

THE “KARL JASPERS FORUM” UPDATE 32 (August, 1, 2007)—A brief review of three cases prefatory to the SECOND CONTINUUM of Gregory Walters’ works

1. UPDATE 32 addresses epistemic ethics but serves mostly as a point for transference to my EXISTENZ-KJSNA WEBPAGE (of PART 4) and the SECOND CONTINUUM critiquing Gregory Walters’ publicized works. It touches on Gregory’s *Human Rights in the Information Age; A philosophical Analysis* because he incorporates the critical spirit of Jaspers, seeing the dangers of imaginings, (p. 73) and Gregory by-in-large manifests a more than reasonable willingness to communicate and with a sense of responsibility sensitive toward making available to all economic levels the best of near instantaneous information (infosphere). Accepting the challenge he builds on the word ‘solidarity’-- though to me it has connotations that need closer scrutiny because of the spirit of politico-religious totalitarianism so close at hand and so willing to saturate the infosphere. Jaspers’ *Axial Age* mystic is given a penultimate accent in Gregory’s book as “solidarity” is alluded to as imperative in the information age. Jaspers carefully guards against the dangers of solidarity becoming a general moral principle; he is careful to avoid any implication that there is any law of rectilinear evolutionism involved whether in the axial period or in any transitional age. So the SECOND CONTINUUM’s destination involves constraining misinformation while maintaining an application of ethics to net-etiquette while aiming at Gregory’s recent KJSNA-APA presentation regarding his philosophical (or possibly metaphysical) thoughts on gene-being. An urgent solidarity appeal in the ontological sense and concomitant positivistic spirit can solidify too quickly by forgetting for a nanosecond that genome measurements are as limited as measurers. In the SECOND CONTINUUM a deeper nuanced technique will be tooled and applied to Sander Gliboff’s nanotechnique designed to spoil the etymological ambiguity that *Entwicklund* helps maintain. For now, below, I’ll attempt an empirical base from three points of transition in UPDATE 32 while applying Jaspers’ review and critique of ciphers of immanence (PFR 186-196). The three points are:

1.1. First, comments by Herbert Muller, Greg Nixon, and Paul Roberts will be considered briefly.

1.2. Second, I consider Sander Gliboff’s efforts to delimit *Entwicklung* by substituting the word “evolution” (1999 Science History Publications, xxxvii, article on Mendel’s use of *Entwicklung* [he uses “evolution”]). The case neglects an expanding Moravian historical horizon, and Sander’s bias is manifested in a reviewing book review he did, which will be examined (in the SECOND CONTINUUM on Gregory Walters’ works). Jaspers’ therapeutic cipher-language will be applied to the case.

1.3. Third, and most promising for research, I ricochet off these empirical examples and reflect on the philosophical side of the Gregory Walters’ *Human Rights in an Information Age*... and do some wondering about (pending his publication) his recent APA paper regarding the *philosophy of gene-being*. It was given the more specific caption “*Evolutionary epistemology, ethics and the Encompassing* in the KJFNA/APA program. As a well-publicized knowledgeable author on Jaspers Gregory’s paper might be misread as an affront to Jaspers’ use of ciphers. Inattention to the wider and deeper

context surrounding the “e”-word could lead to a too lenient regard for “responsibility and humility”.

The second and third points of contact mentioned above will be addressed on my Website’s “KJS/EXISTENZ Webpage” currently devoted to critiquing Gregory Walter’s works. It is suggested at this point that it would be more gainful to go the Webpage, for what follows immediately below involves repetition though it expands by case-examples on the matter of epistemic fallacies and the ethics of omissions.

2. Herbert Müller, Greg Nixon, and Paul Roberts’ postings briefly evaluated

2.1. Outstanding ethical concern—An expression of concern about ethics is in order for none of the personages below make references to Karl Jaspers in the most recent postings. Greg Nixon’s Target Article 95’s bibliography stands out primarily because it avoids Jaspers’ works. It bears repeating that using Jaspers’ name in the title of a forum should bear on Jaspers or change the name.

2.2. With respect to Herbert Muller, Greg Nixon, and Paul Roberts only a short comment will be attempted and then references given for previous pertinent UPDATES that make extended comments redundant. **(See references to past UPDATES at the bottom.)**

3. The epistemic issue involved is whether cognizing should think the brain is primary to mind or whether mind is prior and preeminent to brain. The position of the three personages is that the brain evolved and then the mind—but Herbert seems at times to be cognizant of the position’s unavoidable conceptual limits until some authority is assented to. The metaphysical-philosophy of theology held here is that the origin of the mind is brain and the origin of God is the brain’s mind.

3.1. Jaspers position is that there is as much proof for one as the other while in the epistemic bubble (Herbert uses this word) and that bubble-stance is an objectification of what cannot be grasped wholly by thinking (that’s a delimiting account of Jaspers’ emphasis on science). Herbert’s metaphysical position (metaphysical philosophy) is best understood as he steps out of the bubble and reassures most unnamed constituents that Jaspers’ name would not be in the masthead of his Website if Jaspers was not an “evolutionist” (“e” word meaning the brain came first). Herbert then immediately escapes the resultant fracas by returning to his epistemic bubble.

3.2. Herbert’s trusted authorities—Paul Roberts attempts to remind Herbert that there is a reality independent of thinking (that when seen reveals origin truth). Herbert responds to Paul’s “e” word by referring to the fact that trusted fundamentally authority, including upbringing, affects “e”-origin cognizing.

3.3. What alarmed Paul—Herbert was in the epistemic bubble with his most recent use of the “e” term: In item [4] TA93, Response 11, he touches the “e” button for predictable effect (emotional) and says that “acceptance of scientific findings (*particularly of*

evolution) [sic. parenthetical words are Herbert's, emphasis mine] depends a great deal on childhood experience and so-called common sense and its reinforcement by trusted authorities of great importance..." It is unclear by the intentional ambiguity of his comment, but based on previous comments Herbert takes "great importance" to mean a veritable vatic-like consensus procession or committee of Bishops' as constituting in part the unnamed power source of "great importance". And of course academicians are authorities unto themselves including both Herbert and Paul—unless Paul exempts himself by insisting on avoiding Herbert's epistemic mind-independent reality test.

3.4. Paul Roberts reverberates--He can't take the disconcerting effects of Herbert's ambiguity especially if intentionally used where transparency (in the Paul sense) is possible. What is clear here is that predicting the response by Paul Roberts and Greg Nixon was easy—(again, as the parenthetical paragraph of references below at the conclusion help show).

3.5. Paul's reaction is swift and concise: Herbert is not going to get away with violating the "e"-Doctrine by using the "e"-word equivocally and shaking Paul's origin-core. Paul correctly (but erroneously) thinks that "e"-word signifies absolute certitude of the brain's origin, i.e., the brain came first and then the mind, not anything mind-like and then the brain. So far as he "knows" the brain came first and the mind is not even concomitant. Paul, as predictable, offers Herbert the occasion for pulling epistemic rank. Having stepped outside the bubble long enough to leave his formulae (0-D) outside Herbert answers surprisingly well—except for the last clause about vatic-like sources of power. He reminds Paul that he is using his mind and losing the mind factor while whatever the mind thinks about the brain. In effect he reminds that Paul needs less gray (matter) and more clear thinking about limits. To demonstrate this Herbert makes use of Hawkins' declaration about how many brains does it take to understand the brane theory. In his better reality moments Herbert knows the answer is that understanding nominal branes can be measured to illuminate the mind-brain immeasurable mystery.

3.6. Ethically, Herbert's answer is patronizing for he understands that Paul Roberts is part and partial to the educational industry where funding is dependent on success that is absolutely measured. Nor does Herbert refer or defer to Jaspers in his answer to Paul. Herbert's critiquing is overcome by his laudation for Paul's title and Oregon State association as a retired emeritus zoologist (I can correct this if wrong, see 3.7.). Herbert as a fellow educator kindly turns Paul's single meaning of brain and mind subsequence into an ambiguous and nebulous compliment. Paul's far-from summa-cum-laude brain-treatise is spun into something that can be nominally right: "you are right that the mind is implicit in all this, and to be helpful we should make that point explicit". (Sounds like some Eden-like sweet-nothing whisperings about not being affected by the tree of knowledge.) Herbert merely tactically alludes to Paul's "assumptions". In other more meaningful words, Herbert is reminding Paul that he is not being helpful with this "e" talk because it is the mind's beginnings and endings predicament that limits knowledge. It's part of the egocentric predicament, that not all are equipped to tolerate the constant abstinence or educated to handle learned ignorance. He then makes reference to "branes" and the "Big-Bang" and asked if one is more right than the other. These rhetorical

questions to a fellow educator are unbecoming, for, Herbert could be more confrontational toward educators who might irresponsibly influence students due to hubris—the day the god metamorphosis occurred). The ethical shame is that Herbert could easily have made references to Jaspers to provide the cipher-therapy his Forumers here needed. It is at this point that I wondered about therapeutic words and whether *Entwicklung* might help a Paul from getting giddy over the D. gibberosa.

3.7. Jaspers applied to a Paul Roberts, possibly the same Paul (apparently retired but holds the title of professor emeritus with the Oregon State education industry) affirms to have research interests beginning with the chromosomal *entwicklung* (my temporary cipher substitute for “e”-word) and structure of drosophila flies. He claims to have a special interest in satellite DNA sequences. His Oregon State University-Website touts research that includes a reference to Richard Dawkins and the “possible” new “selfish DNA” and “if” a new “selfish DNA” the variation in quantity and location on Y-chromosomes are predictable. Paul says with undue certitude that predicted occurrence upholds the “possibility” and the “if”. And further that the implications about gains are to be revealed in a work being prepared by himself and one other person. I have asked for a date for his publication on the OSU’s Website and have no evidence of a response yet. The results of ENCODE analyses were made public June 14th 2007. It is doubtful that there are “gains” that would change Jaspers’ observation that would counter his view that the gains still “do not apply to human generation” (GP 511). Without constraining the value of medical research and the dissolution of diseases, and the execution of justice, it is safe to say that Jaspers remains conceptually correct that “there always remains a horizon beyond which no one can see” (187 PFR).

3.9. Applying Jaspers generically--Jaspers systematically reviews concepts of history after shaving off the nominalism and putting them in cipher form. Using his systematic review one can see that Paul’s Forum Comment participates more in rank conceptualization and rank in the educational system than science: “Whenever quantity becomes decisive [Paul’s four billion years], history approaches natural history. History proper is concerned with quality, which arises, is created and made conscious, on the smallest scale. Rarely will it extend to masses of men and place its stamp on the political powers”. Ontological aims and purposes pervade Paul’s history of *entwicklung* and his “science” comes to serve the...powers that be. It’s the hubris-centric predicament of the education industry where the idea of the university succumbs to economic and political forces. “Only an aimless historical research can pursue things at random, without recognizing an order of rank.” (190 PFR) We all need a “self-criticism [that] will keep [us] aware of [our] limitations”. (191 PFR) Paul should continue his research but not with an urgency other than diminishing pain and injustice.

3.10. Jaspers: “However striking our progress in knowledge and skills, at the crucial point we know no more than people of the distant past. Under different conditions of existence, in a different situation of the mind, we stand beside them, facing the same questions.” (302 PFR)

4. Greg Nixon's posting—In his new TA 95, item [34] he speaks of the experience of species and all that...(*entwicklung*) [entwicklung is substituted for the “e” word by me] ... into our species and all that went before and is still unfolding today.” Jaspers: “Man has not become different in the thousands of years we know about...” (300 PFR) In Jaspers’ Philosophical Faith and Revelation ciphers of immanence are subjected to review, as stated above. They can apply here too. Under the caption “*a: Progress; evolution; eternal recurrence*” he points out the problems resulting from ciphers of science when applied to history as a whole: “The reality of such ciphers is impossible to prove; as a matter of fact, it can be disproved. But they do express a historic sense of Being... In the idea of evolution I have my place in an unfolding entirety, in which progress is a minor factor.”(188-9) Greg’s species-transition assumptions and unfolding “today” provides Greg with some assurance of a select place in history and pop “e”-word culture; that is not the science side of immanent ciphers but rather wishful thinking to establish rank among “constructivists”. Greg’s TA 95 is throughout constrained by an assumed metamorphosis at a basically presumed place and time.

(To see how easy the “e”-word uses can be predicted the reader is invited to click on my Site Map and review the following: First Update, item 4 through 8; Third Update, 2.1., 2.2., 2.3., 2.4., 2.5., 2.6., 3.1.; Fourth Update 1.3., 3.5.; Seventh Update, 1., and 1.1. Most important is Update 20. Update 21, items 1., Update 22, 5.; Update 24 relates to Muller’s comment that if Jaspers were not an “e”-word person his name would not be used; and in Update 26 Greg’s tactics regarding Sid Barnett are reviewed.)