

TARGET ARTICLE 70

THE LIMITS OF HISTORICAL DETERMINATENESS APPLIED TO
EVOLUTIONISM by Glenn C Wood 19 April 2004, posted 1 May 2004

Subtitle :

A systematic deconstruction of derivatives preparatory to individuals' receptivity to philosophical illumination and constructivity. An exercise influenced by Karl Jaspers' Existenz philosophy, with an elucidating introduction: a practical application to seeing how evolutionism and the paleontologist Stephen Jay Gould now clearly establishes religious institutionalism and involves a violation of the scientific attitude and the spirit of the Establishment Clause.

Cont.: Answering H. Muller's question regarding my views on "evolution."

<1> Overview

This TA aims at a systematic process of hitting bottom in reason, through subjectivism and objectivism. It is essential to understanding how and why recently evolutionism is involved in the establishment of religion. Here ism means a distinctive theory or doctrine, e.g. humankind's origin, including mind, is limited to a more [Darwin] or less [Gould] gradual process and involves a simian-related progressiveness--see 3.12 below. The TA affirms, for purposes of falsification, that due to the "Papacy's" confirmation of "evolution" and the concomitant concurrence of a world-popular TV evangelist, "evolution" in the education industry is now functioning in the sanctioned capacity of establishing and sustaining established religion. "Evolution" is in quotes to avoid reinforcing theory through common usage. Herein is justification for leaning away from evolutionism and large religious establishments. It's the reason for my efforts to prevent the usury of the name of Karl Jaspers on a Forum where missionaries of "evolution" can monopolize time and space. The TA is largely in disagreement with Judge William R. Overton's Memorandum Opinion, Mclean v. Arkansas. That though "evolution" is clearly established in that case law, it is no longer common sense as the Judge opined, and it can now be shown that evolutionism is establishing religion and violates the spirit of the Establishment Clause. This perspective is preparatory to showing that the biblical ethos neither advances nor inhibits centralized-organized religion, does not necessarily foster excessive government entanglement with religion; and participates in myth no more than evolutionism and is as appropriate as a scientific theory because falsifiable. (I would have ruled against the defendants too but at least opined against the organized-religious plaintiffs for exploiting coercively no less than the defendants.)

<2> Preface

This TA is prefatorily presented for feedback. It assumes the KJF participant is more than casually aware of KJs' works. The following includes an application of Karl Jaspers' Existenz philosophy and philosophical logic to recent outstanding events mentioned above and below. Existenz, though more than definition, is defined as a self suspended between itself and the Transcendent while not forgetting its mysterious ground. References are within parenthesis within the text--which is more of a dissertation than thesis. It is more antithetical within the dialectical process of thesis, antithesis, and synthesis -- in keeping with the spirit of falsification but does not rest on either a material or ideal dialectic. One problem with this TA is it reduces KJ's philosophy to a systematic approach to the ground of philosophy and toward a philosophical logic. I use some of the systematization of Edwin Latzel -- which includes his personal historicity -- and my system in turn includes my personal historicity. Historicity, as KJ uses the word, means an unusual awareness, uncommonly pliable and elastic thought and spontaneous originality. Latzel's comprehension of Jaspers' views meets with his highest approval (p. 842, The Library of Living Philosophers, The Philosophy of KJ, Schilpp editor, Tudor, '57, hereafter referred to as LLP). References to Gould are taken from sketchy -- not reliable for references -- notes made from some of his writings. For 22 years I've kept within easy reach -- for possible use -- the March '82 issue of Newsweek that featured Gould a few months after his testimony in the Arkansas trial. Religion and "evolution" were of general interest then and it is assumed critical interest has continued. The reader is expected to have some knowledge of Mclean v. Arkansas, a chronic passionate interest in the philosophy and psychology of religion, a substantial awareness -- or quest for comprehending KJs' critique of religion in Philosophical Faith and Revelation, and an unwillingness to reduce science to a doctrine.

<2.1> What might be a bit novel about this TA is that it puts the limitations of reason in the affirmative and thereby relevant to the general scientific attitude of falsification. Reason, here, includes verstehen and vernunft -- the meaning of which is not as complex as some translators might suggest. The English language user should not be underestimated, i.e. reason involves what psychotherapists and pastoral counselors could mean by empathy plus a balanced in-depth human understanding, a wholesome comprehension arising from the penetration of reason, and then from potentiality having something meaningful to declare when possible if and when appropriate.

<3> Special Introduction -- tit for tat opinionativeness

Gould is right in form but wrong in content when he attempts to place scientific ideas into historical context. (The word "historical" occupies a focal point of importance in this TA following the General Introduction below.) He has missed the marks when assuming the modern scientific mind needs a punctuated idea to

replace Darwin's gradual idea. He's incorrect too where he views Darwin's evolutionism as wrong -- regarding the gradual changes though guiltless or without accountability--because of a prevalent spirit of impatience in 19th century England. Therein Gould demonstrates unfamiliarity with the history of in-depth human connections and an unawareness and/or an under appreciation for contributions by conscientious in-depth historians like authors of church history and doctrine. He takes his individual observations, makes superficial connections to romanticize about punctualization or objectification, conjuring a cause and enforcing it by the authority of a theoretical paleontologist shielded by the respectable side of the science of paleontology. He adds momentum to that "church of evolution" fathered by Teilhard De Chardin, reinforced by "Pope Pius" X11 and now John Paul 11. (See Chardin's *The Heart of Matter*, *The Christic*, D. *The Religion of Tomorrow*, forth paragraph). Overton gave no apparent consideration to such available exhibits when judging evangelicals as using "coercion however subtly exercised" though the organized religious plaintiffs in the Arkansas Case were coercive in their struggle for religious influence.

<3.1> In an apparent hang-up on chronic and acute standards of measurement made vague by incomprehensible distinctions comparable to the indistinguishable borders between eternality and temporality, the slow pace of eternality is compared to the slow pace of Darwin's England to the now blooming and bloody temporal state of affairs. I mean the historical situation was more complex than Gould considers. There's a more correct comprehension, i.e. a more complex comprehension of the historical situation then, and the connection to recent phenomena tends to verify the human-complexity that defenders of evolutionism overlook. That complexity can now be made clearer to the mind capable of extending science beyond the bailiwick of some branch of natural sciences.

<3.2> Gould was more right than wrong when he interpreted the "Pope's" 96 comments as meaning that "evolution" is now compatible with evolving established religion. That meaning remains after allowing the greatest possible margin for erroneous interpretation of the "papal" comment, while considering the spin tactics of Catholic trouble-shooters. The compatibility of "evolution" to established religion is enhanced by a recollected similar spin toward canonizing Darwin fifty years ago by "Pope Pius" XII.

<3.3> The situation then as now requires an appreciation for the whole being, in authentic selfhood and as well the individuality of historical figures -- some relatively unknown. The sense of urgency was just as great then as now, as was the reality of one's world's possible extinction (though the threat of atomic extinction and terrorism brings it closer to our hemisphere). It was important to maintain a pace ahead of pursuing universalism (catholicity) in the form of the religious nationalism of Romanism and its reactionary countering by Mohammanism, both theocracies in tradition and practice. But the emergent threat was laissez-faire. There was concern about the effect on conduct the

transfer from Catholicism to the English Church would have. The Church of England was an occidental test for independence. The test for Western ethos carried the danger of too much anxious levity. Court jesters could get laughs from dressing pontifically, and wearing big toes (and allometricated big noses), imitating the "papal" big-toe-kiss test. This levity (Erasmus) and intolerance for Catholic authority (Luther) and the later awareness of the dangers of the High Church of England's authority were obvious and equaled fears in America -- as in individual States' ratification of the separation of church and state. (Where the US Constitution's separation clause was not replicated, it took the form of a state's codification, i.e. phrased to appease theocratically cultured voters).

<3.4> There are only excuses not reasons for undermining the humanitarian concerns of the English Low Church, within the religious/evolutionism milieu -- no adequate reason for continued intentional misunderstandings similar to the persecution done by the High Church to the Low Church. Nor is there good reason for attempting to show a basis for man's inhumanity to man by analyzing religious activity and mistaking symptoms for causes, thereby suggesting mankind cannot be changed in an eye-flinching time span. It's not enough to cease historical analysis at an arbitrary Darwinian point, as Gould seems to do. There were a series of events intense enough to be punctiliously eventful with universal conversion potential--not the least of which was the memory of the suffering caused by the inquisition. Nor is it adequate grounds for the continuation of a secular religion of exclusivity couched in scientific paleontological and biological language.

<3.5> The movement of Lower Church (Wesley during the English Reformation) toward the separation of church and state was providing equilibrium, i.e. absorbing the dangers of leisure faire and threats of civil authority, and without losing freedom of conduct and will to a metaphysic of natural determinism. Lower Church social concerns were moving against the business of slavery, and against thinking that people could be ranked by intelligence, color, and features different because somewhere on the periphery of a scale of relative averages.

<3.6> Gould is out of his specialty when competing with the subtleties of the large religious establishments' leadership. I'm disappointed that he testified at the trial, for I remember resonating with one part of Gould's view, i.e. the place of trauma in life. These -- snail-shell indicators of trauma -- are punctilious events, I thought, that could theoretically have a trickle down effect on affective states and genes -- like the negative effect alcoholic parents' alcohol poisoning and attitude can shock the fetus and result in a child without conscience within one generation. It corresponded with the fundamentalistic ideas about one part of the biblical ethos: Suffering. It was essential too for comprehending the ground of Karl Jaspers' philosophical logic -- the approach to and preparation for is mentioned below and includes the ultimate situation of suffering.

<3.7> Recent events point toward the need for comprehending in a systematic way the limitations of subjectivism to place objectivism in its proper place. What happened was Gould's testimony in the Arkansas trial, the second "papal" evolutionism decree, the Judge's opinions, and followed by a Calvinistic senior TV evangelist -- easily taken for a descendent of Wilberforce's evangelical attitude -- aligning himself with the papal position on "evolution." These events have created an urgent constitutional and civil liberty matter. Why?

<3.8> In the Arkansas trial, the Judge ruled for the plaintiffs, he said, in part because there seemed to have been a designed effort throughout the legislative process to teach religion in the classroom. The decision was partially based on the history of the evangelical movement the way the Judge comprehended it, as merely a supposed reaction to evolutionary theory based on misunderstanding about the psychological -- he used the word "moral" -- effect of evolutionary theory. Early evangelical dynamics had little religious doctrine, and concerns have been primarily humanitarian following a spirit not only shown in Western literature but Eastern as well. The TV Evangelist is not a spokesman for the spirit of the evangelicals, and his academic authority amounts to frequent affirmations of a psychology course at Hope College, honorary degrees, and the impressive religious factory. He speaks only for one division of the Dutch Reformed movement, a relatively small but organized sect, but...the TV evangelist's influence is worldwide. What he says has the potentate-potential for the establishment of religion and the reinforcement of some theory in science.

<3.9> The "Papacy" speaks for the Roman Catholic Church. That Church is an established Church and is in an all's-fair struggle for momentum amidst sexual scandals. It has inherently refined subtleties essential for putting a spin on anything and has done so throughout history. It is doing that with evolutionism. Catholicism is unfortunately identified with Christianity, and when it canonizes "evolution" the world takes negative or positive note. This is what Gould is caught up in. Where he might be right, wrong is established because Catholicity is enhanced. Unwittingly perhaps he has punctuated religion in a collaborative/collusive overlapping of magisteries, and whatever might be right about "evolution" is converted to participating in wrong -- thus, evolutionism.

<3.10> This collaboration-confirmation is an incitement to violating the Separation Clause. Now evolutionism infringes on individual rights, for, when "evolution" is taught in schools the education industry is involved in the establishment of religion. And, it is a worthy hypothesis that evolutionism in turn now can be affirmed to be a religion in this collaboration, both in a secondary sense and primary sense. It is a religion because of the degree that it participates on the mythical edges of scientific knowledge. Religions can be enhanced by being drawn in from the peripheries of myth. But this has nothing to do with the biblical ethos Overton overlooked. He came across as a castigator of the Bible and the spirit of the evangelical early phase.

<3.11> It is a worthy hypothesis that undefiled traditional religion separated from state is scientific in such matters of public health, social work, and that it contributes essentially to democracy and the republic. The worthwhileness extends to and beyond the cosmogeny of humankind, and above teleological scenarios as well. The ethos includes sensitivity toward the psychology of worldviews. The Western traditional prevailing view of man is that there's a source beyond the area of the natural sciences though no less scientific than hypotheses of the natural sciences. This Western tradition has eastern religious influences as well, and some comes from the alleged "atheism" of the East. It's alleged because more a reaction to nationalisms' exclusive claim on God. It's less atheism than a recognition that the myth area can be and has been exploited by militant theocracies.

<3.12> Monkey Business

That mankind has ground outside terra firma is testable and subject to falsification. It is no more theoretical than the gradual change or punctuated theses in "evolution." It's the alternative to the immanentalism of Gould who is reported (Newsweek) to have said that some evolving connections might be shown if chimpanzees and humans hybridize -- except, he said, that potential source of research is ethically unacceptable. Here is the recurring evolutionism-freudian slip. This Gould-sentiment expresses the religious, philosophical, and metaphysical mission of the "evolution" theme presented in the compulsory public school system.

<3.13>

What is subject to falsification is the proposition that no less life potential exists in other universes. Technology has permitted research (Search for Extra Terrestrial Intelligence) beyond normal natural sciences' customary bonds and that means a supremely personalistic communicative ground can be researched and affirmative propositions subjected to falsification. To eliminate this area from science education is unscientific. Support for its elimination is paramount to establishing a deistic religious institution -- the assumed authority God left on earth to replace the spiritual source of the Golden Rule. That institution then can and does canonize persons and theories so long as they cooperate in genuflecting. Evolutionism, now, in the American education industry establishes religion both in the degree of participation in myth, and now by Catholicity and TV evangelists' friends of Catholicism and evolutionism, and by way of the radical theoretical paleontologist Chardin, the "father" of the church of evolution who created the sacerdotal connection. Here's a master spin. It's spun from meaning by association: The Chardin's church of evolutionism is reinforced by N.M. Wildiers, Dr in Theology, in the Foreword to Heart of Matter, when he says "...Whitehead, who worked with Russell and became Professor of Philosophy at Harvard ... intended to read [Chardin's] Science and the Modern World."

<4> General Introduction: A systematic deconstruction of concept-derivation, an initiation essential to system construction, a possible philosophical logic opened to illumination.

<4.1> The following systematic concept shattering is largely lifted from a work I did nearly four decades ago as a requirement for a post graduate degree. An attempt has been made to minimize by paraphrasing. While working on the dissertation I was also functioning as a clinician in The Northwest Alcoholism Clinic in Gary, Indiana. There we were realizing the value of lifting the level of the phenomenon known as hitting bottom for the diseased, i.e. piercing, with the patient, the rational barriers to recovery, the rationalizations, the defensive mechanisms. Skid row was fast-forwarded by intervening in the process somewhere along the way such as the home, employment, and community etc. The following is a systematic hitting bottom, a short cut to the effects of the inadequacies of ideas and thoughts about inspiration by direct revelation either through established religion or naturalism.

<4.2.> We are looking at ultimate situations -- the general limitations of thinking, particular ultimate situations, and making universal application -- from five affirmative propositional perspectives, which are never static or undistributed. Ultimate situations cannot exist as only objects of thought, cannot be avoided, have duality, and Existenz can awaken -- illuminating -- and can be accepted as existentially essential. Demonstrating the limits of science is not popular, and it would be impossible to obtain a grant from the National Science Foundation unless an "evolution" theme, an immanent gospel, could be shown. KJ is recognized for his contributions in showing the limits of science. Judge Overton supported opinions by stating that a Foundation had funded programs wherein the "major theme was evolution." It's doubtful funds would have been granted if falsification of "evolution" pervaded the request. In other words the Judge understood "theme of evolution" as commonly understood, as an affirmation of a maxim not a hypothesis to be falsified. (SETI receives funding too from Foundations.) Such commitment to the mission theme of evolutionism represents historical determinateness. (I'm not happy with the style of the following, but hope for feedback.)

ONE OF FIVE: The limits of historical determinateness: Particular and universal falsification of the necessity of seeking the ultimate situation.

ONE 1: The ultimate situation of the historical determinateness of Existenz, or seeing general limits -- One's potential is not to be limited to the idea (rigid or processive, negative or positive) that proceeds from potentiality. The idea can be too rigid to reveal the area of freedom, and an idea can place a restraint on

one's resistance to the situation that calls for unlimited power from one's depth. The idea and its immediate ground must be seen for what it is, i.e., the idea is less than that which made it possible. If one seeks the absolute in an idea, without seeing the limitations, endless major and minor shipwrecks are unavoidable. Seeking for the absolute in the idea may result in another alternative to a genuine quest, i.e., one can give in too quickly to the ultimate situation of existence, to despair, or one can too easily avoid the ultimate situation and escape by a conjured-up convenient idea. When rigid thought and reasoning processes exhaust, the ground for resistance might be revealed.

ONE 2: Particular ultimate situations -- First, it would be historically and existentially fatal to seek being in death; i.e. one must not seek death for death's sake (one does not seek uncertainty, but dares to venture into it). Jaspers' view here parallels the futility of seeking being in exhaustion rather than in the source of all strength. Secondly, one must avoid seeking the ultimate situation of suffering, for if sought it would soon lead to an extreme type of asceticism that would consequently involve others. Thirdly, if one craves struggling, conflict for conflicts sake is the easy result, and Existenz is limited in its exercise value due to an attitude that allows no resistance to conflict. Fourthly, guilt thoughts and feelings point toward a quest for guilt rather than the entertainment of that which could remove our limitations.

ONE 3: The universality of the ultimate situation -- The effects of these particulars when universalized leads to nihilistic thinking. The universal rationalization that proceeds on the basis of the particulars could lead one to avoid doing all that is possible to prevent impending inevitables. The ultimate situation is inevitable if we seek to fill an absolute emptiness by these inescapable situations of existence. If one is committed to seeking the ultimate in idea or ideas, the permeation of this attitude in ideas about death is unavoidable. To seek death means to suffer, to seek suffering means to engage in conflict and to seek conflict means to participate in self-guilt and seeking other's guilt. To seek the ultimate situation universally leads to extremism in all the particulars as well.

TWO OF FIVE: The limits of historical determinateness: particular and universal falsification of the view that being can be had as an object of thought.

TWO 1: Ultimate situations are unavoidable and no first cause can be visualized without them. The greatest idea is insufficient to be the object of faith and absolute trust. Latzel has lifted from Jaspers' work on the ultimate situation another fundamental idea and given it this form: "The unavoidability of the ultimate situation." (Schilpp, p 197) Jaspers appears inclined always toward distinction rather than identity when it comes to a question of man and God relationships. There are no existential propositions that are without

contradictions. Only fictitious propositions are without contradictions (this is not a value judgement about the emotive value of fictitious utterances). Though dedicated to avoiding the ultimate situation, to it we are confined and restrained. Every idea used to resist the restraining nature of reality (actual experience) is dependent on something else to some degree, and thus we are not totally free in a rational sense to possess being nor become free in Existenz. Natural forces and the will of others limit all thought. The necessary (law) and contingent (will of others) binds our thought, and consequently ideas cannot stand outside the area of relativity and claim identity with Being.

TWO 2: All experience the end of existence. This experience can be voluntary or involuntary. First, involuntary in death and voluntary in forgetting that we merely stand out (exist) of being. Secondly, as experience, suffering (as external or internal phenomena) is meaningless and stifling, but at the same time such an idea cannot be formed without suffering and the involved feeling about it. The point here is that one must not limit the meaning of suffering to an idea of suffering, nor can we limit our thinking abstractly to a realm outside the suffering area. Thirdly, regardless of the mental form used to possess and control it, conflict is unavoidable. Any intentional idea that totally separates us from conflict is an idea held as a culminated object of thought, and as such, the deeper conflicts resulting from avoiding situations (actual or possible) are unavoidable. Fourthly, an ultimate situation is also seen in our ideas about guilt, for, one cannot escape feelings of guilt within ourselves nor the guilt others should feel but don't or can't. Regardless of the suppressing force of rationalization, guilt feelings exist.

TWO 3: Though one may avoid the trauma of ultimate situations with intense rational energy, it is unavoidable. Whatever universal or whole inferred from the many -- and penetrating the apparent particular image (ideas) has been avoided -- is neither historically determined, nor particularly and universally based.

THREE OF FIVE: The objective and subjective limits of historical determinateness: Particular and universal falsification of the view that there is no duality to the ultimate situation.

THREE 1: At this point in the movement toward Existenz Latzel mentions a fundamental pervasive idea in the ultimate situation: "Every ultimate situation has a dual aspect: negative character with respect to my existence, and a potentially positive character for me as potential Existenz." (LLP 197) But this too falls into situations impenetrable by reason or emotion in definite form. A) The dual aspect of the ultimate situation of the historical determinateness of Existenz becomes evident now. Forced with a rationally insurmountable wall (situation) in our search for ultimate being, we (strongly suspecting our ideas) may hesitate to make a decision. We find ourselves encompassed by the incomprehensible and imperceptible (and all rational attempts are suspect). B) Further thinking reveals

a dual nature which Jaspers refers to as feeling oneself a plaything of contingencies (no idea is to be thought of as self-caused), and at one with chance (every idea is a matter of some degree of indeterminacy). The dual nature, from the standpoint of idea, takes on an indeterminate character; i.e., chance and contingencies are two sides of uncertainty (knowledge). It does not matter what attitude chosen at this point. When rationalized, it must be contradicted and is therefore a matter of uncertainty. Either (or all) alternatives in a knowledge situation give way to falsification and leave our rational approach in another situation of uncertainty. Either (dual approach) cannot honestly be made a matter of identity. A monism cannot grow out of a dualistic or pluralistic functionalism, not and still remain in the rational area.

THREE.2: Particular ultimate situations lose a singular (corporeal slanted meaning here) nature as well. When faced with death, there might be the tendency neither to desire it, nor fear it, and the phenomenon of death is considered representing a dual beyond, which is a question (i.e., there is somethingness or nothingness, contentment (content) or discontentment (void). We suspend between these two possible objectifications of death. The ultimate situation of death divides into at least two psychological schools of thought. One philosophy of psychology leans toward avoiding death. The other philosophy of psychology is that while conscious of death one leans toward life. There's either an urge to avoid, or a vital elan, avoiding death as the primary motivating situation, or death motivates a quest for life at the risk of death.

THREE 3: In suffering, factual being becomes more or less than what usually is determined to be in times of ease, and while foundering in disease, an enlightened attitude can be the result.

THREE 4: One's struggle can point toward the potential appearance of the Transcendent, and can bring about the realization that danger and foundering are necessary parts of this struggle.

THREE 5: It becomes clear that guilt, resulting from exploitative usufruct, presents a dual nature as well. Rationally defined, guilt is not only uncertain as to whether it is thing-in-itself, or mere appearance. The dual nature of guilt may suspend us and restrain us from feeling obligated to make contributions by the idea that pure volition is not clearly expressible, and because a more luminous reality is awaited.

THREE 6: Universal ultimate situations are simply seen as constituting nothing more than the particular ultimate situations though communicable. Thus, we have only a vivid universal question, the either-or questions, or the self-destruction of self-sufficient ideas as absolute truth.

FOUR OF FIVE: The illuminating awareness of the limits of historical determinateness: Particular and universal falsification of the awakening of

Existenz in the ultimate situation.

FOUR 1: The first of the two remaining fundamental ideas permeating Jaspers' concept of the ultimate situation involves the awakening of Existenz in the ultimate situation, according to Latzel. We are referring to a potential that arises out of the suspension that results from the inadequacies of ideas (and hence personality inadequacies) which cannot appear otherwise to us, those ideas entertained that could easily be otherwise. Whether faced with the necessity of making a decision, or whether one must make a decision in the relative either-or area of existence, both possible directions tend to verify an intermediate area where potentiality may be awakened. One can be in position to realize authentic existence if one suspends between irresponsible withdrawal and the dysfunctional confusion that results from a total commitment to the apparent complexity of existence. For Existenz to awaken, one does, in a way, withdraw from the world of images and things, even as regarding a view of self. One goes beyond contradiction by positing the ego as self-identical and constant, but not in an objectified image. One simply feels the self as participating in a power to which he/she is subject and as such, objectivity-subjectivity is the thought-about ultimate situational ground of authentic self-hood.

FOUR 2: Particular ultimate situations also serve here to awaken potential Existenz. If we are satisfied (fully content) with our lives, and have an eternal security idea regarding death, then death is no longer the unknown, and cannot become a hypothesis. As an ultimate situation, death either sends into a potential or meaningless orbit (it does something to us, or, we're not potential Existenzen). But the ultimate particular situation of death is not the source of potential Existenz.

FOUR 3: The direction (transcendence or immanence) of the level being sought is not necessarily to be determined by the view one may have of suffering. Suffering indicates a need, and at that, very indefinite. We thus find ourselves suspended between the ambivalent nature of suffering, and in a position where we either invent an attitude of extreme anxiety regarding discomfort, or learn to be happy in spite of it. Conflict or struggling helps to create and stifle creativity, but the ground of genuine creativity is beyond the struggling world, and within the area of freedom.

FOUR 4: Guilt isn't avoided honestly when actions are seen as both contingent and independent. The feeling is demonstrated by one's willingness to accept responsibility. Responsibility is the objectification of an awakened Existenz, but not the source of illumination.

FOUR 5: Particular ultimate situations constitute a barricade of restraint to one's level of transcendence. In an attempt to shatter this apparent infinite complexity, potential Existenz becomes demonstrable, that is, universally communicable in some manifestation observable and most influential when punctuated by

trauma's ultimate situations. It appears that each new occupation involves more and more indeterminate reason (we cannot afford to think reason is not always working, for in this way there will be fear and caution regarding ultimate motives) and the abandonment of positive and negative assertions becomes more intensified. The area of the possible illumination of Existenz is nearby. Reason is pushing to the ultimate. (Here we're getting close to the distinction between KJ duality of reason, i.e. verstehen and moving toward vernunft. The meaning includes wholesome experience essential to an encompassing empathy, and enlightened originality -- to say the least. Psychotherapists and pastoral counselors understand the opened ends of reason, the reasoning that transfers an attitude of encompassing ultimate situations rather than being encompassed by them.)

FIVE OF FIVE: The limits of historical determinateness: Particular and universal falsification of the view that the ultimate situation cannot be considered as necessary to Existenz.

FIVE 1: Latzel gives this form to the last fundamental permeating ideas in Jasper's concept of the ultimate situation: "I can illuminate for myself the 'existential' necessity of the ultimate situation." (197) There would be no way of differentiating between the potential and the actual if it were not for the limiting nature of the actual. In other words, only when one objectifies the ultimate feeling of subjectivity (are we subject to restraints or to freedom?) can one know that the self exists. Harmony cannot be known (the feeling of authentic subjectivity, e.g., the spiritually intense harmonious relationship possible between one "I-thou" and another "I-thou") without knowing some disharmony.

FIVE 2: Particular ultimate situations show the existential necessity of the ultimate situations (and the ultimate situation of determining them as necessary). Without death (of one relationship) or the passing away (to nowhere) of appearance, there would be no area (now-here, concentration point) in which to evaluate pointlessness--no more limiting area for meaningful or meaningless self-identity.

FIVE 3: Pure happiness as the lack of suffering would necessitate a dormant Existenz.

FIVE 4: Without struggling, there would be nothing from which to withdraw in an existential movement.

FIVE 5: When it's discovered that guilt is the feeling we have as a result of not being able to do existential justice to everyone, then we can see the necessity of the guilt situation. We have creative guilt if the particular ultimate situations are not overlooked, i.e. to seriously think and feel one can live without this guilt would be more disastrous than living with the guilt.

FIVE 6: Universally speaking, it is necessary to live in a world of restraint with others as a condition of our transcendence. Enduring absolute truth as objectively present and known would be the alternative (the Transcendent would be as dead as would be the goal of our quests). The immanent would replace what would appear to be the healthier transcendental, and "Existenz would cease to be, and with it that being in existence, to which Transcendence can become palpable." (LLP 402) The existential necessity of the ultimate situation systematically portrayed by Jaspers is meant to be impossible to grasp as an objective knowable process. Interpretation requires the highest individual potential and willingness to risk. If this is not realized at this point in the process, it is probable that an attempt will be made to systematize Jaspers' ideas into an arbitrary limited form and content or project a totally nebulous or concrete radical rationalistic system. The depth of the Existenz movement seems to be reached when we reject the identity of self with Transcendence. But in the rejection there is radical nearness while simultaneously the absolutely remote is revealed.

SIX: Conclusion

SIX 1: We have penetrated ultimate situations, the finite to the infinite, (fulfilled the metaphysical quest and reached the area of philosophical logic) to Existenz which, as Jean Wahl, speaking of Jaspers, says: "... exists only by its separation from Being, and its union with Being." (Jaspers, *The Perennial Scope of Philosophy*, p. 25)

SIX 2: That nothing (no-thing) is true nowhere (now-here) seems to be the conclusion. But for the Existenz process this realization does not mean nothingness (for we cannot escape the necessity and the hazards of ontological thinking). We simply have learned neither to justify nor condemn totally on the basis of appearance. Existents put absolute trust in nothing (no thing), and in that trust they discover the mysterious ground of now-here presence; they are those who stand out of the crises of existence and become the determining agents of tomorrow. They posit feelings and ideas that come from within, and posit because of the will that the world should be as it ought to be. They expect the negating of these positive ideas and acts by those who would maintain the status quo, or those who negate ought by ought-not.

SIX 3: We are standing with our face toward a primary nothingness (imageless God) -- the presence that does not exist (doesn't stand out of being) but lives, does not touch but feels, does not plan but acts. We who had relied most on the rational have eliminated it as the object of our greatest faith (by such, Jaspers escapes subjectivism and objectivism, i.e., radical self-reliance). We face "...what remains after everything else collapses," and it is "only in the austere situation ... [that humankind is] free to hear God when God Speaks, only then does he remain ready, even if God should not speak" (*The Perennial Scope*...132).

SIX 4: Although Jaspers' works amount to a mental health exercise he warns: "he who takes this way in philosophizing risks losing his balance in the world...[where there's nothing serious anymore and where men] lose themselves in eccentricity. In the world they become buffoons or maniacs or criminals -- all in the belief of having reached ultimate truth." (249, Philosophical Faith and Revelation)

SIX 5: Conclusion and another beginning

We have only reached beyond the protective shells of thought. What remains is further depth-insight by penetrating aestheticism to avoid emotionalism, romanticism. The ground upon which the authentic individual stands is holy but one is caught resisting the presence of the Being missed while searching. That is the next subject, or what might be used in responses to comments.

Biographical note: Undergraduate Degree in Sacred Literature; Masters in Philosophy, clinician in an alcoholism clinic, State of Indiana; and retired from State of Indiana Department of Public Welfare.