

THE “KARL JASPERS FORUM” UPDATE 29 (OCTOBER 30, 2006)—Short notation on Herbert’s 28 October 2006 Short Note about his mind-brain problem--relating to the unconscionable torture trends

**1. Superficially no thinker can wholly disagree** with Herbert’s Oct. 28, 2006 “Short Note 83”, where he finds fault with an issue of the *Science* publication, i.e.: it is important to retain a thoughtful distinction between “brain” and “mind”. On another level *one can find ample area to disagree with Herbert’s view that “‘minds’ are subjective, encompassing, and operate from an unstructured center...”* Disputing Herbert’s quotation is as important as agreeing with his critique of the *Science* publication--especially while being aware of the encompassing of consciousness and thought’s dependency on cognizing processes with all the limits and potentials thereof. The limits and potentials of the brain are no less real. The encompassing mystique of the category “brain” is not less real.

1.1. I have said before that with regard to absolute judgments about what he considers a mind-brain problem, Herbert’s emphasis on not confusing the mind with the brain can be the more proper perspective for it involves repetitive verbalizations about a priori epistemic critiquing. But Herbert seems to assume that the brain-category is de facto encompassed within and without with less mysteriousness than the mind-category which he equates with experience and consciousness and thereby expects to be more intellectually honest because closer to the source of metaphysics. To think phenomenal mystery does not encompass brain phenomena amounts to a scientifically disciplined critique’s succumbing to a scientific mystique. But yet it is questionable that brain scientists are in the main unaware of the constant need for the engagement of the science of epistemology. Moreover it is questionable that brain experimentation must be suspended until one has a conferred Doctorate in “0-D/MIR”, i.e., a major in zero-derivational fundamental thinking, and a minor in how to avoid mind-independent-reality—the reality according to Herbert’s experience. Herbert is right in pointing out how easily the terms “mind” and “brain” (i.e., the categories) can be confused like putting a cart before the horse or visa versa as in backward or foreword thinking, particularly when the mind is assumed less empirical in quantum or at least molecular weight than the brain. His bytes of experience do not stochastically determine his radical epistemology’s universal applicability with more precision merely because he uses the word “mind” interchangeably with “experience” and “consciousness”.

**2. A biblical structure relative to human sacrifice (2 Kings, 3:24 and 3:27)**--Herbert is correct in part in as much as reductionism (note the “ism” meaning radical structuring) does proceed from and never leaves a preferred faith in...an...assumptive experimentally perceived ultimate origin-concept (such conceptualism being considered on my Richard Dawkins Webpage). Herbert’s critique of *Science* probably senses how bad faith and corporealized mysticism can creep into and jeopardize science when the mind and brain are not properly differentiated due to an absolute ontological presumption regarding basic biological building blocks. But the greater presumption-error is that one is fundamentally more or less structured than the other. His *zero-derivational thinking spoils the lesson’s society learns historically*--such as with the evils of sacrificial human burnt offerings

though performed with the minimum of discomfort to the one being sacrificed. The Abrahamic offering of Isaac has been considered in depth by Kierkegaard but needs to be revisited for deeper insight into the current trend toward human sacrifice and suffering. Herbert's zero-derivational words can be mistaken as a well-intentioned method to avoid origin-sin thinking, but as a mentalism-independent of historical reality it becomes more a thinking participating in the sin of omission. It omits in principle worthwhile principles, such as the constant need for questioning elite-lineage and first-born status. We need to learn to think about how to get the best works out of those who confuse absolute views of origin with an arrogant predestination, and how to get the best work out of those made to feel inferior to the point of fatalism.

**3. Reducing philosophical wisdom** (awe, wondering, and worship) to a physicist's metaphysics does take place in the name of science, but it occurs no less by those associated with "Constructivism" who presume an inviolable origin to be universally applicable, acceptable, and religiously enforceable (such as transparently made evident through the preeminence given to the first of several contributors to the "Constructivist's Foundation's" "Journal"). Notwithstanding (not standing with "Constructivism"), Jaspers was and remains outstanding in the systematic demonstration of the limits of such vitalism in scientism, including the perilous religious (institutionalism's establishment under momentum) absorption or harvesting of schools (like the "Constructivism" school).