

THE “KARL JASPERS FORUM” UPDATE 13 (3-8-2006)
AN EXISTENZ FOURTH-ESTATE EXCLUSIVE

Notation: Herbert’s postings, assigned the date of March 4th, include one from Peter Beamish, and another from Rodrigo Barros Gewehr. There are no references to Jaspers. This week Herbert offers a questionnaire device.

FOR QUICK REFERENCE:

- 1. Mr. Beamish and Mr. Bone’s postings innocently distract from Jaspers.**
- 2. Rodrigo Barros Gewehr zero’s in but makes a common error.**
- 3. Herbert’s new screening “Test Act”—a call for contributors, and anonymity protectionism--recall of D. K. Johnson and Glasersfeld**
- 3.7. Petkov/Muller dynamic**
- 4. Possible motivations for the “questionnaire”.**
- 5. Probable Goal: Exclusive “Karl Jaspers Forum” gated bloc?**

1. Peter Beamish —If I recall correctly Peter has an interest in “time” and “communication” and relates his concepts to empirical experimentation and classifies the results accordingly. His easily accessible Website reveals this interest and respect for natural science (search engines find it easily by typing in his name). He does not mention Karl Jaspers, though it seems he could relate significantly to Jaspers’ periechontology. Jaspers’ systematic philosophical logic is not only based on the empirical work (medical, clinical, humanity) and clarified by it, but includes the basis that goes beyond and can possibly be illuminated by openness to revelation and inspiration. Revelation and inspiration is historically and graphically oriented and such communication is empirical enough to not be a radical departure from the restraining reality of inherited values. But what is unfortunately outstanding is that Peter’s Comment this week contributes to further talk without acknowledging such a precursor’s contribution to what has been in the wind during the last century. When we talk about communicative stuff “in the wind” and because it is less empirical in one sense and more in another sense, there’s a tendency to revert to name-dropping to demonstrate reason’s cantilevering overreach. The name of Kant and his noumenal expressions are reverted to--though one can find no less thinking in general in Plato and earlier writings. Below amounts to a guess as to why this overreach occurs:

1.2. The frame of reference is that Peter is commenting to Hugh Bone’s expressions about Kant’s “noumenon”. Hugh had posed a question to the physicist from Glasgow University, Peter J. Bussey, as did the latter to the former. The issue is the real world as opposed to the appearance world, and though the use of “Kant” and “noumenon” has an academic ring to it, the demonstration of one’s acumen for grasping the limits of reason

does not dissolve those limits. Though the world of mystery is relevant to communication the demonstration of one Kantian level of thinking does not bridge gaps between the clear-and-distinct and the manifold complex. What it does do is radically distract from the one scientist who has the qualifications for critiquing Kant etc. and shedding meaningful light on the world of appearance and the encompassing worlds. After all, Jaspers' textbook-demonstrated-evaluations of the aberrant psychopathological world are unsurpassed. The evaluations included Kant, Kierkegaard, Nietzsche, Husserl, Heidegger, Jung, Freud, and a half dozen Müllers—to name a few from a double column eight page “Name Index” preceding a “General Index”.

1.3. The distractions keep the communiqués going without any reference to Karl Jaspers. Peter Beamish shows his categories for handling phenomena and epiphenomena are original structures. Imprinting individuality unto knowledge can be something as original as a fingerprint. The originality is not rare. They are relatively original in so far as they relate to what is born aloft in the modernity, post modernity, and modern winds--and concomitant experimentation with whale-communications is about as original as one can get in a distinctive sense.

1.4. Both personages are individually complex and their techniques of handling the manifold complex meaningfully illuminating to each. But their relating on Herbert's Website is restricted, like to Kant, or a physicist associated with a University, but no effort to relate to Karl Jaspers whose credentials need no mention. The possible common-thread explanation for this cooperative continuum of avoidance is the radical constructivist proneness to protect one's structures and to argue for a paradigmatic sort of originality, a distinctive ontological leap that creates such a stir, a punctilios impressionism, punctuated discombobulating, with a designed goal of affecting equilibrations in some universal sharable sense. It is being suggested here that if Herbert can avoid Jaspers while using him, then that sets a precedent and amounts to a violation of due process, i.e., due precursory recognizing. For those interested, Jaspers treats this matter of originality in thinkers such as Nicholas of Cusa (including Vico) in his *Great Philosophers*; Jaspers shows that mind structures are not the sum total of what can be known, and the dangers of mind structures when doctored by vatic authority. Originality does not mean necessarily progressive knowledge.

1.5. Further reason for adorning blinders to avoid seeing the reality of Karl Jasper is his respect for the imageless, regards for the ground involved in biblical faith, and his preference for the protestant principle. Like it or not, that is a major issue under determination. And this gets us to further discussion about Kierkegaard, and how he, now more than Jaspers, is being misused in efforts to make him more a Catholic Christian than protestant. That “or” reversion, that if he cannot be classified as a Christian Protestant than he must be a Catholic Christian (see item **3.** where Herbert makes no reference to Jaspers but entertains an erroneous association between Kierkegaard and Vico). I really don't think Mr. Beamish or Mr. Bone understands this and could probably care less. But this simply means their expertise can be used and Herbert's Website gives them occasion to publicize their views. But, back to Kierkegaard for he has been referred to much lately on Herbert's Website, and he does so again this week.

2. Rodrigo Barros Gewehr—Rodrigo asks Herbert for clarification regarding his statement that the biblical Abraham conjured God (see item 4. below). Rodrigo makes a common newcomer's error. I did the same. He begins by bowing to the image, the creed, the Muller-formulae, e.g., "MIR" (a negative proposition which means there is no reality other than what the mind structures). One should never do that with Herbert for it is like having to bow before a religious image before being welcomed into a religionist's home featuring an image of a patron saint. It can mean that if you do not kowtow to his sacred symbols you are unwelcome. Such display becomes a test of a particular faith.

2.1. Rodrigo's Comment presents the opportunity to show that Jaspers' critique of Catholicism is no less objective than toward that of Protestantism. His emphasis is on individuality not institutionality. The former can qualify the latter but the latter can disqualify the former from reaching authentic selfhood. One can get a doctorate from an Institution and lose one's individuality to the obligation it entails. A distinction must be made between the institution and the individual. Jaspers clearly leans toward the protestant spirit as a movement than the Catholic spirit. He gives reasons for this leaning in his *Philosophical Faith and Revelation* and the section on Kierkegaard and *After Kierkegaard*. But he also expresses deep appreciation for the dedication as such of some Jesuits, and the Catholic priest who first brought to Jaspers attention him that he was talking theology as well as philosophy. His debate with the least of all genuine Protestants, Bultmann, shows what Protestantism had come to as forewarned by Kierkegaard. I can say too that one of my few long-term friends had studied for the priest hood but decided to marry. We would argue daily though friends, and his devotion to his Church was expressed in "I don't respect necessarily the person of the office but the office." The office was a wholly sacred image to him through to the time of his death. We were poles apart on that issue, but the closest of friends and fellow workers for the Indiana Department of Public Welfare.

2.2. Another example of this distinction can be found in Jaspers expression of appreciation for Maria Salditt who "stood her ground in the spiritual chaos of Germany's present...passing on to youth the glories of tradition...[i.e.] philosophical transformation of her heritage of pious Catholic faith...her...contact with the contents of Catholic depth" (*Philosophical Autobiography*). But this is a person-to-person appreciation and one that does not relax the need for guarding against the misuse of philosophy and science by an institution's officials caught up in a vatic bureau, who convene, must produce, and give consent, resulting in vatic degrees which become confirmed knowledge because it is something structured in the name of catholicity (Vico's idea that we can only know what the mind structures is prone to catholicity, and Nicholas of Cusa's acquiescence to whatever the vatic authority authorizes—against his better judgment). Talk about "sacred" imagination and imaging can be meaningful if a diminishing of the reductionism results, and of course there is the need to give image to the imageless in terms of imitating godly conduct (Jesus). Jaspers said we can talk about God so long as we know that God cannot be reduced by such thinking and talking. Though Rodrigo may not need that reminder, newcomers to Herbert's Website should be cautious about providing the constant opportunity to avoid Jaspers while implying Herbert exhibits and reiterates

Jaspers' ideas; especially in as much as erroneous ideas have been thoroughly debunked in every normal sense.

2.3. This week Rodrigo demonstrates a proficiency in the use of the French language--to which is added an English translation. The meaningfulness of the "French" quote seems significant. In essence the quote amounts to the limits of science, but that has been a predominant feature in Jaspers' works since the second decade of the 20th century. Without this humbling awareness of limits, this learned-ignorance admission, it is dangerously true that the more we think we know the more insignificant humankind becomes, and that caveat superbly applies to the results of the negative proposition involved in Mr. Muller's formula which means there is no mind-independent reality. The mind being the only reality, nothing thinkable can be taken seriously. The learned ignorance principle does not ignore teaching and learning, but zero-derivational thinking tends to put a positive spin on considering worthy-reality worth naught. What is also clear here is that Rodrigo has available in French some of Jaspers' works, but he probably came to Herbert's Website because of the use of Derrida not because of the use of Jaspers. Many seem to have come to the Herbert's Website because of their lack of awareness regarding Jaspers works. Herbert, perhaps under advisement, might be attempting to remedy this image by attracting those who should be experts in Jaspers works, such as:

3. Herbert Muller's Autonomous Anonymity Test—Herbert, this week, is asking for contributions and guaranteeing anonymity. He is requesting that a largely multiple-choice questionnaire be completed for his use to be evaluating at the end of March. This effort clearly reveals the systemic problem with his epistemology in the actual application of his positive zero-derivational philosophical-metaphysic. The word philosophy applies only in as much as zero-derivational thinking becomes a wise but fatal fallback to the protectionism of an area of feedback on a questionnaire relative to "reality".

3.1. Herbert, still using the letterhead of McGill University in his e-mail address, has assumed a defenseless position regarding his accusation that the biblical Abraham was an atheist in the sense that he conjured "God". There is no way Herbert can answer Rodrigo's request for clarification (see item 2. above) without either appearing theistic or by becoming more deeply and radically mired in constructivism. Deism is an as-if useful bit of theology, as we will see, but the step from atheism to deism is long. His answer to Rodrigo will opine that the name "God" represents a concept, and a god-surrogate will be picked out of the blue while simultaneously avoiding using predecessors' ideas about "vitalism". He will most likely give substance to this vitalism by verbalizations about epiphenomenalism. The questionnaire "test" is designed to discombobulate traditional worthwhile open-ended interpretive normal potentially friendly transcendent flexible mechanical categories functionally spinning at a normal rate; the "test" is designed to then freeze reason's temperament into an immanent state of slowed bombardment of semantic, syntactic, and pragmatic ideas, and then by verbiage cognitively channel or funnel retarded ideas into an unrealistic state of equilibrium, upon which he will plant a claim to universal truthful applicability due to it's similarity to the linear-vector phenomena involved in quantum mechanics. But he will have a quality vitalism more in

mind than quantum mechanics. (One can imagine it is a well designed effort to then feign conversion from atheism to Henry's "Deism", and then Henry will have fulfilled the final part of the designed test—which is based on Henry's TA.) This is the sort of thing Herbert means in saying that the questionnaire test could be connected to "particle physics".

3.2. Glasersfeld emerges out of Herbert's unconscious too--As a radical epistemological idealist Herbert comprehends the no longer defensible position, and that he as an individual epistemologist has stepped out of his sphere and into reality. So he, conditioned, engages familiar tools, i.e., his formulae to save a precipice-hanging self-image. When he engages "zero-derivation", another's image becomes conscious (though there in reserve all the while), a partner in zero-arms so to speak. He immediately thinks of Mr. Glasersfeld. He speaks like one who could be made to say there is no reality independent of minds but he is not in position to rescue the cliffhanger. He unfortunately used the words "radical" and "constructivism" and used high case R and C, which had and has a fixation denotation regardless of the amount of elucidating. And Glasersfeld will probably allow it and maybe even make a show to at rescuing Herbert...if Herbert refers to his Target Article 17. That is why one will find in item (G) Glasersfeld's Target Article 17 is referred to in Herbert's "Check Your Reality"—a contrived test for continued participation in his Website forum. The reference to Glasersfeld serves also to allow a fair hearing to Glasersfeld's position, and his Responses defenses. It offers further opportunity for correctly the damage done by D. K. Johnson.

3.3. A Radical Constructivism's (Glasersfeld's) outspoken adversary is David Kenneth Johnson. He is the author of TA 75 that revealed the fault-lines in Radical Constructivism. Recalling Johnson to the "Forum" through mentioning him in (E) of the questionnaire amounts to bait to get Glasersfeld and Johnson intertwined to continue the entertaining upheaval distracting from Jaspers. It should be mentioned here that Mr. Johnson has never mentioned Jaspers and has little appreciation for the parochial issues imperative to wholesome comprehension. But he has the critiquing potential for such comprehension.

3.4. Johnson's TA was a publication done several years earlier but in a context remote from Jaspers as a specific frame of reference. But he apparently gave permission for the posting though not slanted toward Jaspers. His candor...was...a refreshing stylistic bit of honesty compared to the brotherly kindness exhibited by academics having special interests in common. Glasersfeld and Johnson have associations either with a reputable academic institution or interests in book sales and could use favorable publicity. That's their inhibiting reality. Perhaps Herbert thinks the anonymity will serve to lubricate the slip into a guarded "Karl Jaspers Forum" section of the newly formed Constructivist Foundation community. That would require an application of some unusual hermeneutics to detect the authors' identities. But that would be a community in which I would not in principle enter unless freedoms were guarded and third-estate commoners and fourth-estate Jaspers-Journalists were objectively welcomed and not...subjectively exploited. Neither would Jaspers enter, if he followed the advise of his wife, but being embossed on a masthead's banner, he is being dragged along like a security blanket into the

Constructivist Foundation and now possibly into a “Karl-Jaspers-Forum” locality at the end of a cul-de-sac (where the flagpole awaits).

3.5. Richard Conn Henry’s Target Article 84 is used as the most recent basis for the “test”. Herbert would like to recapture Mr. Henry’s contributions if for no other reason than to show Richard did not leave due to being set-up for exploitation. Also Herbert needed Richard to absorb and share the risk of Herbert’s manifest atheism; Richard’s Deism could compromise, at a distance, theistic faith to a point where it could be useful as a theo-metaphysical tool to complement Herbert’s ontologism, i.e., his epistemological mentalism, his atheistic immanentalism.

3.6. The Chris Hooley’s reference is puzzling (item A, TA 8), except that he was once a member of, and ordained by, a “non-denominational order”. I have lost clear track of Mr. Hooley but perhaps Herbert has not. Interesting...

3.7. Vesselin Petkov, associated with Concordia University, is given recognition in item (D), and Baggett in (B). Petkov allowed himself to be set-up on Herbert’s Forum, and partly perhaps because of University ties and the reputation of Karl Jaspers. Herbert probably feels a little guilt over this now, in so far as a Constructivism encourages guilt, i.e., always short of admitting errors due to “the vatic syndrome”. Petkov had a personal visit with Herbert the substance of which Herbert posted, followed by some correspondence with Petkov. It seemed to have backfired. It shows the risks involved when institutionalism is a factor. Petkov, regretting having allowed his paper to be posted, made a departure similar to that of Richard Henry’s kind departure. Henry’s deism concept is comparable to Petkov’s fourth dimensionality detection; both showed some original way of handling and talking about the constellation of manifold existence encompassed by Being—when thought about. His handling approached the periechontology of Jaspers’ but Jaspers understood it as nothing newly discovered but technically describable. Petkov’s realism leads easily to a philosophy of predetermination and therefore ontologism. Henry’s deism has more personalistic character and leaves more room for the freedom of the will, but the will posits God somewhere in time and space and smacks of theistic conjuring—an extrapolated epiphenomenon. Petkov’s major premises were dangerous when applied to natural sciences and origins, something Petkov sensed but responsibly fell short of, compared to Jaspers. Petkov was on the right track in realism but as regards the constellations of the mind Jaspers was more responsible. Both Henry and Petkov approach the constellation of introspection through realism, but Herbert has yet to step foot seriously into reality. Herbert’s responses had superficial value and the idealism was enhanced by verbalizations and entered areas only Jaspers was experienced enough to responsibly handle. Anyway, Petkov retreated, but the deceased Jaspers is nailed to the masthead and cannot depart.

4. Possible motivations for the anonymous aspect of the test—There may be some members of a Karl Jaspers Society, or those in some manner affiliated with religious or secular institutions who might contribute to Herbert’s Website if anonymity is effective. That is true of some having interests in book sales but do not wanting to be identified due to published questionable interpretations of Jaspers works. It might include some who

have subjective interests or personal or social agendas best preferably concealed by a claim to such a high level of scholarly objectivity that authorships' biographical information might be objectionable and then distract from argumentation that is so self evident that major premises are unquestionable. Objectivity in that sense would be another word for an absolute scientific and discipline argument removed from personages and out of reach and out of touch with humanity. If anonymity is secured, or if it is impossible to verify contributions, it can be claimed that the weight of comments or those multiple choice questionnaire results justify the continued misuse of Jaspers name or that a majority agree upon a private or special interpretation of Jaspers.

4.1. What is certain is that the anonymity part of Herbert's "test" opens up a window to unverifiable sources and involves a systemic weakness. The public would have no honest intellectual judicial access to bring the weakness to the justice seat of human reason. There is undeniable data justifying the view that there are also some contributors Herbert might want to keep screened-out. He has that non-legal civil right. But *there is no moral or categorical right to force the deceased Jaspers to contribute against the will and testament expressed in his whole works.* Further desecrating of that will could result from this "test" which requires an e-mail address as a condition for submitting the completed questionnaire and comments, and then guaranteeing anonymity. It's a formula for easy plagiaristic constructivism excused by picking something out of the wind of prevailing evolutionism.

4.2. Precursor precedent for anonymity or pseudonym use might be the reason Kierkegaard is being referred to lately, for he utilized that tactic initially. It is a tactic used when one has a message to proclaim but the named and unnamed powers are too dangerous to opening oppose. But in Kierkegaard's case he one lone individual not a society of guarding Kierkegaardians.

5. Probable Goal: Exclusive Gated "Karl Jaspers Forum"? —Herbert's apparent screening-questionnaire could be the first stage of his "Karl Jaspers Forum" disappearing underground at the end of the cul-de-sac (mentioned in item **3.4.**) and screening would be instrumental to that bloc. Herbert's privy to contributors' identities surmounts the anonymity. To submit a completed questionnaire or "survey" one must be a "confirmed" submitter. One must enter an email address and in return an email will be returned apparently to confirm that the author is not being impersonated. This sounds innocent enough to avoid stealing another's identity. But it can also be used to screen certain and most authentic contributors. That is probably the way it will go, that is, only those with approved group-status association will be accepted, i.e., one must have a honorable or earned doctorate confirmed by a group that an author is who the author is (Dr. of AIWAI). My learned-ignorant guess is that Herbert would prefer going underground rather than admit he has misinterpreted who Karl Jaspers is. Admittedly, I'm probably giving a non-realist and zero-derivationist too much credit for shrewdness. My interest is to plead the case of Karl Jaspers not to have a go at Herbert's defenses.