

THE “KARL JASPERS FORUM”, JASPERS ON CREATION AND EVOLUTIONISM, UPDATE 6 (1-15-2006)

JASPERS’ CREATION APPLIED

Notation: Next week’s responses on this Web Page might be delayed due to my Website manager’s prior engagement.

Prefatory Comments

01. Herbert Muller’s postings of 1-14-2006 include one by Slavoj Hontela and Herbert’s response to Stephen Modell’s C72 under TA78. Herbert apparently did not respond to Richard Henry’s TA 84, so I will not respond till later.

02. The Hontela posting, a finicky approach to a Phillip Benjamin Comment, is essentially a carefully worded exposé but used by Herbert against Jaspers’ psychology of philosophy. Jaspers’ philosophical wisdom goes beyond cosmogonies. Mr. Hontela appears to have said that Phillip’s “philosophy” is “more sophisticated than other CREATORS are able to provide” [the emotional outburst “CREATORS” is reportedly Slavoj Hontela’s]. Below in JASPERS’ BEYOND COSMOGENY it will be shown that the “Hontela” outburst includes Karl Jaspers’ creation faith as seen in his philosophical psychology of cosmogonies. A distinction needs to be made between cosmogony and cosmology; when a cosmogony is psychoanalyzed, logistics are involved and the resultant logical systematic clarification transforms it into a cosmology.

03. The Hontela Comment is being cautiously viewed as alleged because there is no usual and direct way of verifying the authorship or correctness or context of his thought processes. Readers are told that the only way one can contact Slavoj is through a sympatric media, i.e., Herbert’s e-mail. The hermeneutical implications of that conditional sort of communication are questionable at best. I cannot communicate with Slavoj for clarification of context and meaning except through an interpreter who has censored me from his website. One certain thing is that *the Slavoj piece does not mention Jaspers*, which possibly explains its encouragement, selection, and use by Herbert. It seems relatively certain that Herbert is reading my Web Page, but it is not clear whether Slavoj is being kept in the dark. What is also absent from the Slavoj quotation is any criticism of a Vatic attempt to capitalize on

“evolutionism”, to make its “ism” universally sanctified, i.e., transformed into a religious state of certainty from which Catholic forces can collect other forces like from the medical and educational industries. On that the Hontela piece is silent, but adamantly emotional about Phillip keeping his views to himself.

04. Herbert’s TA78 R28 to Stephen Modell is an inadequate effort to correct the failure to make pertinent references to Karl Jaspers. Slavoj and Stephen do not, so Herbert slips in another reference to Jaspers again, and one to his vatic authority. Slavoj carefully did not make an evolutionism argument, so Herbert has to show how in three ways Jaspers has to be an “evolutionist”. First, a journal of science used the word in “Evolution in Action” and was popularized as the choice “Breakthrough of the Year (2005)”. Second, that...choice...is enhanced religiously by the continued reference to vatic authority. Third, it is alleged that Karl Jaspers was given to evolutionism similar to Herbert’s evolutionary view, and similar to that of a vatican, which is supposedly correct in so far as it participates in the way Herbert thinks. Herbert’s misrepresentation of Jaspers must be constantly combated, for what Herbert is trying to do is make Jaspers subject to the catholicity, the universal acceptance of Herbert’s ontologism, his evolutionism, his certainty regarding the immanental origin of humankind.

05. Anybody familiar with Jaspers should be prepared to comprehend that he would have nothing to do with that, and understands that the whole of Jaspers works’ slant away from such misuse of a vatic authority. If Herbert cannot show that his use of Jaspers’ name is relevant through his and his vatic evolutionism, then there is no justification for the continued use of the name in the title of his Website. He must make a unity of the three presumed authorities above. If a vatic can lay claim to and misuse a title like catholicity, then he can misuse the name of Jaspers.

1. JASPERS’ CREATION GOES BEYOND COSMOGENY

1.1. In Jaspers’ *Philosophy and The World, Selected Essays* 1963 Henry Regnery Company, U.S.A., pp.125 through 133, he expresses himself clearly on the issue of “creation”. I’m placing that word in quotes--until later below--in an effort to remain objective regarding the constricting effects of creationism and evolutionism on science. Note “isms” are radical and contribute to schisms.

1.2. Herbert's thought process begins with a vatic quest and ends with a "Vatican" opinion (having the force of a Judge's reasons for a certain ruling) and thereby religiously establishes a catholicity, politically exploiting educational forces. Herbert wants to exploit the canonization of evolutionism, but use God as cannon fodder. In contrast, Jaspers begins his Essay by citing a Vedic poet's reference to a hymn which stresses the mystery of the world, and asks the question: who can know except the One, the all seeing—or does he not know, either?" The vatic and Vedic contrast is apparent, and with regard to the Vedic, as Jaspers shows, "there is no longer any statement that would fit the all-encompassing, the infinite. Thought pauses inquiringly" With regard to the vatic, it seems to me, thought pauses upon command and critiquing ceases with regard to both science and authority. (125)

1.3. Jaspers then itemizes cosmogonies including "evolution" and of course a "Maker" and the growth of consciousness out of unconsciousness.

All these concepts, up to the most sublime [note 1.4. below and how Creation becomes the most sublime], have one thing in common: their proponents seem to know what happened. They operate with forces, gods, substances, categories, whose own source is not further inquired into. [*What I—Wood--am doing here is enquiring further into the reasons why Herbert uses Jaspers use of the word "category" to shut down further inquiry into Jaspers' talk about "creation" and "evolution".*] The mystery stressed by the Vedic poet has been lost in the idea of knowing all about it. The inquiry does not halt before the mystery; instead, it ceases thoughtlessly in the answer. (126)

Herbert again in this most recent Response [11] attempts to use Jaspers' use of the words "biological categories" to show some ontologism or evolutionism was Jaspers' intent. As such it would shut down further inquiry, and this is what Herbert wants. But *The limits of science are what Jaspers is known for*. The above quote sheds light on Jaspers' statement that "it is certain that mankind as a whole cannot be grasped with biological methods". Herbert's certainty about Jaspers' evolutionism fits precisely what Jaspers means by "proponents seem to know" both in the way Herbert interprets science and Jaspers.

1.4. Jaspers then states that...beyond...these mythical cosmogonies "a more truthful answer seems to lie in the concept of creation from nothingness."

Jaspers puts totalitarian worldviews and mythical cosmologies together, within time/space conceptualizations (time and space being merely tools without content when not applied to specifics in the world, so to speak). But time and space conceptual forms do not fit creation. From this point on in Jaspers' essay creation becomes the "most sublime" concept mentioned in the 1.3. quote above. *Any argument from similarity with Herbert's Vatic reference "tool of absolution from thinking" is subsumed by this nothingness, and by the fact that philosophy is slanted always toward the individual vs. a collective of collectives, and a committee's consensus regarding the direction best to be pursued in the quest for power.* Herbert is trying to make Jaspers and Vatic authority the issue for his Website. If the infallible vatic authority can make a creed that results in a conceptual difficulty, than surely so can Karl Jaspers, and then Herbert is wholly justified in using not only the Vatican, but also Jaspers in an exploitative way. Of course, the intervention of a "divine" vatic into science-education is perniciousness toward science and protects an area of knowledge from further query. Herbert ignores the perniciousness issue. The rest of Herbert's exhortations about the bible and original sin and man's responsibility are classifiable as glossolalai, for...who needs it but those Herbert assumes have the same inhibiting experiences he has had. It is futile to continue to point out to Herbert that there are distinctions that have to be made when terms like mind, experience, and consciousness are used. In [6] he continues to misrepresent Jaspers by saying that "Jaspers has long insisted that the mind (experience) is encompassing". What is incorrect is that Herbert equates mind to experience and experience to mind. Herbert frequently does this sort of thing by the misuse of suggestive parenthetical comments.

1.5. Jaspers says the creation of the world is exempted from temporality, which is part of the world and there are two historic instances of this idea. The first is the "Biblical idea of Creation" which as an idea "once conceived, will not put a stop to our thinking". Herbert cannot grasp that statement (127). The other historic instance of creation out of nothingness is the Hindu idea such as the world is a "flash of this non-being in the seductive guise of being...Here, too, the end is the abyss before the dizzying question..." whence the spell or who cast it?

1.6. The creation concept reminds us that we are conditioned to think in terms of beginnings and ends and that...beyond...such thinking there is that which "transcends our faculties of imagining and thinking." (129, 130)

1.7. But there is a different psychology in the way our consciousness is affected by the world being eternal, or by the world being created. Jaspers says if the world is eternal then that means humankind's source is from the world. He is talking about evolutionism while not using that term:

...if the world is eternal...[humankind] is its product. But if the world was created, man himself was directly created by God.... Bodily, in the physical and psychological functions of the body he is a product of the world, but in his essence he is outside the world, now as before.... It is as though we had been created as the world has been, but not by way of the world. As animated bodies we are a part of Creation, but our freedom comes directly from God. Thus, while being in the world, we are also from elsewhere. We find ourselves in the world, and yet we are not of this world alone.... If we could grasp where we come from, we would cease to be human. We can only touch the frontiers of the consciousness of our humanity, which consists in being imperfect and imperfectible. The cipher of the idea of Creation...stirs us by the very fact that it does not permit us to know. (131, 132)

1.8. Herbert's final exhortation amounts to his bias that theism amounts to blaming God for evil. Apparently feeling a little guilty over that he attempts to escape any suggestion of being "blasphemous" (his word not mine) by verbalizing that he has...the...mission, the "responsibility" of proclaiming atheism. This is not Jaspers' mission; rather Creation helps us "instead of understanding ourselves in mundane terms, there is in us something that can set itself against all mundane things. If we are in the world from elsewhere, our mission in the world transcends the world". Herbert substitutes definitive experience, which he erroneously equates with mind, for the mysterious world. Herbert is not withstanding the ancient "bard—as well as thinkers from all ages—in one encompassing mystery". (133)

1.9. Only one's gross inability could interpret Jaspers' talk about categorizing the results of research as meaning he is given to evolutionism. If one is going to use two categories of "evolution" or "creation" by his own words he is best understood as standing with "Creation..." Anybody can read his "The Creation of the World" essay, and if there's any doubt remaining one only needs to read on regarding his comments on "Immortality" and "Non-Christian Religions"—essays immediately following. If one still lacks comprehension of the context in which Jaspers is speaking go to the previous essay on "The Fight Against Totalitarianism". If

doubt still remains, remember Jaspers not only loved but respected his Jewish wife Gertrude, her religion, and her departure from stifling exclusivity, and that they read the bible together during his forced retirement during the Nazi regime's reign.