

TA70 (Wood)

Response 1 (to Müller, C4)

Evolutionism as Fundamental Ontology Not Science, Answers to Muller (EVOLVING QUESTIONS [Note. Mr. Muller's caption for his C4]) by Glenn C Wood, 19 September 2004, posted 25 September 2004 [with a note, in square brackets, by Herbert FJ Müller, 19 September 2004]

Notation (3-30-2006): The title "Evolving Questions" given by Herbert to his Comment 4 is a play on the word "evolving" and is used here confusing the two ways "evolving" is used. Herbert is implying that because there is a movement, process, or even a development in dialectics that by applying the word "evolve" in that sense it somehow shows how ridiculous it is to protest fundamental ontology such as the historical dynamics involved in evolutionism, such as from the time of Anaximander's interpreters through Darwin's. Clear distinctions need to be made between origins we know and origins we do not and cannot know. The absence of clear distinctions leads to the undifferentiating hoped-for-absolute-certainty from relative empirically demonstrable origins that can be and have been used in struggles for power. Herbert's evolutionism-ontology is a quest for order in the form of a major premise. Jaspers says, "our ability to find order is the premise of cognition..." (p.200. PF&R) and here Herbert turns the premise into a thesis resulting in an objectification imposed upon reality that needs no critiquing.

HM "On your request, I want to comment on your article on evolutionism. Now you write at the beginning that your paper is in answer to my question to you concerning your views on evolution. However, I do not find a discussion of evolution in your TA70, but rather a somewhat complicated presentation on a wide range of subjects."

GW: Your response is appreciated ... but. I'll quote what you wrote at the end of vdMeijden's TA73, C10: "...[I]f you become aware that you are in a trap, you can do something to get out of it." Your whole statement shows the title of TA73, C10 was given too serious a thought. And in my case, even though TA70's caption was clearly slanted toward avoiding traps in a systematic way, such was dismissed and declared complicated and too general.

If the title of TA 70 presented difficulty; information regarding historical, logical, and scientific determinism is readily available in philosophical dictionaries and On Line. The forms of thought are easily appropriable.

It might have been disappointing to not find a hoped for total world view in the

TA70 especially in as much as the author is friendly -- without losing the attribute of criticism -- toward religious and historical records. The article demonstrates the reasons Karl Jaspers could consider futile what you seem to require for discussion. You have already affirmed -- incorrectly -- that KJ avoided natural sciences, and omitted such from his work on Nietzsche. We agree evolution is not an important matter to KJ, except, I say, as the trammels of a life-order to be avoided, and comments are less than some might want. We disagree as to the reasons.

HM "To make a commentary possible, I will ask you some specific questions about your notion of evolution. If you could provide concise answers to them, they might then serve as a basis for discussion."

GW: This seem on the surface to be a fair approach, but would involve a decision to wade into the infinity of the finite without philosophical faith to remain buoyant. The Forum, I understand, was given the title Karl Jaspers apparently by yourself. To discard buoyancy by forgetting the historical limitations does a disservice to KJ. I try to comment about evolution only in so far as it represents Karl Jaspers ideas. Comments about evolutionism include my individual experiences.

It appears "concise" is here an invitation to come to a turf with one's spiritual arm (attached to the historical) and self-hoodity potential removed and forgotten, i.e, already signing something affirming "O-D" and agreeing to radical constructions from nothing.

[NOTE - "Concise" means a short, but clear and complete statement. If you cannot say what you are talking about, there is nothing to discuss. And the purpose of the Karl Jaspers Forum is discussion, not preaching. - HFJM]

It reminds me of what KJ said while pointing at the sophist's behavior : "... advances [are made] to join hands in a formula [O-D, RC...] as if this must embody the truth." Brackets are mine. (Man In The Modern Age, Part five, under The Sophist, The Nameless Powers).

Moreover, if one wanted to communicate, TA70 contains enough generals and particulars for reaction or transaction in a meaningful way.

HM "This could later-on, if you wish, be followed by other discussions about your own opinion on what you call evolutionism, and the reasons for it, and perhaps in a third instalment about the opinions of the various authorities you mention : Jaspers, the Pope, Gould, Teilhard de Chardin, etc. In the interest of clarity of discussion, these questions should be treated separately."

GW: We should approach questions aware of limits. Remember, please, this is

not about what you might want to discuss so much as what is relevant to Karl Jaspers. We got off to a good start when we discussed previously and briefly Jaspers' views of Nietzsche. The approach you seemed to have taken was to reflect negatively against Jaspers, by quoting an assumed authority, and thereby disqualifying Jaspers from the natural sciences.

HM "By the way, could you sketch, for the uninitiated, what "the Arkansas trial" is ? "

GW: It's suggested that you do what I do when a subject is unfamiliar. Just search on the Internet. Type in "evolution" "Arkansas trial" "Gould."

An uninitiated person coming to the KJF would have to look up MIR, O-D and RC. If nothing was available historically (recorded or artifact available) and if interest remains, one would need to do an unindexed search of the KJF while being suspicious of traps. Here again, O-D and RC, vying for mass acceptance, becomes an abbreviation for truth, both coming to truth in the higgledy-piggledy of statements like Ernst von Glasersfeld's response: "I love Muller's suggestion that religions should adapt some of the ontological assumptions to the practice of life, but I'm afraid they won't -- they stand and fall with the contention that they possess the truth." (See TA73, R6, <3>) Here there's a mutual misunderstanding of religion to preserve the formulas' impulse as a vital urge in the craving for higher forms of self expression.

HM " How do you (not Jaspers) define evolution (not evolutionism), do you think it is a viable concept, and why or why not ?"

GW: Let's talk about the misuse of concepts' designators, rather than talk as though the misuse were real enough to be universally accepted ? Nietzsche and Kierkegaard were prophets pointing out the problems of existence and not offering a world view (except with Kierkegaard's commitment to living like Christ -- which included self sacrifice). Let's be disciplined about the limitations of our tool to avoid being trapped by the misuse of tools like O-D and RC when applied to religion and philosophy.

HM "What do you think is the basis of the evolution concept, and how do you think evolution relates to genetics, heredity and hereditary illness, gene action, protein formation, the taxonomy of plants and animals, and to anthropology, among other things ? To what extent do you see the Biblical story in the book of Genesis as viable basis for thinking ? In a situation where genetics and Genesis do not agree, what action do you propose ?"

GW: Some dynamics you're asking for from me on evolutionism/ evolution can be found in TA63, C47. It's not a meiotic nor mitotic presentation such as it seems you might want; i.e., it's not a reduced view of evolution to something we

all can agree on, nor is it a narrow view of the historical dynamics. It shows no reluctance on my part to discuss evolution so long as doing so does not by recognition embellish the misuse.

Your questions approach what can be discussed, and have been touched upon, but it seems you prefer to first set me on grounds where a multitude can monopolized this Karl Jaspers Forum with anything but meaningful reason.

Moreover, because you entered the Genesis account into this discussion, the burden is on you to state your studied-interpretation of that portion of the historical records.

Finally, would you be exact about where you think genetics and Genesis are at odds -- without reducing either to a dogmatic interpretation universally binding ?