

## THE “KARL JASPERS FORUM” WEBPAGE, UPDATE 9, (2-4-2006)

Notation: This week’s postings on Herbert Muller’s Website include Comments from Gary Boyd, Hugh Bone, and Serge Patlavskiy. I’ll devote most of the evaluation to Mr. Boyd and his relationship to Mr. Muller and Mr. Glasersfeld.

1. **Mr. Gary Boyd**--There’s a pack-string or concordat-thread of loyalty detectable in the history of Gary Boyd’s contributions to Mr. Muller’s Website. A review shows the first comment to be TA45, C38. It amounts to a purely complimentary comment for Herbert Muller’s “talk” given at Concordia University. Gary contributes again (TA 69 C 13, 4-3-2004) addressing Glasersfeld specifically in a one-liner-like show of approval for his “constructivisms”. The support is verbal and not dialectical. Gary contributed a sentence in this last week’s posting that refers Glasersfeld (perhaps appealing even more to Huge Bone) to a “popularized” author writing about what “must be genetically” “evolved” through interaction and discourse. Another sentence occurs this week 2-4-2006, at the conclusion of which Gary’s credentials are listed almost equal in length to his comment. He claims an interest in philosophy but has never to my knowledge referred to Jaspers. Gary’s celebrated association with Concordia University warrants a little attention. Its history is easily identified with Loyola, and one would not be unreasonable to wonder whether the Jesuits would relinquished much of their influence in the merger with George Williams University. What is manifested in Gary’s contributions is this pact-string of loyalty to another associate-educator of McGill University with an equally interesting history. Gary here is coming as a friendly-Herbert-reinforcement as did Glasersfeld’s posting of 12-23-2005. But Glasersfeld ought to know better than to contradict himself as shown below.

2. **Gary and Glasersfeld’s** loyalty flutters too much and suggest something abnormal, something outstandingly exclusive in spirit. Karl Jaspers would have easily picked this out too. Glasersfeld’s loyalty to his Constructivistic community showed up when he attempted to rescue Mr. Muller from claims that Jaspers, based on the possible meaning of a German term, was given ontologically to evolutionism. Part of the reason for this is probably to make it comfortable for the evolutionism used by some Constructivist thinkers in the new Constructivist’s Foundation community. From what little reading I did of Glasersfeld’s writings, the conduct seemed abnormal enough to be hiding something. Take for instance one of his earliest comments made at a

“Panel Discussion” arranged by H. Muller. In Panel Discussion Part 4 he said, “I don’t know how consciousness could have evolved or did evolve, but...I think it would be very useful to study the ontogenesis of consciousness in children.” What sort of intellectual spirit could interfere with that apparent intellectual bit of honesty? Was it something Muller and Glasersfeld shared in the decades leading up to WWII, the period during, and after? Is it that if the real Jaspers were reviewed and revealed, anything of value in “Radical Constructivism” would be precluded? Making meaningful connections here presents a real challenge to psychopathology. One thing that seems correct is that wondering about origins is less a problem than no longer feeling the need to wonder.

3. **Mr. Nair**--During that...designed...Panel Discussion Part 4, an exchange took place between a Mr. Nair and Muller. In that exchange Nair (see <11>) does not get to complete a thought or sentence without being interrupted by Mr. Muller. It happened several times. It was obvious that Muller was attempting to L-Lead (as in D-Day) the discussion with leading questions. The intervention demonstrated an attitude-mission, intentional or not, of interference which he has consistently remained faithful to in his misuse of Jaspers. Associating with the name of Jaspers obviously brings Herbert some comforting certitude, but leaves the spirit of reason disturbed.

4. **Mr. O’Neil**--The problem with this use of the notable personage of Karl Jaspers is revealed <12> in the statement by a Mr. O’Neil: He concludes that Muller did not solve the question of mind-independent reality. He concludes with, “*You didn’t solve...but you did give me reason to go back and look at Jaspers and your web page again*”(emphasis mine). O’Neil wrote again in 2-19-2002 (TA48, C4) and there demonstrated his Catholic leanings, and opposition to protestant thought which he misconstrued. Regarding terms like “evolution”, he says correctly, that “all such terms are metaphorical...” but then he declares his commitment to the universality of the metaphor “evolution”. He verbalizes about an interest in the history of evolutionism (my ism use here) but says it is “utterly irrelevant with regard to truth” (TA 48 C12, 3-26-2002). With that absolute word “truth” enhanced by “utter” he manifested an ontologism that shows up in his inference that microbiological data establishes this “truth”. The only time I can recall that Jaspers utterly used “utterly” is when he said the origin of humankind is utterly unknowable. O’Neil is saying that there is a category of science complete enough to establish a catholic truth. O’Neil thinks Catholic! In TA48, C 16, 4-30 2002 he again propounds a misunderstanding of Kant, protestant

principles, and proclaims a contradiction and identifies Catholic catholicity with free will—a definite oxymoron. If he can get away with that, then he can get away with the view that “evolution” and the fundament of humankind’s origin is identical. He too fans and displays his credentials: St. Mary’s Hospital, Psychiatrist, psychoanalyst, and Assistant Professor of Psychiatry McGill University. It apparently impressed Dongier who congratulates O’Neil on his...poetic...words aimed at Petkov and Rifat (the latter was detectable as one of Catholic Culture and disturbed regarding miracles, and soon after passed away, thus demonstrating O’Neil’s limitations as a psychopathologist). Why poetic? Because Dongier said, “I don’t understand a word but never mind...” his “admiration was enhanced” (TA 48 C18). O’Neil was apparently satisfied with such unreasonable adulation for it was the last heard from O’Neal on Muller’s Website. One wonders though what the ground for such mutual feelings might be.

**5. O’Neil and Jaspers**--How interesting, then, though affirming an interest and commitment to reviewing Jaspers, O’Neil does not refer to him but sees the issue as one between a principle of Catholicity and protestant principle the latter of which he easily misunderstands and then misuses. He has the first part mostly right, but mostly wrong on his comprehension of the historical context of metaphors, whether it be the word catholic, protestant, evolution, or creation, and most emphatically wrong about Kant.

**6. Serge Patlavskiy’s Comment** to Mr. Muller was accurately summed up in “Reality cannot be defined as mind-independent”. Serge is still attempting to reason with Herbert. Herbert is not capable yet of facing consciousness from a first person, that is personalistic, perspective. We have to face the fact that it is possible some will never be objectively introspective enough to see the objectivity of their subjectivism. My personal view of that is that unless Herbert hits bottom and admits the limits of his formulae and confuses the guilt of misusing Jaspers he will remain encompassed by his own subjectivism and social approval. My only criticism is that Serge could easily find support for his epistemological cognizing by reference to the Paradigm Karl Jaspers such as the epistemology to be found in his Truth and Symbol from Von der Vahrheit. My feeling is that if he were to fearlessly read Jaspers (maybe he is), he would find an epistic and independent fellow-traveler.