

TA70 (Wood)

Response 5 (to C3, J Johnson)

DIALECTIC WITH EVOLUTIONIST J. JOHNSON (INC. JASPERS AND EINSTEIN),
THE ESTABLISHMENT OF RELIGION IN THE EDUCATION INDUSTRY by Glenn C
Wood, posted 22 January 2005

Notation (3.29-2006): At one point in our dialogue, Joseph Johnson expresses a realization that almost captures the essence of evolutionism, and that interpretation is considered following item <10> below; and my comments on his statements are included in brackets. It has occurred to him that my concerns are with "evolution" being used to establish a religion; to which I say that is true in that now a vatican-authorities have sanctified the ontological reality of an absolute origin. "Evolution" now taught in schools does tend to establish those religions. But my concerns, and clearly Jaspers', has to do with the certainty that the origin of humankind is known and can be taught as certain knowledge in compulsory educational situations and where complementarities must be considered. Then, because Herbert misunderstood, and misinterpreted Jaspers as being in agreement with Herbert's' evolutionism, J. Johnson ceased wondering about the issue. When I objected that his talk about "evolution" on a Karl Jaspers forum suggests Jaspers was given to certainty about the origin of humankind, J. Johnson's reaction was that Herbert had already shown that Jaspers was given to evolutionism the way they understand it (see my TA78 C 40<10.1>--and extraction of mine soon to be if not already posted here--and TA79, R12 on Herbert's Website).

<1> I'd like to comment on TA70C3 (with one more comment on C2) regarding "process physics." Process physics seems more appropriate as a critique of evolutionism than an apologetic for "evolution." (Also, I've not forgotten your TA55C16 and understand the meaningfulness of transacting to it.)

<1.1> Notation: I've not read H. Muller's most recent TA 78 except in a skipping way this morning, and think it may represent a healthy unfolding of communication processes. I've made no changes in the following because of it.

<2> HISTORICAL PROCESS

In C2 while speaking of "process physics" you expressed a desire for interface logic ("process science and universal...values"). It appears you might be looking for some causal connection between "process physics" and religious history such as the subjective-objective responses to experience, i.e., recordings about a historical constant (e.g. accounts of faith), the observation of it available to

everyone (e.g. Bible).

<3> THE PREFIX "E" AND "CON" IS A VOLITION MATTER

You find religion burdened with mythology. If one prefers, religion can be seen as burdened with mythology. But mythology can be a positive thing if one hangs on to the substance of mythology. On this side of overt consciousness it includes the myth area of cognition without which there's little uninhibited communication with being (process=noun and/or transitive verb), or with one another for that matter for action at a distance involves mystery (empathy). You find religion to be mythical, i.e. not something empirical except as a thing to be comprehended objectively, and objectivity now seems to you to mean a subjective objectivity (a JJ post mind-independent reality {i.e. H. Muller's formula MIR}). Perhaps this is because the onslaught, waves and particles, of experiences are disturbing and so these convolutions are tolerated, and mental convulsions are avoided, by adding the prefix "e" after forgetting the "con." The honesty obvious in your wondering (philosophy) is seen in the admitted implications of your explicit reasoning processes, i.e. admitting a theory to be abstract, and the abstraction theoretical. The test of philosophical wondering is the clarity of the concepts to you. Your commitment is admirable because it includes decisiveness regarding the sublimated aims, i.e. social improvement targets. Your mission method is the repetition of linguistic symbols and proselytes are moved by expression of certitude more than comprehension of meaning. These mythical components are prerequisites for what you call religion, and you probably are the greatest living proponent of the religion of "evolution"--maybe a neo-scientology.

<4> THE SEAT OF "EVOLUTION" AND THE SOURCE OF SALVATION

It appears you have come to find an explicit principle of "evolution" within the objective-subjectivity-objective cognizing processes (epistemologic) and are now seeking support through current popular talk about "process physics" (See your TA63 C19). Mythology (reasoning in a disciplined way about mystery) is unavoidable so far as reasoning (logos) about even natural science and is not a burden as such any more than the weight of a tool. I mean, the ground of mythology has a hither side, the psychic potential for imagination and the talk about it, but it becomes a burden when the myth area is given content and that then idolized, and the ground's wholly other side is then forgotten. In the myth area rational search for being can occur with such intensity that we imagine things to fit the tools. Convolutions become "evolution" by volition--a will, urge, to have power over the complexity. What appears as convolutions lose a therapeutic function in the movement toward balance, a balance via Being (the unknowable but historically witnessed--the Transcendent) between Being and being (what is knowable--immanent).

<4.1> Jaspers has pointed out that humankind has always been substantially

unique and unchanged in substance. The mythology therefore you speak about is the exploitation of the mass awareness of the myth area but myth content is enforced in the struggle for power, such as in the autocrat Caesar's claims on a divine lineage. It's possible he had an apparition of course, but was just as capable as we in critical self-evaluation, and political enough to exploit the cultural propensities of the masses. We can fail to apply a constant critical attitude (philosophically speaking the scientific method of infinite falsification--the attitude) toward "evolution" and overlook the unavoidable convolutions of the predicament of thinking.

<5> INJUNCTIONS COMMENSURATE WITH CAUSE

Religion in a general sense has to do with a measure of history ("universal values" mentioned above by you), in some sense measurable by all. Mistakes occur when a perspective becomes an injunction (a holy writ in the name of equity, i.e., equally distributable) commensurate with its cause (like a papal decree is an explicit manifestation of an infallible revelation and logos is localized).

<6> SUBSTANCE AND CONSTANCY

Some religious perspectives measure only a sprinkling of historical data. Enough history is necessary for total immersion of an individual perspective and includes a comparison and differentiation of religions--a differentiation possible only if contact with substance is maintained, that is, something constant though not piece-meal only. The substance reveals itself in the constancy of mystery that prevents our determinations from becoming Being (being's source) as such (ontological phenomenologisms). But the communication process is predetermined if religion is reduced to zero in an immanental process (the well is poisoned to the spring). In the same way "evolution" cannot be communicated if zero-derivation logic verbalizes "It's abstract evolution"--that is the no-fault fallback when reason is in default. Indeterminable potentiality is the essential substance and is not the rationalism of zero-derivation. The biblical perspective can represent such an immersion. The Bible is not worshiped (bibliolatry) except to the degree that its authors' words are preserved, for it testifies about the substance of being (which is another way of saying "process" for Being-being is not only a noun--in the sense of person--but a transitive verb personifying and affecting objects). But that is more philosophical faith and revelation than the metaphysics of "evolution."

<7> PSYCHOLOGY OF "PROCESS"

But somewhere before metaphysics is the psychology of "process." After all, that's the subjective domain of "process physics," or meaningful introspective ways of handling signs to things but assuming there's an inherent transfer of

revelation about substance from neural networks (pragmatics). It's a pseudo revelation but through the microcosmic and then abstracted into a macrocosm (a falling again into the Heideggerian faith in finding the fundamental ontology) and syntactic becomes bibliolatry. And this is where I'd like to turn attention from objective subjectivism and individual structural responses to experience to something empirically objective that can have potential universal significance.

<8> KARL JASPERS' 1913 USE OF "ANLAGE" AND "PROCESS" IN THE SCIENCE OF PSYCHOPATHOLOGY.

After all, we are dealing here with cognitive matters which stand out (exist, static noise) in such a manner as to be outstanding, that is, abnormality is manifested when compared to what is substantially and universally accepted as normal, though diverse, behavior. Here we are dealing with subjective phenomena that manifest themselves as a "process-psychosis" (Gen. Psychopath. P. 654, see reference below in item <8.1>) and are distinct from personality, the latter being what is normal and comparative, a constant interrupted by processes that are either temporary or morbid (and progress is measured by good or bad prognoses toward or away from healthy personalities. We are not talking about genetic preconstitutional (physical) or predispositional (mental) anomalies (like in true homosexuality where both sex-organs develop--KJ's Gen. Psychopathology, Sexual Disorders). The subject matter involves patients or persons who come on the social scene with normal performance but then succumb in part or whole to a dis-ease of the mind some having the nature of a physical onslaught (brain) and others having an effect on the physical and including both simultaneously.

<8.1> Individual life develops out of constitution and constitution is the "Anlage" and that term distinguishes what is more constant from an imposed process as disease and of course distinguishes from preconstitutional states (p.12). Cultural milieu, he says, merely furthers or retards the unfolding of the individual constitution (Anlage). Personality disorders are disruptions in the constitution; they are "(Anlage)" (constitutional-personality) variants where changes can be seen (p.445). I'm mentioning Jaspers' use (1913) of "Anlage" because it narrows the meaning of "constitution" and "process" to show the concept is not new and has been treated extensively by Jaspers and prior to Cahill and probably prior to Whitehead's (Process and Reality, 1929) views on "process." (References are found in Gen. Psychopath., English translation, 1963, University of Chicago Press.)

<8.2> Process in this sense can be used in physics as a concept distinguishing what is indeterminate from a commitment to a metaphysic of progress (ontology-minus philosophy). Process can be used in physics to distinguish between the theoretical cosmic substance and the tendency to give physical form (metaphysic) to the unknowable by the use of words like "foam" or "ether." Those words come on the scene like a process corrupting the "Anlage" of Being.

<9> CAUGHT BETWEEN THE NEBULOUS AND A SOFT EVANESCENT

Your evolutionism seems to have moved from objective reality to subjective reality perhaps due in part to not wanting to be criticized for mind-independent reality thinking. Now your evolutionism appears to me to be confined to rationalism, and must now prove "evolution" by declaring that there's an "evolution" process that occurs in cognizing and this is the implicit physical ground of the explicit metaphysic, i.e., "evolutionism." Confined though to pure reasoning, you've gotten in a position of being accused of failing to apply the formula of 0-D (zero derivation), and must admit an idealism, for you have apparent problems with the unavoidable duality of nature.

<10> (P. Benjamin -- KJF contributor -- has been doing some interesting work in personalities. I've not had the time to review, but looking forward to it, in view of process and personality concepts mentioned above and the role of personalistic thinking--its constancy or loss of use and misuse of in history.)

I'd like now to respond in greater detail than heretofore to TA70 C3. My comments are in brackets, or double brackets within your brackets. All paragraphs are your quotes except the last two.

"Commentary 3 by Joseph Johnson 25 April 2004, posted 15 May 2004.

It has taken me a while to realize (I think) that you are not arguing against evolution as a science, [I'm arguing against science "ismic" (believe that's your symbol for dogma or principle) that is, ism-pride and the need for some semblance of an empirical certitude] but against evolutionism being touted as evidence of support of established religion, in public schools, etc. I quite agree. [My position is that "evolution" is a substitute for substantial religion, revelation, philosophy and a serious psychology. My position is that established religion reinforces a poor psychology masquerading as process or substance. It would be better to offer courses in the science of psychology and present "evolutionism and creationism" there for they represent historic world views and have consequences worthy of study.] But, having no background in concepts like Historical Determinateness, I am left with little else to argue, other than an incidental point [But it appears to me that you do have a historical determinate in the effort to jump from implicit to explicit "evolution." Determinacy in the sense in which you use it here has to do with the history of predestination and the effort to come to terms with its implications regarding freedom of the will in humankind. I use indeterminacy to show the limits of predestination or what might be referred to as cosmic direction].

My local library has no copy of Jasper's "Philosophical Faith and Revelation," nor has Amazon, or B&N. [This being a Karl Jaspers Forum, and you having the propensity toward science, you might try to get his the latest edition of General Psychopathology. Its worth is attested by the demand for its English translation. It is not "pop" popular in America partly due to what some find difficult and I think you have found or heard that it's convoluted. It's convoluted perhaps like the brain and mind, or like the convolutions of being's experiences -- and I may add upon which evolutionism is based because cognizing efforts short-circuit on his philosophical attitude.] I did find Jaspers' "The Great Philosophers - IV" at the library and quickly turned to read the chapter on Einstein -- that ended as follows: Jaspers: ". . Einstein replied in approximately these terms: "When I read Jaspers, it affects me like listening to a drunk; well, Hegel affects me the same way. It surpasses my comprehension. I don't think I want to ruin his reputation, but I cannot recommend him." " [Perhaps it would have been better to start further back in the chapter.] Reading philosophy leaves me with a feeling of being lost in a jungle away from any path or recognizable feature [He does write in a manner that disturbs mental calmness within complexity]; a contrived convolution [There's that word the relief from which is "evolution."] of words with meanings as ephemeral as the weather; as though the writers never heard of science. [Philosophy is an attitude of openness, and when one doesn't have it, it's replaced by a metaphysic and misnomered philosophy. Philosophy "produces no universally valid results ... no generally accepted definitive knowledge ... not characterized by progressive development like the sciences ... Communication then is the aim of philosophy (Way to Wisdom, first two chapters)]. I have the impression that philosophers rely on code words broad-brushed across the screen, nudges and winks; artful invocations quite indifferent to meaningful grammar of everyday life that would normally be used to connect and relate tangible bits of reality in rational syntax. I was a charter subscriber to the JCS journal and remember with considerable disgust and revulsion the lead article of the first issue that was, to me, actually vulgar in its indifference to meaningful human discourse. I can scarcely imagine what the message was, and have little faith that many others knew. I'm sure Einstein would not have known either, so I don't feel as bad as I might [The bias here is so obvious that I can only thank you for being so kind as to comment of TA70. I guess it's important for you not to feel too bad, but there's such a thing as creative or existential guilt. Was Jaspers attitude toward Einstein as judgmental as Einstein's?]

So what is the problem with discourse in science or philosophy? [Here a philosophical attitude is oozing through, a psychic slip, a reduction of the philosophical attitude to metaphysical-ontological thinking. The scientific method is not the problem nor is philosophy] The best I can imagine is that science has failed to transcend the "obvious reality" of content. [You mean: science has failed to fall victim to abstraction fixation?] Thus, philosophy is left to try to explain its insights within the language and concepts of materialism resulting in

phantasies of dualism, etc. [No, that's a metaphysics not philosophy.] It gets no help from "stalled" science [Philosophy is the attitude which can see scientism]; the shaft of the arrow that normally follows the philosophical point [You really must correct this misconception of philosophical faith and religious revelation as you search for comfort in dealing with the scientific method] in its flight toward deeper knowledge and understanding [Philosophical wisdom is not gnosticism]. Hopefully, process physics will begin to clear a path, provide durable metaphors through the near-trackless jungle of cosmic process [Here the philosophical attitude of wonder, awe, and openness to communication is side tracked by a surrogate meta-abstractibility, i.e., "durable metaphors." It's done to justify continuing the search for certitude in the natural sciences to which all other sciences can be reduced--if it's not "quantum evolution" it's now declared to be the "evolution" of cognitive phenomena]. End of your quotation.

Can't see how a convolution of processes in physics with a subjective slant could be anymore accommodating to "evolution" than progressive evolutionistic thinking. It might be accommodating to philosophy in that it should not commit to a deterministic natural substance, but again that's not a recent natural revelation.

I appreciate your comments, especially in view of how much about philosophy you dislike which is probably more what has replaced it like "formal logic" such as in Russell. Also, your thinking is such that one must come to confrontational terms with it or be guilty of failing to understand what you are communicating.