

BLOG-CASE SAMPLES: PREPPING FOR CHRIS THORNHILL'S JASPERS, A SPECIAL "KARL JASPERS FORUM" UPDATE 37.1 (routed 5-11-08, posted 5-12-08) Herbert's 5-10-08 postings by himself and Maurice McCarthy show the need for a nuanced critique of Stanford Encyclopedia's "Karl Jaspers". Go to "Karl Jaspers Applied" to Glasgow's Chris Thornhill
<http://www.karljaspersapplied.net/TweakedCritique.htm>

TABLE OF CONTENTS—WHY THE NEED FOR A TWEAKING CRITIQUE

1. Cases showing the need for the nuanced critique of Chris Thornhill's article
 - 1.0. Herbert reproaches Dawkins and venerates vatic personages--
 - 1.1. Herbert misunderstands Jaspers' truth-task in "von der Wahrheit"
 - 1.2. Dawkins is now on Herbert's reality-list
 - 1.3. This leads to another "e-soul" crusader, the well-meaning Maurice McCarthy
 - 1.3cont. V.V. Raman and R. W. Smith's collaborative discipline to avoid the renowned psychopathologist Jaspers
 - 1.30. Humans above vegetative states make observable psyche connections
 - 1.31. Maurice's psychic connection approaches an understandable abnormality
 - 1.32. Anything having to do with Cologne (Germany) super-naturally of interest to Herbert
 - 1.33. Maurice's proposed pontifical origin of "e"-science—Herbert salivates
 - 1.34. Maurice sees a two-soul material connection—Herbert embraces for the bite
 - 1.35. The causal meaninglessness of the "two-soul" connection
 - 1.36. The Eastern Orthodox picturesque iconic appeal to evangelicals caught in the vortex of the postmodern void that inhibits the potential for authentic selfhood
 - 1.31. Maurice's psychic connection approaches an understandable abnormality
 - 1.32. Anything having to do with Cologne (Germany) super-naturally of interest to Herbert
 - 1.33. Maurice's proposed pontifical origin of "e"-science—Herbert salivates
 - 1.34. Maurice sees a two-soul material connection—Herbert embraces for the bite
 - 1.35. The causal meaninglessness of the "two-soul" connection
 - 1.36. The Eastern Orthodox picturesque iconic appeal to evangelicals caught in the vortex of the postmodern void that inhibits the potential for authentic selfhood
2. Now, to the Web-page on Glasgow's Chris Thornhill

1. Timely cases showing the need for the nuanced critique of Chris Thornhill's Stanford Encyclopedia's article--The timeliness and importance of a critique of Chris Thornhill's special encyclopedia's description of Karl Jaspers is made clearer by Herbert Müller's 5-10-08 postings. Herbert attempts to get meaning from associating with a dignitary's name, i.e., Jaspers. In yesterday's posting the name is used next to Herbert's use of "encompassing" and in a sentence parenthetically modified by "(1947)". The parenthetical-date emphasizes Herbert's view that a later Jaspers committed a reality-independent-of-mind error, that over time he changed and failed to adapt to the "evolved" level of complex consciousness that Herbert propounds. Herbert's belated view that Jaspers failed to adapt is used subtly as a defense for using Jaspers' name in his blog's masthead. The 1947 work he's referring to is "von der Wahrheit"--a work about which he prefers to think that Jaspers was not yet in decrepit awe of *entia naturae* and still properly on the way toward *entia rationis* (see item [3] <http://www.kjf.ca/93-R22BUB.htm> . I use Herbert's postings in part as an excuse to spin into a review of Chris' Encyclopedia-

article to see if there are nuances that could support such interpretations of Jaspers. I then attempt some tweaking to make it more difficult to retard Jaspers as Herbert does.

1.0. Herbert reproaches Dawkins and venerates the vatic--In item [1] Herbert attacks Richard Dawkins <http://www.kjf.ca/106-R11MCC.htm> for also, like Jaspers, losing his epistemic mind. He then venerates the...really big...religious organization to reinforce his "Vatican's" "principled" stand for "biological evolution". In these itemized paragraphs his arguments are suppose to make non-denominational "protestant sects" appear out of touch with reality [2] and in need of eidological "as-if icons". Note, below, the unreasonableness that this "e" talk engenders: in item [3] his thinking process now includes religious organization's dogma as the cause for handicapping psychic connections about which he counsels Maurice (see 1.3. below). Note that it is the "e-origin" dogma that is festering a case of illogicality. Some ambiguity in communication is unavoidable and in need of tweaking—but Herbert's subjectivism is abnormal.

1.1. Herbert further misuses Jaspers' "the" task of truth in (Wahrheit) as though if understood it substantiates Herbert's style of truth. Moreover he implies that Jaspers somehow *post obium* verifies the 10-96 Vatican's sacrosanct-"e"-creed that "Sincere Christians" universally [like the majority of established churches and secular forces] must now believe and accept whatever is connoted by that word "evolution" (See Gould, *Diet of Worms* 280—that Gould in-your-protestant-reformationist-face phrase also indicates the collared hubris engendered when, as "a Jewish agnostic", his counsel was sought by Catholic priests and determined effectively accomplished. p.270). Herbert is careful to escape illogicality by restricting the epistemic subject-object fundament to one polarizing pole, i.e., he radically restricts experience to a single logical side of the bio for the sake of singularity, i.e., a metaphysical catholicity in accord with his terms of endearment. His crusade seems to be revitalized by his recent pilgrimage to the place of early upbringing, that geocentric type of south German Catholicity in the city of Cologne (see item [19] <http://www.kjf.ca/106-TAMUL.htm>).

1.2. Dawkins is now on Herbert's-hit list perhaps because Dawkins dared to see—the one decent thing he and I have in common (if I recall correctly)—the 10-96 practical-decretal was a dastardly uncalled for intervention into the objectivity of science. Unless Dawkins is simply disappointed that he was not the Vatican's hubris-guest of honor at the science festival for the propagation of the Catholic faith, he might already be realizing the need to come to public terms about being an atheistic corpse (depleted of vital "originary" faith—to use Thornhill's word to describe Jaspers' Existenz) set out for those vatic-eagles perched to immanently secure against the transcendental vital-constant from being miraculously resurrected and succored by any means other than the tactics of capital-catholicity. I'm referring to tactics such as Oxford's Tractarianism movement (tracts possibly being distributing now at Glasgow, for Glasgow was initiated with a club and lead bull to prevent reformationists from trespassing further south). The Tractarianism movement was a substitute for pilgrimages to Rome, i.e., if one cannot be enticed to touch foot in Rome than the glories and pomp of Rome must be by any and all technical means taken to the pilgrim in transit to new worlds.

1.3. And this leads us to another "5-10-08" postings by a crusader for "e-souls", Maurice McCarthy, who, along with Herbert, has also been caught up in the rapture of the "papal" visit to America--one of the 21st century's spiritual blunders (a papal visit

Jaspers had, pre-10-96 and pre 9-1-01, once stated would have no significant impact on the American soul, i.e., psyche—citation reference needed here when found). See <http://www.kjf.ca/106-C27MCC.htm>. By collaborating in avoiding Jaspers on a “Karl Jaspers Forum” one can serve as an accessory to the glaring omission of references to the deceased Jaspers—thus continuing the illogicality of Varadaraja V. Raman and Roulette William Smith’s participation in this interdisciplinary violation of common sense—they too avoid Jaspers on “Karl Jaspers Forum” with what seems like an intense intentionality. The excuse is that they want peer-reviews but then stay clear of the insights of the most renowned psychopathologist.

1.30. Anybody of normal development makes psychic connections--Herbert too cautiously points this out in his Response to Maurice. Maurice, for the cause of the Saint-soul of “evolution”, has made a causal psychic connection; a connection between the first “Pope” with a mind for exploiting the Pseudo-Isadorian decretals, though they be forgeries (Jaspers, PFR, et al). Maurice ignores or maybe condones the manipulations of the record and omits the baby retaining the bath. Herbert excuses it in tolerable non-confrontational style because it is part of his and Maurice’s ongoing experience—and the fact that Maurice always in the end says something favorable and yields to Herbert’s formulae. Confrontational techniques are left to the bearer of bad news that almost sound like ad hominen attacks in a Dr. patient situation. Beyond the fact of the forgeries Jaspers describes the far greater calamity as “the transformation of original Christianity into the political Church” (47 PFR, and, oh, by the way, the date of PFR belongs to the so called “later” of Jaspers’ works). So, no wonder Maurice, too, stays clear of Jaspers, for, in effect his Dr. Müller is accepted as the representative of Jaspers. Some want an experience of the “rapture” of absolute truth so...badly...that the corporealized body of the second coming is found in radical subjective constructions that plead for being ravaged by something objective to justify further withdrawal into a subjectified “nirvana”.

1.31. Maurice’s psychic connection approaches abnormality due to the restraining nature of a determinable sort of origin-thinking (origin-sin may be a little strong here but “[S]aint-Origin” would be more forgivable—[s]aint-origin is less prone to being identified with the really big religious organization). Though Maurice may not be conscious of it, the connection involves the birthplace of Herbert, the South German Catholic theological stomping grounds of Nicholas of Cusa with ties to Basel, Heidelberg and...Cologne. (See Jaspers on Nicholas in *Great Philosophers*, especially p. 218, 248, “Cusanus not a precursor of the Enlightenment” and Nicholas’ unheeded advice to “Pius II” against the unrealistic crusade against the Turks p. 118, and his claim to an already established (Plato) principle of “learned ignorance” p. 120--not to mention the learned ignorance principle literally manifest in Genesis.)

1.32. Anything having to do with Cologne naturally enough interests Herbert, especially if something “spiritual” can be utilized to [R]omanticize his birthplace. So he asks Maurice to provide some historical documentation for the “spiritual” connection with the “Vatican”. This will be a time-consuming challenge for Maurice for it requires much delicacy for explaining the pseudo-Isadorian decretals that he, perhaps innocently, introduced into the “Saint evolution” debate.

1.33. The proposed “papal” origin of science, following the “papal trail”: What Maurice is proposing is that when “pope” Nicholas I intervened (not Nicholas of Cusa) into the affairs of King Lothair II and his wife up North, Nicholas used the donation of Constantine to depose the Archbishops of Treves and Cologne who were siding with Lothair on the mistress affair. I think this is why Maurice precludes that the “holy see” in effect made science possible. It’s not possible to disregard here the politics involved, which Maurice has a mind to see too, so the “papal” vatic argument went like this: Due to the pseudo-Isidoran decretals, a substructure to the Donation of Constantine, Rome had proper authority in that region including Herbert’s home town. That sort of tactical misuse of authority was later in the East challenged by Photius patriarch at Constantinople. Photius saw through this Pseudo-Isidoran prerogative and reacted. The tactic was probably just as clear to North Germans at the time of Lothair. (“Man has not become different in the thousands of years we know about, for we deal with men of every period as if they were our contemporaries.” p. 300 PFR.) The result was that Nicholas excommunicated Photius who in turn excommunicated Nicholas due to the Latin heresies. Maurice sees this but disregards the forgeries, and due to his upbringing that handicap is understandable. But there is more...

1.34. Maurice sees a two-soul theory involved here that amounted and amounts to a disservice to science. He must somehow argue that the “Vatican” originated the spirit of research leading to the unity of the sciences in the occident. The pattern of thinking here is part of that Catholic struggle for power over the history of “Saint evolution” and it involves the perhaps more apparent than real readiness to sacrifice the Eastern Church, a readiness is a right by vatic-virtue tactics like decretals (e.g. the “e-origin 96” praxis decretal) conjured for the singularity of the big establishment which does not permit a relaxing of the ban on Photius. So due to excommunication we have a dualism-soul in Catholicity, i.e., the Orthodox Eastern Church and the Western Latin Church; the latter Maurice aligns with and must make it fit “evolutionary science”. The schism is embarrassing and makes the word “solidarity” less consistently wholly Catholic. (Actually there’s a triune schism if one includes the much more apparent than real Western Anglican Church). But it has nothing to do with what Herbert refers to as something “spiritual” and what Maurice refers to as something regarding the “soul” (and much more to do with what was considered the Islamic threat to the force of “solidarity”).

1.35. How the two-soul connection is made—It goes to the so-called spiritual argument side of the marriage contract that says what the Church has joined together let none put asunder, like in the Biblical idea that the two shall be one in marriage. The situation boiled down to a test of authority, which failed for the Latin “Vatican” in Germany’s north, like it failed in the case of Henry VIII. It had nothing to do with science (maybe war science) as Maurice would like to make of it. It is that “science” connection for which Herbert wants documentary support; it would enforce, by concentrating on Cologne the vatic “spiritualization” of his place of upbringing. He knows Maurice cannot establish the connection to Herbert’s radical-constructivist satisfaction, but it would provide food for consumption for Herbert’s hubris-sort of “zero-derivation” (see Herbert’s hubris-note at the conclusion <http://www.kjf.ca/106-R10BEA.htm>, where it is assumed that physicists agree with him if they don’t contribute to his blog). Also, Maurice’s labors could once again vindicate Herbert’s early-use of Anaximander to show an Eastern Orthodox connection with that philosopher’s “philosophical evolution” (you

know, that Anaximander's "only a theory of evolution" and the battle for the middle East's biblical soul).

1.36. A greater case for the "Eastern Church's" tint (more apparent than real) of iconoclasm having contributing to the "st. evolution" might be quarreled, but that would be an equal and unnecessary stretch of the mental capacity for making meaningful idea-connections, and it would border on a missionary endeavor for the presumed necessity of an eidetic psychic picture in society and history (ontologisms). There are enough shallow thinking evangelicals as it is bowing before picturesque icons of the Eastern Church as a result of the postmodern vortex's sucking up and inhibiting authentic open-ended self-images. The modest iconoclasm of Eastern Orthodoxy means nothing except having pictures in the home was less community pugnacious than having in-your-islamic-jewish-protestant-face iconic statues at the gate. Visitors and laborers must show a condescending sense of kowtowing whether picture, statue, or attired-habit especially if it involves the community autocrats. If one is autocratically disrespectful enough there's always the resort to crucifying or burning...But I've gone off spectrum...

2. Now...to the Web-page on Glasgow's Chris Thornhill's et.al articles.