

TA70 (Wood)

Response 4 (to C9, vdMeijden)

Strange Errors and Editorial Annotations, misuse of Jaspers, by Glenn Wood 2
December 2004, posted 11 December 2004

[1] An Apparent Mistake Corrected

After having attended to some personal needs for the last several weeks, I've recently reviewed some Forum contributions and have the following comments regarding TA70C9. First, C9 begins with my name in brackets "[Wood]" and could be interpreted to mean that I'm the author. It is a mistake in that I'm not the author of that paragraph.

[2] Some Unbecoming Editorial Comments

Then in TA70 C9 there are bracketed Editorial comments made by HFJM. In reaction to vdMeijden you say you "... have no intention of changing things [meaning you have no intention of changing the name of the Forum, that it is fixated]." You said "[That was not you but Wood; but you have both said that you are allergic to clarity and conciseness, and then you complain, I am not sure exactly about what - maybe about the strange wish of the readers that you write in a comprehensible fashion? Also, making suggestions does not automatically imply change of procedure. - HFJM] It might be well to remind yourself that other contributors to the Forum have confessed an unfamiliarity with KJ. How much clearer can one get than to point to areas where you have obviously not appropriated Jaspers' way of thinking but have remained engrained in verbalized oversimplifications of existence? You emit energetic packets of fairness, as I've pointed to before, but this wave of apparent intellectual dishonesty about allergy is a manifestation of an allergic reaction -- to what? But not to the issue of religion. To you religion is an Establishment of a Traditional nature, and only as such is there any possible stabilizing value to it, and sectarian movements are reproachable. With KJ religious establishmentarianism or institutionalism are uncompromising, and the more compromising they become the more philosophical they become "I consider that religion exists only under the aegis of ecclesiasticism, and that to speak of religion in any other sense is a compromising deception." (Man in Modern Age, p.155, Anchor Books, 57) The context of this comment involves the effort to show how revelation and philosophy overlap in the real world of authentic existence without a faith in revelation in the sense of the imposition of authority by Established Denominational Churches. Now, you, on the other hand, have a clear and concise view of religion, that is, an uncomplicated reductionistic view designed to

fit your Formula so that discussion can be carried out on your terms. Myself am using religion in the uncompromising and compromisingly deceptive sense. What is empirical about ecclesiasticism is it stands out in history as something corporeal, but from that perspective authentic independent selfhood-religion is deceptive but more correct -- leaning toward the noncorporeal. I use it in both senses because of its common usage.

[3] Let KJ Determine The Qualifications For Using His Name

To justify the usage of the name of Karl Jaspers the editor should become wholly familiar with Karl Jaspers for he, KJ, says: "It is a good idea to begin by specializing in one philosopher...one of the great philosophers ... for antiquity any bibliography is limited by the small number of texts..." (Way to Wisdom, On Reading Philosophy). In the absence of such study, one can escape detection by references to such as Parmenides (he would less seriously plead a popular Goddess as a source than you might speak more seriously of "evolution" as a source for religion) and Anaximander -- Descartes too if one has no awareness of the history of the church. Even if one fails to comprehend KJ there remains primary material for reference and discussion. If one fails to engage selfhood in the process of comprehension, that too can be discussed.

Then of course, you must immerse yourself in history, church history, religious history, while being immersed by others' constructions.

[4] Public Confession Is Good For Forum

Finally, the Editor could own up to error, such as, admitting openly unfamiliarity, and the incorrectness of his mental construction such as when he said KJ never mentioned Vico. Difficulty in doing so shows the inherent weakness of "O-D." I mean simply because the KJ-Vico factor is not something you had personally experienced does not justify saying he did not mention Vico. It would do the soul good to make such a public confession. It would not only admit to unfamiliarity with KJ but also demonstrate conversion potential, and some intent for correcting misinterpretations of KJ. Who knows, maybe there will be enough empiricism on the great judgment day for the record to be admitted as evidence and the question asked: "Did you or did you not make the statement?" The next comment might be: "There's no justification for abasing GW for placing Vico and Constructionism ("constructivism") in historical context, when it was you who introduced "Vico" out of context." (The foregoing is presented with kindly smile.)