

<1> Introduction

Consideration was given to replying to each of the paragraphs of JJ's R5. It would have been too extensive to consider definitions, involving too many landings and not enough soaring. Nothing was found to dispute in vdMeijden's C7, and Mutnik's comments were found invigorating and will be referred to below in context.

<2> Part 1

In view of JJ's amended wording of the quantum law of evolution, in my rush into a quantum particle defensive superposition to oppose a Stapp/ Mcfadden/ JJ-like quantum law of evolution, it appears my efforts against it did more to support it by pointing to McFadden's systematic reductionistic support for quantum evolution. It is appreciated and understood that R2,3 is more of a stylistic change than substantial, and that there is some orderliness in quantum mechanics is obvious -- at least indirectly. Refinements toward a hoped for quantum evolution law to sustain an "abstraction theory and the structure of natural order" could yet come across as an expression of meliorism. Simply being caught up in a natural process of unfoldment might be further avoided if further refined or amended, to "a subjective structure of an apparent (phenomena interpreted as in Kant) wished for universal natural orderliness." That would recognize that humankind can make the world better rather than assuming the world is getting better in every way -- positive but perhaps naively excluding the little fish being eaten by the bigger. Such a change would not diminish the seriousness of labored decision and a cosmology interpreted, as PM suggested, less provincially. From a humane cosmological or rather cosmopolitan perspective, at any one time -- this side of a hoped for biblical conflictless millennium -- it is reasonable to say one orderliness is chaos for another; and that is a reality unavoidable in a Husserl type of return to things themselves in as much as the have-nots are as much a thing-as-such as are the haves.

<2.1> JJ asks what is the highest abstract of natural order ? Seeing more or less than cosmic trash in a return to things themselves quite naturally -- leaving room for a natural religion -- though incorrectly takes flight in speculation or contemplation about the beginnings and ends of things themselves. PM seems rational, maybe too much so, about this and therefore seems nihilistic, for his thinking seems to take off an assumed top rung of the abstract ladder -- which is really topless on either end -- but there's no inspirational lift, only a return to a search for patriarchs somewhere in Zen and a phenomenology of a later-Husserl type. Husserl's contributions to psychology involved nothing new over Kant's phenomenology except a reaffirmation of the need to be reminded that there's always a need to return to things themselves though impossible, and Jaspers

uses phenomenology in an attempt to deal with psychopathological data observed in and affirmed by patients and phenomena always requires careful interpretation regarding the connections to made of ideas. Jaspers states that Husserl's earlier use of phenomenology was of value in psychology, but when later used to indicate the essence of things intuited through things themselves, that becomes not only a problem for interpretation (a scientification of philosophy) but for the potential source of wisdom in interpretation. In TA 51 regarding the "revelation" to ("Latter Day Saints") Joseph Smith I was using phenomenology trying to make empirical application through falsification which resulted in bracketing the matter after showing possible connections with phenomenal events of the time. Eliminating the likes of a Smith testimony by some principle of falsification would reflect against cipher reading, philosophy, and of course biblical revelation. It was better to bracket it. The same should be done with JJ's theories of evolution/creation and with PM's things in itself and prehension, both, to me represent -- in the brogue of Sartre -- a bad faith when carried to beginnings and ends.

<2.2> After reading C7,8, I reread the events encompassing the Jacob-Ladder dream in Gen.18 paying special attention to the psychology of Jacob's thinking (when in route to get a wife) for after all it was his dream, which he interpreted in some absolute manner the effects of which are still being played out today in the fight to localize God in the struggle over who can possess the key to peace (Jerusalem = possessor of peace). At its functional best phenomenology is still several miles off the thing itself -- the distance between Bethel and Jerusalem.

<3> Part 2

On the lighter side of this dialogue, I'd like to take the liberty to make a few comments about the unusual phenomena, which JJ's been trusting enough to share. Such sharing is comparable to what I was attempting in TA51 regarding myself, Jaspers, Nietzsche etc. Self-observation, introspection, of this sort and intensity is considered extremely difficult by James and requires subtlety and accuracy, and some boldness to face the connections and effects on conduct. Jaspers has said there are some not capable of this sort of introspection, or words to that effect, and I think that's an accurate observation and not a value judgement. That might be why if law is needed an inverse evolution might be effective on some whose behavior can only be controlled by some prohibition like "see this is what you will become under this life style." But that's more a law of how to avoid death rather than a faith to live by.

<3.1> Quantum measuring degrees -- JJ had obtained and was reading a technical report wherein Velikovsky indicated that during W.W.II RCA collected data indicating interference with short-wave radio which seemed to place credence to minimal interference when planets were at 60 to 120 degrees relative to the sun. The likelihood of that seems probable to pool players

(referring to the extraordinary Compton billiard table with subatomic particles). It seems to me trees' limbs and roots naturally grow that way tending toward overall balance even on windswept shores -- if the trigs can't incline the trunk leans into prevailing forces. The relevance of the relativity in cosmos and the microcosmic can be largely taken for granted until individuals' worlds are turned upside down -- embellishing a bit on PM's evaluation of space junk -- which still needs to be seen through, and for those believing in biblical revelation seen more positively as an order declaring the handiwork of the heavenly father. But that's due to faith in revelation more than faith in our honest observation of the cosmos. I mean, if the earth is about to be hit by a meteorite that verse is authoritatively comforting and the merciful God might at least place the believer and unbeliever strategically at ground zero.

<3.2> As JJ's father was good at astrology my father was extremely good at dowsing. It's doubtful that either of us exploit such as miraculous, no more than how the mind can move a limb or give expression to feelings, nor how feelings can, and as William James says as a basic postulate of psychology "no mental modification ever occurs which is not accompanied by bodily change"--therefore beware of at-risk lifestyles. (The principles of Psychology, 1890 Vol. I p.5). Regarding the paranormal our family generally took the biblical admonition quite seriously and stayed clear of sorcery or soothsayers limiting such as there is of it to biblical stories and discussions about their meanings, while noting that if someone wanted to misbehave and found difficulty deciding on a proper course, critical thinking could be short-circuited by reverting to signs. Thus when potential mates against established convention want an urge to take a preferred and arbitrary direction the question is asked: "what's your Zodiac sign" and so the stars take priority over the decalogue even as a guide. I think this is what Jesus meant when he said a wicked generation seeks after a sign.

<3.3> How this all emotionally explodes into something sublime and moving is challenging to one's capacity for making connections. A follow up question to JJ would amount to a search for the emotional connection to sublimated urges turned inward. Without asking I'd wonder if he remembers -- for lack of a less misused word -- falling in "love" nearly fifty years ago or something comparable - - a catalytic process, the creative urge, a sustaining vital elan sublimated with mental consequences. For instance Karl Jaspers attributes much to his relation with his wife Gertrude when all things just seemed to come together in their togetherness.

<3.4> Reductionism -- JJ's References to quantum law and quantum theory and mechanics led me to hasten into the subatomic to see if there was anything that could give integrity to reductionism there. I'd gone there before not in search of an ontology but to see how difficult it was to see limitations and see what could be turned into a pseudo science to replace philosophy and revelation.

Comparable in forms to religious fundamentalistic thinking about the Greek and Hebrew languages, that's a basic or fundamental place to go, similar to going into the nucleus of HM's apeiron, for it refines intelligence by not sustaining dogmas by some natural religion iconicism -- which can be carried to far when applied to biblical revelation. We can then listen more impatiently and sympathetically to those doing laboratory research on the shadowy cave-like brain knowing the epistemological limits of thoughts from a quantum mechanic perspective where small can be beholden as more beautiful than held and exploited.

<3.5> Cipher reading -- The principles involved in cipher language applies to JJ's reading of phenomena. As PM has indicated -- if I understood -- the cosmos can be overrated or overvalued in abstractions; though to me meaning it can be a cipher to be read with inspiration and not turned into a mere wayward sign. The same can be done with any science including the microcosmic field of inquiry and experimentation. Capitalizing Cosmos might smack of exploitation especially if it's shaved of infinity, which JJ does not seem to want to do, but does seemingly reduce personal attributions to abstractions on a ladder where ingress and egress is one ended. That shaving is not avoided by the use of evolutionary subjectivity as an unfolding or creative object though at the highest rung on one section of the ladder of abstraction. (See Whitehead's objective immortality and eternal objects.) Whitehead's "prehensive occasion" is a kind of feeling, every feeling a positive prehension whereas every abstraction a negative one and could be similar to Jaspers' reading of ciphers for they are not considered mere abstractions and he, like Whitehead, warned against the high abstractions of science being mistaken for concrete reality. A ladder imaging could be interpreted without excluding contemplation being a top visible rung and meditation, though nebulous, beyond, prayer being the last though out of sight, and what descends is up to God and the openness of the humble ascender who went there only by the grace of God. (I'm grateful to PM's comments which led me to look again at Whitehead and especially James, the worth of the latter coming in part from medical training; and it's hoped PM might take another look at Jaspers.)

<4> Part 3

Now on the heavier side -- Speaking of W.W.II let's look at Heisenberg and Bohr in the Copenhagen dynamic situation during W.W.II and consider the interference angle in the world of the humanities; looking at the importance of exercising free will regardless of possible cosmic influences, decisiveness and restrained indecisiveness regarding the race for the atomic Bomb. Germany was working on it and there's controversy about H's contributions. H's uncertainty in spite of B's confidence cannot be ignored. I'd guess H delayed the inevitable, whereas B, though reluctantly, hastened one side along. H and B struggled with the consequences of free will, indecision and decision, though only playfully

considering the predeterminable, but maybe ... prayfully ... wondering about the will being subject more to deterministic chance, fate, or providence, the nearer side of indeterministic processes. How much religious values determined their decisions, thank God, is probably beyond comprehension -- and more prehensive if objective uncertainty replaces an objective certainty, for as James said: "When indeed one remembers that the most striking practical application to life of the doctrine of objective certitude has been the conscientious labors of the Holy Office of the Inquisition, one feels less tempted than ever to lend the doctrine a respectful ear." (Will To Believe, essay.)

<4.1> In part justification and relevance for this existential H/B saga is WJ's Pragmatism which in effect says the value of thoughts depends on the positive effects. In this reference the metaphoric object is evolutionism/creationism and the atom bomb the empirical object. Both H and B were theoretical physicists, but more than that they were individuals with histories. They were guys thrown into a situation where they were forced to view knowledge as an instrument for the sake of life not life for the sake of knowledge. Propositions for consideration would be how much humanity-theory was involved in the atomic bomb creation. Both physicists were influenced by religion or at least intense humanistic concerns (they both had wives and mothers like Jacob and Esau did). H's studies at the Gymnasium included religion. It's suspected he as director slowed the bomb's progress -- perhaps due to some convenient "constant" elevated to some principle of just-enough uncertainty. B worked on the bomb at Los Alamos, opposed secrecy (a predisposition one could assume H knew) and wanted international control over the bomb while fearing the consequences. This ethical struggle shows the philosophical and religious aspect of the Copenhagen interpretation of quantum mechanics, and if Stapp, Mcfadden, Hawkins can resolve that problem then perhaps their hasty judgements, their nonphenomenological approach to evolutionism/ creationism might be worth restoring from the deleted basket. Otherwise it seems the height of irresponsibility to be interpreting phenomena from a physics field in terms of philosophy or theology. The intensity of irresponsibility is only exceeded in the subtleties of their metaphysical commitment. What if any did the objects of evolutionism and creationism play in a positive way in the atomic bomb's creation or evolution -- pardon the terms ? If the same forms of thinking are like those involved in materialism and spiritualism (James) and if there is no practical difference between the two in this Copenhagen struggle than James' could conclude the dispute is idle. It is not an idle matter because still open to uncertainty and therefore it can be assumed to make a difference until provable otherwise and it would be best for "renown" authorities to stick to their area of expertise.

Hugh Bone's Comments re: <4> Part 3 - Heisenberg and Bohr

The stage play, "Copenhagen" about Heisenberg's visit to Bohr in 1941, was so interesting I got a copy that includes an extensive postscript by the author, and references quite a few relevant historical documents.

The play isn't just about physics. It starts with the long-dead ghosts of H and B, Bohr's wife Margarethe, and re-plays the visit. It is about memory and forgetting, love, friendship, politics, especially politics.

The Nazis had disparaged relativity as Jewish physics, and many of the best physicists left Germany.

There is now a movie version of the play on PBS which is very well done.

There is interesting philosophic material in the Postscript, including the question of the ability of homo sapiens (anthropomorphically limited) to understand the world of nature.

CONSTRUCTIVISM RADICALLY DEPARTS FROM JASPERS by Glenn C. Wood 5
October 2002, posted 5 November 2002, TA45, C1

The TA53 dialogue regarding creationism and evolutionism, though an exercise, even though metaphysically "refined" doesn't seem "sustainable" for it's that type of knowledge or thinking that "moves in a circle, so that only the content and the capacity of the circle differ from each other." (Jaspers, p.799 Library of living Philosophers.)

The content and capacity is the phenomena and phenomenology of a reality which as a whole is untouchable and unknowable regardless of how much is abstracted and structured from piece-meal participation.

TA54 is relevant to TA53 and TA51 and has captured my interest -- which I try to follow. So I'd like to begin reviewing Jaspers' with radical constructionistic thinking in mind to see if it can be shown that there's only stylistic changes -- like seeking novel recognition in a largely speaking English world by using another language -- without giving due credit.

It seems constructionism (constructivism) without the ism shares with the biblical Jaspers an opposition to Thomistic thinking; but with the "ism" it amounts to constant leading to the things from the sensory object of awareness all the way to deity while denying the deity. The turn now to TA54 acknowledges that

Jaspers is the father of theistic existential concepts (illuminating constructions) -- Existenz defined as a self suspended between itself and the invisible Transcendent, and that the radical constructionist might attempt to avoid the ... theistic ... in order to be paradigmatically recognized as a unique originator.

The concentration (Piagetianism) on children as primitive source suspiciously could amount to a change in "a little child shall lead them" to a potential "mislead them by misuse of childhood experiences."

JASPERS ON THE LIMITS OF SCIENCE, STRUCTURES AS APPARITIONS By Glenn C. Wood 3 November 2002, posted 19 November 2002, TA54, C3

Introduction: If the KJF editor agrees, this comment seems applicable to TA54 though initially prepared as a Comment to Muller's C27 (on C26 by Wood) TA48. Paragraphs in <> relate to <>'s in C27. References to Ernst von Glasersfeld (G), and Gerard de Zeeuw (Z), Alexander Riegler (R) are from "Foundations of Science" click-on reference under TA54.

<1> HM expresses a concern about the potential effect on "development" in science if an interpretation of C 26 (TA48) is understood incorrectly. I'm grateful for the reminder of how delicate the balance along this line can be. But C27 leaned differently than C26 intended. C26 <1> was trying to show the relativity by comparison and differentiation of what passes for radical constructionism (given distinction by Constructivism) (RC) with Jaspers' (KJ) philosophical logic. (To me "ism" hints strongly of exclusiveness and closed endedness; and those high case letters, i.e, RC hereafter are not to be construed as an acceptance that radical constructionism has been raised to the level of the epistemic principle.) When such a comparison is made it seem to me KJ stands out as a paradigmatic philosopher and as regards science at least seminal. A former student (at least the statement is in the Translators' Notes) of KJ has said: "although few philosophers have practiced science better or esteemed it more highly than this author of an authoritative treatise on psychopathology, he never ceases to insist that one of the chief rewards of practice of the scientific method is direct acquaintance with the limits of science." (Author of the Introduction to KJ's Nietzsche, see TA51 Bib.)

RC thinking ought not slight KJ's contributions. If that continues constructionism (radical constructivism) can then justly be judged radical, novel, also autistic. Within "RC", then, an apparition could manifests itself, and be taken as a stealth-like abduction, i.e. without recognizing the contents of induction and deduction necessary to "development." ("Abduction" here used as Pierce used except meaning a denial of at least an essential part of a neglected source of a so-called

educated guess.) HM's concern about development seems to be a measure of that difference between what is meant by revelation and rationalization. Both can be an authoritative complex defence mechanism if there are radical forces under momentum -- such as RC's momentum. But there are no radical constructs in KJ's works that escape his own radical critical reflection -- that's one reason he's found difficult to read, but not too difficult for Glasersfeld (G).

For ex: Plato to be understood, says KJ, means "to take him as a basis for testing our own thinking..." (p.113 Gr. Phil.) KJ has classified Plato as a seminal thinker, a founder of philosophical thought and is critical of Aristotle for placing Plato in some position within an arbitrary view of the history of philosophy, saying that Plato was part of that development of a philosophical mind dependent on the "Italic" school. Plato's "theorems" can be compared with views that develop, but not his philosophy that participates in the nonexistent. My view of KJ's works is that he is paradigmatic more than seminal in that his existential thinking is not only philosophically and scientifically outstanding -- because systematic -- but also that he recognizes in human history that humane potential is fundamental and not a potential that has developed. Aristotle has to assume his own philosophy to be more developed or superior to Plato's; that assumption was his absolute for judging Plato. Philosophy is what makes for the great original thinkers and Jaspers names Anaximander as first but that's because there is a record of sorts. Records, right or wrong, inspired or conjured, must be critiqued. I see this fundamental philosophical leaning toward the awesome in biblical thinking as seminal. Biblical lessons have to be responsibly deciphered and this appears to be the KJ position too.

HM's reference to Vico seemed to suggest that KJ had abducted constructionistic thinking without giving due credit to forebears; and C 26 showed KJ wasn't setting himself up as an absolute "Italic" as Aristotle did to Plato. Vico might be an "Italic" to HM and RC. C26 showed KJ gave credit where due and mentioned Vico. It almost seems as though there's a need to show that if KJ abducted ideas, that this precedent justifies RC for slighting KJ, even to the denial that Jaspers mentions Vico. As regards the development (giving and arranging content) of ideas; it's KJ's testimony that Plato, Kant, Nietzsche, Kierkegaard, wife Gertrude, and Max Weber, were clearly influential in his scientific and philosophical logic's development. So here the proper question is who influenced Plato and Gertrude (besides those who influenced Anaximander)? At the time of C26 I wasn't thinking so much about what HM was doing with Vico and the others, rather, what the others might not be doing with KJ.

But now that HM has mentioned it, it's conceivable he unintentionally contributes to the idea of ... progressive ... development by being part of that convention, or that empowered and financed RC community where, after constant fine filigree screening, consensus could become the standard. HM is listed in editor R's

Foundation of Science's RC acknowledgments, wherein that list could lay the potential for the development of the tyrants mentioned in Z's TA54 3.2. Talk of tyrants infiltrating -- such groups as RC -- might affect a screening out those who talk about biblical revelation, for that's the educational industries' "in thing" unjustly implying: how could such not be a tyrant. Posting TA54 could show HM's editorial genius or divine guidance to assure RC's membership doesn't total the sum of tyrants of subjectivism unable to see themselves as such amidst an intoxicating in-house congeniality.

There's so much revealed parenthetically, and especially impressive is HM's hinted-at preference for "instrumental thinking" over "development." He also reminds that there's a difference between philosophy and science, and that RC is a science in process whereas KJ is a philosopher. KJ is always scientific and but always more philosophical. It's probably correct to say that the forum is called KJF partly because KJ was a MD, psychiatrist, i.e., scientist. His orientation was science and was no less a biologist and/or psychologist than Piaget, though the latter might be seminal in a special way, KJ more paradigmatic and at least seminal in general and specials (one does not become a psychopathologist without having outgrown psychology). It doesn't seem disconcerting that KJ may not have mentioned Piaget whose investigations revolved about children and in that frame of reference had no reason to mention KJ (he may have). But RC takes off from there, seems to stomp on Popper after making him an "ontologist," a lesser figure or more vulnerable -- because less convoluted or difficult -- than Jaspers, and returns to matters already covered by KJ such as in General Psychopathology.

<2> One ought not expect interpretations of philosophy and revelation to be more universal than what's possible in the interpretations of science -- given the limitations of the mind. What avoids dogmatism is leaning toward the fundamental potential nature of humane attributes, mainly the humble one which recognizing the limits of the mind; a Western/scientific phenomenon emphasized most by KJ. The positives of Western standards being promoted internationally can be seen in the awarding of the 2002 Nobel Peace Prize to a bible thumper from the bible belt (Carter) in recognition for efforts to resolve problems the products of which are due to interpretations and applications of science which gives one nation continued power over others. It's either this nation or another--something to be made the best of because unavoidable. Psychological insights can show that the difference between the Orient and Occident is seen in reductionistic ideas about faith rather than biased theistic or nontheistic conceptualizations. Faith makes up for the real difference, but the golden rule spirit can be seen in the Cain/Abel event and rather than a Jesus/Muhammad comparison, it's more of a Arab/Holy Roman empire reactionary situation -- not omitting the immorality both Jesus and Muhammad were responding to including those violations of the revealed golden rule that

crucified one more than the other. Why must there be a doubling of the negative biblical lessons experienced by those failing to practice the golden rule? Because TA54 incorrectly says the bible was the standard used by church committees judging what does and does not amount to doubling? Those committees did not use properly deciphered biblical lessons, but rather determined arbitrarily which doubling could be ignored for the sake of church/state-like perpetuity (Kierkegaard's there are no biblical christians here applies).

<3-4> Here HM states, if understood, revelations must be (a) personal and radical-constructionistic primarily and (b) effective on others. Seems to me therein lies the value of the biblical account of constructions -- without the radical. Here (a) assumes something (b) needs. Latzel says of the symbols KJ uses, e.g. "Existenz," that they are (a), but (b), if capable, must be prepared to help oneself, but not all can for "they can be understood only by a potential Existenz." (Schilpp p. 319--see TA51 Bib.) Such semantics, signs, can become ciphers for the scientific and philosophical/theistic community. To discard objective standards because of misuse amounts to replacement with interpretation as an absolute standard -- imposed arbitrarily. The reformers of the Reformation saw that need for the standard because of the immorality of the Church. Those institutionalized "historical revelations" and "miracles" resulted in disastrous consequences but were not the result of biblical forms of thinking, rather; the church's conventional subjection of biblical truths strained through an established institution's tenacious perpetuation. When bible based thinking was authentic enough to be a threat to the political church, conventions were convened to rule on matters not so much from a biblical perspective as from a traditional group preservation perspective--seemingly contrary to what TA54 implies when mentioning the bible. "RC" has that potential for self-preservation. That might be harder to see if there are more financial awards from bible bashing than bible thumping.

The suffix "ity" in objectivity includes a vagueness akin to the hiddenness of reality (there's ity again) and when respected it can be capitalized, i.e. Objectivity. It opens up the objective to immanent insight and the subjective to transcendental revelation. Glasersfeld prefers the word intersubjectivity to "objectivity" quoting Heinz von Foerster's complaints about "objectivity." But objectivity -- if not subject to an innersubjectivism or "intersubjectivity" -- prevents delusional thinking, that thinking done in the innersubjectivism resulting from the crowd-like hypnotic effect of intersubjectivism. The observer is not self-caused nor are individual ethics wholly inner or caused by intergroupism -- unless revelation is secretly abducted. "Ity" seems to be something unfamiliar to Glasersfeld and because of this his intersubjectivity could become inner-intersubjectivism. "RC" must be restrained from reducing the high and low case "o" in "objectivity" to an even smaller "o" for "RC" is popular enough (though claiming persecution) to do so, for after all radical constructionism is now

"Radical Constructivism."

It's understood that science is objective in the way HM states. But dropping "ity" for a potential "RC" "ism" is risky. To do so would be like losing oneself from the historical lifeline while being invited into the parlor of RCism where the Foundations of Science's editor can say that another's experience doesn't qualify for the collective; another's experiences "must fit into the current web of knowledge in order to make sense -- a fact which is stressed by the constructivism movement in education." To retain "objectivity" is to remain detached from that sort of consensus. "RC" has a sticky web-like philosophy even if disclaimed. "Now the picture of public philosophical discussion is curious," KJ says, "in many instances a critic obviously is tied to his opponent -- the more so, if the latter is a creative philosopher --, by that fact that unnoticed he has permitted himself to be hitched to the thought-trains of the one attacked." (Schilpp p. 850) Objectivity permits a detachment in principle though there is the risk collective's actors will say that a nonsubmissive tyrant has been screened -- meaning a creative philosopher/scientist. The web is shook as a forwarning.

Take TA54 as example. It's a noble -- hopefully not ignoble -- effort to bridge the gap between conventional science and the on-the-way to conventionality of "RC". TA54 seems initially to be refreshingly objective toward the arbitrariness of "RC", but due to the momentum of "RC's" popularity in education circles Z ends up talking about detachments and attachments almost as an effort to avoid saying in normal language "Hey, hold on, from a proper detached perspective there's nothing new." Funded science educators cannot allow this to happen and there's an understanding that "development" must be protected. What is probably most novel in "RC" is the content furnished by Piaget, but most of the essentials of that content are inherent in the forms and high quality observations of KJ's works.

Piaget stated each of us think we are psychologists. But moving beyond that we are psychopathologists, for as Jaspers said, as "children we drew things not as we saw them but as we imagined them, so, as psychopathologists, we go through a phase in which we have our own notions about the psyche and only gradually emerge into a direct, unprejudiced apprehension of psychic phenomena as they are. Phenomenological orientation is something we have to attain to again and again and involves a continual onslaught on our prejudices." (p.56 Gen. Psycho.) This detachment and attachment in so called science involves the distinction between psychology and its counter pathology because "ologies" have to do with our logical or systematic ways of handling the normal and abnormal from some overall historical standard and principle to which normal and abnormal can be measured.

"RC's" emphasis on the subjective surely ought to welcome the general KJ's

guidelines for handling the phenomena of experience, and phenomenology is making sure terms mean the same class-like thing for the users -- while remembering the distinction between phenomena and noumena --, terms like subjective/objective. KJ itemizes meanings in the introduction to what begins with the subjective phenomena of psychic life of abnormal psychic phenomena; (see following par.) and TA54's relevance to KJ is seen in the objective performance of psychic life in total performance, etc., and the bridge, though primarily and vaguely empathetic, is addressed in meaningful connections. The current state of moral affairs seems to warrant the application of psychopathologies' methods more than normal psychology.

As we are all psychologists we are also, if balanced, not unaware of our diseases of the mind (with the exception of 4. below). Not immune, if reflective at all, we are patients of our better selves, constantly in therapy. We can start this self-evaluation as thinkers subject to the following (reduced and reworded) definitions by KJ: 1. The objective, measurable performances; and subjective means everything comprehended by empathy; 2. objective can mean what is understood as intellectual, and subjective as that grasped by sympathetic insight; 3. objective can be used for what then succumbs to subjective insight; 4. the objective and subjective can be hardly distinguishable in some experiences, only slightly differentiable if at all by a person or observer; objective retardation and subjective retardation hardly distinguishable even with exceptionable learned empathy (might include those incapable of seeing the objectiveness of their subjectivism, those without Existenz potential -- maybe as in Latzel's quote above); and 5. the last part of this dichotomous constant provides for matters in the community and involves those objective phenomena that can be tested and discussed. Subjective phenomena are those less vivid and untestable but rest on purely personal judgments and unclear impressions -- wherein communication might exhausts itself in the sort of silence mentioned in TA45C18 by Pivnicki.

The editor of Foundations of Science says: "Constructions of the mind cannot be arbitrary because of the historical dependencies of constructs." Of course the agenda and ulterior purpose is to edit, and publish "RC" material but this comment must be a little embarrassing for "RC". No, the arbitrariness of the subjective is avoidable to the degree absolutes are restrained and don't interfere with honest discussion except maybe to do good deeds. Arbitrariness replaces empathy when subjectivism becomes objectivism and the latter disclaimed. Arbitrariness is controlled by the acceptance of what cannot be changed, i.e. the restraining nature of subjective and objective reality -- the limits of the ity-bity mind.

HM's idea is not an absolute nor a revelation, i.e., that religions can only bring certainty by modern day liberal's use of "conservative," for that's more of that bad faith, unless what is meant by conservative is the biblical idea of the

imageless God and consequential individual freedom, and certitude is based on faith more than knowledge -- but that's more conserve-ity than conservatism. GOP and GOD is often but ought not be considered identical. HM's view of religion's need for certitude might encourage that identification.

HM remains tenaciously faithful to Anaximander -- maybe an outstanding original thinker who had to be talking to those potentially familiar with the concepts, and circumstances may simply have been favorable for venting ideas. Maybe he had a Jewish wife of the lineage of Hagar or Sarah -- Anaximander I mean. I ask again: why not go back to the biblical Job or the imageless God of the decalogue, or what was current and constant in the genesis account? Why must the potential for conceptual communication be assumed to have developed at the point of a change in stylistic language?

Re: <6-8>, hopefully there's no misunderstanding about the affect (affectations) of the signs KJ used. His greatness is in the manner of expression, which encourages communication, moved along by one's willingness to interpret according to one's orientation. That language sought for in TA54 could be the cipher language referred to by KJ without reducing individual revelation to rational insight inducted and deducted from subjectivized objective experiences. That cipher language requires an attitude different from the popularly correct but truly incorrect statement by Z, that the bible in the middle ages contributed to restricting science (TA54, 2.2).

What HM says is his knowledge of KJ could be that both see that God cannot be limited to an event in time and space (see Schilpp, 785 KJ's reply to critics). The damage done by limiting God and revelation to time and space can be seen in the early penal codes of New England. In Maryland a convention of Catholics and Protestants passed a law against denying the doctrine of the trinity the third offense resulting in death and of course confiscation (abduction) of goods. Such trinity-thinking is not a biblical concept. It's a rationalized effort to remove the uncertainties from a state-church faith, a reduction of God to subjective dimensions and predicaments of thought without acknowledging minds' inherent limits and proneness to seeing things in terms of beginnings and ends. Thomas Jefferson saw clearly that if no executions took place in Virginia it was not due to moderation by the state-like church, but due rather to historical circumstances which had not been developed or handed down to us. Perhaps this is what HM means by revelation.

What I mean to accomplish from a scientific collective perspective is to limit excessive degrees of universal concurrences, which seems bent on slighting a biblical-ethical standard. It's seems appropriate to do that on a "Karl Jaspers Forum," for innuendoes slighting biblical influences (including Glasersfeld's disapproval of "fundamentalism") could suggests it's KJ's view too -- whereas it's

not. That ethical standard's new Objectivity is the partial product of the freedom allowed by the U.S Constitution's separation of church and state: the liberty to return to the spirit of the golden rule manifested in earliest records: the Old Testament and, reemphasized as in a universality (love that "ity!"), enlightened by the Decalogue spirit and neighborly-love of The New Testament.

So, as HM collects examples of mechanisms that interfere with discussion, and though it appears to him that revelation can be one of them, if the gavel has not fallen yet, it's hoped that maybe he'll beware of the clear and distinct in "RC". Pseudo revelations hindering communication might be hidden there too and qualify for the top of the list.

EVOLUTIONISM JARGON REQUISITE FOR IMMANENT EXCLUSIVITY by Glenn C. Wood 12 January 2003, posted 21 January 2003, TA55, C10
Comment on Hontela's TA55 and Müller's C5

<1> I'd like to make a brief agreeable comment on TA55 [4]. It is "... difficult to understand that 'plants want to survive and flourish, and to do so they follow the sun.'" That anthropomorphizing seems typical of language used in radical evolutionists' constructions; it's too much nonobjective subjectivity without much quality objectivity; and, that, not avoided by referring to what we can know by either term : God or Nature. God is at least a confession -- or substitute for failing to or not wanting to admit we cannot know -- that we can't know, and Nature is used in the same way with greater pre-determinism, imaged or constructed as a ladder from props. This or that species to survive "evolved" features for this or that purpose, it is said; whereas honesty allows it to be said that the species survives in part due to apparent contingencies.

<2> TA55[5]'s "each living organism standing on any step of the evolutionary ladder ..." is not only a radical construction of what is too much to be reduced to a construction; it is ... jargon. It allows for the linguistically greased ascent and descent of the structure easily into the unknown and unknowable. Terms like "the evolutionary ladder" admits one into the prevailing club of immanentism for that is one of the main babbling bits required. If one does not start a conversation with such as "evolutionary ladder" or "God" in certain radical groups, then one is excommunicable, or at least considered unworthy of direct address. Reminds me of this person who came for food stamps, and my disagreement with an associate who argued the man was not eligible because he lived in a cardboard box, i.e., he had "no bona fide address." "Evolutionary ladder" is used as a bona fide address or privileged redress to meet the demands of some assumed authority's decree, or Degreed authority, or general educational industry's out-of-control funded trend, and has little to do with empathy and sympathy toward amoebae and plebiscites -- both are farmed,

cultivated, and harvested to mimic prelates with doctoral degrees and ecclesiastical primates' with honorary doctorates' "ladder of evolution" constructs.

<3> HM's beginning thought in C5 <1> appears like a genuflecting, a flashing of a club card which reads "ladder of evolution." It decreases the value of the superb ideas about the degrees of practicalities and limits of reductionistic thinking. Who can argue with HM's AIDS-virus analogy? None! Nor can it be forgotten. It was a big bang more real than the cosmological Big Bang ... theory. What a shame the condescension on the "ladder of evolution" infects those addicted, diseased, discomforted by evolutionary constructions. The point will be missed, for the ladder of evolution leaves open the idea that mutation based on a transmutation hope resulting from some AIDS-prone life-style is worth dying for. HM is to be credited though too for at least going down the ladder -- in keeping with the mind being apriori to brain -- rather than being on some step while forgetting the suspension factor, as in Karl Jaspers' sense of Existenz, that inescapable predicament of a self always suspended between itself and the Transcendent. That "itself" is perched on the ladder and the Transcendent forgotten to some degree to meet exclusive club eligibility factors.

<4> HM wants to get Anaximander involved here again, and the encompassing seems limited to subjective ongoing experience beginning with Anaximander's few -- and convenient -- extant words. Is Anaximander HM's Michael, the archangel disguised as the prince of Greek culture, rather than the prince of Israel, the prince of Islam, the prince of Latter Day Saint's new Jerusalem (competitive with the "mother of God" apparitions' effort to enhance -- through unverifiable reports -- Catholicism and Orthodoxy) ? I want to ... keep ... Karl Jaspers involved, otherwise the Forum should be called the Anaximander's Forum. Karl Jaspers talks not only about the experience with the encompassing but experience with the Encompassing. And if we're going to speak to empathy and consciousness and "restricting" " 'consciousness' " to aspects opened to empathy, we must at least give credit where it's due remembering Anaximander had nothing to say about empathy comparable to Karl Jaspers' treatment of understanding in the second part of General Psychopathology in which he distinguishes between the static mode and the genetic mode of understanding and the place of empathy and sympathy in understanding the degrees of connections. That's found not only in the second part of the Book but also in the introduction. (See TA51 Bibliography for reference.)