

MISSING 78 C 35
KARL JASPERS FORUM
TA78 (Muller) Commentary 35 (to R8 and R11)

SUPERFICIAL CERTAINTY (LEAP DECREE VS. JASPERS' CRITICAL FAITH; AND
ZERO-IRRESPONSIBLE CERTAINTY)
By Glenn C Wood
11 May 2005, posted 21 May 2005

INTRO.

In the application of Herbert Muller's (HM) "zero derivation" (Z-D) formula to the respectable Karl Jaspers (KJ), and respectable Karol Wojtyla (KW), Herbert has demonstrated its inherent weakness. It will be shown below that HM has failed to properly represent KJ. KJ is not given to ontologism or evolutionism, as HM claims.

<1>

First, one is struck immediately with the ease with which the Z-D author succumbs to the authority of an institution including the insider use of titles of distinction. One might think that a zero derivation argument would avoid ad hominem arguments, but it in fact inverts and implodes the argument, e.g., from Wojtyla to "Pope" is an ad holy hominem argument. The HM post hoc argument is that because an institutional head is now saying the same thing Jaspers said, Jaspers must have been unofficially not too wrong. It is shown below that Jaspers does not share KW's ontologism or evolutionism (see Third item below) and that the worthwhile biblical views expressed by Jaspers are misappropriated in the attempted harvesting of the forces of evolutionism to further establish Catholicity.

<2>

Second, HM errs when he associates the KJ position with the evolutionism of the depersonalized head of an institution (titles of distinction mythologize). The statement in R8 [2] that the individual Jaspers' "evolution" is like that of the institutional Wojtyla is inaccurate essentially. HM's footnote quotes in German from page 38 of the English translation of the Origin and Goal of History. Jaspers is there examining views and this particular section refers to Portmann's position. The reference was preceded by talk about a general biological criterion, which does not account for humankind's non-fixation potential. Mr. Muller's mistake is common for readers of Jaspers who think he repeats himself and is convoluted. (In his preface to General Psychopathology he states that some say his book is

too hard for students, and then says "... I consider it fatal to adjust at a low level. One should be guided by better students...")

<2.1>

Regardless, even if there were similarities between KJ and KW, the title of distinction doesn't suppress the fact that Jaspers' philosophical views were expressed long before the exclusive theological-like decree (the authoritative official Institutional position). It has been my position that Jaspers has been an obstacle in the way of Catholicity's (a title exploiting the word "universal") search for a contemporary updated replacement for Aquinas--one who is more accommodating to popular scientism. But Jaspers has made sure he shall remain out of reach of such exploitation. It is not out of character with Catholic political maneuverings to attempt an on-the-sly absorption of the Existenz philosophy of KJ, laying claim to his views and actually taking credit for them. That's what is happening when it's suggested that Jaspers owes his views and success to Catholic Heidegger. That's what's happening when Jaspers is identified with Wojtyla.

<2.2>

Please note HM's quote in German is from a section immediately before Jaspers personally expressed view that "Man cannot be conceived of as a zoological species, capable of evolution, to which spirit was one day added as a new acquisition. Within the biological sphere man must have been, from the very start, something different, even in a biological sense, from all other forms of life." From this statement it is clear that though biological data presents much intellectual material, the mystery of life increases with knowledge. It's an affirmation that throughout the finite parsimonious processes infinity becomes clearer. Isn't it strange that the misrepresentation of Jaspers' position comes from a section I had referred to when attempting to show Jaspers is not guilty of evolutionism?

<2.3>

In KJ's Introduction to "Origin..." he declares, proclaims, his philosophical position. I have quoted it previously on this Forum, and repeat it in part here: "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 by any kind of knowledge. ...All men are related in Adam, originate from the hand of God and are created after His image...." (xv) To attempt to say that this proves Jaspers succumbed to an ontology is the sort of anti-reasoning that postpones the hoped for concord of souls and loving boundless understanding which Jaspers hoped for in that same paragraph. Therefore, the "postulate" attributed to Jaspers in HM's TA78, R11 [5], that differences with animals supports the "evolution of the brain" is a lesson in post hoc/ special pleading fallacies inherent in zero thinking.

<2.4>

But, those differences Jaspers is primarily referring to are the morbid biological predispositions such as the psychoses that occur in all races (p37). HM missed the opportunity to escape the evolutionism rut, and put the matter in psychopathological perspective. I mean rather than seeing how intelligent-design-leanings are reactions to the determinism of chance can be understood from a scientific pathological approach. Instead he simply says bible-standard believers are pathological because they don't trust evolutionism. The opposite is more likely: that trust in a definitive origin(ism) (evolutionism) poisons the well of reasoning. Let me give an example:

<2.5>

I am a white person. I asked a person (categorized perhaps as African American): "How do you feel about the view that inherent in evolution is the potential seed for racial bias, that in the eons-of-change some now in competitive-economic interaction can think in terms of inferiority and superiority in some original sense?" Ans: "An African could feel superior because involvement in evolution was more original and earlier." Neither of us were psychotic, but the exchange shows how evolutionism can be used to enforce social psychoses. HM's statement of faith (evolutionism) that he knows the locale of humankind's origin {d} is not Jaspers, and it's not healthy, and has no place in a compulsory education system. Paleontological findings do not have to be presented from a Dawkins or Gould ontological pulpit, but the word "evolution" is now profane and religious, and like clerical habits adorned by teachers, must be discarded. The "intelligent design" reaction would than be unnecessary.

<2.6>

Jaspers' faith is not an ontology but is friendly toward "being". It's mostly improper when HM said {f} Jaspers talked positively about ontology "only later". One could properly say Jaspers most certainly did further clarify the word (for slow learners who need a new word to escape hang-ups) that if ontology is to be used it must be with a firm standing in and with periechontology (Philosophical faith and Revelation). But did HM read his 1949 "Perennial Scope of Philosophy" (unchanged and unabridged edition in English 1968 Archon Books, pp 148-9) wherein he shows how an ontology can be closer to anti-philosophy and remote from philosophical faith (the faith which is reached "through unfaith" p.146). That is not a leap of faith like the leap decreed by the HM paradisiacal (paradigm) "Vatican".

<2.7>

Jaspers by a command does not leap after touching a toe into reality or by feeling a wet finger on the brow. He gets immersed without losing contact with the periechontological, but one gains clearer appreciation for the Encompassing of the encompassing after penetrating--though buoyant--the latter. Ontology, in

practice, Jaspers says, inevitably becomes a particular knowledge of something within being "not a knowledge of being itself." (Perennial Scope 148) HM's paradigm is subtly moved into an authoritative seminal position. An immanent-ontological leap of faith is an authoritative requirement or work instigated and authorized by the institution--in this case. It can be said clearly that Jaspers had previously expressed something similar to what HM means by a functional ontology. It is so clearly expressed by Jaspers since the beginning of his writings that to suggest it's something late and now seen by a HM formula's personal interpretive revelation is staggering to reason. He sees it because he awakened from zero-slumber within it.

<2.7>

As regards HM's apparent need to genuflect before a religious entity by finding something positive in KW's use of "ontology", let's recall that (see next paragraph) KJ criticized Heidegger for his quest for the impossible fundamental ontology. (And, I recall -- thirty years ago -- reading a piece by a Roman Catholic (Collins) from the St.Louis University which expressed high hopes for Heidegger's fundamental ontological efforts as something Catholicity could use as an updated replacement for Aquinas concepts. It was the first inkling that led me to think a fundamental ontology could be appropriated for a universal [catholicity] purpose, I thought, "not even over Jaspers dead body".) Jaspers in his 1923 General Psycho...pp 776, 777 scrutinizes Heidegger's "fundamental ontology" effort. He said it involves a fundamental philosophical error for it offers students a total scheme of human life as if it were knowledge (true, Heidegger's Sein and Zeit was published a few years later, but Jaspers was obviously privy to his ideas). That's what "evolution" does.

<2.8>

HM in his zero derivation substitutes for religion and scientism's certainty (TA78R11) makes an effort to reduce the faith of periechontology by limiting confidence to "temporary anchors" [16]. In [14] he does a most generous analysis of Dawkins' evolutionism while ignoring the danger of his scientism's certainty. He thinks Dawkins "bottom up" "evolution" is an acceptable non-holistic conceptual tool. It's as though HM awakens from a zero slumber again and is immediately overwhelmed by the endless data "everyone knows to be true (Dawkins)" and "church men confirm (Dawkins)" without taking the time to see origins and goals from an encompassing responsible perspective.

<2.9>

Does this Dawkins quote (Moyer interview) sound like temporary certainty? "...[A]mong the things that science does know, evolution is about as certain as anything we know. And that, of course, as you know, is accepted by responsible educated churchmen, as well as scientists." This radical certitude -- sanctified by Catholic authority now -- is used then to reduce human kind to animalistic and

biological confinement or fixation (change only within the bounds of biological specializations) thus reducing students' potential for transcending by talk about a fixated biological relationship to our "cousins the chimpanzees and amoebas". That sounds like a radical certitude that has no place in science. But HM's zero-derivation agenda awakens within this prevailing certitude and bonds immediately. This Forum's Hontela-observation of puking amoebas is more becoming of science, and my addition of the anthropomorphic "puke" is an uncalled-for certitude akin to Dawkins "cousin" (kissing cousin?) status.

<3>

Third, he continues unreasonably to avoid seeing that my use of evolutionism is as simple as his refusal to use the word "reality" unless modified with "as-if". My cautious use of the word sees that Dawkins evolutionism is the same as saying Dawkins is holistic in the negative sense HM uses the "holistic" term (though he says Dawkins concept tools are not holistic). HM says (TA78R11 [9]) Dawkins cannot be an intellectually fulfilled atheist. Yes he can. It is called rationalism/scientism. The infinity of data can occupy the mind constantly like it did with Nietzsche -- and Dawkins' sanity can be retained as long as he remains attractive and useful to Oxford's historical ties within the evolutionism of Catholicity. And then in [18] HM sways from his anchored temporary moorings by pointing out that non-theistic religious people can be happy (well, KJ talks about a happy Buddhist sect Jesuits found in Japan who were theistic protestants, p.11 "Origin..."). Let's see: To HM the atheist Dawkins can't feel happy, but non-theists can... So, what sense can an Existenz counselor make of this obvious rationalization?

<4>

It's essential for HM to establish that there is something better than a bible belt commitment to faith, which he says must not be allowed to "prevail". He feels Catholicism can prevail because it's the Church of Evolution in the Chardin sense, it insists on imposing titles of distinction, capitalizes the word catholicity, sanctions "evolution" and has HM approvingly using its nomenclature (I should have told HM my first name was Doctor.) The bottom up design of Dawkins evolutionism can prevail in the education system because HM says it's basically non-holistic, but bible belt USA talk sounds too absolutist and mind independently real.

<5>

As is common in counseling sessions, HM finally reveals one problem in the concluding moments (just prior to his critique of zero-derivation where all substantial critiques could have been cross-referenced to previous Forum contributors): He knows the origin of mankind; it's African, and it bothers bible belt Southern Americans he says. These bible believers know this to be true but have an agenda of suppressing the truth. That's why they don't think evolution

should be taught in schools. Here again HM emerges from zero-hibernation with an appetite for quick comprehension, and Internet data without historical roots is swallowed and not digested. The more complicated but reasonable answer which HM prefers not to see is that "intelligent design" is a counter claim against the "bottom up" design charge of evolutionism. It is transcendence in freedom vs. an implied restraint of immanent biological determinates. For now I'll simply say that is pettifogging and ad hominem argumentation and leave it at that. (His ongoing experience is obviously limited. He chooses to ignore the movement of early Evangelical successful efforts to eliminate slavery when evolutionism was initially influential.)

<6>

Though HM may think it humorous, let me say: now that it is agreed that Catholicity is the Church of "Evolution" and that he disagrees with Jaspers that the origin of human kind is unknowable, it seems more fitting that the Forum should be changed to the KW Forum.

I'd be happy to address in greater detail any of HM's TA78 points -- relative to KJ.

Glenn C Wood

e-mail <glennwood@zianet.com>