

“KARL JASPERS FORUM” UPDATE 37.5—ABOUT A PROFANE BOUT BETWEEN OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY’S PAUL ROBERTS AND MCGILL’S HERBERT MULLER REGARDING RELIGIOUSLY HAVING THE LAST (NON-AND IRRELIGIOUS) WORD

A review of some final assigned dates on Herbert’s “K J Forum” reveals that on January 2, 2010—within days of his demise—the final December 28 2009 R26 (to C69...) was posted. His passing was reported “January 2010”. Herbert FJ Müller’s passing-like gesture was captioned by the words “THE WAY FROM HERE”—*but only after a brief penultimate confrontation with a monkey-wrenching infiltrator*. In effect Herbert was responding to the...metaphysician...Paul Roberts’ insistence that every “Karl Jaspers Forum” donor make the same zoo-noise he makes (Paul being a “zoologist” of sorts).

The first item that stands out is that Herbert’s last posting asks a question already answered by his forum’s namesake, Karl Jaspers. Secondly, whereas *Jaspers had already addressed and answered the ethical question in historical moral terms*, Herbert missed the opportunity to direct the question to one of the greater violators of humankind’s better epistemic processors, i.e., the better reason that encompasses the ontologism of intolerance such as that clearly manifested in the contributions by Paul Roberts, specifically his specialized sort of haranguing (never once referring to the primary works of Karl Jaspers). Rather Herbert asks Harwood Fisher, not Paul Roberts, to design an ethical program for the UN < <http://www.kjf.ca/106-R26FIS.htm> >. Harwood Fisher’s postings were exercises within the infinity of the finite that constituted no ontological-threat to humankind—though Harwood failed to approach the “Karl Jaspers Forum” by way of some direct reference to Jaspers’ works.

Jaspers answered the moral-ethical question in *The Future of Mankind*, and he did it without taking the teeth out of dove-like peacemakers, that is, by not recommending the removal of the threat of war entirely by a shallow millenarianism (like the loose love recommendations of Einstein, Max Born, Oppenheimer... see *The Future of Mankind*, Chapter: New Way of Thinking). Jaspers did it standing on soil best suited for holding out for the realism that involves the conversion of each individual, a change within the individual that comes about but not dependent on the imposition of a universal ideology propagated by a south-of-the-Alps religious State and its state religious institution of holy orders.

Herbert neglected the specific chance to remind Paul that what his ontology proposed was in harsh contrast to what Jaspers’ proposed, an application of an old method of humankind’s new way of thinking, an individualized non-hubristic method. Paul’s method is, hubristically, worded thusly:

The primary purpose of all animal or plant bodies...is to survive long enough to propagate...that particular body’s share of the gene pool, the DNA molecules that made it and make other bodies in order to help a variety of germ lines persist in the flux of time <http://www.kjf.ca/110-C23ROB.htm>.

That aggressive substrate, that attitude, the intolerance in this ontologism is frequently manifested in Paul's postings. If someone uses his "e" word (evolution) with less radical commitment than Paul prefers; he cannot constrain the urge of his ontological bent and he lets loose a specialized-atheistic-formula smattering that effectively morphs into profane expressions that makes street sacrilege in the secular city—like "God damning"—seem innocent.

Herbert failed to ask that question of Paul, i.e. his secular religiously used "e-ontologism", but rather worded his most recent responses to Paul with the usual caution that avoided any clear disagreement with "doctor" Paul and with such succinctness that little distinction can be but suspected. Herbert avoids any clear distinction by the use of the word "exactly", meaning that Paul is doing unintentionally exactly what Herbert requires.

Characteristically to "constructivism" Herbert does not (did not) want to share the priority-thunder with Paul (nor did he with Jaspers). Herbert does *not* say Paul *unconvincingly* defends his metaphysic, but refers to it as a "reality-design" that must "include the subject" *but does not do so emphatically to be in compliance with Herbert's formula*; Herbert's view being that Paul's metaphysic comes across as-if excluding the subject, which Herbert says is "common-nonsense". It is Herbert's way of saying that *his* atheism is more of a primary faith and that Paul's atheism is more secondary or at least once removed...though hubristically unrecognized by Paul.

Herbert's penultimate posting to Paul is Herbert's timid way (<http://www.kjf.ca/106-R23MUL.htm>) of talking carefully with a hard-core user of Oxford-haloed language that's been established since the Wilberforce-Huxley debate and reinforced through a "Vatican's" holy-order sanction (while ignoring the historical tension in the separation of the English and Roman Church). Herbert did what he usually did when face to face with a void, with the question of ultimate origins and destinies; he did a safe "universal" institutional enchanting gesture; he did a vatic deferral as he had in the past deferred to the "Vatican"—and then signs his postings reassuring his readers that his special language, his formula (Zero Derivation 0-D) must be worthy due to an association with McGill University. Posturing similarly Paul begs for a higher-education handicapping advantage by email-placarding his association with Oregon State University.

For a history of Paul Roberts' permeation throughout the "Karl Jaspers Forum" click on UPDATE 20 <http://www.karljaspersapplied.net/updates/KJforumUD20.htm> and UPDATE 36 <http://www.karljaspersapplied.net/updates/KJforumUD36.htm>. For a history of word and concept use: <http://www.karljaspersapplied.net/JaspersDawkins.htm>. Click on <http://www.karljaspersapplied.net/ExistenzKjsnaPart6.htm> for a Logical rejoinder to the Dover Trial.

