

## THE “KARL JASPERS FORUM” UPDATE 22—Notations and prelusions to a new “Karl Jaspers Applied” Web Page pertaining to Richard Dawkins

**ANNOUNCEMENT:** I am taking time to begin work on a Web Page involving the application of Karl Jaspers (from my “Karl Jaspers Applied” perspective) to Richard Dawkins. The Page should be posted soon and will be a work in process.

### **Forum Notations:**

**1. Making sense of no references to Jaspers**--Herbert Muller’s postings dated 5-27-2006 have no references to Karl Jaspers. Whatever value in “constructivist” thinking found in the Forum contributions by Herbert and Ernst Glasersfeld can be found in Jaspers. Ernst admittedly has not and is not studying Jaspers’ works and feels no need for it—pleading Jaspers’ is too metaphysical. One has to wonder if pleading ignorance of Jaspers’ works could be a pretext for avoiding the appearance of using concepts for which Jaspers is noted. Neither intentional nor confessed ignorance meet the learned-ignorance criteria. Flaunting multi-linguistic expertise and then making no, or too few substantiating references tends toward excuses rather than reasons for the lack of knowledge. The assumption of impenetrable linguistic expertise is gnostic, and the deficient search for supporting references amounts to securing mental calm. At any rate the agnostic stance is historically unjustified. One does not do a thesis or dissertation in an academic setting without researching extant works; one should not boldly assist a request to contribute to a forum named after Karl Jaspers without studying his works.

**2. Ernst’s defenders**—It is noteworthy that whenever Ernst is confronted, such as by J. D. Johnson, several take positions defending Ernst’s concepts before he responds. To me J. D. Johnson seems capable of standing alone and he obviously prefers to do so. He certainly does not need defenders, and it’s understood that my observations are as unwelcome as the degree to which I can be confrontational in technique. He has admitted that he knows some of Jaspers, which is a reasonable claim for a teacher of philosophy. But even a little reading of the therapeutic philosopher, Jaspers, if properly comprehended, deserves some reference. Standing alone is true to form for a philosopher, and it would be better to not reference Jaspers than to do so incorrectly--as I am willing to do standing alone without sharing the risk but placing Jaspers more than less out of...harm’s way (i.e., the Forum). My stance is somewhere on one side or the other of a stupidity-or-learned-ignorance scale. Several, including Sid Barmett and Terren Suydam, have defended Ernst’s position previously and continue to do so without reference to Jaspers. One can get the impression it is not academics here as much as clamor for the most prestigious position beside...nobility.

**3. Herbert on theism, atheism, and theistic thinking relative to “species” survival**--Herbert answers J. S. Johnson’s wondering about the merit of “RC” (radical constructivism) to species survival and enhancement. JSJ’s reference is obviously other than humankind. In other words, without a mind or minds “RC” can hardly be relevant to the fundamental-ontological evolutionism. JSJ perhaps thinks the ball has been thrown

back to Herbert, but in reality, it never left the court of his thinking. Herbert knows that without thinkers there is no dialectical ideal and/or material process.

3.1. What is established here is that a game is being played without rules. It is played at and beyond the boundaries of here-and-now thinking and at epistemic-science's limit. *But in replying to JSJ Herbert unruly* uses the word "constructivism", the "ism" correctly giving it dogma status. That status is a self-generating autonomy, a concomitant value judgment based on the gratuitous determinant of progress, a presumptuous revelation. Herbert senses that the change to dogma sounds like theology. So, he knows a comparison with theistic thinking must be made in such a way that inspiration and edification might result, to affect the feeling or consciousness that a difference really exists. The differentiation Herbert makes places theistic thinking on the side of evil and "constructivism" radically opposed and on the side of good. Now the slight-of-emotion continues. The Glasersfeld/Muller collaborative process involves being capable of multilanguage, and enough English to get by, but is without excuse in using open and closed concepts interchangeably. In short, Herbert says that the ism of constructivism does not exist, but yet leaving the suffix attached. Then he removes the ism from theism and points at the "theistic", and posits it in the category close enough to politics for immediate contamination.

3.2. Herbert after the fashion of Richard Dawkins hangs the argument for atheism on emotive factors like the fight against terrorism after hanging the cause of terrorism on theistic thinking. Terrorism cannot reasonably be related to theistic belief but Herbert is incapable or unwilling to see the harmlessness but effectiveness of belief in the imageless. Jaspers has consistently said that God cannot be talked about but when talked about we have to know what we are doing to avoid isms. Protestors or nuance critics are needed (as Weedon said on Herbert's blog). Herbert's "atheism" shows his unawareness of, or aversion to, biblical theistic thinking. Theistic thinking is not on par with political powers. The latter can assume the form of atheism and become the secular authority to burn heretics determined to be such by an atheism disguised as theism (though infiltrated theists might occur). Biblical theists must risk the tyrannical consequences of non-militantly displeasing the chief powers--according to New Testament thinking. But Herbert, again like Dawkins, reduces unconditional non-aggressive forces to fit a popular bias toward religion. The boldness with which this is done shows the effectiveness of forces such as a well-financed program to propagate evolutionism in the name of science from Oxford's simoniacal chair occupied by Richard Dawkins (My Word Program shows simoniacal as questionable, and I feel some guilt for using Word).

**4. Egging originism on--**Neither Herbert or Ernst use the e-word carelessly and not at all during the most recent postings. They don't need to. There are radicals around to take the point in the primordial conflict. Both are set on encouraging its use by finding something with which to egg on the contributions of those who cannot think without that serious pseudo scientific certainty about their origin. Questionable too is the affirmation of openness to uncensored communication in the name of the theistic Karl Jaspers. Herbert's Website, prey to becoming a vectored-designed blog for atheism, offers the

opportunity for bashing theists. So, none are encouraged to seek and make reference to the concepts of the theistic Jaspers.

**5. The Ernst/Herbert use of vatic authority**—Paul Roberts is a teacher of “evolution” or what I call “ontological originism” in Oregon to children of mandatory attendance age. Disregarding the limitations of thinking he talks and teaches unlimited certainty on a fundamentally unanswerable question regarding humankind’s origin. Herbert, in a display of some allegiance to academia, brings Paul back to the reality of the limitations of mind in TA86-87, C16—like he did with JSJ above. Herbert’s wording is meticulously cautious; he does not want to appear to disagree with Paul’s atheism, which is what happens when the door is opened at the limits of knowledge toward the mind’s limits. That is, it is the mind that is positing causes and effects. He answers that one cannot transcend experience, and the grounds for theistic commitment is implied to be non-experiential. Herbert’s atheism is too implicit in the May 13 C16 to Paul. He sees that the opportunity to be explicit already exists. In Herbert’s possession on May 12 is J. S. Johnson’s inquiry about the applicability of “RC” to species survival and enhancement. This gives Herbert the opportunity in TA 86-87 C 26, May 27, to say that “theistic” belief is behind terrorist activity. “Theistic” is categorized as destructive along with terrorism. So like a knight (“von RC”) on a mission, radical constructivism reacts antithetically to the synthetic ersatz (theism), by a reactionary categorical singularity, i.e., atheism. Though Herbert does not use the formula “RC” or “radical constructivism”, he does use the word “constructivism”.

**6. The great vatic philosophical and theological conspiracy**--Herbert and Ernst are together on using a vatic philosophical source and a vatic theological source to establish atheism through evolutionism (the mind “evolved” and conjured God). The commonality is there even though Ernst is an admitted unlearned ignorer of much he dubs metaphysical, especially Jaspers. Metaphysical to him means anything that could infringe upon his agnosticism that has its foundation in a gnostic epistemology (like a superiority complex is the manifestation of an inferiority complex’s survival urge). Both attempt to reduce Jaspers’ philosophy of an opened-ended psychology to a metaphysic-ontic on origin. Herbert plunges into current experience carelessly. He defers to the theological vatic proclamation that “evolution” is factual (I say, factual enough to be harvested as a reinforcing force for the “evolving” church). The colluding has to do with both deferring to the philosopher Jaspers as a vatic authority, an authority who’s German is transliterated improperly to sound like a declaration that the origin of humankind as fundamentally known. They ignore his statements about playing with causes and effects at the limits of knowledge, and ignore the philosophically wisdom that the origin of humankind is “utterly unknown”. Their behaviors here is ignoble, and try as they might, Jaspers begins and proceeds and ends with an unmistakable conceptual foundation of faith that “Origin and goal are unknown to us, utterly unknown by any kind of knowledge”.

**8.** So the historic, prehistoric conflict goes on but hopefully without more burnings. Although you never know when academicians’ stipends are threatened. If Google bombing fails...who knows! Now, let’s go see Richard Dawkins.