as there are infinite dimensions and directional perspectives in a spinning universe most of which is unknowable and ultimately non-predictable but believed to be plotable based largely on inherited information (see \*31.1.). The reasoning here is that the infinity of the finite is such that the thinker can stand anywhere to align with points or units of observation to establish certainty though probability ranges. This diversity applies no less to DNA units and margins between units. For instance Richard makes much—in collaboration with his sidekick “Yan Wong” (Rendezvous 26)—of gene participation in neutrality and even more of ...almost neutrality...or “nearly” neutral genes, which is an imaging process obviously designed to come up with a so-called molecular clock to establish some predictability for a fixated/mutation law which is less fixable than revisable. What we have here is an effort to deal with what changes and what does not change, and the need to justify a molecular Big Ben that strikes in some determined fashion 39 times at Richard’s preferable points, according to his admitted “quaint conceit” (*Tale*, p. 457) but within 1,200 million unites (the term “algebra” is used to establish “nearly neutral” genetics and pure-math time-unites to concretize and clinch the matter). In other words, if neutral presumptuousness not does establish...the...triangulated vector in the direction or the goal of a preferred

singularity because the position in space and time conceptualization is too loose, then there's a tightening of the range by way of "almost" neutrality. Then to add poetical sophistication, some quantum-physic-nuance language is used to give credence to the figments of imagination, i.e., using quantum talk about probability and certainty. Let us say that though no forensic-like DNA match can be made to establish a particular link between simian and humankind difference, all the researcher has to do is move within infinite complexity where difference is eliminated through the removal of any triangularity or divergence from serial or linear goalism (I mean what determines triangularity is what diverges from a straight line). This can be accomplished with at least three points with the thinking observer as one point and at least two distinct points. I can take simian DNA and humankind DNA and stand at a point where they either occupy linear or serial interdependency or as observer I can stand at a point between the two, foreword or backward and still be able to exploit probability of mutation to establish a goal of singularity (a singular goal relative to an ontological singular origin). Quantum mechanical engines move in a vector sense but not by singularity due to the probability aspect. Direction is managed by extreme triangulation, i.e., within probability boundaries but with no ultimate direction. One might see a vector within ranges that fluctuate from side to side and it is unpredictable which side and with what frequency within a given range (and then the experimentation is complicated by thinkers' complementarity which too is inseparable from triangularity). Add to this variability the further uncertainty of ultimate position within a spinning infinite universe, add to this the fact that one can occupy an arbitrary point to fulfill a straight-line perspective, lining up three points or probably "almost" or "nearly" infinite points that could suggest serial or parallel universes. Quantum mechanic's certainty loses its meaningfulness with regard to the non-pathological in the in-depth epistemic dimension, and add to this the uncertainties that an infinitely complex reality presents, and one is then in a position of seeing the impossibility of "recovering" humankind's singular empirical origin in the way that Richard expects of his triune out-of-the-atmosphere bits (Darwinism, Dawkins, and neo-Dawkins/Darwinism—spinning on nominalism, i.e., name droppings). It seems to me the final results of such complexity on the epistemic question gets us back to need for faith and revelation, the uncertainty that Glasersfeld unfortunately referred to as "agnostic" after the Huxley tradition. How this complexity and uncertainty can maintain itself respectfully while considering the alleged results of "evolutionism" relative to artificial intelligence remains to be seen needless to say. The useful results of microbiological mechanics will not support an absolute, and not at best but only at its worse support evolutionism.

**31.1. Agricultural Tractors and triangularity, traction in reality**—I want to conclude the Fifth Continuum's item 31 with a homespun anecdote (see 19.9 above). Back on the farm, we had a 1940 John Deere that could turn literally on a dime due to the potentiality of its triangularity. The front wheels were aligned close together in a triangular (cambered) way they would work as one wheel, and the rear drive-wheels had a separate brake for each wheel. A dime-spin could be accomplished by a thinker applying one brake while using the steering wheel in the direction of the spin desired (epistemologically speaking with a range from a designed normal directional singularity to triangularity as temporal-arity spatial-arity permitted according to some frame of

conceivable infinite relativity). The tractor could actually be steered in a relative straight line by using only the brakes too. But the brakes had another purpose, if one wheel lost traction, braking that wheel shifted traction to the other wheel making for greater control of directionality.

**32. Coming homunculus reflections: Dawkins regarding Bio-micro-molecular-quantum-mechanical epistemological homunculus machinations and the use of computer science terms—To be continued...**