

THE “KARL JASPERS FORUM” WEB PAGE UPDATE

12-15-2005 Report on H. Muller’s postings of 12-3-2005

1. One is immediately struck by the absence of any effort at further communication with Mr. Benjamin on the most recent “KJF” postings. The current postings simply ignore his physics and biochemical comments. One wonders if that’s the old tactic of ignoring a situation in hopes that it will go...way...away, leaving one’s private website way unimpeded.

2. The unimpeded way is that not one contributor in last week’s postings related anything said to Karl Jaspers. Neither, of course, does Mr. Benjamin, but he admits he knows nothing of Jaspers, and he does not exhibit his name. What Mr. Benjamin shares with Jaspers is fearlessness for open discussion in the field of natural science.

3. Mr. Muller parades the “Karl Jaspers” domain name. At one time he attempted to show, by reference to an alleged authority, that Karl Jaspers was uncomfortable with the natural sciences to the point of avoiding such, e.g. he, according to Mr. Muller’s source, eliminated it from his work on Nietzsche. That claim is incorrect. This was shown by myself to be not only incorrect but also irrelevant to understanding Nietzsche’s philosophy, and especially irrelevant from a psychiatric perspective, irrelevant because that was a perspective Jaspers did not specifically emphasize nor get bogged down in while in the philosophical mode. The nearest Jaspers came to an evaluation of Nietzsche’s patho-mental state was while referencing his latter days of insanity. Even then, Jaspers, as a physician and psychopathologist, humanely pointed out that the causes were unknown although Jaspers considered all corporeal possibilities. But the fact of an objective psychopathic situation can established an emphasis on the difference between human and animal kind, for only humankind can have mental diseases that are totally uncaused by empirical brain-study and peripheral phenomena. Jaspers in fact did include Nietzsche’s biological playful thoughts in such quotations in which mankind can be seen as evolving into an animal more than evolving from an animal.

4. Greg Nixon persists in (78-C61) the attempt to endear himself with some medium though which he can manifest his selfhood while maintaining some semblance of realistic objective criticism, that is, holding on to realism. He claims he and A.N.Whitehead are “...almost entirely supportive of radical

constructivism". Mr. Nixon as an "expert" on the deceased Whitehead does not bother with Karl Jaspers. That is strange in as much as Muller calls the Forum after Karl Jaspers! Greg is missing an opportunity to endear himself to a movement. What if Greg could show that Jaspers could be a radical constructivist? Mr. Muller would then add a new distracting star to the masthead, i.e., a Nixon star.

5. What Mr. Nixon apparently must do is show how he is worthy of standing side by side with other constructivists within the exclusive constructivist foundation community by showing how others of like sophistication, like Whitehead, are also radical in their constructivism. But he must do a clever peripheral-spin off and then back into Whitehead and speak like a H. Muller-atheist: Whitehead is said to be almost a radical constructivist except for his "cautious belief... 'God' [not the Xtian deity]..." The bracket comment is Greg's--I guess. Then Whitehead is deemed less qualified than Mr. Nixon because he is uncomfortable with Whitehead's talk about Creative Potency and God. Mr. Nixon then emphasizes what he sees as autopoietic in Whitehead, and talks about experience (as does Mr. Muller) and constructivism--or creativity. But then, Greg has to be different enough to be somewhat original, while still qualifying for citizenship in the newly established constructivist community. He wants to be a masked realist too, and like a Nixon-refined-Whitehead is a radical constructivist(ism), Mr. Nixon also talks like a radical constructivist(ism). Perhaps he hopes none will notice the movement from experience to "panexperientialism" (another Greg-refined word for having immanently grasped when, where, and how an entity becomes conscious). Here, after he had discovered absolute truth, its objectivity is then confirmed by the experience of the assent to that conjured truth. This is a well-camouflaged circularity of reasoning processes, all done in an effort to be novel and thus talk a radical constructivism language.

6. What a shame to use such realistic conceptual acumen as Mr. Nixon possesses to develop a metaphysical logic solely to belong to a group and seek acceptance through an accommodation to atheism. Herein is his violation of Jaspers' emphasis on individuality and freedom, his liberal stance, and the Existenz theistic philosophy. Of course if Greg related radical constructivism to Jaspers, Greg could no longer qualify for membership in the new community. At least there would be no preferred-reference from Mr. Muller. Why? Because: if Jaspers were to outshine, as precursor to constructivists' thinking, it would affect the constructivists'

claim to originality, and contribute to the renewal of biblical faith. Greg will have none of that because it interferes with his dependence on Mr. Muller's Website for his metaphysical logic's survival.

7. Regardless of the verbalizations, Mr. Nixon's effort at conformity is obvious. He has that basic fundamental groupism tendency which distorts his realistic thinking into a dialectical idealism. He does not stand-alone as an individual and realist. And he could so clearly stand-alone. He tiptoes into the constructivist convention through others' fame, others he forces into a radical constructivism category. He completely cuts off Whitehead's theistic leanings of faith. What he is hoping for is to write something acceptable enough to be meet with Mr. Muller's sanction, showing enough reverence and timidity to be invited as a visiting lecturer in the new constructivist foundation's journal. He wants Mr. Muller to extend to him an official invitation to the community's...coliseum.

8. Why does Greg not attempt to make Karl Jaspers a radical constructivism proponent? It might be because of a preference for remaining unopposed and removed from being subjected to further analysis like the above. His reaction, to my pleas for him to make his comments relevant to Karl Jaspers, was to boycott that Forum until opposition could be eliminated.

9. Dewey Dysktra (78 C63) wants *laissez-passer* too, and has identified himself with radical constructivism in the person of Ernst von Glasersfeld. He refers to the Target Article Comments where testimony of this association can be found. Dewey has demonstrated a willingness to modulate when it is to his advantage (see his Short Note regarding Muller's sought-for-consensus for censorship at the bottom of his "KJF" Website's index age). He is the one who didn't want abrupt censoring in...principle...but only to reserve the "KJF". He values it for it offers opportunities. He expressed no concern about relevancy to Jaspers. He wants to use it to speak to something new allegedly needed in the education industry, something he is pushing for where he teaches, and for which he obviously needs objective support from authors of notoriety. I don't know what the issue is relative to educational techniques, but wonder if it is primarily justification for switching the burden of education unto children who already have curved spines from carrying books home where parents can do the homework. What are the alleged learning results? Marks on defensive records showing homework completed? How do these radical constructivism methods compare with that of Socrates' students? Did

students attend Jaspers lectures because he had nothing to declare? What was that Heidelberg tradition he concurred with and that which he changed? Mr. Dysktra refers to his Comments under TA17. In C11 all that he does is identify with Ernst's Glasersfeld Radical Constructivism, and Ernst makes "no claim to be an education expert". In C 16 he is trying to make a book-author an authoritative base for a change in teaching tactics, and is endearing himself to that authoritative source. Here he defends Ernst by stating he does not prohibit engaging invisible entities. But, later Ernst does just that by the more than tacit agreement with Mr. Muller's atheism. Dewey then publicizes the fact that he has a personal e-mail from Ernst.

10. In Jaspers view ciphers of nature and God do speak to us, in contrast to what Dysktra sees in Mr. Glasersfeld (about whom I know little except primarily what he said on Mr. Muller's Website). For Jaspers, conscience is emitted, transferred, taught, some by empathy, by the teacher to the consciousness of the students. Jaspers has something to declare. He always had something meaningful to declare, as in the case of his guiding counsel to Hannah Arendt. He is an educator not just an indirect interfering referee over worthwhile ideas. Also see my coming update regarding **Festschrift for Ernst von Glasersfeld** on the Constructivist Foundation Web Page of my Karl Jaspers Applied Website.

10. Serge Patlavsky continues the attempt to be understood in 78C62. Mr. Muller wants to share the burden of this dialogue and invites Serge into the constructivist-foundation community's coliseum. He also extends an invitation to the realist's team of D.K. Johnson and M. Silliman. How he would like to escape and share responsibility for that dialogue which he clearly is losing. At least in the coliseum Ernst, who owes Herbert one, can come to the rescue and assist in engagements, and if in the struggle anything is settled or anyone out filibustered, radical constructivism can claim success for persistent communication efforts. Well, D.K and M also deserve being caught with their best guard down, for they too ignore Jaspers.