

TIMESPACE, JASPERS ON HEISENBERG, by Glenn C. Wood
31 August 2002, posted 10 September 2002, TA48, C20

<1> Philosophy and revelation are unrecognizable to me in this discussion between Mr. Muller and Mr. Petkov. To compensate the response below is more of a general than specific overall interjection. The predeterminism of a block universe seems like a corporealized substitution for revelation. A substitute for philosophical faith is seen in the view that post-modernism, constructivism, and Glasersfeld's radical constructions have surpassed philosophy's wisdom. These substitutes seems like either an indifference or inattention to the works of Karl Jaspers. It prompts me to draw attention to this defect by bringing some spice into this diet of cud, though I really hate to bring this up (no cud intended): How did you fellows get in without a degree in Karl Jaspers?

<2> Space and time, space-time, and spacetime are subjective forms the contents of which are construction material from experience -- so it appears to me. These forms of thinking are, with some recent modifications due to atomic physics and the special and general theory of relativity, still like Kant's apriori forms for experience. It means space and time and their intrinsic potential dimensions are subjective in form but not content.

<3> The uncertainty in the measurability of subatomic stuff challenges the normal Galilean slowly moving stuff of space and time. The less time we have of getting out of the way of atomic stuff the closer space and time get. The conjunction becomes less apparent and appears as Space-time. Space-time is still apriori forms though modified by sophisticated aposteriori experience.

<4> Subatomic experience appears (phenomenally) so fast the apriori-aposteriori forms of space-time hardly work at all and tax the unifying tendency of the imagination. Now in the phenomenal swirl the intersections of space-time are hardly distinguishable. Space-time now becomes spacetime. In spacetime we can easily get disorientated, but it would be fatal not to attempt coordinating for human purposes, even though uncertainty has become a principle. Predeterminism in this principle isn't taken seriously; at least not to the point of seeing unity as independent of uncertainty.

<4.1> Jaspers wrote: "The concept of reality in which atomic physics comprehends the unity of nature fails to cover natural reality as a whole" and "it [subatomic physics -- my words] cover a specific side of this reality, a side whose universality -- as Heisenberg has impressively shown -- is bought at the cost of dispensing in such cognition with the abundance of natural phenomena. These [natural phenomena-my comment] remain outside the realm of explicability or of questioning, even. The one exact science covers only a unity in nature, not the unity of nature." (Phil. Faith and Rev., Collins 67, p. 172)

<4.2> Note: As a philosopher Jaspers stops short of saying there is a natural unity, and that a special coordinated handling cannot be the way of determining ... the ... unity. In the microcosmic field we can see the move from space and time, through space-time and are ... now ... experiencing spacetime and yet we are no closer to ... the ... unity of nature -- if there is one outside our concepts and constructions. Revelation (prophets) comes into the general field when the dangers of institutionalizing concepts and constructions becomes absolute in some corporeal form, and wisdom sees it and looks beyond for a certainty that can be carried without extra burden into spacetime fields. Frontiersmen have to leave icons and divining rods along the trail, and the last I heard they cannot carry electron exceleators.

<5> Petkov has a problem easily identified with in his position. The formula, involving the Minskowki space-time, appears designed to accommodate the preGalileon determinism of Augustine. Augustine is relied on as a stable source of something constant whether it's in Lutheran, Greek Orthodox, or Roman Catholicism. It can even be found here in earlier New Mexico's Catholics who, wanting some independence from Spanish and French Catholic/ politics, claim certain liberties referencing Augustine as the authority.

<6> We are dealing here with forms of the mind, and not only their special application but the general application to the inexplicable, and questionable unity, of nature. (Though that appears to participate in contradiction it also appears not to for contradiction is unavoidable.) These forms aren't immune to the phenomenological process used not only in space-time and general relativity but subatomic and macrocosmic realms as well. It applies to the unity of the whole of nature ... phenomenologically, i.e., we cannot normally escape logically handling the way things as such appear to be; that is, they appear more or less than what they are as such (another way of saying superiority complexes or inferiority complexes in the field of psychology -- same forms of thinking; because they are basic forms).

<7> Muller's concern is the unity of the application of a special formula to all fields. "... [M]y reason to participate in this discussion is that I think reality should be the same for everybody and for all fields. " (R1<6>) He mentions there are no fields excepted and often, sometimes parenthetically, and now more specifically, names the fields of religion and even jurisprudence. Here he is more right than wrong from his perspective and from mine more wrong than right. His formula works well in some special areas and functions in general when cultivating the way-out-back metaphysical field. Metaphor: But looking at it as an experimental aircraft, I'd not bet on it flying.

<7.1> What is being deliberately ignored -- for the alleged sake of universal

science -- is the revelational and philosophical fields which are beyond the phenomenal unity or chaos of experience. Religion historically includes holding dear a sense of sacredness, and philosophy holds dear a regard for prudence. The jurisprudence of religion is seen in the wisdom of the separation of religion from legislation. Philosophical wisdom relates to the freedom not only of religion but also the freedom of the will in a free state coordinated with civil behavior, starting with the individual regulating selfhood while modulating somewhere between being total deprived and a child of God. Philosophy and religion gets us into the fields of responsibility -- ethics.

<8> The determinism of Petkov and the zero-derivation of Muller have moral and ethical gaps as wide as the distance between philosophy-religion and metaphysic-science. Petkov seems to be calling for a ecumenical counsel at Concordia of physicists to resolve this problem and to develop a dependable consensus from these experts -- after they are pinned down. What's at stake are the Augustinian deterministic seeds of thoughts in the Lutheran reformation, and the Jesuit's brand of absolute determination. I can see the need for competing with the predeterminism of coordinated or organized eastern and western catholicity, but I'd think the reforming of conduct without predeterminism should be sufficient to show the poor psychology of predeterminism in a conjured divine coordinated unity.

<8.1> We are still dealing here with forms or modes of thinking. The same form of thinking is essentially involved in predeterministic thinking as in predestination thoughts. Emitting or oozing from these forms is the belief in something inert, some automatic pilot like device, an inertia momentum, having a material behavioristic impact on conduct ... the oozing carries an overabundance of confidence that the predetermined can be determined. Sarcasm: It can be so well come to terms with that we can develop a contractual relationship with it but of course this means a real corporation considered as sacred.

<8.2> We are either the elect or damned usually determined by the channel of predeterminism. The consequences of this presumption has moral dimensions, dimensions also considered really independent of mind so much so that it becomes a woeful excuse for throwing caution to the winds. Muller wisely reminds us that dimensions are few or many depending are the eye of the beholder and that there are -- I say -- too few who can see this; so few it takes a touch of revelation: Thus enters Paul ...

<8.3> The biblical Paul had to deal with this problem of the misbehavior of both the elect and the non-elect. He had the responsibility of getting the best works out of those with superiority complexes and those dealing with inferiority complexes. Here absolute postulates and loose thinking had to be made the best of, and he did it through philosophy and revelation: the elect behave themselves

and love the non-elect and the non-elect need to believe they are God's children too and behave themselves accordingly. Complexes are avoided through grace and faith but not limited to explicit sources. Predeterminists can be safely referred to Paul for counseling.

<9> Petkov is right about the need for objectivity -- but it's really Objectivity -- in subjectivity. Muller is wrong about a use of objectivity in the external (in the normal subject-object sense) sense alone. The mind is always subject to something objective in some sense or super sense. That's what the word subject means. The mind is also subject to an Encompassing Objectivity from in and beyond (not beyond in the sense of a return to phenomena or epiphenomena from somewhere comprehensible). That is just the way it is in communication while in the subject-object mode; it's essential for understanding what is neither subject nor object in reality.

<10> To reiterate, Muller is right about always needing the mind to interpret, but wrong about the subject never being an object. He needs to get with the herenow of spacetime. There seem to be here an unnecessary intrinsic stranglehold on the potential source for wisdom and revelation and mainly because he sees some dangerous absolute postulates like in Petkov's predeterminism. That predeterminism of Petkov's is not the Objectivity the subject is subjected to from within and vertically beyond. That Objectivity is indeterminable though we can come to terms with it so long as we know it's never reducible to terms as such, not consumed in definite reasoning processes and feeling states of a space and time, space-time and even spacetime type.

<11> Muller seems to want the subject to be the origin, a subject from nowhere in a sense, and he nicely challenges Petkov to reduce MIR (that's considering reality to be independent of mind) to questions. Petkov will not be able to do that without using the mind, or without losing his mind. He can do it by filibustering which is sort of a reduction of chaotic experience to a constant linguistic barrage (sort of what I've been trying to do with experience from the field). Filibustering is more like reality though and will be successful if it can prevent Muller from using his mind which in effect means he's lost it for all practical KJF debating consequences. Filibustery is pseudo jurisprudence and used when communication fails. It can keep us a safe distance from the reality independent of mind, but far enough away from the perimeter of zero-derivation's black hole.

<11.1> Petkov will have no more difficulty in coming up with questions than the epiphenomenon of biblical encoding has in coming up with answers. There's that much data. Muller will be able to successfully show that biblical like encoding is also possible with someone prolific like Nietzsche or Shakespeare.

<12> This matter of predestination and determinism and plain loose thinking regarding responsibility is experience I grew up with. It showed up early in life when hearing a preacher from one fundamentalist group say something like: "Once saved always saved." It showed up later too listening to a seminary Dean excusing shortcomings by saying " ... That's just the way I am." Etc.

That "the mind is always subject to something objective" <9-10> is not evident to me; can you clarify this ? Objects originate within ongoing subjective experience, thus in SE the subject can be said to be "subject to experience" if you wish, but not to objects. In particular the encompassing is not an object, it is identical with the non-structured apeiron.

Herbert FJ Müller
e-mail hmler@po-box.mcgill.ca

NEEDLING EXPERIENTIAL OBJECTIVITY by Glenn C. Wood 14 September 2002,
posted 1 October 2002 Response to Mr. Muller's note following my TA48 C20,
TA48, C23

<1> Appreciate the question and opportunity to say more about what is not evident; that mind is always subject to something objective. A quote is found in Jaspers' Way to Wisdom which indicates he's in apparent agreement with Schopenhauer's view that "... there is no object without a subject and no subject without an object." The object lessons below include experiences with Jaspers, holy rollers, and needle needling.

<2> Objectivity can be the "Comprehensive" as in "even when I think of being as such, I have in mind nothingness as its antithesis." (Way to Wisdom, p.30 Yale, 1966.) "The moment we state the subject-object dichotomy in which we always find ourselves and which we cannot see from outside, we make it into an object", "an image by which to express what is not visible and can itself never become object." In this sort of objectivity we must not forget that which though not visible can never become object except for some educative purpose.

<3> "Still thinking in images, we ascertain through the source that is present within us a polyvalence [muti-relativity] in this subject-object dichotomy. It is fundamentally different, depending on whether I as understanding am oriented toward objects; as Dasein, being-there, toward my environment; or as existence

toward God." Jaspers then expands on the three orientations, but I'll skip to: "As existence we are oriented toward God -- transcendence -- and this through the language of things, which existence uses as hieroglyphics or symbols. Neither our understanding nor our vital sensualism apprehends the reality of this symbolism. God as object is a reality only for us as existence; He is situated in an entirely different dimension from the empirical, sensible objects susceptible to compelling knowledge." (Ibid. pp. 32,33.) (The three types of orientation are also found under *The Human Being as a Whole*, in his *General Psychopathology* p.771, University of Chicago Press, 1963.)

<4> "Thus the Comprehensive, when we seek to apprehend it, breaks down into several modes of the subject-object dichotomy ... (1) the understanding or consciousness as such, as which we are all identical; (2) being-there, as which we are each of us a particular individual; (3) existence, as which we are authentically ourselves in our historicity."

<4.1> "The Comprehensive, conceived as being itself, is called transcendence (God) and the world, while as that which we ourselves are it is called being-there, consciousness, mind, and existence." (Ibid. 33.) I would think experience or objective evidence fit in all three modes, but more clearly in existence because we experience most vividly that which stands out of being as objects in our objectifications.

<5> Anticipating an objection of "Mind-independent reality" let me say sympathetically that I share a proneness against objects and homunculus icons. But the philosophical mind cannot avoid objects (like the brain, reality, or umbilical cords). "The path of true philosophizing loses neither the subject nor the object in the appearance of Objectivity, but instead grasps Being in their polarity." "Now there is finally the comprehensive and yet special task of grasping Being in totality in the subject-object polarity through the mediation of both, and to do so in such a way that both are immediately in Objectivity." "That is now our theme. The cypher is neither object nor subject. It is objectivity which is permeated by subjectivity and in such a way that Being becomes present in the whole." (p. 31,34,35, *Truth and Symbol*.)

<6> For understanding let's return to that early life experience, that state of being when objectivity subjected me. It's that sewing machine again. Here was vague consciousness, comprehensiveness, (being-there, mind, potential existence...objectivity) as a toddler, then putting my finger under the needle and stepping on the treadle, and the needle penetrating the finger tip. Here was real objectivity with simultaneous apprehensiveness to which I not only became subjected, but also hatched another object-subject dichotomy permeated with apprehension. This experience of objectivity (the sewing machine and the comprehensiveness prior to and after the experience) in a sense involved the

movement out of both sides an encompassing.

<6.1> Objectivity permeated with subjectivity outside the sewing room was also experienced through the encompassing feelings of love, understanding, empathy, unspoken beliefs, forgiveness, even degrees of the usual antitheses to these. The Objectivity is kept within existential bonds by the revealed lessons from time immemorial. To me and the family that Objectivity primarily includes the experiences of others recorded and revealed in the Bible.

<7> The question of objectivity-subjectivity involves philosophical faith and faith in revelation, a combination of possible spontaneous wisdom and trust in the Word on the homefront. Example: My father told me he was behind the field-roller while it was backing. The reins got caught under the field roller which of course was the horse-signal for reverse; next his toes were under, he fell back and the roller was approaching his chin. I ask him what he did then. He said: "I hollered 'whoa' and then 'giddap'"

<7.1> Just where subjectivity and objectivity apply in this particular experience remains questionable but real all the same. It seems to me there was a person subject to some object. He was also subject to the two words, though it could have been "object" and "subject" it was "Whoa" and "giddap," and the experience revealed which side the roller he was pinned under and which word was most objective and real for that existential situation. It seems this quote is applicable here: "The conflict is resolved in the movement out of both sides of the encompassing." Gee or haw may have been best, conditions being right, like if Muller and Wood were chin-pinned under opposite sides and ends. It would be best to agree on gee or haw, but in that circumstance, it would take an Objectivity akin to revelation for us not to say the wrong word.

<8> The above can appear as sophistry, but so can fewer words. Anyway, Objectivity points toward philosophical faith's ground, and also toward faith in Revelation. My historicity makes this meaningful for me, but I cannot say it's exactly Jaspers' meaning. What do you think ? What does cypher language mean to you ?

VICO-ERROR, AND MULLER'S BIBLE AVERSION-BASE FOR ANTI-OBJECTIVITY by
Glenn C. Wood 11 October 2002, posted 22 October 2002, TA48, C26

<1> As HM suggests {16} it seems worthwhile to concentrate on Karl Jaspers and our interpretations of his works to see "if epistemological constructionism" is compatible. It may not be the sort of emphasis welcomed by authors attempting unique contributions since KJ's passing. My position is that the best that can be

done is to come up with stylistic changes that have some shock effects, or editing some of his works relevant to current events. How disconcerting it would be to wanna-be authors to discover their proposals had already been thoroughly considered by a person of renown who's relatively unknown. I'm so certain of his pertinence that if my library had only three books it would be the Bible, General Psychopathology, and Philosophical Faith and Revelation.

<1.1> (HM may be glad to note ({14} states KJ did not mention Vico) that a Giambattista Vico is listed in the Origin and Goal of History as one of the imperishable contributors to the philosophy of history. Also, perhaps it would be fairer to refer to ... later ... Piaget and Rorty as compatible or incompatible with the ... earlier ... KJ? Vico is -- but Piaget and Rorty aren't -- found in my 1995 Oxford Companion to Philosophy which probably suggests why KJ -- from what I can determine -- omitted the latter two. (see {14} and {15}). (In a post-script GW adds : While rereading Jaspers' Reason and Existenz and in his "First Lecture" he says: "Over against Descartes, stands Pascal; over against Descartes, Hobbes, and Grotius, stands Vico...")

<2> Please permit me to reestablish some wished for credibility possibly eroded by {10} and {11} where my mention of the Bible as part of the family environment was responded to with a question: What if someone says I'm wrong? What if someone responds by declaring their own book standard? What was communicated in 6.1 was that the family environment included the Bible as the affirmed primary guide for conduct. That's not as much a boast as historical data, and no need to defend it. It is central in my worldview and to deny it would be comparable to denying whatever was received through the umbilical cord. Nor does the moral law or ethical guide mean one is destined to be better than another. We can consider the Bible/Koran matter when it's demonstrated there's a comprehension of a comprehensive history which would require coming to terms with the misuse of the golden rule and consequential reactions. (Question: Though there's a popular aversion to the Bible what good would it do to fail to recall such things as my father's comment that whereas he once was a member of a secret organization, after his affirmed "conversion experience" and study of the Bible he concluded [revealed to him personally] it was improper and so he withdrew?)

<2.1> My worldview includes the conviction that individuals need a golden-rule historical standard responsibly interpreted homilitically -- therapeutically. That biblical spirit has been a functional codified standard long before the apeiron and won't disappear as a fact of life. It begins with a pointing toward the invisible; and no matter how hard one tries, there's no way a fixed ontology or objectivism can be squeezed from what is primarily invisible without being estranged from the invisible; the biblical account includes those negatives aspects. The biblical spirit may have utilized apeiron-like symbols in the New Testament, but there's

no change in the spirit of the golden rule since the "beginning" -- pardon the expression. The worldview, ideally, includes a leaning toward the invisible more than the corporeal.

<2.2> It seems that if one leans toward the corporeal the ultimate result is at least a latent ontology; and if there's extreme caution about being clear about the as-ifs, there's an erroneous confident presumption of an as-such. Designating the invisible as Objectivity might be disconcerting to one leaning toward corporeality and subjectivity as such. That said, it's understood that HM quite properly wants to avoid fixation in corporeal Objectivity. However participation in the invisible controls the danger. His warnings are still needed, and if some must step in the apeiron in returning to the biblical invisible that's all right.

<3> In {12} HM wants to discard Objectivity and use the word revelation, and states the operative word should be intuition. Intuition by use (Locke and Kant) includes induction, through compelling sense experience, and abstractions and apperceptions result. It appears HM position is -- and let's come to terms with it -- that there is no revelation. Perhaps there's less objection to Objectivity but rather objection to revelation as something objective enough to be acceptable in some universal sense -- universal enough to have moral and ethical force when responsibly interpreted.

<3.1> Me thinks HM is being a little subtle here, knowing that John Locke's intuitive knowledge requires nor admits any proof, and that "the bare testimony of revelation is the highest certainty ... an assent founded on the highest reason" (Concerning Human Understanding, Degree of Assent, Ch.16, item 14); and, one can predict, HM would then lead us like a quantum machine along spectral lines to Kant's a priori-like space as "but pure intuition" and can involve syntheses, axioms, formulae constructed of magnitudes, or quantum, or experience (Critique of Pure Reason, Axioms of Intuition, Proof). This course shaves off the value of revelation's wisdom or if one prefers those biblical opinions of higher reason, those revelations that come to us -- and in Kant's words "they [private opinions] are necessary to our inner tranquillity;" and revelation is, in my view, beyond pure reason and participate in wise private opinions but without forgetting the Transcendental source which should not be dismissed because of an aversion to Bible.

<3.2> Kant is less cautious than HM who may be too cautious. Kant says "we must preserve to them [hypotheses, opinion, the inventive, the visionary] this character, carefully guarding against the assumption of their independent authority or absolute validity, since otherwise they would drown reason in fictions and delusions..." and "...nevertheless, we cannot properly dispense with them." (Crit. Pure R, Discipline of Pure Reason). Though a biblical-like revelation

isn't what Kant is talking about specifically, the forms of thought are applicable. Jaspers, who agrees with Kant that belief in revelation would be calamitous for man, can still say: "I want no thinking that would ultimately bar a revelation." (Philosophical Faith and Revelation p 10.) If KJ seems to be saying he does not believe in revelation one must not take that to be an absolute revelation. Nor can one read the Bible and mistake a private interpretation for revelation binding for all though the science of hermeneutics can be persuasive.

<4> In {10}it's fairly asked if there would be an objection to changing "objectivity subjected me" (referring to the sewing machine needle through the finger) to 'events shaped my experience-structuring?' Though not as pointed I've no objection to those words ... except in so far as why they're preferred, i.e., from whence come the words? If we were in a frame of scientific reference where objectivity means data universally obvious (whether two or more in the world) there's no objection. Science is limited to objectivity, but objectivity is not limited to science, and objectivity to the individual when testified to must be dealt with. Events are fixations points relative to "experience-structuring." What I want to include in the event is all that goes before it not omitting the invisible and what revelation meant to the encompassing familial ... structures; and what revelation can mean to one subject to unfortunate events, such as, the conversion experience of one of the founders of AA which includes not only Karl Jung's influence but ... the Bible and its value placed on group benefits.

<4.1> Objectivity here is not lost in the use of "event" "experience" or "structure" if proper judgement is reserved. KJ says: "...we should not arbitrarily conceive of that which encompasses [Objectivity--mine] in the same way as objects in the categories of event, causality, substance, force, etc. although when we make comprehensive statements we tend to use such expressions which we have immediately to treat with reserve." (Psychopath. p 771.) The word Objectivity, to me, is more comprehensive than a bit of experience determined eventful by the arbitrariness of subject. The reason "reserve" is sacrificed to technicality is to eliminate revelation, to avoid its pitfalls. Revelation is thrown out with the pitfalls.

<4.2> Again, it's understandable, because I've been there, as to why the aversion to the word revelation. Kant and Locke had been there too in their historicity; Locke being more influenced by the spirit of the English reformation. The world confusion over revelation is why Jaspers produced Philosophical Faith and Revelation. They were approached objectively but the invisible was not discarded. (It's important though to note that it can be safely said that Jaspers wanted nothing to do with institutional revelation, but could not deny its powerful factual existence in the form of e.g. Lutheranism and Catholicism.) But the flexibility to treat a word with reserve should involve the overall spirit in which it's used and in this case it's not an objectivity binding on everyone "no

matter which religious persuasion." I can point to the invisible, and even challenge another's faith-persuasion to persuade me of a human sacrifice as significantly shattering of dogmatism as the crucifixion of Jesus -- but in the course of loving communication. It can be done most effectively if the objectivities to which others are subject is objectively understood and an alternative Objectivity is available.

<5> If consistency is required in a fixated sense it will not be found in Jaspers, such as that seemingly required in {8} where HM says Jaspers either made a mistake or a translator made an error. Could this suggest that if consistency fails a HM criteria it's not sanctionable as absolute revelation? Here reserve should be engaged again; KJ can not be appropriated if one has compunctions about leaning toward the invisible. Taking such a refuge in wished for translation errors is ineffective in as much as enough of KJ works have been translated and not disapproved of by KJ, and he has stated his philosophical views altered little in form since his first writings. So, let's hear confessed at least a third alternative that's good for the soul.

<5.1> KJ says: "If in the nature of communication by statements, I seem to speak peremptorily, the understanding reader will not be deceived. He will note the import of the way of thinking, shown in the sequence of parts. He will see it manifested in the continual appearance of seeming contradictions which have meaning nonetheless. He will find the contradictions resolved by referring to the one undefinable something expressed in so many ways..." (Phil.Faith and Rev. p.14)

<6> The apparent justifiable anxiety toward revelation shows up in HM's interpretation of "cipher." It is "complicated" as he says in {9}, and I say, true, if one cuts off the Transcendent as source; but that cannot be done by using Chiffren instead of cipher. Cipher, it's incorrectly thought, can't mean more than ideas or mental structures that "we use all the time..." The HM wish that KJ had set out the original non-separation seems almost asking for an absolute ontology. As regards the original non-separation, it's a matter understood with an understanding exceeding "as-if" and "as-such."

<7> It might be helpful to read KJ's critics in The Library of Living Philosophers: Karl Jaspers, for there the items questioned by HM have been addressed. In his "reply to critics" KJ says this about criticisms of his use of ciphers: "Whenever I turn to myths in all their forms I am anxious to read the ciphers and to hear that language which ultimately refers to or derives from the One, which is not present in any cipher nor in any myth." (p.782) It's predicted that HM will see and emphasize the idea and structure side of the quote but have difficulty with the One not being present in any cipher. Whereas Jaspers continues: "I mean rather a passing beyond all myths, -- the picturesque foregrounds of the infinite

manifold, -- to an unpictured godhead, which appears neither as picture to the eye nor as thought to thinking..." (Ibid.) To me it is clear KJ is cipher-spelling out the original non-separation.

<8> The translators of Jaspers' works I've read are reasonably reliable and reasonably attempt to define words that cause difficulty. KJ also sometimes states which critics have grasped his meaning, e.g.: "I am grateful to Lichtigfeld that...in agreement with me he recognizes in my philosophizing the movement towards the Biblical idea of an unpictured God, toward the carrying out of the commandment: 'Thou shalt not make unto thee an image or likeness.' " (Ibid. p.783.) That's not subjectivity as much as a capital Objectivity safely preserved from subjective objectifications. It's also revelation; it's a transparent objectivity seen through and through which insight comes to the transparent subject.

<9> Full references to KJ's works can be found under TA51

SYSTEMATIC HITTING BOTTOM IN ZERO-DERIVATION by Glenn C. Wood 18
August 2002, posted 27 August 2002, TA52, C7

<1> Some time back Mr. Rifat had sent me a copy of his TA52 inviting me to comment. I responded by e-mail that some study and thought would be given to the ideas and with the intention of responding through the KJF.

<2> The following can be considered a spin-off of that effort and an acceptance of Mr. Muller's stated hope for an "inter-disciplinary" (TA11 R5 Swift's C5) approach to -- and here's the spin -- zero derivation for we all must in a sense return to what is essentially ineffable and immeasurable.

<3> Initiating an inter-disciplinary Jaspers-Existenz effort in this TA52 context -- since the author's demise -- isn't uncomfortable for me, for though I could not identify easily with Mr. Rifat's experience and findings; less honesty now out of compassion would be seemingly unacceptable by his own terms of communication.

<4> Compared to my world of experience, I have not had that manner of experience forced on me as he had indicated it was forced on him. I now assume he had an illness that needed a professionally prescribed medical regime, and that he took full advantage of the situation and described the phenomenal affects in terms of his interests and prior developmental experience; and that he might have exceeded the regime for reasons I'll not judge.

<5> It's hoped Mr. Glasersfeld -- first appearing in a comment (C10) to Muller's

TA15 -- chooses to participate along with others (his background -- personal history -- is of great investigative interest to me for he had been a farmer in Ireland during WW2, etc. and has been in the field).

<6> Mr. Muller has chosen to respond to TA52 in a most educative and tactful manner to the point that if one wanted to cease talking about -- no longer with - - the departed, his comments could be considered conclusive. Except his comments, as he knows, have implications that need considering.

<7> In TA52C1 he apparently says that the primary MIR-view, i.e., reality independent of mind, has come under attack by "post modern" thought. It's comforting when Muller then says "... which in turn is partly a result of the emphasis on loose and dream-like thinking since the mind expanding 1960's." Hopefully the reference was to "post-modernity" because it's needless to say about mind-independent ontologists.

<8> My personal aversion to words like "post-modernity" and "constructionism" can be partly understood because it's in the beginning of the "post modern" loose period that I left for the field, only to return and find the fundamentals of the history of ideas undermined by "post modernity" -- not unlike the loose thinking of the priesthood on the "Catholic" church or that of the ministers of other churches; there are presumptuous risks to begging for handicaps through titles of distinctions like "father" or "reverend" etc. If one's first name is by design and all intention and understanding Mister and last name is Smart, others are subjected by design to forced respect, or subjected to an accusation of being disrespectful.

<9> Returning from the field it was found that the historic house of ideas -- which had fundamentals -- had been arbitrarily moved from in-depth foundations and placed beside a ... real independent-of-reason radical construction, a house like the Winchester mystery house. Adjacent to the Winchester house was found a house on hidden floating footings void-of-all-"outdated"-mystery, and advertized as a unique radical construction by comparison with the radical "metaphysical" Winchester house.

<10> I thank Mr. Muller and this forum for an intense crash-course on "post modernity" and "constructionism" -- especially "radical constructionism." Upon leaving for the field I was using the Dictionary of Philosophy, Ancient-Medieval-Modern, edited by Dagobert D. Runes. Note the word "Modern." Note also that post modernity is not found in that dictionary. (Construction and psychological construction is defined.) It was printed in 1955 and I had the 1958 reprinted copy. Further investigation followed:

<11> The Oxford Companion To Philosophy, edited by Ted Honderich, 1995,

contains perspectives and definitive meanings to these terms. Not having been brainwashed by degrees of usage, these definitions have been made clearer by relating them to the way they have been used by KJF contributors, especially those symposium experts (notably beneficial has been Glasersfeld's "radical" constructionistic approach though I've not seen any normative or involuntary [see TA11 R5 to Swift's C5[8]] structure yet that differs from applied forms -- concepts -- of thinking such as that of Karl Jaspers' years ago. I wonder though if talk about something radical has an appeal to the loose secular thinking done this side the loose thinking done in the name of religion).

<12> "Post modernists" in the Oxford book seem to be those primarily who seek and find in Descartes something distasteful: his search and discovery of certitude in experience which could not be doubted; and includes the minimizing of Kant's enlightenment which resulting from his thoroughly recorded critique of pure reason. Arbitrary, modern, loose thinking erroneously prefers that period to be a closed chapter in the history of ideas.

<13> "Post modernists" are the ones wanting to be laid-back, unrestrained, loosed from those standards strung or laid as footings though sometimes uneasily detected throughout the history of stable thought. Radical constructionists might feel some pride too along with "post modernists" in being the instrumental determining factor that brought about a notable change like in the Oxford dictionary on philosophical terms.

(Descartes restrained his written thinking to make room for the institutional church's authority, and Kant made room for the prevailing traditional and popular view of God though the latter was less afraid to express critical thought not fearing the spirit of the inquisition. "Post modernists" or loose thinking also pose no less pressure. Accommodating to that spirit is easier than not accommodating. A sort of educative guess or intuitive sense and investigative inclination can suspect that whatever Kant or Descartes was accommodating to can be found no less in "radical" constructionists' claims. The threats now being more like a loss of a cherished institution-position and benefits rather than the threat of being burned alive at the stake. Having said that I apologize to my elders Muller and Glasersfeld who are well beyond retirement ... but not the love -- certainly not an addiction -- for the work.)

<14> "Post modernism" seems a little ludicrous -- along with the so called "linguistic turn" which reduces emotive language too much -- if it is thought the to-be-continued-chapter can be closed without seeing the reactionary damage institutional forces can have, i.e., the loose thinking by "radical constructionists" of another era. Loose thinking ought not ignore seeing the modern moral values resulting from religious movements/ ideas in a free state. If the loose thinking of "post modern" ethics is supposed to be better, more functional, than the mind-

independent functional apparitions of Descartes -- which is more apparent than real when seen in context -- such looseness is a good argument for the return to talk about an absolute moral law or/ and standard of ethical guidance but not through a revolutionary twisting by the linguistic brogue uttered by one with popish or revered titles but ... rather ... a pointing toward a heavenly father by one -- wholly other than myself -- most qualified to do so.

<15> So ... it is time to respond with a systematic approach to zero-derivation (0-D), or zero "negativity." Mr. Muller has a 0-D hypothesis which is applied to various contributors' comments. I've previously and systematically hit bottom in that area. He cannot find, localize, the Transcendent. Innocently he may have perhaps changed my comments about periechontology and applied the caption "epi-enlightenment" -- which I react to because not knowing how much he participates in the spirit of "post modernity" and "radical constructionism." Relating swarms of experience from the field has not gotten into the 0-D classroom laboratory nor on the minute part of the "radical" constructionist drawing table that I've seen.

<16> In the later 1960's I had recorded -- it's in the library of Lincoln Christian Seminary -- intentions of producing a philosophical logic to be applied to experience after seeing the limitations of reasoning and feelings, hoping to continue the work toward a Doctorate -- which was valued in my youth only. Faith in God or the Transcendent was not destroyed nor did the faith prevent forming structures. Faith actually permits seeing that our structures must by the nature of thinking include some conning this side of Transcendence, thus reconstruction and destruction becomes unavoidable.

<17> That construction, that philosophical logic, has now 30 plus years of extra experience which remains available, as does a good memory for the essences of first experiences. My type of "zero-derivation" never lost faith in reason nor lost the need for being faithful to personalistic feelings. But my personal relationships in life have been easy compared to others, and I suspect much easier than Mr. Rifat's, so this is not boasting about having something not given -- faith. I suspect faith is different from Muller's 0-D though I don't know, but no suspicion at all would leave us with nothing to compare.

<18> I'm willing to go with Mr. Muller to 0-D, zero derivation, if we go all the way, and then meet Mr. Glasersfeld in the field for consultation relative to construction this side of the netherworld, i.e., the hither side of the transitory ocean of Being. (It should be understood though that I'll not agree to assume religion and physics needs to go in different directions from the radicle -- root -- because of an presumed intellectual bridglessness.) It's agreed one cannot construct a philosophical logic and apply it thoroughly without an interdisciplinary dialogue leading to and through "zero derivation" or something like

zero negativity if that valley of death is where we must go to reach togetherness and stand with nothing before the "Unknown God."

<19> How to go about this task in the KJF -- systematically hitting bottom and then reconstruction -- is uncertain. Another Target Article ? Commenting on the symposium's TAs? I could do the latter but of course it would be a little like an individual's presence on a gang's turf -- without the same dangers --; I mean symposiums are made of experts amidst the wisenheimers and wisewomen from back-forty wiseacres.

<20> Here the question is posed in a comment to a comment in the most recent posting (TA52), and because Muller's comments about loose thinking allows it while his comments about coordinated thinking requires it, and because coordinated/ loose critical thinking is historically not confined to Muller's parenthetical comment that questioning about mind-independent truth and reality has been questioned in the "... past 2500 years." It's relevant too to Rifat's comment -- the content of which is questionable -- that "monothought dissociation [*italics mine*]" was launched at least 3500 years ago with Akhenaton. I maintain that limiting critical thinking and feelings to the time of Anaximander is no less questionable. (The earliest man had full potential and could have written a critique of pure reason if he had had enough leisure from the hunting and cultivation fields. But he would not have had to have been radical in his constructions, nor needed to conjure a hypothesis or a metaphysics to depart from, a radicle or root from which to disassociate.)

<21> Thanks for tolerating the above convolutions. If there's no suggestion I will probably start working on another TA but some indication of approval or value would be encouraging. Without this it could seem one is being ignored because of insignificance. That then leaves only the mission of defending Karl Jaspers' name. Mr. Muller has indicated somewhere on the KJF that he realizes the risks of being made a fool of by the chances he takes especially regarding this matter of physics and religion. I can identify with that too and admire his bold spirit. I've little doubt that in Mr. Rifat's struggles with physics and religion he had such fears too and understood that element of risk.

[NOTE – I would be interested to see what someone else makes out of the 0-D notion. It might be similar to, or perhaps very different from, what it is for me. This could give rise to an interesting discussion. If you want to make it into an article, it might be instructive also to compare your view with Paul Feyerabend's "Conquest of Abundance" (cf. TA31 and its discussion), and further to visit the Radical Constructivism web site of A Riegler. - E vGlaserfeld has not been in contact with me since a recent fire at his home; you might write to him directly. -

HFJM]

TREE DISEASES? by Glenn C. Wood 18 September 2002, posted 1 October
2002, TA53, C2

Comment to TA53 by Glenn Wood

A note to the editor : It would seem most appropriate to attach the not yet posted TA45 C72-4 and to C74 (to R10) as a Comment to TA53, and not attach to TA45 -- or at least post first under TA53. Those TA45 comments were, according to records, dated (9-8) prior to the amended TA53 dated 9-11. This brings up the question whether TA53 amendments were due in part to a forewarning, some quantum miracle-like fluctuation, or unverifiable divine providence.

To tolerate my suspicions: Your attention is directed toward David Hume's critique and suspicions of miracles based on the experiences of his time. The historical precedent in point: he points to those alleged miracles at the tomb of the Abbé Paris confirmed supposedly by educated dignitaries and when seen as something to be exploited further was leaped upon by the supposedly most educated elite, the Jesuits. This is the abstract ... leaping ... that is more miraculous than the miracles as such Hume is observing. That sort of exploitation is easily carried over into traditional theism which must also be suspect. That is why after Hume and in part due to his published observations that there began a movement out of Scotland for a standard, namely the Bible, which in effect said community miracles ought to be confined to the era of the Bible. It did not eliminate belief (especially personal trust in the imageless God) in miracles but confined them to some standard other than the exploitation by the recognized religious institutions. (It's sort of like applying zero-derivation regarding wayward miraculous thinking and seems most appropriate regarding the encoding of the infinite nature of an alleged quantum evolution. So, now, is the time for your zero-derivation formula.)

Another writer I've not been given permission to quote (but I take the liberty here to interpret) has attempted to defend natural religion or theology by pointing out that Hume does not consider fairly the God of Theism, that God having the best ... portfolio. In my view that is the very God Hume is confronting rather than the God that needs no portfolio. The portfolio is something limited minds need, and God has accommodated to that need in the Bible. By the way, that writer's portfolio is overly impressive.

Now, I request the previously submitted postings be added below. Thank you. (It's a miracle how well you do under the circumstances.)

[NOTE : I am changing the posting of GW's comment to Johnson's TA53, as he requests. - HFJM]

BEGINNING DEBATE ON QUANTUM EVOLUTIONISM by Glenn C. Wood 8
September 2002, posted 1 October 2002, TA53, C3

<1> Mr. Johnson in "On Brain in Mind" and "The Machinery and the Music" provides some answers to two questions: What was the unusual experience which had a revelational [my word] meaning in the development of his worldview, and how can one know right from wrong in this worldview? Appreciated his quick willingness to share a personal testimony. I'd like to add a few nuts and bolts, and resonating notes. (Not much time below is spent verifying references to KJF Comments and Responses and so some are eliminated. My apologies for injustices.)

<2> Tree as ageless phenomenon -- The life-changing vision of a tree for Mr. Johnson is very symbolic. It is probably a more basic science than the simplest end of the teeter-totter field of physics -- quantum theory and mechanics. Trees are right down Wood alley. I've told my kids "There is no such thing as a tree." We separate it from the ground, sky, birds, lightning, God, etc. There's no such thing as a tree as such. "Tree" has meaning though ranging from the measurable to the immeasurable. Mr. Johnson's tree is interesting even though there is no way to verify the causes and effects of that personal vision except in the ultimate result upon the worldview growing out of "the quantum law of evolution."

<3> The emphasis on images is not unlike the initial images that seemed to have influenced Teilhard de Chardin. He admits his Catholicity (which emphasizes images -- my observation) and talks about the significance of a nail head on his nursery floor and the lock-pin of a plow found in his front yard (See The Heart of Matter).

<4> A comparison with my first -- around age 2 -- tree experience starts with this lightning flash/crack and then hearing my father tell-and-show how it had split the trunk of the large tree about twenty feet from the house. The direction in which I was going and the point where in the living room I fixated is as real now as then -- almost. Only at that point did the tree exist to me.

<5> Other outstanding experiences involve the biblical trees, my father being a preacher: the tree of knowledge of right and wrong, and the tree of life. And of course there's the tree that stood on a hill far away: that old rugged cross -- as

the old hymn goes. The tree has served to absorb much mental and emotional anxiety. This is a reminder that we are in historic company regarding the significant place of trees in the biblical worldview.

<6> Religious trees are not seen as irrelevant baggage in my worldview nor is dependency on them overlooked. Nor can I claim to have by extraordinary manifestations of those images discovered something "explicit in natural order," (TA45 C74 to R10<13b>) that is, the "quantum law of evolution." Though not remembered with enough frequency, trees like the above predate our births, and if forgotten I've learned not to judge those whose memory may be superimposed upon by traumatic events from which the more sheltered have been spared. Such trauma could be war-shock or intense disillusionment with religion.

<7> Note these quotes: "quantum law of evolution," "the Cosmos is evolving in a coherent way," "evolution of the mind is simply one of the most complex extensions of evolution of Cosmos," "mind evolves because our genes were selected by nature to rule our choices by various factors including two major ones: the impulse to survive and to refine the expression of nature," "evolved mind is nature-like," "the whole gives meaning to the parts not the other way around," "Except in religion, the idea that Cosmos is a coherent whole seems not to exist" and Mr. Johnson includes some Christology, that; the second coming -- speaking about evolved values -- will happen whenever mind chances/ chooses to survive long enough [and I might add it will be soon enough and more like being "slammed-against-the-wall," pressed into assenting to the handwriting on the wall].

<8> Those near quotes are reminiscent of Teilhard De Chardin's words; he passed in midyear of ... 1955. (By the way those dots are used for pause-like emphasis -- though I'd perhaps forgotten, while rereading Kierkegaard found he used them -- and in this case the pause means that it was the same year of Mr. Johnson's tree. By the way Joseph, what was the subject of that technical report you were reading at the time?)

<9> Some of Teilhard's expressions: In his "The Heart of Matter" and the section "1. The Cosmic, or evolutive" he says "...just at the appropriate moment the idea of Evolution germinated in me, like a seed: whence it came I cannot say" and "What were the influences or what was the sudden jerk that caused this feeling to appear and drive its roots so deeply into me...?" He found himself emerging from static dualism "into a Universe which was in a state not merely of evolution but of directed evolution." In his "notion of evolution" he went beyond the "...Atomic..." as the immutable and all-embracing essence of the Universe. His "Religion of tomorrow" was "a religion of evolution."

<10> Teilhard's religion of tomorrow, religion of evolution, has surfaced in such

ideas expressed by the "pope" (Teilhard's germinating seeds of evolution were probably less natural and more inherently Catholic) and from the pulpit of the Crystal Cathedral : The CEO of that corporate church (he has referred to himself as such) has stated that he agrees with the "Holy Father" meaning he has "no problem with evolution." (To which let me quickly add "no amen.") If that sounds like a proclaimed law of quantum evolution it just goes to prove a point, that the removal of excess baggage (tithes, traditional biblical accountability, -- and the unfortunate competitive financial support for having the largest pipe organ in the world) does not give originality to subtle imagined forms of atheistic inclinations.

<11> Teilhard's hominization (the evolutionary development of human characteristics that differentiate from his primate ancestors) is quite comparable to that found in Mr. Johnson's "quantum law of evolution," but perhaps incomparable to his commitment that "...biological evolution is speeding up as we...choose our mates for such qualities and religion was a tool, a concept that served in its time -- fortunately (<13b>)." A superficial difference between Teilhard and Johnson is mainly the use of words like "quantum mechanics." Teilhard carried his religion to the ultimate immanence too, the Catholic Church being a traditional line in the progressive evolution of man and his interpretation of the incarnation fits in his line of evolutionary progress (See Chapter on "The Christic").

<12> Quantum Clarification needed -- The quantum mechanic's debate continues to rage and one can't suffer for want of an audience for none are exempt from being awestruck with quantum theory and mechanics. It's hard to imagine there can be such debate where there exists a "quantum law of evolution." What is this law? Who legislated this quantum law of evolution ? Who executes it ? How does one challenge the law and its execution ? Are we to simply bow to an ontological image of a law out of wishful thinking ? Here perhaps Mr. Johnson, having a clearer image of the "quantum law of evolution" can elucidate it with words more clearly to me. I'm sure he can.

<13> That area of physics has a certain enchantment about it. We need to remove some of the mythical content from the word "quantum." Like: quantum means "amount." A definition of Machine: A device using power to do work. Quantum mechanics from a practical perspective has to do with determinable amounts of the worth of working machines.

<14> Quantum machinery are imaged in such devices as Chernobyl, Three Mile Island and the five other accidents in nuclear power plants, and of course those still functioning. That seems to cover a very large array of practical aspects of probability and uncertainty and it's not as theoretical as the quantum proverbial machine for exterminating a cat (Schrodinger's). The comforting temporal effects

resulting from immeasurability of the remote and near theoretical experiments in the macrocosmic and subatomic physics, is the uncertainty about predeterminism and a shattering of ego-centricity often hidden or shrouded by scientific and/or poetical jargon depicting overconfidence. Uncertainty sharpens the Socratic thorn of the scientific method, falsifying with constancy, ever mindful of wayward electrons and quantum fluctuations, and keeping terrorists out of nuclear-plant control rooms.

<15> It's obvious to me where subjectivity as a microscopic image of the natural ontological subjectivity is going. What subjective imperative might be involved is this: it's imperative that a clear distinction is seen between what Karl Jaspers' Subjectivity is subject to from a philosophical and revelational standpoint : It is not a natural law of evolution, and there are psychologically meaningful reasons for this. It's hoped we can draw enough from his General Psychopathology and from personal experiences to be somewhat convincing.

<16> It will take some more getting use to the way Mr. Johnson is using his words. It appears he has clear images in mind. It will take some more reading and relating in some fashion to adjust. Meanwhile it would be helpful to get his response to the following :

<17> I'd like to conclude this first part with a few quotes from Karl Jaspers, which represent a kind of reversed hominization : "Man, one might continue [regarding man's origin, the mystery has grown deeper] has always been the authentic form of life, and all other life is a degeneration from man; in the last analysis, it was not man that developed from the ape, but ape from man" and "Man cannot be derived from something else, but is immediately at the base of all things" and also "every insight into man, if absolutized into a supposed knowledge of man as a whole, destroys his freedom." (The Perennial Scope of Philosophy, Archon, 1968, pp. 58-59.) It seems to me that in Mr. Johnson's worldview there's the danger of a loss of freedom in such statements like: "Mind evolves because our genes were selected by nature to rule our choices by various factors ..." and "... biological evolution is speeding up as we ... choose our mates for such qualities."

<17.1> My question is how does this apparent predeterminism as seen in your vision of the tree and your worldview differ from the above, and also, say, Mr. Archambault's view that man has always existed, a view substantiated to him by his reported vision of the Angel Gabriel (IT, Eternity as if it had a beginning) ?

<18> My worldview is similar to Karl Jaspers but the limits are not to be attributable to him : In the introduction to "The Origin and Goal of History" he says: "My outline is based on an article of faith: that mankind has one single origin and one goal. Origin and goal are unknown to us, utterly unknown to us

by any kind of knowledge." ... "All men are related in Adam, originate from the hand of God and are created after His image." (Yale, 1965) Though Mr. Johnson uses familiar moral (experience) and ethical (abstracted golden rules) language there's obviously no imageless biblical God, and no Transcendental source for divine precepts. We are seemingly being asked to throw out or ignore the book because of the failing evolutionary and natural tendencies of the established churches.

<19> Unfortunately I'll not touch on those outstanding agreeable areas in Mr. Johnson's views. This is to avoid providing momentum until our ships get on course.

PHILOSOPHICAL DEBATE OF EVOLUTIONISM CONTINUES by Glenn C. Wood 27
September 2002, posted 8 October 2002, TA53, C6

<1> Regarding definitions -- TA53 is an excellent example of subject being subject to something. Moreover it's good enough to be dangerous, and that's said sensing the author doesn't take ultimate credit for the inspiration behind his interpretations. That said, it's suspected there's an issue: a quantum mediated subjectivity rather than the subjectivity to the infinite Objectivity of revelation's historical standard. Eventually it may be more appropriate for a defining of terms such as subjectivity and objectivity, but when it's seen that there's some obvious aberration that needs harnessing and reeling in...here and there. Meanwhile the linguistic flow should be given full cycle (and one of history's Jeromes left to rest ... wherever he is). This is being said to assure there's awareness of the need for explicit definition in science but there's also the need for thought to be dragged along by the uninhibited turbulence of, imageless forces for some, and temporary icons for the needy (see TA53 Abstract 5th Par, final sent.). In this case the consequences of forces are the psychological effects of the biblical invisible God differentiated from the effects of the details in "quantum law of evolution."

<2> Regarding expertise -- Needless to say the only subatomic physics education I've had is through readings too, such as the Dancing Wu Li Masters etc. In the absence of Hand's-on look-see experimentation one feels dependent on the objective integrity of others whose oaths to political, religious, and sublimated rather than sublime urges might diminish objectivity and short circuit...choice. So the independent thinker relies on forms of thinking, like biblical uncertainty and consequential faith, translatable into a fearlessness to enter -- after having already walked through the valley of apeiron -- the beginning of the end of life, the domain of quantum theory in search of forces and the alleged foam-machine's mechanism.

<2.1> The most recent reference has been the internet postings on quantum evolution by Johnjoe Mcfadden. (I being a cynic wonder if there's a race between Stapp and McFadden to the publishers.) With interest lighted like a christmas tree for "quantum evolution" his works are first on internet engine searches. The critical mind can wonder if this is not a cooperative scheme to sell books, a less-than-God's scheme of redemption for book worms, a redemptive scheme determined by a latent or dormant predetermined choice out of the prehistoric foam, an aboriginal tale clinging to incoherence in the guise of coherence, an exploitation of superior expertise into the mysterious primordial stuff driven toward emotional comfort sustained in inertia or and/or refined in decreased entropy (getting one's ducks in order on survival's battle front).

<3> How can the predetermined be measured ? What bible-like epistemological philosophical revelational standard can be applied to reality that's greater than that survival instinct ? -- that quantum-stickiness to a begun past impossible to shake off except in self denial. If not for the personal judgementalism -- I recognize and admit to -- being the measure by which others are measured and judged, I'd be quick to point to the one in history who pointed beyond creation to the heavenly one, and who overcame the quantum law and nailed it to a symbol of his self sacrifice and hope. But I'm unworthy to explicitly further exploit name. Those holy ones can utter the name if there are any voices in this desolate place where Nietzsche's ugliest man lays claim.

<4> Coming to terms with God or Evolution -- To show how life developed along a certain path Mr. Mcfadden uses an example of a thought "note" process : a series of words are uttered, let's say by a counselor that a counselee responds to and in this way the thinker is moved along till the right word is uttered. It's comparable to the the way measurings fuel the quantum machine. Though resounding to much of TA53 there was a problem with emotively charged words, perhaps my problem, true, but none the less real but real and defensible, and universal in some more or less sense.

<5> Due to the historical inhibitions imposed upon thinkers by institutional church law, "evolution, quantum, law of" can be the words being led to. The counselee is led along measurably, the path toward mental health either by shattering the institutional church's immutable law's mutation or absorbing it by another mutation. When that word is squeezed from the counselee a state of mental health is supposed to be reached, a zero derivation domain, a foam covered chaos where a quantum Zeno inverse measuring process can begin. It can be seen as a quite understandable reactionary emotively charged "law of quantum evolution" to replace church dogmatism. And if this is not understood, there an increased need for renewal of an alertness, for the centralized religious organization cannot be trusted to permit forces of ideas to develop unless

collectible, unless prone to harvesting by the decreased entropy effects of authority's measurings directing back toward a controlled sabbath like inertia.

<6> What's being said is that the "quantum law of evolution" already causes division and the harvesting begun toward a one world centralized organization; and so to the threshing machine goes that special complementary of coherence and increased entropy hoped for in [5] -- the artistically conjured aesthetic quantum-logic which has a scaffold ready for the ceiling of some citadel's chapel.

<7> Removed now from the threat of overt inquisitions and the exploitation of the word "God" there remains the threat of psychological entropy, the directional effects of evolutionism's ideas on youthful urges not disciplined by biblical standards. Youthful and viagra enhanced dirty-old-man urges still need discipline and latent quantum superposition seen for how it can be exploited in the most subtle ways, a still potential sinkhole of uncertainty and descent, for after all ... eat drink and be joyful for there's nihilism in fundamental quantum, a drifting shifting idea measuring creative urges and giving misdirection; what is to be will be and who knows what unpredictable beneficial mutation may result from aberrant performance.

<8> There's a side door left open in TA 53, and it looks religiously correct or complementary enough because given the name "creation" -- a word used implicitly but manifesting a constrained providence though absorbed quickly in an explicit law of chance, chance tunneled complementarily to a law of adaptation, selection, replication ... Just as there's moral reason to minimize evolutionism there's adequate reason to minimize creationism if it tends to preclude research that could reduce suffering through such as microbiology -- and this quote ... by Raman TA5 [4] "...a single hit by a cosmic ray may lead to mutations of enormous long-range significance" can apply to the emissions from a theory of evolution accelerated by mass ascent due to assent to a law made of quantum mechanical observations. The need for law points to a moral state of degradation out of control. Due process is suppose to provide time for repelling laws legislated by the exploitation of unjust forces. There's still enough uncertainty for ... due process ... to rescue mankind from the "quantum law of evolution" and leave room for faith. Due process is yet in the peripheral as seen in McFadden's quote by Hall (Barry Hall, University of Rochester) in (internet) Chapter 12, that "... the selective generation of mutations by unknown [emphasis mine] means is a class of models that cannot, and should not be rejected."

<9> These unknown means, this divine intervention again of uncertainty leads us to the precautionary words of Karl Jaspers in General Psychopathology which contains a viable thought form perhaps a symmetry of a universal nature which will survive throughout the quantum theory and efforts to make it law : "The basic substance of heredity at any time is the realization of the ground-plan of

that species, the repetition of the same basic structure which constitutes this particular form of life. The theory of heredity concerns itself experimentally only with slight modification, the ripples on the surface as it were, not with the foundation event." (p.512 University of 'Chicago Press, 1963.)

<10> To be continued note : Coming -- The "quantum law of evolution" defined; falsification of the view that humankind is no longer the measure in subatomic physics. (This may materialize into an interdisciplinary approach to hitting bottom in reason and emotion. [Also it does the heart good to see the accurately dated recording of contributions from those without titles of distinction such as TA 53 seems to be, i.e. if not a pseudonym. They, the ideas, need to be protected from exploitation by aggressive authors].)