

PRECIPITATING MANIPULATION OF JASPERS (Ed. Reply) by Glenn C Wood 28  
November 2003, posted 7 December 2003, TA60, C11

<1> Just returned from a home construction in the Northwest and I have been doing a little KJForum reading and would like to first respond to your footnote in TA60C9 and an editor's note to PM's TA63C6. (I was sorry to see Jalali withdraw from the Forum and would have liked to have defended what appeared to be an appropriation of the Transcendental spirit of KJ. Unsuccessful attempts were made to e Jalali today.)

<2> Your reference to the KJ statement of purpose -- that construct, existant, that which stands out of your Karl Jaspers experience, that thesis -- doesn't nullify the prior reality of encompassing complexity. The philosophically minded might wonder more about these causes than about "evolution", for the former is in the realm of possibility while you can still give testimony whereas the latter is but reason's cul-de-sac-like pastime. Nor does the stated purpose lend credence to an off-the-wall-of-zero-derivation, a liberality which encourages meaningless unlimited verbalizations about our predicament of thinking. Namely a predicament of thinking in terms of definitive beginnings, about origins as though such can produce a conjured revelation through reductionistic analysis and thereby avoid the complexity, that "0-D" ... complex ... that should not so easily be avoided by referring to an arbitrary foundation, i.e. a stated purpose of a construct.

<3> The stated purpose does not alter precipitating data that led to the use of Karl Jaspers. If the editor had some accountable reference from Karl Jaspers which shows an approval of the editor's understanding of Karl Jaspers, that would be a precipitating factor. If you had had direct involvement with KJ, that would be another, but, in the latter case, though you had the obvious intellectual potential and corresponding timeliness for such it was not taken advantage of -- for you had studied in Europe if recollection serves me correctly. Also, if someone with an agenda -- that you might be innocent of -- suggested to you the need, knowing your potential for reducing KJ to something less meaningful and threatening; that would be a precipitating factor. No less a tempting factor too is reducing the factors to something so clear and distinct as " I simply thought" this or that and that's all there is to it. Such a simplification is possibly an avoidance of the complexity of the encompassing you might refer to as objectivity or the ground for your structures. (See your comment to Mutnick who says you cannot say where experience is, and then rather than say it is no-where you imply it is now-here. I think you say ultimate being is what we experience and the ground (formed inside experience) of God and one's identity. Then God and identity is referred to as a working fiction -- fiction being an emotive word and easily interpreted atheistically. If you mean God cannot be talked about except while realizing what we are doing that is not only representative of KJ

thinking but also Biblical. Is it proper to think you would probably not admit to this clearly for it would not be generally of interest?

<4> So ... it isn't that I mind "sparks flying", it is that KJ is being reduced to something of general interest. He has never been of general interest but there may be some wishing he could be subjected to such. The challenge to do a TA on the matter of evolution would in my judgement contribute to the futility of general interest. I've in other comments already said what KJ has, to my knowledge, to say about the subject, and the little amount said is insignificant compared to his extraordinary philosophy and psychology.

-----

#### REPLY

The chief point of interest for me is the openness that Jaspers had to all views (or in negative terms, the absence of narrow-mindedness). He showed this to an exceptional degree. Secondly, it is his central concept of the encompassing, which in my opinion is fundamental, and related to Anaximander's apeiron. Both these aspects I try to foster as qualities of the KJF. Thirdly, he was held in great personal esteem by a friend of mine who was his student. And furthermore, he worked in psychiatry as well as in philosophy, which is an important feature for my own work.

Whether to structure the encompassing theistically or in other terms is a personal decision which all make as they see fit - but I believe it is important to deal with this question because it is central, and that to neglect it leads into blind alleys.

I don't agree that a philosopher's work can be not "of general interest", nor that that is a bad sign, as I understand you to be saying in <3> and <4>. Most of them claim that it is, because they try to find out about the bases of thinking. Indeed, by this definition, philosophers cannot be esoteric, and in case they try to be esoteric (as for instance the Pythagoreans did) they miss their task. Jaspers himself said that everybody has a philosophy, there is no choice, and the only questions are whether it is aware or hidden, and whether it clear or confused. Philosophy applies to everyone, simply because thinking is or should be everyone's responsibility. For this reason I don't think that philosophers' work follows the same rules as that of astronomers, chemists, or archaeologists, who have knowledge that is defined by their experience, to some extent outside of that of other people.

Herbert FJ Müller

-----

Thank you for the important insight as to your reasons for using Karl Jaspers' name for the Forum. Your friend was fortunate to have studied under Karl Jaspers. You are to be commended for uneasily volunteering this information, i.e., for not seeking authoritative status because of this friendship with one directly influenced by KJ.

<2> As regards my comments about general interests: My view is that it would be great if KJ's philosophy and psychology could be known by the general public but it would be better aloof rather than misunderstood. But the idea that philosophy ought not be of general interest is an incorrect -- and intriguing -- understanding of my intent. I simply meant KJ is not well known in contrast to evolutionism talk. For instance while visiting a detoxification center in St Louis in the late sixties or early seventies, I ask the psychiatrist there if he was familiar with Karl Jaspers (I was telling him about my intentions of using Existenz philosophy at the alcoholism clinic where I was employed). He said, yes, he'd heard of KJ but that he is difficult to read. I think you, HM, meant something similar when you wrote that KJ's writings were convoluted. Thoroughness though can be thought to be difficult or convoluted. What appears like convolution is perhaps more circumstantial minuteness. But then, perhaps you are correct in the sense that the brain is convoluted, especially the cerebrum, i.e., seen as such though our structures.

<3> KJ cannot be understood if one persists in thinking that the encompassing can be interpreted theistically (that God is ... merely ... conjured) and that such structuring has no relevance to the Encompassing of the encompassing.

<4> Rather than KJ, what is unfortunately of general interest is evolutionism and creationism. Evolutionism can be talked about endlessly on the Forum -- as endlessly as the participation in the superstitious or mythical stuff that's part of the encompassing of our experience. As regards superstition and the ground of it -- mythical or mysterious, Karl Jaspers is a philosophical theologian but more than that a theological philosopher, and theology too therefore is relevant to the Forum. But scientific superstition takes the route of least resistance through evolutionism on the Forum as seen in comments referred to, including comments from theologians that they have no problem with evolution, and references to religious evolution. Jaspers says: "If a theologian, unable to tell science from scientific superstition, comes to regard a modern world image as irreversible" [such as the church of evolution, Teilhard, Forum authors too but in secular terms -- GW , not KJ's statement] it amounts to de-mythologizing the biblical faith. (Philosophical Faith and Revelation p287, Chapter on "Liberation and freedom now.") Demythologizing the biblical faith is bad psychology such as seen

in the incarnation – embodiment -- in Edward Moore's TA51C1.

<5> The Pope's and Schuller's view of evolution not only makes use of scientific superstition, but confirms religiously whatever degree of superstition is involved. It's another case of the vultures circling the corporeal or embodiment (Matthew 24:28). It's a case of theologians exploiting science. Schuller, quite needlessly, enhances his authority by reminding the people he had a personal acquaintance with Carl Menninger and Victor Frankle, and that he majored in psychology at Hope College. Meaning from this association is equal to, and perhaps an effort to excuse, the association with evolutionism and it shows how a very important person can have a less than perfect philosophy and psychology of religion. Schuller would have been more correct in showing the influence of the author of the Power of Positive thinking, Norman V. Peale.

<6> However, as you know, and as Jaspers says, "we cannot escape from the knowledge derived from science, nor from the conditions in existence which science and technology continue to transform at an alarmingly increasing pace." That's not a mere convoluted sentence but rather seeing the dual nature of science, benefits as well as the dangers.

<7> It is so easy to interpret KJ atheistically, but if done one is seeing his anti-institutional side, not his faith. The established large institution will proclaim KJ to be atheistic; and even fundamentalists might refer to him as an antichrist.

<8> Here is what I mean : I was sitting -- not invited -- next to Leonard H. Ehrlich as he said that Karl Jaspers wanted nothing to do with revealed truth, or words similar to that. I thought Ehrlich was seeing the anti-apparatus side of Jaspers. I nodded in agreement, but interpreted the statement as relative to the frame of reference of the historical Catholic Church, and especially the support of it through Descartes. It would have been easy for atheists to have taken this statement as tending to support their position. I saw it, as I hope Ehrlich meant it, from a balanced perspective.

-----

EVOLUTIONIST CHARGES ME WITH BEING CONTUMELIOUS by Glenn C  
Wood 12 January 2004, posted 25 January 2004, TA60, C18

As a result of Greg Nixon's critique of my contributions, I set about reviewing the Forum looking for contumelious signs in my comments for which I should apologize if requested -- which seems unlikely when tit for tat concepts are fair. I looked at my pieces from GN's possible perspective, and some of GN's, recalling when I first started reading GN's comments how it seemed clear there was an obsequiousness manifested, as in one who needs to feel part of something, or

wanting to stand next to someone in uniform. Some of GN's comments are: Muller was "straight as an arrow" and references like "Our" point and "I .. again agree 100% on each point" and in his book-in-process "I even mention your MIR ... giving you a footnote" and "we are in full agreement ..." It had reminded me of someone in love.

It isn't too hard to see that there was no further need to read GN's contributions. One only needed to read Muller's, for there was ample reason to expect GN was, in fundamentalists words, in HM's amen corner.

A review of GN's Personal Report (Tucson 2002) showed a lamenting over good manners displayed in public, that such was "negative" and that he missed the vigor of some encounters previously experienced. That complaint doesn't seem to match his criticism of my "arch" and "jeremiad." So one is left with making sense of it, and the sense I make of it is: (First) perhaps he would like encounters but not with Jaspers nor ken.

After reviewing some of the stuff written after the above quotes, it is easy to see why he would like to eliminate KJ from any dialogue. For (Secondly) his theological comments to Archambeault reveals the possible ground of caution in approaching the theist, KJ. Though that might be the case, I cannot accommodate GN's request to discontinue referencing KJ in the Forum. If it were not for KJ being reflected in it I probably would not be involved. It's like philosophy, everybody declares a philosophy one way or another, so the KJF reflects one way or another on KJ. However, I've made a case elsewhere that one cannot appropriate Jaspers philosophy without bringing selfhood along. He writes that way, as he has said.

And, (thirdly) GN has declared in not the kindest words an intolerance for fundamentalistic thinking, and KJ shows a balanced view of Biblical religion. GN seems to want to solo on the Forum, would prefer to omit "Dr." Jaspers and therefore have less "trouble in getting to Solla Sollo" (One of Seuss' book).

If one could review all that I had contributed to the forum it should be clear enough that my primary mission is to defend the name of KJ against those who would like to make him the least of influences, or misrepresent him intentionally or not. If GN cannot grasp the need for that in view of principalities, forces needing personages to harvest for the institutional threshing machines, than, I can only suggest that he research for himself. For, it is not enough to know the possible interpretations of words, but one must put whole life's experiences into the interpretation as well.

KJ's works are as available to GN, and if disagreements are found then let us discuss it. It's quite possible that our individual perspectives might result in

something meaningful.

In all fairness to GN, after finishing the review of his Forum comments, which I'd not bothered to read as stated above, but have now read, I was surprised to see the lucidity in which he pointed out the limitation of HM "O-D". But it seems GN wants HM all to himself to criticize. However, I had done that already with some use of KJ as authority which in effect gave credit to sources outside and prior to my own views. In so far as they go GN's exceptions to HM "O-D" are precursored in Jaspers, and the Bible for that matter, and most certainly in my work several decades ago and in the Forum. That (fourthly) is the windmill GN attacks. I had more wind to consider than GN, for there was the problem of how to reveal the dangers of "O-D," while conserving the primary sources of the ideas being trespassed, e.g., the Bible's imageless God, and KJ as an updated, systematic, and disciplined source.

That need GN seems to have for togetherness with an other, a Thou to stand behind, at the expense of someone else is showing up now in the bold repetition of HM's already posted question regarding my own personal views on "evolution." I'm trying not to stand behind KJ but stand up for him in as much as he is dead and his name is on a placard.

It's advantageous to minimize another's comments which when understood not only show the target was seen and hit sooner, but in such a way as to include all that is felt real but less conspicuously clear and distinct ? However I thank GN for bringing me to take another view of his outstanding later discussions with HM.

-----

AN EVOLUTIONIST CHARGES AD HOMINEM by Glenn C Wood 13 March 2004,  
posted 27 March 2004, TA60, C20

[Mr. Muller gave a title of "amphioxus" to this Comment]

The judgment that my comments have been "ad hominem" suggests that there's been a violation of the conditions for contributing to the Forum and such should preclude my participation or at least an editor's discretionary screening of parts or all (-- which could easily occur by pleading some allowable error rate or computer glitch). This judgment is consistent with the attitude toward the value of interpreting biblical texts (after routing the last response I wondered if GN was the one who once confused the beginning of John's gospel with Genesis, and some admirable character showed itself by admitting error with an "Oops..." ).

(What the Forum needs is a second-party account of contributions to increase

confidence in propriety. On occasions I've forwarded copies elsewhere so that it might be verified if needed that some were not posted. Getting personal with contributors tempts collusion like that management of events by back-room good old boys. When that happens, e.g. HM and GN, pointing at it is sure to result in a chant "ad hominem.")

I think objectivity requires the avoidance of being personal and complimentary and that the editor should not seek out contributors who are agreeable. GN's comments tend to verify that sort of thing occurs -- that consequence of subjectivism ... I mean it should not be done in the name of KJ.

GN does not need the aegis of the Forum's editor to show the strengths of fair thinking, nor the healing balm of a dignitary's compliments. Such has a weakening effect.

-----

EVOLUTIONISM STAND-IN FOR IMMORTALITY (Ed. Catharsis) Glenn C Wood 29  
November 2003, posted 14 December 2003, TA63, C15

<1> Re. H Muller's and Leslie's and Rees' religious comments in TA63C1  
What KJ would say -- I think

What KJ has to say about man's survival is: Human kind ought not survive unconditionally in a moral and ethical sense. Rather than respond directly to a TA about "evolution" as though there's something objectively substantial there, the occasion to respond to HM's religious litany -- which is here but a critical response to the "evolution" litany -- provided the opportunity to show the significance of KJ's philosophy of psychology. That said an example of the significance might be seen in that some portion of the world's population is reacting to the survival of the technically proficient by pecking the flesh off others to maintain the apparatuses of conventional comforts. Acuteness of thought and accuracy of predictability is distributed no less among the poor who are often finding, in the absence of comfort, hope in concepts about immortality. They, these fundamentalists HM refers to, can see immediately that the world Church would usher in hell on earth to which they, the infidels, those cautious about authority, would be confined immortally, i.e. to a suffering eternally where there's no time for relief. This tendency, though, toward comforts and control seeks like water its level in all classes.

<2> HM's leanings in moral questions relative to "evolution"  
HM isn't all wrong in showing the logical flaws in TA63. Life beyond is implied in TA63, for there's no life without the potential ground for it (KJ's Encompassing of the encompassing and Transcendent) just as there is something greater than the

speed of light because of potentiality. We look for identical life in our frontiers. It can be objectified in terms of life elsewhere, and of course this would be objected to by HM for it would admit to a Transcendental window, an Encompassing of the encompassing, an incoming from a source beyond thought and experience. Forgetting this is easier for HM and this premeditated or repressed recognition is why he declares against man's immortality in <19>. It's also objected to by L and R of TA63 because of the commitment to and dependency upon what is of general interest -- the predicament of thinking piece meal, or with beginnings and ends. HM's arguments though are limited by immanentistic confinements too, and there's the implicit denial of potentiality, and an explicit rejection of the heavenly father concept and the need for a schoolmaster-like law preparatory to grace and faith (both in history at large and the history of each individual).

### <3> HM's phenomenal Moses

In <6> HM manifest a misunderstanding of the faith and teachings of Moses and a limited comprehension of the Bible in history. Moses did not teach God to be an authority that "we have created as an ideal image of ourselves." This interpretation shows HM cannot view Moses as being in an encompassing world of others' influence (Abrahamic faith) and therefore could only have conjured God. That is now an explicit HM interpretation and the result of subjecting faith to reason's zero-derivation perspective -- nothing is given to Moses, Moses only deceives the group for purposes of stability and conditional tribal survival. Moses would be violating his own traditional influence, for Abraham's faith had values reaching beyond community lines.

### <4> KJ's view of fundamental Religious movements contrasted with HM's Institutionalism

Contrasted with KJ view that the hope for the salvation of the world lies in small protestant groups, HM's agenda here is quite clear, for fundamentalists are classed as a faulty substitute for Monotheistic established religions such as that "Church" Teilhard was trying to promote. TA63 is more of the same only without that Church -- a Church that would peck flesh to get aboard extra terrestrial colonization just like it picks the flesh off the carcasses of it's best members making "Saints" out of saints and expecting the rest of the world's religious to genuflect. The avoidance of doom is hoped for, by HM, apparently in the ecumenical union of churches, in the Omega like union of one "Holy Universal Church." The dangers of a universal Church can be seen in Teilhard's efforts and commitment, but HM sees it as a sort of ecumenical-secular movement toward union, the union of a catholic or universal religion and the religion of "evolution".



#### <5> HM's search for papal authority

Though hoping to fill the gap created by a misunderstanding of Moses, HM still insists on being publicly observed bowing before Anaximander as being the true source of reason's revelations. An "evolved" HM-Anaximander can teach something nearly biblical but not Moses? Zero-derivation has to make a "Saint" of a mind for the revelational influence of the Apeiron -- and for some popularly correct reason it can't be a biblical personage. Kant is then called to witness; that the more developed Kant was the more compatible with "0-D view" -- an interpretation of Kant no less questionable than that of Moses. I came to a zero-derivational like view of my "I" within the first few pages of Kant's Critique of Pure Reason, but only to be rejuvenated with the faith I had received within my earliest encompassing. If HM in research of normally inaccessible extant notes find otherwise might I suggest it is Kant's reaction to the influence of the Teilhard-like Church Institution (reformed or otherwise) rather than a comitment to "0-D." (Want to remind a reader that I place the abbreviations in quotes or whole words to avoid the customary use, high frequency of use, to the extent they might become considered axioms. That is why Pierre is dropped from Teilhard too. It means no disrespect for the person but a refusal to submit to hynotic bits of authority because of an institutionally conferred title of distinction.)

#### <6> HM transfigures Moses

What a Mosaic spin. Moses is recognized as prior to Anaximander in giving divine respect for fundamental thinking, to finding the divine through thinking or mountain top meditation. Now that HM has revealed the real Moses, Moses too can be compatible with HM's "0-D" if he, Moses, would tell us what he really believed about God rather than what he wanted the people to believe he believed. Has Moses appeared to HM like to Christ on the mount of transfiguration? Other than the few words attributed to Anaximander, by what extra-biblical source does he know the ontic Moses?

#### <7> Institutional absorption of excess mental disturbances

One point that the TA63 author makes is that there's something he cannot identify with regarding HM. Around 50% of that is due to the religion of "evolution", and the other 50% due to the immanental religion of HM. I have detected that too, a core without a normal identity, a mental bombardment in confined space impossible to pin down -- a balance retained by the absorption of energy through institutional involvement and security. But L and R are without excuse for failing to see that the judgement toward HM is feedback data with a kickback.

<8> The need for disclosure; relief from an editor's privileged immunity.

Perhaps now HM would share with the Forum earliest recollections such as those of the home life, parents? We are not getting any younger. It's sometimes required that psychologists, therapists, psychiatrists be analyzed. Was this a requirement for your position? Would sharing some of this violate or threaten a radical "0-D?"

-----  
Regarding Moses (<3> above) : I don't suggest this was Moses' (or your, or Jaspers') opinion, but from a 0-D point of view it appears that way.

Concerning your questions at the end, I would say that after the events of the 1930s and 40s in Europe it seemed to me that one cannot replace making sense on a personal level by taking shortcuts of various kinds. Rather than primarily relying on ready-made views on basic questions, as offered by various authorities, it helps to start from scratch. This does not mean re-inventing the wheel, but that all practices and concepts (including Moses') should be available for re-testing from point zero, when needed. - This procedure may be of help also for some long-standing conceptual problems in various fields, unsolved but still urgent, and under discussion in KJF.

I would also like to ask you a question: since you often refer to evolution, it would help if you could you say what your view on evolution actually is, and why. – HFJM

-----  
THE FUNDAMENTALISM OF EVOLUTIONISM by Glenn C Wood 1 December 2003,  
posted 21 December 2003, TA63, C18

It would take too long for this comment to be posted as a TA. So, to keep the "evolution" tide at bay, I'm placing it under TA63 -- reaction to C8 (it could be appropriate for TA55 as reaction to C60, and in some ways a response to Maurice McCarthy's TA55, C74).

<1> Karl Jaspers' responsible use of "evolution", the similarity to uninhibited or suppressed sneezing.

KJ had limited his words about "evolution". The reason can be found in his General Psychopathology (GP), "Somatic Accompaniments of Psychic Activity," where an analogy can be found in a sneeze. "Attracting attention may increase both coughing and sneezing reflexes, particularly the latter, but they can also be

suppressed for the same reason. (Darwin's bet with his friends that snuff would no longer make them sneeze: they tried hard, tears came into their eyes, But Darwin won his bet.) The suggestibility of "evolution" can also release inhibitions and give direction to basic urges (Basic urges such as "at certain times in situations that foster male communities and give them a philosophical importance, homosexuality plays an important part ..." GP). Encouraging contributions about "evolution" on the Forum, it was inevitable that one would make the connection to tendencies toward sexual promiscuity, the implications of the comments about the peafowl, none of which affirmations can be proven as applicable to a verifiable or falsifiable view of history. To express the assumption (see Rasmussen to Hontela TA55C60) that it can contribute to a view of history was bound to happen.

"Evolution" can be used similarly to the way the word God is used: to gain attention by declaring to a gang one's profane or religious compliance or subservience. Perhaps that's one reason KJ used Encompassing or Transcendence instead. Encompassing and Transcendence can be used profanely too, by using the words in an immanent rather than transcendental way. That's one reason I've objected to the abbreviated use of zero-derivation and mind-independent reality. The abbreviations can suggest acceptance or rejection in general, a title of distinction, and distracts from the Encompassing and Transcendence of history. "Evolution" as a workable ontology is a profane expression in leftist educational gangs, and when one wants to fit in one speaks in a tongue emphatically as one might use foul language. That's overstated to make a point.

<2> How zero-derivation really ought to work in the Jaspersian sense and what HM and MM mean when near their best thinking

In Philosophical Faith and Revelation he speaks of ciphers of history. Progress, evolution, and eternal recurrence is discussed. They have rudiments (a fundamentalism base -- GW) in reality. When applied to history as a whole -- as a cipher -- evolution is impossible to prove; "as a matter of fact, it can be disproved (in this sense falsifiable -- GW). But they do express a historic sense of Being." He says that evolution carries the thought that I have my place in an unfolding entirety, in which progress is a minor factor, but a factor. I (GW) say to see evolution in this sense is seeing ongoing experience from a special objectivity, and that it is how HM and others ought to use a zero derivation thought process. But KJF contributors and the editor can make evolution a cipher, i.e. Being reveals fundamentals in a Heideggerian sense. Maurice McCarthy's TA55C74 is diminished in value through a need to be aligned with "0-D" and its views on evolution; it's sufficient that he says: "You can always assume you know nothing and start all over again." When he suggests I don't understand "0-D" he probably can't identify with what I as toddler perceived and

conceived when experiencing the sewing machine needle piercing my finger, i.e., the effect on consciousness and conscience.

<3> The use and misuse of divine guidance, the latter by students of the Anaximander school of thought, that man developed from animals.

Against evolution is the concept of divine guidance; that history is guided by providence, and can have the effect that we count on a definitive guidance. KJ, with philosophical wisdom, kicks into neutral (a sort of "0-D" without losing the learned-ignorance grasp on Being) to avoid the pitfall of absolutism and radical constructionism, says: "To me Jeremiah alone seems to touch on the other possibility -- that God may also extirpate all he has shown" (See Philosophical Faith, Chapter on "ciphers of, immanence." referred to in TA51). Here KJ avoids the problems some religious sects have by an over confidence in their divine status. One such fallacy of religious thinking is seen in the sectarian phenomenon of Calvinism, and example of which is Robert H. Schuller, The Crystal Cathedral, a representative of the Dutch Reformed Church. He also represents one who has publicly stated that like the "Pope" -- aligning himself by association thereby -- he has no problem with evolution. In religious language Calvinism takes the form of "Once in grace, always in grace" or "eternal security." It is one of the quite proper reasons for the establishment of a sect that corrects that bit of poor psychology, for, one ought to "take heed lest ye fall" which is the spirit of the warning of Jeremiah.

Evolution as a rudiment carries the danger of being a fundamentalism affecting behavior. Observations of animal sexuality can enhance reflexes. Making an application to an unfolding in history, such as that a bird-brain decided one day to start unfolding -- with what is said to be a conscious success -- an apparatus to attract more females and successfully though creating a harms-way situation; that is the sort of appealing thing to students with surging urges. It's educators' irresponsible hypnotic suggestion -- with popular appeal -- that a sexual experience should be so valued as to risk life in time and eternity; it sends a dysfunctional message and replaces possible meaningful missions with perverted statemen. This sort of talk was avoided by responsible leaders like Moses, a responsible school master with rules regarding sexual conduct which would assist in survival, (circumcism being but a safety factor for females while promoting male promiscuity). The Mosaic law though didn't solve the problem of promiscuity but led to scapegoat sacrifices so that a variety of sexual experiences could be sought with less inhibition. So from the rudiment of urges influencing interpretations of the history of humankind comes a secular fundamental thread in "evolution."

<4> KJ and religious fundamentalism, and evolutionists/constructionists hopelessly await acclamation

As before said, KJ devoted little to evolutionary arguments by comparison with his philosophical and psychiatric work. Fundamentalism to the evolutionist is known with absolute certainty to contribute to abnormal behavior. In his GP KJ mentions "the statistical investigation of various faiths has given us the fact that the largest number of disorders are to be found among the fringe supporters of various sects. (In GP, "The Abnormal Psyche" p.728 -- see references at conclusion fo TA51)." He's referring to religious sects, but the form of thinking can be applied to fundamental evolutionists.

Those statistics are not surprising but can demonstrate that some sects can resolve disorders rather than enhance, such as in the case of John Wesley's ministry to the institutionalized. Jaspers does nothing more than mention the statistical work done. That such statistics have a negative connotation regarding religious sects is questionable due to complexity, for "The delusional experiences of a philosopher are distinguished by a wealth and depth of meaning while those of a simple person are more in the way of fantastic distortions of superstitious fancies." There are meaningful bible based sects that provide for the emotional needs of the latter, whereas established traditional churches search for the former to prop up tradition. For instance Catholicism seeks a replacement for Thomas Aquinas, pinning some hopes on Heidegger but Karl Jaspers' timely productions kept getting in the way.

In the face of those statistics KJ can still express the meaningful view that the Protestant ground carries more hope for man's survival, individually, because of independent groups. That refers to religious sects. (Future p 259). It is not surprising though that those hooked on evolution as a fallback will speak despairingly of fundamentalism, but upon forced reflection come to uneasily discuss the fundamentalism of evolution as though all the while aware of the problem but were above being affected, such as done by Nixon because of an affirmed novel constructionists perspective. Here the evolutionist create a solution for a problem inherent in the fundamentalism of evolution and expect acclamation for a construction which in fact was a limited deconstruction of a faulty construction. The value of religious fundamentalistic thinking has been and is being tested in the America (see TA51). It is being verified and falsified in the American experience. AIDS is part of the American experience that falsifies evolution as a meaningful view of history.

<5> Father Anaximander substituted for Father God

Finally, the problem of the evolutionary view of history can be seen as starting with Anaximander. In as much as he is ground for justifying "0-D," and apeiron associated with something divine, this gives momentum to church-like missionaries of evolution. It is no wonder that constructionists (Consructivists)

can be tempted to feel comfortable holding on to that historical thread. Moses observed -- see Genesis -- the same phenomena, as did Anaximander only without the fundamental immanentalism. For this reason, especially when challenged, defenders of evolution chant an emphatic devotion to the zero-derivation, and agree to the editor's objections to mind-independent reality. There's some deep feeling of satisfaction in hypnotically observing the peafowl-like colorful theory of Anaximander's evolution; it adds potency to basic urges; it continues that school tradition with admirable Jesuit like commitment -- where if the Church depended on evolution to survive in the traditional form they would endure burning at the stake.

-----

ZERO-DERIVATION NOT SUBJECT TO FALSIFICATION by Glenn C Wood 28  
December 2003, posted 18 January 2004, TA63, C24

I'd like to respond to HM's response to Meijden's wondering about the repetitive value of "O-D" and "MIR" language.

First: I can see the value of HM concerns regarding the mind-brain problem, as I think Meijden does, and see the dangers of the HM formula; but it presents as great a problem when coupled with HM's acuity and invaluable academic experience which gives religious-pedagogic strength to anything HM proposes. His formula presents an even greater danger when attempts are made to apply such to philosophy and theology. Here he is out of his personal encompassing world of experience I think.

Secondly: The discussion should not be concluded, and though my criticism has bordered disrespect, what I have learned and been taught in these discussions has been of sabbatical value to one committed to learning. The repetition of HM's position relative to other views has had educative value for me, for:

Lastly: I'm in a better comprehensive position now of working on that TA regarding the work I did in the late sixties on hitting bottom in reason and emotion (the Existenz philosophy of KJ applied...). It takes up where HM's "O-D" and "as-if-MIR" flounders in not meeting scientific methods: failing to meet the empirical test, violates parsimony, objectivity, and convergence of evidence requisite to unlimited communication. The scientific principle too is escaped by an "as-if" approach to the encompassing we are and the encompassing we are in.

I'm looking forward to comments on the Article. How to reduce it appropriately for the Forum is no quick task.

-----  
HUXLEY COMFORTS CATHOLICISM VIA AGNOSTICISM by Glenn C Wood 18  
January 2004, posted 21 February 2004, TA63, C30

<1> Found it interesting that M's comment demonstrated a point by referring to the Jesuit's question "Do you believe in God" and Huxley's sonorous "agnostic" which he took credit for coining. Prior to reading M's comment while pursuing a line of research I came across an author who said of Huxley's claim of having invented the word agnostic, that the idea is not new and was expressed by the Biblical Paul who said that the world "knew not God." G. P Fisher (Professor of ecclesiastical history, Yale) said: "the agnosticism to which the Apostle referred commonly had a stock of beliefs of its own in regard to the world unseen, therein differing from the agnosticism of which Professor Huxley has the distinction of being the godfather." It seems here we have a root word, used in the context of a couple theories that is bountifully incommensurable to the Biblical reference mainly in Huxley's claim to originality.

<1.2> Huxley was probably more aware of what was needed for academic survival than we are because we're removed from the more than as-if real assumptions made vague by timely distance. Huxley knew how to answer Jesuit forces. He knew that historically Gnostic thinkers were good at keeping traditional non-evolutionary Greek and Jewish traditions and philosophies rolling, and this constituted a threat to the historic development of Roman Church traditions. Huxley knew what he was doing by using and qualifying the term gnosis, for he was saying to the threat: "Don't worry fellows, I'm no threat but rather my stuff can be adapted to the cause of your Catholicity." However, the new word only appeared to be incommensurate with gnosticism, for evolutionism was involved in the Gnostic-like complex system of intuitive knowledge sophistically manipulated dialectically. It was abundantly not incommensurate with Gnosticism within which system was contained the essence of evolutionism. Huxley comforted the Jesuits like Gould did as a guest of the Vatican. Gnosticism and Institutional Revelation are conceptually identical.

<1.3> It seems to me that academics and want-a-be book-authors are most adept at laying claim to something original—especially the origin of humankind. If it's not an unwitting use of an old word, it's the most sophisticated efforts at cultivating ground for the growth of the extraneous.

<2> Painting greener looking pasture for budding authors is attempted for instance in the idea that terms in one theory are incommensurable with the like terms in another theory. Abundant room is made for material from the minutest difference. That's supposed to justify disregarding the similar use of terms and ideas by predecessors or even contemporaries. It seems to me Feyerabend was

very good at this with regard to Popper, etc., so popular one can use Feyerabend as support for anything novel. From what I've read he had expressed appreciation for Hitler's oratorical style. He appears to have experienced the power of terms firsthand, for he was in and injured for life in the German military during WW II. I'm simply wondering if out of some glimmering of hope from guilt feelings one can more easily see that having commenced to partake of a theory like fascism, one ought to defend the conduct by emphasizing, with a novel caption, the need for engaging the critiquing faculty without suppressing uncomfortable memories.

<3> HM has at least a somewhat novel term if "0-D" can be used frequently enough to distract from the religious implications of the idea of zero derivation. But the idea is certainly not new neither in part nor whole. Fortunately HM has moved away from a negative slant toward mind-independent reality by the use of an as-if-mind independent reality. But even here the as-if for science is incommensurate with faith when used to try to identify the unknowable with an as-if nothing. Here, though incommensurable, it does not mean there's even a little bitsy identity. There truly is some as-if-ness in faith from a wholly other perspective, but with faith one proceeds with an appreciation for a providential-fateful as-if-ness coming from beyond rather than from an in-depth conjured formula. With faith the as-if-ness can still be affirmed if one is burning to death for the as-if goal (though there is a "bad Faith" such as burning others or being burnt as a means to an end; the end here though is not as-if but a well defined commitment to an exclusive worldview--Catholicity).

-----

DEBATE CONTINUES WITH ABSTRACT THEORY OF EVOLUTIONISM By Glenn C  
Wood 23 January 2004, posted 14 February 2004, TA63, C31

#### <1> ANALYSIS

Perhaps I should withhold detailed response to C25 until after HM's reaction (also I'll be involved again in another overdue project). It was another tantalizing exposition. (I think our dialogue is unique, and it's hoped there's at least some appreciation for relating to KJ.) It was hypnotically impressive to the degree that one could wish it were true, that the origin of man had finally been located, i.e., located to the degree that explicit beauty is the search for implicit beauty. Here was manifested a systematic explicit movement of thought with the implicitness of poetry and prose. This while affecting a biosphere like aura that almost seemed designed to preclude analysis and empirical testing, conflict, and thereby sustain the theory. The, or a, good theory has to be testable in some way other than dialectics and emotion, and self-analysis and analysis by others ought not be thought off limits. The empirical ground where this is possible was only hinted



at (culture, behavior, decisions). The origin of man cannot be determined, proven or disproved. Embarrassing provincial efforts (like a hog's tooth misinterpreted to be the bridge between man and beast) have left evolutionists resorting to syntactics, (the relative use and meaning of linguistic signs within a sentence) some pragmatics (the relation of linguistic signs to the user), and with semantics (relation of linguistic signs to things) bringing up the rear.

## <2> DISAPPOINTMENTS

There were some stultifying expressions in C25. It did not seem necessary to associate the theory of abstract evolutionism with HM's personalistic and historic fallback symbol, the apeiron of Anaximander. It will be interesting to see what the editor of the KJF does with this comparison. On the surface it seemed like a complement by compliment, a hope for supplemental assistance in the conflict with the West's most preserved written code of conduct (which the young need and the old can often forget, forget their youth and what they are regretting), and help for avoiding seeing the views had already been expressed before and since Anaximander, differing only in incidental contents.

## <3> LAYING CLAIM TO ONE TREE IN THE GARDEN OF TREES

JJ's use of the imagined pine forest seemed a little rustic and not very historic. I understand his abstract theory better by reflecting on the Genesis account of the fall. There's an abundance of incommensurable trees in the forest of experience for the mind to digest without directing the decision faculty to one focal point -- even though cosmic in scope -- and then territorially guarding it; it has the effect of putting a shell around an "evolved" one-world-tree decision, a cell for the beholder. There's no need to partake of one tree even if it's a meta-tree. When that happens, if one is gifted with imagination, one has this flash of "now I know" followed by a systematic defense mechanism. A felt need for an explicit holistic (but absolutized by the use of "cosmic") approach seems to have fallen into a whole idea which everybody with "evolved" talent most see in the same way, but especially using the same terminology. The tree JJ is in that judges right from wrong is: "NATURAL ORDER IS FUNDAMENTALLY SUBJECTIVE."(4.4) The only thing I can see correct in that absolute is that we can't think at all without thinking. But the world or cosmos we find ourselves in is objective, and so is the self momentarily objectified during the thinking process. Though it has been pointed out before, one can't have subjectivity without objectivity, the latter being a prerequisite for self-imaging to which it is subjected. "Objectivity, therefore, comprises these three at first separable moments: it signifies objectness (being-an-object), perceptibility (being-a-thing), validity (being-a-claim to affirmation or to perception" and "Consciousness of Being lies simultaneously in the grasping of the object and in the consummation of subjectivity," and "Existenz appears in the intertwining of subjectivity and

objectivity. (Truth and Symbol, "Objectivity as Cypher, The Grasping of Being in the Subject-Object Polarity").

### <3> EXISTENZ

Existenz has no definable content but is not loose toward implications as though we conjured -- due to "evolution" -- anything or nothing, God or devil. It represents a leaning toward the invisible in ultimate situations. Existenzen cannot ontologize subjectivity or objectivity; neither can the fundament of Being.

### <4> GOOD STUFF

There's some really good stuff in C25. Some of it has the force of prayer -- to evolutionism. Most of it declares a power of positive thinking, albeit from a certain naivety. It is a commendable effort to get the best good works out of others holding that suggestive cosmic/worldview the essence of which is transcendence without Transcendence. Besides some superb thoughtful connections, it presents an opportunity to show the need for an objectivity to avoid subjectivism. It seems I'd said that before, but it needs empirical demonstration -- more later. It also shows the embracing strength of the decision factor, and the mind's power to influence micro and smaller phenomena. Such does seem to argue against the direction and hopefulness of Hontela's micro research regarding the origin of consciousness. I mean if decision has causal efficacy, what chance in freedomless does a micro-entity have in manifesting uninhibited conduct in the face of a force that can amend the second law of thermodynamics. Consciousness is at least objectivity though most vague in times of comfort; it includes pain, memory, and consequential decisive structures.

### <5> BEYOND MELIORISM AND ICONIC PATHOS (JJ'S<4>)

My detailed response (if time allows) will not depart from past efforts to show where KJF's views may differ from those of KJ's. From his works on history and psychopathology an application can be made and compared to JJ's evolutionism - - which remains decisively and radically a meliorism, i.e. the world is getting better everyday in everyway, and only those with most "evolved" minds can visualize it. This will return us to the empirical testing field. The wholeness KJ's refers to is more than the wholeness of the JJ strain of evolutionism; more than holistic but includes it, absurdly more in a healthy sense, wholly other, beyond the explicit and implicit, beyond, before, and after abstraction, beyond clannish decisions, and includes "a faith which neither sees nor possesses but trusts, in association with a traditional faith handed down by persons that are admired and loved" (From KJ's Gen. Psycho., The Human Being As A Whole).

I've got to go and hope to return in a few weeks.

-----

JASPERS NOT UNCOMFORTABLE WITH NATURAL SCIENCE January 2004, posted  
7 February 2004, TA63, C32

<1> Just a quick and loose note here before getting involved in a building project. "Discomfort" is probably not the correct word for describing the relatively minor time and space devoted to "evolution" by KJ. Things should be seen in holistic -- not whole-ism -- perspective. Evolutionism during Nietzsche's time was not analyzed in ways similar to what HM has done in C28. It's my unsubstantial (for the moment) guess that in KJ's judgment the pop-culture popular influence of Nietzsche had done enough damage such as the misuse of his out-of-context views by the Nazi regime. It is more a situation of KJ being responsible as an influential person. Even more though it is KJ's in-depth effort to comprehend the whole Nietzsche in so far as possible and from the psychopathologist's experienced perspective. This comprehension and analysis shows that for Nietzsche "life is not a struggle for existence ... rather a struggle for power..." That was and is my position regarding evolutionism too, i.e.; it has been and can be used in the struggle for power. Seeing that though is difficult for the strugglers because it would amount to a confession that it's not science but the quest for power.

<2> Perhaps Kaufmann's objective approach is too narrow in his analysis. Here the biographical sketches of subjects are of utmost importance as KJ has pointed out in his General Psychopathology. For instance if one relates Nietzsche's works with historical events, such as the disease-epidemic of the period, and his personal relationships, plus identify with his normal urges, it is obvious why Nietzsche would exploit a form of evolutionism. Kaufmann has provided some useful translations but interpretations are suspect and don't indicate street-wisdom regarding passion.

<3> I'm referring to Nietzsche's relationship with Lou Andreas-Salome. She was the female member of Freud's Vienna Circle, but before that, when she first met Nietzsche, she was involved in working on the dynamics of morals. It is not surprising then that a pursuer might preclude with a system of his own such as a work on the genealogy of morals just to break down her own system of resistance (remember that photo of Lou in the cart holding a whip and Nietzsche pulling like a horse?).

<4> Nietzsche's (N) "Thus Spoke Zarathustra" is the child of this hoped for relationship, I think. One's work can be sublimated creativity and a substitute for unrequited love -- a surrogate child. Several years ago I was considering writing

a novel about this relationship for that was the only way it could really be handled, for N cannot be interviewed. In downtown Santa Fe NM while walking with my daughter I caught a glimpse of a book in a book-store window. It bore a title something like "N's love affair with Solome." I said to my daughter: "Look, I don't believe it, someone beat me to it."

<5> Another passing comment: The comment about monotheism has seemingly ignored the significance of the meaningful side of absurdity, while the fact that absurdity too leaks through naturalism/evolutionism seems to have been unestimated. It seems to me preferable to have the absurd straining through the fine filament of the historical records than through results of the education industry's struggle for power. But that will have to be addressed later. The overall impression of C28 is that it's an effort to justify superimposing evolutionism over the Bible to bury something of historic and imperative value, and to do so by finding one authoritative witness while diminishing the significance of KJ.

-----

WASTING JASPERS ON EVOLUTIONISM, HIS VIEWS CONT. by Glenn C Wood 17  
March 2004, posted 10 April 2004, TA63, C41

<1> The following can be taken as more of my view on "evolution" in answer to HM's request for my position. We are wasting too much time and energy on this abstractism.

It's hard to respond to JJ's abstraction theory without using first and second person forms of speech. Third person seems more objective, but it moves too far from the affirmed subjectiveness and fragility of the theory.

The use of "JJ" is meant to overcome the restraints and dishonesty associated with getting personal, and that is my intention here. JJ's epiphenomenal subjective experience appears to be the basis of the abstraction complex, and it seems to have had a life changing or influential effect on JJ comparable to the biblical Paul and historical others, like one's religious conversion experience that led to the formation of AA. Personal experience, known little here, is the fine filament through which believed revelation comes -- reference here is being made to the vision JJ had which is found in his first contribution to the forum. JJ seems unduly committed to evolution and GW (my objective self) has an apparent aversion to the same. GW hopefully can show objectively that the aversion is based on something other than subjective processes.

<2> KJ says "research itself lives in the tension between the current whole and the smallest detail" (last page of Chapter Four in Origin and Goal of History).

Smallest details are manifested like this: GW places "evolution" in quotes, refuses to capitalize and abbreviate theories -- except where objectivity is unquestioned like with "GW and JJ." GW finds what would appear to the evolutionist the smallest detail, but which to the more objective thinker illuminates the apparent aversion. It's a detail found in history -- like that Oxford debate which was reflective of the evangelical movement which -- though maybe unconsciously -- opposed Catholic catholicity by taking a route that does not lead to Rome, and includes a reaction which now reflects a whole theory of naturalism threatening moral decisions in general.

<3> GW reads JJ as a cipher of objective existence trying to understand why a bit of non-objectivity rears itself to make the theory acceptable, like the association with a less than correct interpretation of HM's subjectivity, and seeking confirmation from Anaximander's small and philosophically uttered only extant few words. It shows an unusual commitment to vision and some unusual individual private history can be assumed as one layer of ground for the imagined form. What seems to come closer to the ground of the commitment is the warning about the Yellowstone threat to humankind, and occasional reference to creation and the creator shows the open-endedness of the potential for intense images.

<4> My purpose, again, is to guard against the misrepresentation of Karl Jaspers' views. For instance, rather than seeing the value in a quote by him JJ (<28-29>) chose to interpret it negatively by suggesting KJ has intolerance toward some cultures; whereas KJ represents the epitome of hope and effort at communication. That misinterpretation of KJ's quote about the value of the influence of those we love may have come from what's interpreted as my intolerance of a whole world view grounded in evolutionism. Contrary to JJ's judgment that faiths war against one another is the more in-depth awareness that struggles for power conflict.

The easy misinterpretation implies more perhaps an intolerance for the daring refusal to submit respectfully to "AT." But it points out the need for GW to make sure distinctions are made and that KJ is not misrepresented by his defender.

<5> So GW must be fair, honest, about misrepresenting KJ, and my seeming aversion to "evolution" though reflecting my experience-based feelings and unusual approach to research, is not perhaps so much that experience of KJ. GW has stated KJ speaks little of "evolution" which is objective considering KJ's main thrusts, which is psychopathology and philosophy. Also, being in the academic arena KJ had more to lose by not using the word evolution to show its limitations when honestly evaluated. JJ's abstraction from evolutionism (ism pointing toward a whole world view of an absolute nature) shows the need at this point to, in greater detail, reveal KJ's position on "evolution" and through this showing it is

hoped the problem with JJ's theory can be seen clearly.

<6> KJ's views can be found in The Origin and Goal of History and in Chapter Three entitled "Prehistory." "Man cannot be conceived of as a zoological species capable of evolution, [I prefer to stop here and move on to applying KJ's psychopathological contributions to Forum views, but objectivity prevents -- GW] to which spirit was one day added as a new acquisition [My form of thinking includes the idea something extraterrestrial occurred represented by the divine breathed-in-living soul of the biblical text, but KJ seems even more biblical, for:] 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 [in terms of beginnings and ends--reflective of the restraints of piece-meal phenomenological thinking GW -- I'm reminded of the debate with a fellow Greek-Hebrew student who before space-ventures declared it to be impossible, not on biblical grounds but on the mistaken idea that nothing could stand the heat of reentry. That possibility was foreign to my thinking. Later at another school I met John Hurd who's father, he said, invented the material that withstands the heat of reentry. My point is that humanity's potential exceeds the restraints of beginnings-and-ends thinking and the from a biblical perspective the origin of humanity can be from beyond potentially speaking].

<7> KJ continues, hopefully JJ will follow this closely: "Attempts have been made to interpret man's biological peculiarity as the product of domestication, on the analogy of animals, which change their essential nature as the result of domestication inflicted on them by man. It is not man who has created culture, but culture that has created man [according to that erroneous attempt -- GW]. Quite apart from the question of where culture comes from in this case, from a purely biological standpoint the universal consequences of domestication are not found."

<8> KJ asks what happened in prehistory, "that vast stretch of time during which humans already existed ... [that time of] historical silence in which, nonetheless, something of vital importance must have taken place. The movement of becoming completely human is the deepest enigma of all, up till now utterly impenetrable and beyond all comprehension. Such figures of speech as 'a gradual process of transition' merely serve to obscure it. We can evolve phantasies [mythical abstractions] of the genesis of man. But even these phantasies break down; whenever we try to picture man coming into being, our imagination see him already there."

<9> He goes on to say that on top of this we don't know what man is now, (and though contributors to the Forum are just now seeing various concepts of selves as less than absolute, the idea has been around for a long time and clearly found in KJ works, and in the sixties led a professor of pastoral counseling of mine to

write on a final exam (which I still have and treasure) of the matter of self images: "I have learned from you."). KJ then resorts to playfully visualizing prehistory in two elements: "the biological evolution of man, and the historical evolution, which took place in prehistory, ... [remembering these are visualizations including the unknown] "Biological evolution brings inheritable characteristics, historical evolution only a cultural heritage ... Biological reality can be apprehended in the structure, function and psycho-physical characteristics of the body; the reality of the cultural heritage can be apprehended in language, behavior-patterns and works."

<10> "In the process of becoming human, going on through long millennia, the fundamental features of humanity must have been fixed as inheritable biological qualities that are still present. In historical times, on the other hand, man has not undergone any demonstrable biological metamorphosis... we have not the slightest indication etc" and "Even the biology of man, if we once succeed in grasping it, may perhaps prove different in some way from all other biology..."

<11> This seems to be adequate to show the difference between KJ comments on evolution and my cautious use of the term -- though JJ should read it for himself for KJ's quality thinking on the matter. It also, if one has a will to objectivity, shows the need for JJ to qualify the eloquence and certitude of his theory by subjecting that proudly admitted subjectivity to the humbling objectivities of prehistory and history. An unusual self-centeredness -- selfishness is not meant here -- probably is the ground for vivid imagination, vivid abstraction that even assume human characteristics, i.e., anything from an intense personalization of a meaningful tree top experience to attaching human characteristics such as that of angels.