

THE QUESTIONABLE QUANTUM LAW OF "EVOLUTION" by Glenn C. Wood 19
January 2003, posted 28 January 2003, TA55, C13
[Comment to TA55 C7 with references to TA53's Response to Wood's
Comments]

Introduction: The last three paragraphs below reveal the essence of my disagreement with C7, and contain quotes from Jaspers that seem relative from my perspective. JJ quotes Stapp and Jaynes whereas I defer to Jaspers.

<1> Joseph Johnson's TA55C7, though largely participating in possibility thinking by begging the question, remains that which attracted me to Teilhard De Chardin's speculations -- during my own leisurely philosophical moments within the security of the Seminary. Further reflection, and earning a living in social work, showed the alluring side of such abstractions. C7 does not strike me as the embodiment of the attributes of the Transcendent (Jaspers used the word as substitute for "God" -- a misused word). Try romantically as possible, human characteristics, like laying down one's life for others (while not taking others along except in so far as they too will take up the cross as individuals), cannot be abstracted, cannot be constructed from the destruction and restructure of symmetry, cannot be restructured from flashes of antithesis/ synthesis derived from physics -- quantum physics as well. Selfless sacrifice does not automatically proceed from visualizations of superpositions or increased or decreased entropy though called "synergy," for empathy and sympathy cannot be reduced or deduced. Human kind's distinguishing attributes are more than the effect of chanced or predetermined directed momentum; the bombarding by presumed quantum essences will not restructure into a divine symmetrical will in the forms of a synergy based on a universal symmetry in a non-symmetrical world nor in explicit structures from something implicit in even a hoped for open science. Begging of the question has been in this dialogue for it is assuming that evolution is traditional enough to warrant being assented to as a common sense matter of course.

<1.1> (Notation: It's alleged in the Oxford Companion to Philosophy that Anaximander "made a striking appeal to symmetry." Jaspers refers to him as a radical constructionist because "he was the first to represent the cosmos ... as a coherent whole" (The Great Philosophers). But Jaspers is quick to point out that these radical constructions are based on what others said he said -- views "imputed to him by other writers." The appeal to symmetry is therefore of secondary sources and less reliable and perhaps more the "rigid concepts of later times" as Jaspers says; and "... by his intellectual leap Anaximander arrived at an abstraction which was later to generate the determinate idea of natural law." It's my position that JJ's type of abstraction is based more on the determinate idea of a law and not on the infinite unknowable. Apeiron means infinite, and of course finite processes like thinking can only re-present the infinite inadequately.

The reader should know -- or research for themselves -- that Oxford philosophy has a Franciscan association historically with some opposition to the rationalism of the Dominican Aquinas but still Catholic with a place in the great continuing controversy. John Locke studied there for a time but considered it somewhat a waste of time.)

<2> Phenomenologically speaking (i.e. that unavoidable predicament of representation) the object of that faith, that assent to meliorism -- expressed as "the quality of existence seems to improve as mind evolves" through synergy -- will become, for the comfortable, not only a workable syllogism's premise, ontology, but slip immediately into an ontologism (absolute premise) as such, a socialistic ontology in keeping with the higher complex mind's assumed evolution unfolding into something potentially good, and though communicated in -- as JJ admits -- inadequate wording. These limited words can become meaningless jargon. But to JJ's credit the cosmos is believed to be an open system, and that there's more to "evolution" than meaningless chance. But explicitly chance is unavoidable and determined by evolved minds to be meaningful chance -- meaningful now though invisible in the primordial soup (symmetrically thinking, the explicit present must be seen in the implicit past, and if the subject were in the past the same would appear obvious in the future). The meaningfulness of the cosmos is understood by JJ in terms like "relatively easy" to "know" the "elemental meaning" and it's "simple observation"<4> -- I'd guess "simple" to mean someone's institutions' Thomistic like standard of common sense, the progressive brain's evolution refined by practice making it perfect and perfectly approvable by some civil institution with dogmatic decisive powers supported by the belief that it mimics the cosmos. JJ envisions the direction of cosmic evolution not as a matter of pure faith or hope but because of rationalism's account, a certainty with religious intensity, an "account for all process, both objective and subjective" <2>. In <5> consciousness is "simply" response to stimulus, or a built-in (intuitive?) reactivity or predetermined orderly response.

<3> C7 seems to accept Jaynes' view that the brain evolved, made a jump from a dominating intuitive side to an analytical side. It's alleged that inner voices were accepted too easily without analytical critical thought until a period 3000 years ago. There's the suggestion that schizophrenia though today considered by some an illness is rather in the whole of history an anachronism, but yet a KJF participant might be considered well and current for practical purposes when visited by an angel, or a tree (I'm meaning absolutely no disrespect but wonder about the meaningful connections). "Evolutional" throwbacks are considered advancements sometimes (something that undeniably occurs and is probably what Nietzsche had in mind when he told that the man who is walking back might be getting ready to take a giant leap forward). There might be some less confusing and functional value to the view of analysis and intuition if we can change the language by dropping the commitment to progression to more

therapeutic terms than "evolution." JJ's abstraction theory, proceeding still from an assumed law of quantum evolution, is the intuitive side still talking to the analytical side. If there's anything to the idea that earlier humans manifested schizothymic symptoms, it only shows it's possible for up-to-date regression to occur using other terms -- modern terms (excuse me, post modern modern term's terms); such as, an "abstraction theory" which is really a structure minus testability which somehow manifests an implicit law of nature. Current symptoms of regression are uttered freely because cultural powers -- academia -- says it's ok now to hear voices from quantum levels because we are 3000 years more experienced -- ok if the graffiti "evolution" is respected often to demonstrate a prudent conformity when confronted by the educated gang.

<4> So JJ approaches life, as Jaynes, and Chardin, accommodating somewhere between "the pope" and the Robert Schuller, the latter taking advantage of the power of positive thinking about evolution-ontologisms, and the former, too, getting ready for harvesting the final one-world power, waiting to make it's way into the international union to end all conflict. The religionists want to get on the secular/profane band wagon. JJ says "...if equality under the law were totally [totalitarianism -- my word] the law [who's enforceable interpretation?] the world would be a better place, by far..." The implication of such a law is orderliness, symmetry in internationalism or catholicism, a one-world order, but it's attraction indeed is in the "appeal of religious mysteries." If the eternal God can be convincingly cut off and replaced by abstract symmetry, we, due to the loss of freedom, shall require the services of the law and order of the institution's quantum and papal like mechanics (bureaucracies). Servants are of course equal under the law of the prelates, but the golden rule becomes not so much a neighbor to mugged stranger but an institutional law where the meaning is that one must obey their place and allow the good old boys and good buddies (who know how to infiltrate) to write the statutes or interpret the golden rule.

<5> JJ tells us that visitors to "refined perceptions" are affected emotionally but there's no symmetry affected but lots of experienced certainty with no "communicable truth." (There is of course symmetry in the life of Jesus but not many who want to hear that truth.) There remains "a sense of highest abstract" that indefinable incomplete something, or cosmic expression which is communicated in <12>. It reminds me of a Pentecostals gentleman who would pray to God (for my salvation) to sustain and refine, only using the word transform rather than refine (transform by the renewing of our minds, Romans 12:1). There's probably more humility there in that prayer than in the emotive and emotional utterances of words like "creates" "carries meaning" about forms that "sustain and refine themselves" and all sub-uttered under "the quantum law of evolution." The Pentecostal appeals to God and the other knows the law. I prefer being prayed for than accused of not trying to understand "AT."

<6> The partial agreement I have with JJ (I've indicated elsewhere) is: Personality traits, human attributes to exist must stand out of something or nothing we imagine (i.e. image) essential as source. That nothing or something is potentiality and then objectivity, a little similar to the consciousness that makes retrospective and prospective consciousness possible when affected by normal trauma. Subjectivity is, when becoming subject; subject to potentiality which when thought about at all is potential objectivity and then the subject its object. JJ, leaning toward "evolution," wants the source to be more in the static part of understanding-processes rather than the dynamic empathic processes, i.e. rather than in the source of humankind's attributes. We have to avoid megalomaniac leanings from growing into a thicket of rationalism, ontologism from hiding in the jargon or a socialistic creed -- while superficially only seeming to be open mindedness. A law of equality could demand that if I have the momentum to levitate myself by shoe straps the other person is equal to the task though bare foot.

<7> Others have agreed on duality -- bipolar -- or phenomenology of consciousness. Cutting to the quick, this cannot be incorrect fundamentally for thinking cannot proceed without striking an arch between two poles, which are always more or less than universals or particulars. If one thinks at all about consciousness, it takes on a dualness from the predicament of thinking. But to forget this highly contagious aspect of the conscious mind and talk as though some fundamental ontology has been uncovered is the product of superiority feelings coming from a subjectivity removed from its objectivity. Whether the poles are real or ideal in some degree is a matter of faith in a self-image-amongst-others and faith in God. It seems JJ's faith is in quantum thingness -- with occasional religious jargon used, i.e. posteriori creativity resulting from synthetic subjective handling of ongoing experience. The alternative is -- from the functional rational side -- trust in Objectivity or the source of human characteristics that carry value tested and recorded objectively with some limits placed on static traditions (culture) and dynamic revelations.

<8> By static traditions is meant statue like images or prohibitive statutes (the holy spirit of God being the essential genetic side of the constitution of existence), and cultural norms without the potential for some change and safeguards. A culture's origin could result from the influence of powerful pedophile priests and the static nurturing institution. HM's AIDS virus example shows the dangers of reductionism including that of JJ's quantum evolution and really becomes a form of the tests of what ought to constitute consciousness, i.e., not radically cutting off from awareness the values inherent in historically tested behavior "that our life might be long" (but not unconditionally, for some ideals, such as the quest for life is worth dying for, as in the epiphanic crucifixion to end all crucifixions).

<9> The problem with evolution-jargon is that it refers to ontologic realities and not symbols -- except as an afterthought when considering linguistic limitations. Jaspers introduces his Origin and Goal of history as an article of faith and uses terms like God, and man 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 the consciously manifest." We are not on JJ's path, not if "the common path is the evolution of the mind" <13>, and the practical activity and objectives are not caught up in a predetermined consciousness inherently and potentially in the cosmos. The voice from existence, the cipher language of inner and outer being transcends our own intellect's abstractions from what is believed fundamental to an open-ended science.

<10> The theory of the quantum law of evolution takes the form of an applied law of evolution to socialistic dynamics. Meliorism, at least some degree of naive optimism, becomes the test of the truth of the "law of quantum evolution." JJ sees that the value of the abstraction theory is nil without testable consequences in human life. The law of quantum evolution jumps from consciousness of selfishness to empathy. There's a vague recognizing of surrounding consciousness. JJ calls it sentient consciousness, "mindless C if you will" TA55C7<7>. It appears for JJ consciousness progresses from a mine to ours mentality because of "evolution," the latter -- ours -- being far superior today due to evolution evidenced by social institutions. Seemingly the quantum law of evolution and directed momentum and enhancement jumps over loving God wholly and neighbor as self and doing what the self would like to have done for self; it leaps to a "law of equality." "Equality under the law," and civil order is the practical application of the symmetry formed in the movement from quantum superposition to higher forms of order, and social-universal-order can't be stopped due to the inherent potentialities of forms that carry and unfold faithfully gathering momentum and by strength of order gains social volume, and absorbs the environment eventually in a perfect symmetry like a crystal cathedral.

<11> The "quantum law of evolution" permits JJ to say (disregarding inequality and liberation "being a distant dream for most" TA53R7[13]) that the wars of tyrants are getting smaller and there's "worldwide (if grudging) backing against tyranny." That seems a bit optimistic, and there's more truth in what's parenthetically murmured, and casts suspicion on "the quantum law of evolution" and the immolated structures. On the surface it sounds like the faith of the biblical Paul who said in Romans 13:3 "...rulers are not a terror to good works but to evil" and if it were not for the language JJ uses which limits faith, his simple faith warrants a biblical like respect for having enough hope for most of freedom's disenfranchised and a reduction in tyrants -- though measurable by a micrometer. JJ would be more deserving of attention if he were to base his belief on the biblical references rather than Stapp references. Paul was more right, for

his faith was in God's supremacy, even while dying as a martyr, the faith is still there declaring that "all things work together for good to those who love the Lord"

<12> In TA53R7 JJ asks what is there in the Golden Rule and equality under the law that is unworthy of a faith to live by. Ans.: What is unworthy is that Golden Rule when thought to have evolved as man responded and reacted and compromised with existence. What is worthy is the unimaginable, indeterminate source, the love for God and source of what is meant by doing unto others as we would want done unto us. What is worthy of faith is what is beyond pretentious words and abstracts. There's no Golden Rule without the guide to worship the Lord thy God ... As regards equality under the law the way JJ means I can only understand that to mean the Godless empathy and sympathy involved in an evolved golden rule, but surely with exceptions: not something like pedophilia and the feeling one pervert might have toward another, and that a child ought to submit under a secular law of equality. If the exceptions must be itemized than there's no historic Golden Rule but rather a misusable law assuming equality until guilt is determined judicially.

<13> What is abstracted from experience in general objectively and subjectively is the constancy of the mind's -- and emotion's -- limitations. I reread JJ's TA53 R to one of my Comments about the systematic need for reason to hit bottom which he interpreted as something to be avoided at all costs. The opposite is what I meant, it is not avoidable so let's get to it straightaway but consciously. If any rule is to be abstracted from the field of experience it is the felt need for hitting bottom constantly as we bounce and rebound through life never really reaching a rung on ladders that allow the luxury of receiving an absolute idea or feeling that is not in reality off the wall in some fashion. That's phenomenological thinking. It's relativity to the extent we can never possess a space in the movement of things to grasp a truth as such, that therefore we must trust some Biblical standard, and though revelation is not subject to private or group's interpretation -- but the truth is always objective.

<14> So JJ emphasizes the positive side of human confidence as a necessity -- I suppose for goal orientated reasons like a politician might use any profane means among the profane to acquire office for some opposite purpose like infusing some sanity into the profusion of aberrant behavior before AIDS like forms are given the capacity to sustain and refine ... through an equally aberrant commitment to the unavoidable transcendancy of ... biological evolution now reaching new immanental in-depth levels of profanity making familiarity the breeding ground of contemptible mutations (e.g. TA53's R reference to examples of efforts at solutions--a good point, and if one is dealing with skid row victims the bottom is already hit so further efforts at hitting bottom are unnecessary). Hitting bottom in reason is seeking a balance between feelings of being elect

through abstraction and nihilistic disfunctionality through a dominating thought or feeling of futility; and when assisting those on the bottom, a change of milieu, in terms of language, is necessary. For example: how would JJ improve upon AA's 12 steps; by substituting "the law of quantum evolution" for God ? That law or abstraction from something inherent in it cannot resolve the fallible limiting nature of human kind's greatest attribution : love gone astray forgetful of biological limitations.

<15> How then should one use "evolution" and God without presuming a refining and sustaining assumed semantic (as signs to things) aspect to language like a "law of quantum evolution" and "equality under the law" ? How can a form of the Golden Rule reduced to pragmatic (as signs to users) symbols be prevented from becoming a law executed and administrated by some form of humanism (shoe-string levitation) ? Let's see how Jaspers does it responsibly:

<16> In the Origin and Goal of history he begins cautiously avoiding the profane or secular; he uses symbols like faith, God, His image, Being without consciousness, and the fall. He knows the value of words from his experiences with patients in the mental hospital. Then biological evolution is used when talking about the prehistoric, "that which is biologically inheritable is permanent" and even if graspable -- which it isn't -- "may perhaps prove different in some way from all other biology." He speaks to "historical evolution" as something contrasting to what we don't know,"... the biological and historical ... do not coincide". He then introduces the word metamorphosis as a substitute for "evolution" having consciously and properly categorized evolution into the unknowable area of prehistory and how they -- history and prehistory -- interact is "a closed book to us as a totality." That seems to be more balanced than JJ's abstracted theoretical quantum certitude currently manifested deterministically as an ism in socialization. JJ's common-sense path's derivation from the "law of quantum evolution" is like an established-religious faith -- faith in a transmutation from prehistory to history, from superposition to quantum mechanics, and then for the sake of social symmetry the unknown becomes known to common sense.

<17> In contrast to the lucidity but looseness of influential thinkers, Jaspers, the therapist, says : "Man cannot be conceived of as a zoological species, capable of evolution, to which spirit was one day added as a new acquisition [not a sudden shift from an intuitive synthetic right hemisphere to the more analytical left corresponding to some magnetic polar shifting of the earth which manifested itself in Anaximander's apeiron or revelation of the infinite -- my comment] Within the biological sphere man must have been, from the very start, something different, even in a biological sense, from all other forms of life." (Chapter on prehistory in Origin and Goal) In fairness to HM it should be noted that Jaspers appears to agree with his assessment of Anaximander's contributions: "At this

moment man first learned to look at himself ... (Great Philosophers, Anaximander). My view though is that the biblical Jesus is the embodiment of the infinite potentiality of human attributes, and his lineage is neither purely Jew nor Greek -- not according to the biblical account.

CULTURAL "EVOLUTION" AND SCHIZOPHRENIA by Glenn C. Wood 9 April 2003,
posted 15 April 2003, TA55, C38

I ran across a quote by Karl Jaspers, which seems to apply to TA55 and Responses. Jaspers is considering the disease of schizophrenia and primitive people, i.e. comparing psychic illness to primitive psychic life relative to dreams etc. and makes this comment: "Here enumeration of similarities is initially quite impressive but it soon becomes rather boring, particularly as in the given case one always feels at the same time the dissimilarities as well." (General Psychopathology, The Abnormal Psyche, In Society and History.)

SH finds similarities. Jaspers says in the above matter: "But nothing has been achieved in this respect." SH's views are not boring, but certainly I am left with the awareness of the dissimilarities regardless of the forms of thought being applied. These applied forms of thought are not new. While in undergraduate school I obtained all the books possible by the author Harry Rimmer; and SH's TA 55 had me reaching for Rimmer's 1935 book "The Theory of Evolution and the Facts of Science" and found nothing new had been achieved.

So the similarities and dissimilarities are found so long as we are thinking -- looking for reasons for being less a part of a transcending philosophical community, rather seeking separation or isolation in the primitive where similarities can be found in worms. While finding similarities in beer-yeast and primates and giving the name memory to the unknown and unknowable -- and then verified by more words -- we also have to remember memory is the primary condition? [15]

What is outstanding, and revealing, is SH's view that there's no problem understanding how culture can develop at any "level of the evolutionary ladder" [10] and if not knowing the place of consciousness then certainly the place of memory is understood at each level. However culture can develop in one generation unless disease kills the group -- such as in the case of a matriarch's eating dead and diseased relatives (see TA51, [8:42]). Of course hunger was a major factor. Perhaps if analysis persists the motivation of a culture-of-evolution could also be uncovered. What is there about lower-rung life found so appealing and exemplary?

How does the revelation [10] of "the primary condition of the evolution by natural selection" contribute to the culture of humankind? Remember the intense dissimilarities outnumber the similarities -- at least all those sharing similarities not writing for the Karl Jaspers Forum.

THE PERSONALISTIC LEANS TOWARD IMAGELESS SELF-IMAGES, by Glenn C.
Wood 9 June 2003, posted 17 June 2003, TA55, C48

Wood's responses to PB are bracketed [].

<1> (From Benjamin, C47 :) Woods writes: **Undefined religion has a more-than rational function and ought not to be associated with the radical rationalism of suicide bombers as done... when mythical content (knowledge) replaces faith. HM's formula when applied to "or other" seems to change this biblical God into an ontological assertion and then declares God an impossibility replaced by 0-D; then God, not only unseen by 0-Derivationists but disbelieved due to faith in a creed-like formula**

<2> Obviously, **undefined religion** is a quote from the Epistle of James the Apostle. The word religion appears in the Bible, 4 times ... [The word religion is used in Acts 26:5, Jas. 1:26, 1:27, again -- religious -- in Jas. 1:26, and Acts 13:43.]

<3> [James used the word threskeia which -- according to J. H. Thayer's (Greek-English Lexicon) had primarily a "fear of gods" common-use while signifying external religious worship -- involves ceremonial activity. My view is that the word needed modifying and this is what James was trying to accomplish if one looks at his writings as a whole. He wanted Jewish Christians to do good works for those having little ulterior motive other than the basic needs. He didn't want them involved with local forces but rather to change the fear of these gods into the wisdom that follows from the loving-father concept, and change ritual into something meaningful such as taking care of the basic needs of the have-nots. Regardless of what limitations the word then had; as now, fearing disapproval from the generally acceptable religious establishment -- whether ceremonially swaying or participating in a religious iconic parade -- demonstrates one's conformity to the community's good old boys who can and do use religious tradition to measure allegiance to predictable expected political behavior and thereby maintain local control.

<4> James, the brother of Jesus, the victim of political/religious behavior modified the word by the use of "undefined" and "true." James internalized religion and says, "have not the faith ... with respect to persons" whether

condescending to greatness or crucifying a great but politically unpopular person. James' type of faith-and-works revolutionizes "religion."

<5> In other words show me your faith by normal religious behavior and I (James) will show you mine by works. In 1:27 religion is transfigured through a concept of God, a modification of the fear of gods who are gratified by predictable rituals and prone to the fearful exploitation by secular forces who boast proudly their distinctiveness. We can biblically speak of true and undefiled religion in the spirit in which Kierkegaard's speaks of what it means to be a biblical Christian. To use a word signifying the fear of gods was perhaps a confrontational tactic to get the scattered twelve tribes to base wisdom more on works before God rather than those clear and distinct ontological gods which the community leadership can exploit.]

<6> This means an Ekhad or Unity of I-You-He Persons

[The biblical imageless God shatters perpetually all forms of iconology including bibliolatry. It includes the judgmental view that one can know "I" to the point where "I" participates less in the invisible -- and more in the visible as an "I" icon. There is no biblical self image that is greater than the biblical imagelessness of "I." The image of God is imageless and it is best to think of ourselves in that likeness. And the "you" ought not be subjected to the judgmental definitions and all other "yous" of our experiences are more or less than the images we make of them (and this includes US presidents none of whom deserve titles of distinction). Even the biblical "He's" (Jesus) essence is of humbling uncertainty. His origin is as uncertain to knowledge as that of our recollection of our individual origin, and His life is one of illuminating transfiguration -- a motivating example for the sublimation of our urges. And the genderless Spirit of Holiness remains like the wind from whence it cometh we know not, nor what it is definitely, nor where -- with more knowledge than hope -- we're being led.

<7> Consciousness of self participates more in the imageless vague awareness of being while participating less in iconic self structures, i.e., self images of inferiority and superiority -- the latter leads to judgmentals, like "compared to mine, that other person's biblical God is less biblical than mine though mine is not clarified reasonably." Here "I" has become a speaking judgmental icon that is inferior to the imageless image of God and defended by a facade of superiority.

<8> The functional value of the biblical account's of God's person is that it can have a greater than lesser potential (objectivity, intellectual honesty including the invisible but personal ground for our visualizations) for believers' avoidance of superiority complexes. In "zero-derivation" one has no such braking system. "0-D" when practiced by the younger (university students) and more impulsive without personal examples of enlightened love can rationalize (a real though denied objectivity) and return to a culture tolerant toward human sacrifice such

as crucifixions.

<9> The proponent of "0-D" has a definite influential personality however and utterances against such behavior gives weight to personal dimension ... now ... and declares silently the importance of good biblical personalistic attributes. I think it can be clearly shown that Jaspers would agree with the psychological value of theistic biblical personalistic attributes. It manifests faithfulness toward the ground of our greatest ideas and feelings, and shows respect for the earliest recorded lessons revealed.]

DILEMMA OF THE DALAI LAMA, JASPERS ON NIRVANA by Glenn C. Wood 15
June 2003, posted 24 June 2003, TA55, C50

Thoughts about what Jaspers says about nirvana

<1> SERIOUS KJF HANDICAP

A critical response to HM is handicapped by the potential convenience of "0-D." The convenience is seen in the obvious need for keeping communication on the Forum flowing. Reverting to a culture of humming is going a little too far but it might be good for clearing the sinuses. The seriousness of his position is ... undermined ... by the expression that his views are "for the purpose of discussion..." This can mean a simple escape system for those not taking seriously philosophy or religion. A zero dimension can be jumped behind like a breastplate without exposing human attributes. One can jump into "0-D" at any personal epistemological whim. That's the human-avoidability convenience of "0-D." There's no less tendency to neglect human and potential inhumane consciousness upon re-entry from nirvana and zero-derivation. It might work for HM -- except for his felt need for a claimed unique formula that would fit biblical religion. As a universal formula revealed to HM it could present greater problems than the inflexible ontologies he warns against.

<2> CAPITALIZING ON CULTURAL AND "0-D" HANDICAPS

Nor does likening "0-D" to some old-culture's language lend itself to serious discussion. The substance hoped for eludes us in this association with Nirvana, though the Nobel-Peace-Prize Tibetan's name deserves respect. Karl Jaspers, while speaking of Nirvana writes, "We ought to understand that striking paradox of a language to end language." (p 265 Phil. Faith and Revelation; Collins, London, 67) I suppose it could be said that Existenz, God, The Transcendent is that sort of language too, but it does not lose consciousness as ground. This is not to say that the "Nirvana" exercise contributes little to a spiritual exercise of

universal kindness -- but no more or less in Buddhist behavior as in any cultures' tendency to be humane -- unless the universal kindness results in a non involvement in human affairs where applying justice is sought for in and shifted to Western ways where utilizing consciousness is persistent.

<3> INCARNATION/REVELATION NOT RADICALLY MIRACULOUS AS NIRVANA

The biblical idea of the incarnation if properly subsumed under the presumptuous faith in the imageless God is not as friendly toward this constant transcendence (transcending thought without responsibly handling revelation) and its psychological pitfall (capitalization, exploitation) The pitfalls can be avoided through the possibility of revelation and a great confession on one's inadequacies -- if the incarnation is seen as participating more in the invisible than visible, and miracles are seen as a distraction from the miracle of life as such. The biblical Jesus, the incarnation, is a safe and restricting image pointing perpetually toward the invisible, but without sacrificing humane feelings and without leaving aside consciousness though consciousness experiences vagueness.

<4> MISUNDERSTOOD REINCARNATION FRIENDLY TO "0-D"

"0-D" can be a subtle constant incarnation without any appreciation for revelation (and that is probably why reincarnation might be appealing, i.e. the DL provides HM with some apparent contentment), but there's a miraculous continuity of consciousness assumed in "0-D" which accommodates apparitions, a real symptom of schizophrenia. From zero derivation's dimension come personal characteristics though denied. Human attributes are unavoidable. That might be safely dealt with by the elderly but not by those who are all too human and easily influenced and fall over themselves seeking leadership, and after disillusionment they seek and find support for individualized structures in apparitions given special designation (transcendental titles). This appears to be what happened and happens to those who are visited by angels. Grounding is lost, but personal attributes nonetheless continue though vicariously grounded in imaging (the imagination).

<5> GROUNDLESSNESS IS EMBARRASSING

If memory serves correctly when the DL was in New Mexico he was asked about his reincarnation. To me he seemed embarrassed by the question, at least uncomfortable for having been put on the spot to have to accommodate reason to a cultural tendency that inhibits reasoning, i.e., reasoning within general consciousness. The sophisticated personality associated with "0-D" and the affirmed compatibility with "Nirvana" might be also uncomfortable to DL.

<6> HONESTY OF EXCLUSIVE THINKING AND THE QUESTIONABLE EFFORT OF

"0-D."

HM seems critical of Roman Catholicism's (RC) official non-participation in the D-L call for unification, i.e., the plea for some uniform form of catholicism. There would be RC participation of a subtle manner if there were any possibility of harvesting that union for the ultimate goal of "Holy Catholicity's" tradition. Of course the only union allowed would be that the Protestants cease protesting and return no longer trouble-makers to the capital of holiness. They would be quick to harvest from the Reformation like "0-D" is quick to stand next to the DL.

<7> RADICAL TRANSCENDING

What seems strange is that HM seems to slip so easily into "0-D" and yields to the "Holiness" of an Asian personality representing a historical radical transcending. Jaspers speaks of "Nirvana" as an example of radical transcending. He says in the West transcending is a shadow that shows the sunlight of cipher. In Asia, there's a consistent transcending, and its benefit makes us aware of our Western rudiments (see p. 265, *Philosophical Faith and Revelation*). By Western rudiments he means the encompassing that during transcendental treks cannot and ought not be deceptively left in the world. This includes the cipher language of the being we are and the Being in which we find ourselves. Revelation can possibly occur when forms are shattered through systematically realizing their limitations. Something new can occur, though as a flash. In speaking of the Buddha he says: "There was nothing particularly new in Buddha's doctrines, terminology, forms of thought, conceptions or action." (p 42, *The Great Philosophers*; A Helen and Kurt Wolf Book, Harcourt, Brace & World, NY.) There is nothing new in "0-D" except those disciples seeking secular saints to whom to pray and hope for some look-like-new formula that omits a restraining (to them) biblical tradition. What's radical and new is the intense aversion to some part of general consciousness.

<8> INCONSISTENCY IN THE "0-D" NIRVANA EFFORT

It appears to me that the classification of holiness (exclusivity) is given to another while criticizing the presumed holiness and exclusivity of RC. If the holiness required for reincarnation (The DL is revered because thought by some to be a reincarnation) and if holiness is too obvious a frantic search for leadership (saints to whom to pray) in and on the way to Nirvana or "0-D," the authority of the DL must be academically established. It's established to support what appears a "0-D" formula for a world religion. The case is made by listing books and lectures the ultimate data being that the DL lectured at some University. It seems to me HM suggests the need for established authority is greater because some decided not to participate in the Tibetan's call for union. Though some from the Jewish and Islamic community at least attended, it seems

to me the reason is open to interpretation. The decision made by some not to participate could have been that the Tibetan way of life had become comparable to RC. In Tibet "even the old methods of magic became buddhist methods, the monastic community became an organized church with secular rule (presenting so many analogies with the Catholic Church that amazed Christians saw it as a work of the devil, a grotesquely distorted imitation of Christianity)." (p. 48, Great Philosophers, Ibid.)

<9> MIRACULOUS NOTHINGNESS OR REVELATION'S ETERNAL DECISIONS

So it looks to me like "0-D" is searching for miraculous leadership or is willing to point toward a notable person as the nearest substitute for God or papacy. Though not admitted by "0" derivationists, belief in miracles is essential to nirvana and "0-D." Jaspers says: "Nirvana turns everything -- God ... encompassing, including the relation of Existenz to Transcendence -- into ... delusion, magic ..." (p. 102 Phil. Faith and Revelation). Jaspers goes on to say that "In the world, seen from the world, Nirvana seems utter monotony ["0-D" has that much in common with Nirvana. My comment]. Revelation on the other hand, is first diverse among the Jews, Christians, and Muslims, and secondly it acts upon the world, promising and demanding. It becomes a factor of the utmost vitality and tension in a mundane existence that is not a matter of indifference, not an illusion, but the site of eternal decisions."

<10> EXPLOITATION OF RADICALS

Here (in 9 above) Jaspers is showing that in meditation or the contemplation of nothingness the questionable miracle occurs: "Nirvana cancels all embodiment. The road to it is marked by ciphers only. Revelation is embodied in the incarnate God and does not permit itself to be turned into a cipher." Revelation is more than a cipher. In the penetrating through our structures of thought and intense feeling states, we see limitations, and then if God wills, logic can be instantaneously and simultaneously enlightened upon re-entry. This is what makes for the enlightenment detectable in great philosophers and great reformers, especially one who when revered would respond with the reminder that there are none good but the heavenly father (Anaximander might have responded similarly to HM). The canceling of thought-forms done by the Oriental method is miraculous for it does not participate in reason's post and pre contemplation; it takes fantastic flight and leaves general consciousness. It is a miracle (and by miracle I mean those apparent outstanding events that distract from general miracle and then exploited by schools of thought and power) that one can leave personal characteristics and withdraw catatonically into a "0-D" when gods, God, or ontologies threaten favored structures made from claimed subjective ongoing experience removed from objectivity.

<11> THE RATIONAL WORLD OF RETROSPECTIVE AND PROSPECTIVE REMEMBERING IS NOT NIRVANA

Jaspers is not manifesting superiority for his Western heritage, but evaluating by means of differentiation by comparison: "It takes a comparison with those Asian analogies -- which have a grandeur of their own -- to appreciate the singular Western concept of a rational World." (p 197PF&R) Though in Nirvana there is a shedding of all deceptive objectivity or worldly ignorance, it's not achieved by pure speculation in general consciousness (see p. 267 Ibid.). General consciousness does not include a zero dimensional ground for "0-D" but rather involves the various intensities of consciousness prospectively and retrospectively encompassing -- mostly obvious in traumatic events, those objective events with an objectivity no less objective than subjective responses. General consciousness can include a vague sort of remembering personal origins.

<12> COMMON LANGUAGE BETTER THAN CHURCH AND STATE GAMES (OR "0-D" AND NIRVANA GAMES)

It's my position that "0-D" without the HM academic personality is little more than the common expression "let's rethink this again from the beginning" and that would be all right if HM gets his way and combines let's-think-this-again and religion and never really reaches his "Nirvana" by leaving the encompassing consciousness -- humane consciousness (but he leaves some of it by not seeing the simultaneity of objectivity and subjectivity). An essential difference between HM's "0-D" and nirvana is that "Buddha's word for this world ... is nothingness ... Nirvana" - cipher, an encompassing inhibiting bit of evil in India's history, for "the world comes from an unknown primal act, ... the maker, playing a game." (p. 214, PF&R) "0-D" seems like game playing and religion is not taken seriously. We might see the need to keep religion and functional rethinkable reason separate in the analogy of the separation of church and state. It is serious business. But yet the hope for uniting "0-D" and religion depends substantially on the gentleman from Tibet who is calling for a contractual-like understanding between Protestants and Catholics (something that should indeed attract the attention of Jews and Arabs for they know experientially what can happen when P and C religiously control local and national politics (just as the Tibetans learned what happens when irreligion religiously controls the State).

BEING-AS-SUCH NOT SUBJECT TO EVOLUTIONISM by Glenn C. Wood 4 July
2003, posted 15 July 2003, TA55, C 55

[1] In response to TA55R3 it's seems proper to show that Jaspers' reasoning differs from Hontela's "evolution". The omission of such a comparison implies

similarity. I repeat again and again this is the Karl Jaspers Forum and to express views without comparison smacks of something less than learned ignorance, especially if one can so miraculously jump from consciousness and memory to a more than workable ontology, to Being itself as subject to evolutionary thinking.

[2] The need for this comparison is seen by vdMeijden's statement (TA55 Hontela C41) "I'm not quite sure what HM means with this 0-D or Karl Jaspers." There's the assumption at large -- and I doubt vdMeijden is making that assumption but pointing to a problem -- that if HM says something it is the position of KJ. It is not a KJF law implicitly nor explicitly. It seems Anaximander is used, by HM, not because of a dimension of nothingness or potentiality for reason, but because of an alleged evolutionary (evolved from a Greek to an Englishman) type of thinking which can unfold into universal orderliness utilizing God in the necessary process. The use of KJ here is similar to the use made of God.

[3] (When HM gains momentum for "0-D" by using Jaspers it causes misunderstandings and confusions that reflect against Karl Jaspers. An example of this is found also in TA32. In a discussion with Peter Mutnick HM states "mainly Karl Jaspers has emphasized the importance of the encompassing." HM is trying to show PM that the word transcendence and the word encompassing are different and Jaspers and HM use encompassing similarly whereas PM is incorrect and confusing transcendence and encompassing. To support this view HM makes reference in the bibliography to Von der Wahrheit.

[3.1] But Jaspers and HM do not agree, for, Transcendence "... in the real sense (is) ... the encompassing as such, the Encompassing of every Encompassing ... Compared with general Transcendence belonging to each mode of the Encompassing, this Transcendence is the Transcendence of all Transcendence. Wahrheit, 109" (Library of Living Philosophers, Karl Jaspers, pxxii NY 57) Because HM said it, PM seems to initially criticized KJ's use of encompassing. It seemed to me PM was initially interpreting KJ through HM's misunderstanding. HM does not appear to grasp this meaning of transcendence and encompassing partly perhaps because it is not part of his ongoing experience and therefore troubling to his conceptualizations.)

[4] For the readers' information here are some quotes from Jaspers which can clarify Jaspers' view of evolutionary thinking though he doesn't use the word:

"In my consciousness of essential reality there takes place the decision as to whether I see in Being less than I am, or whether I sense in Being more than I am.

"In the first instance I follow realism and materialism, positivism and idealism,

which all agree in this one thing, that I see myself as something which, as the culmination of everything, has developed out of something earlier and lower, and which has grown out of something that was soulless, unfree, and at first, indeed, even lifeless. This interpretation, however, founders on the fact that as it proceeds it provides no means for comprehending what man is capable of being, for comprehending his love, his thinking, or his knowing. This interpretation is ultimately reduced always to forms of naturalism, technicalism, or utilitarianism. [Hontela's TA seems to fit this type of procedure, i.e., his observation of bacterium behavior through the physical evolution perspective which continues into his view of cultural history. In my view the observation of animal behavior is morally detrimental -- spoken as one reared on the farm and now streetwise in the profane secular city -- and does not make easier a higher order of thinking.]

[5] "In the second instance, I surge up and beyond myself with the urge to yield to an 'other,' to reality itself. It is the movement of philosophizing which, bound to tradition and historical depth, finds its possible fulfillment in symbols." (Truth and Symbol, The World of the Cyphers, p. 57, see TA51 bibliography) [The tradition is strong, but with less depth, in HM's reliance on Anaximander's evolution and Hontela's on Darwin.]

[6] Memory and consciousness should remain faithful to historical depth and tradition. A newcomer, as regards records, would be Anaximander as interpreted, and evolutionism which concludes thinking about reality results in a higher order of thinking which must be essentially present as a seed in Being, and ultimately the conjuring a God justified by a reference to nature, wherein faith is immanent and not transcendental. Jaspers, warning about the psychological limits of such, says:

[7] "... [T]he ascent to the one God is to be protected against an attitude without faith which can be clothed in misleading thoughts. The actuality of the one God is undermined, for example, by the following consideration. The one God is an idea which brings us, like a magic potion, as it were, to our freedom. The idea does, indeed, make the highest demands upon us and opens up the widest space for us. With this idea man swings himself up out of the constraint of his existence and the narrowness of his impulses. When it has been said that the idea of God is necessary for the control of despotism, malice, and the ill-will of the average man, for the peace of society and for the reliability of intercourse and harmony, it might now be added that the idea of God is necessary so that man may come to himself, so that man may become free of all the world for himself. Even in this sense one might repeat Voltaire's statement that if there were no God, He would have to be invented." [In the next sentence and paragraph:] "Such thoughts are, however as senseless as they are destructive. An invented God cannot have such an effect (even if he might perhaps through deception of the masses temporarily bring them into submission through fear of

punishments in Hell). Only an actual God is capable of this [not as HM says in TA32 "'God' is...presumably a default or fall-back option--if I've not taken him out of context; or as he says in TA32[29] "a maintained 'theistic backup.'"]. The man who invents God and does not believe in Him does not experience the uplift. The man who, while deluding himself, believes in Him, would bring about what, according to his nature, would never be comprehensible from delusion. In such a merely seeming-to-understand, that which is Existenz and Transcendence is, in the categories of vital and psychological causality, robbed of its meaning and essential reality." p 77, 78

[8] Again he says: "It would be a mistake to presume that with the pointing to the foundation and mode of philosophical movement a fulfillment is already given, a program set up, or perhaps even the consciousness of Being mediated in its content. It would be a false expectation that in such indications a knowledge is acquired by which one could be guided." p.78

[9] Jaspers is not undermining empirical research by these warnings. If human suffering can be reduced by observing and experimentation with micro organisms; fine. But to justify a cultural establishing progressive process by pointing at the microscopically - observed as a standard for man's moral conduct, is seeing in Being less than "I am" -- Jaspers first instance above -- while claiming what is seen as less is really the more-than "I-am" --thus an I-am not capable of comprehending Jaspers' second instance above. The second instance involves an unreduced consciousness and memory where the historical is recognized as an objectivity and includes ... the Decalogue.

SQUEEZING LIFE FROM ZERO-DERIVATION? by Glenn C. Wood 10 July 2003,
posted 12 August 2003, TA55, C56

<1> ACQUIESCENCE

A casual review of Maurice McCarthy's (MM) past postings seems to me to show an uncritical acceptance "O-D"; at times acceptance even seems embarrassingly embellished by such statements that "O-D demands that each of us learn to stand as spiritual ones" "and leads us to where we can take our rightful place as the least of the heavenly hosts" and "the freedom of thought that O-D provides is unparalleled" and results in self reliance "until we earn the right for the Shepherd to open the Gate." (<3>) Are not these emotive biblical like use of words designed to establish an external authority, one MM stands beside and defends ? But that, you see, is the risk "O-D" takes when set about to show its exclusivity apart from man's earliest history, and when the personal value of such a formula is shared with the world as though it could be a universal formula if understood.

<2> PROTECTING APPENDAGES

A personal breastplate isn't needed so long as MM stands behind HM, but it's to be noted that what alleged frightfulness and loneliness is claimed in a commitment to 0-D, it is diminished by being at oneness with notoriety and by some degree enshrined as an authoritative figure, i.e. Anaximander. But that was not my point; my point about the breastplate is that human attributes have to be left outside, hung and potentially forgotten on a hook in a denied mind-independent reality. The word epistemology does not hide that limitation. The word epistemology is not a confirmation stamped on a passport to heaven. Awareness of the theories of knowledge and criteria of truth does not earn passports to heaven -- reference here is to MM's <3> bootstrap transcendence and suspension "until we earn the right for the Shepherd to open the Gate."

<3> ATMOSPHERE CONDUCIVE TO PARANOIA

(I do admit that I wonder if contributors might be Jesuits. That's wondering resulting in part from not knowing anything about the personal religious history of the contributors, but only the academic letters perhaps. I don't apologize for this suspicion because it's quite naturally an abnormal reaction in an environment where straightforwardness is replaced by stealthy infiltration of education plants. In this case gaining the admiration of Eastern cultures would be beneficial to Catholic and Protestant Christianity, i.e., reaping that harvest field, could be thought helpful in the control of the militant adherents of Islam -- so might reformed Islam for that matter.)

<4> UNNEEDED DIDACTICS

I thank MM for an effort to teach me that 0-D is "merely ... the cleanest precondition of knowledge." (<1>) However that is not the need. My point in great part has been that HM since before-and-after Anaximander does not stand alone on the technique for escaping biased thinking. He is not as lonely as the Biblical prophets had become and far from the lonely thoughts of the last one's crucifixion. He may wish he were more alone and destitute of poetic and artful embellishments.

<5> CONSCIOUSNESS TALK

MM's interest in consciousness and knowledge, and that consciousness-of-being awareness makes it easy to capitalize 0-d as though it's a new doctrine, a new objectivity outside a subjectivity assumed to have recently evolved. MM's way of handling experience though makes it easy to see he has no problems in "0-D's" universal application, especially when applied to religion where there is always

something to declare, a commitment to all that is human and good. MM says "0-D...is not substantial and asserts nothing." But I say it asserts by avoiding the substantial and thereby repressing the ground of nothing. "Nothing" is another way of admitting ignorance, but the biblical "God" is an utterance declaring ignorance in hope of ground and possibility, and is more intone with attributes such as holiness, justice, mercy, love, and truth -- those attributes which John the Baptist saw limited in himself but objectively present in his cousin.

<5.1> In TA32C7 MM states "The experience of sense perception as an experience reduces to feeling... Feelings are perceptions." <2> "Thinking therefore precedes feeling..." <3> I say that's rather doubtful; but that would be my word against MM's word on the matter. But MM's view here is taken by MM as a prerequisite for the "0-D" school.

<5.2> The feeling of being is prior to thinking and is not abandoned due to thinking unless feeling is traumatized and thus suppressed. In the latter case it could be said that after the suppression, feelings are an after-thought as in the case of sociopathic behavior. But who is GW to say, right ? And who is MM to say, right ? Let's see what Jaspers does with consciousness.

<5.3> We start -- though we could start elsewhere -- handling the feeling of "being that we are" with consciousness as such. For Jaspers it's one of the four modes of being that we are. Existenz, existence, and spirit are the other three (expanding on these is subject matter for a TA -- as is KJ systematic handling of the limits of thinking and feeling). Consciousness-as-such is beyond any consciousness about it. Consciousness has a transcendency to it, as do the other three modes of handling the being that we are. I think it's important here to see that this awareness of being is a "we" awareness, a natural awareness of some unavoidable dependency on parents, community, church, etc. These concepts fit easily my own experience within consciousness (as expressed elsewhere such as with the sewing machine needle). The technique of "0-D" can easily be used in areas far removed from consciousness-as-such and more in the area of existence (Dasein) the being that I am empirically with others. The sewing machine needle became the objective experience that brought consciousness-as-such's consciousness of being to thought, I had no remembered thought of consciousness previously. I did not lose consciousness of human attributes experienced previously by some thought about the absolute nothingness as ground of the experience. The mental structure resulting did not turn into a phobia about sewing machines or machines, but included consciousness of justice (pain for disobedience), Mercy, understanding, and love manifested by my mother in that moment but not limited to her alone.

<6> CAMPBELL Vs CAMPHILL

Did you, MM, mention the Camphill Movement because the founder was influenced largely by Robert Owens, and as a contra argument for TA51's reference to the failure of the New Harmony, Indiana's experiment, and the debate Alexander Campbell had with him ? Would you share your thought process here if there's more than what you wrote ? That's an interesting matter for research. For one thing the resulting movement -- from the socialistic failures -- could be the best that socialistic thinking can produce, i.e., the aid to the severely disadvantaged. Robert Owens made the same mistake "O-D" is making by showing good works to be the product of atheism rather than faith in God, that as man evolves he needs to go beyond belief in God, to structuring artistic organizations that meet the spiritual and material needs of less artful masses. This is perhaps the unrecognized reason "O-D" must have a beginning midway -- Anaximander -- between an earlier event and the event of the organized institutional Church; and if you don't belief in the Church as authority it's looked for in an Eastern less Western epistemology like the Dalai Lama.

<7> COMPREHENDING A MISAPPREHENSION

In <4> you, MM, said "but you are quite right that the religions of the East need reinvigorating with science." I'm aware of the limits of science, and with Jaspers, see -- as does HM and yourself I guess -- the materialistic inclination. I would not say the East needs more technical means of mass destruction comparable to the West in order that exclusive mountain-protected cultures might survive. I was saying that justice in the form of self defense is one human attribute left shelved in mind-independent reality during and sometimes after the Nirvana exercise, and that HM too gains momentum for his formula from a consciousness that does not relax its defensive mode of handling possible experience. I'm not judging the Tibetans but reacting to a plea for assistance to protect ... a culture or a formula without unconditionally surrendering the least bit of it.

<8> MISAPPREHENDING GENESIS

The commitment to take on the world alone upon multiple returns form "O-D" isn't made more convincing due to MM's statement about creationism and evolutionism. Here MM stands -- not alone -- not only with HM but with the creationism group : "Creation out of nothing is even more difficult than O-D" (-- though it's uncertain whether MM means "more difficult" to be greater than common thinking, whether MM is talking about humility as in learned ignorance--) and eases toward the other side by comparing it to the ignorance demanded by evolution (--whether by this is meant evolution can be compared to biblical creationistic thinking and evolutionism is all the more established by that association). Then, through an independent-of-mind movement, reference is made to the biblical God : "God first made the world and only then saw that it was good." This stated meaning of this emotive biblical reference is less than a

good exegesis of the text. The Hebrew, though unnecessary for argument, does make room for the meaning that the source is unknown (transcending epistemology) but the rest of what came about was a restructuring of what was apparent though unstructured. The restructuring part of creation that MM is referring to follows the first two verses of Genesis and is, to me, a misreading of the Mosaic concepts. Here the occasion to apply "0-D" in this frame of reference is clear. In other words, 0 derivation could be done and useful if the attributes of the heavenly father of the first two verses were remembered -- for it's the last verse of the first chapter of the biblical-creation account that says God saw as good what was restructured from existing stuff. Since then, this has been known as the world that needed cultivating.

<9> WORLD AND TRANSCENDENCE

Jaspers handles the being in which we find ourselves with two modes : Transcendence with a capital T, and world. Transcendence, if I may apply it, is near to the first two verses, while "world" amounts to the restructuring. The importance here of referring to scripture from an empirical radical viewpoint is that Neither Jaspers nor Anaximander stand alone regarding the use of these modes or forms of thinking. There's an admitted ignorance, learned ignorance, without losing faith or trust in a heavenly father, plus the added responsibility of continuing to restructure to assure that what was good survives.

<9.1> What Jaspers says -- without an inferior feeling or the need to use the words of "creation" and "evolution" -- is that "... man burst out of the cycle of natural events -- events identically reiterated for generations, changing only over long period of time -- and broke through to thought, and thus to history. (The Future of Mankind, second paragraph of "The Scientists and the 'New Way of Thinking.'") And this seemed to KJ to have happened suddenly, simultaneously throughout the world, and not dependent on normal means of communication: "The true situation was rather one of contemporaneous, side by side existence without contact." (See Origin and Goal of History, p.10, Collins, 67) I would be less quick to jump from the empirical to the metaphysical here. I'd be reluctant to avoid the Mosaic testimony in the Genesis way of putting it, and assume a 0 mode, i.e., standing still, but without losing a healthy degree of the metaphysics, the testimony, talked about in Genesis; i.e. I would cling less to the metaphysics of a "0-D" and say : there may have been an empirical technique of communication available then, whether confined provincially or having a source from outer regions of the world.