

TA70 (Wood)

Response 2 (further to R1)

BEWARE OF THE CLEAR AND DISTINCT

(TO BE CONCISE OR NOT TO BE CONCISE [Muller's caption, whereas mine is concise or precise) by Glenn C Wood 25 September 2004, posted 2 October 2004

Notation (3-29-2006): It was not unusual for Herbert to make an editorial annotation to a contribution. Protesting his clear and distinct ontologism is of course a challenge to the reduction of complex reality when more understanding than judgment is needed.

Statement from G. Wood to HM's editorial proclamation inserted in my TA70, R1.

HM's editorial note inserted in TA70R1: "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"

GW: Here you're proclaiming something. This demand for the clear and distinct prevents in-depth communication. It's consistent with "0-D" and seems used here as an editorial KISS (keep it simple stupid) of death within the body of a response; it's a Comment in affect comparable to those parenthetical inferences you make that "0-D" is applicable to religion. How will my response be posted if at all ? As R to what ? As a Note ?

You can interpret discussion according to these rules but ought not do so by using "Karl Jaspers." It might be that a purpose given to the Forum is hidden behind the title Karl Jaspers to attract attention to "0-D." A discussion on a Karl Jaspers' level is not carried on by starting with statements that are so clear and distinct as to eliminate essentials. We must be weary of the hypnotic suggestion behind clear and distinct boundaries which insists on starting from nothing, i.e., "0-D"; it not only begs the question, it demands it like a papal decree. Keep it KJ not HM.