Rumsfeld's Wisdom

Where the known meets the unknown is where science begins

BY MICHAEL SHERMER

At a February 12, 2002, news briefing, Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld explained the limitations of intelligence reports: "There are known knowns. There are things we know we know. We also know there are known unknowns. That is to say, we know there are some things we do not know. But there are also unknown unknowns, the ones we don't know we don't know."

Rumsfeld's logic may be tongue-twisting, but his epistemology was sound enough that he was quoted twice at the World Summit on Evolution. The June conference, hosted by San Francisco University of Quito, was held on the Galápagos island of San Cristóbal, where Charles Darwin began his explorations. Rumsfeld's wisdom was first invoked by University of California at Los Angeles paleobiologist William Schopf, who, in a commentary on a lecture on the origins of life, asked: "What do we know? What are the unsolved problems? What have we failed to consider?"

Creationists and outsiders often mistake the last two categories for signs that evolution is in trouble or that contentious debate between what we know and do not know means that the theory is false. Wrong. The summit revealed a scientific discipline rich in data and theory as well as controversy and disputation over the known and unknown.

For example, Schopf began with the known: "We know the overall sequence of life's origin, from CHONSP [carbon, hydrogen, oxygen, nitrogen, sulfur, phosphorus], to monomers, to polymers, to cells; we know that the origin of life was early, microbial and unicellular; and we know that an RNA world preceded today's DNA-protein world. We do not know the precise environments of the early earth in which these events occurred; we do not know the exact chemistry of some of the important chemical reactions that led to life; and we do not have any knowledge of life in a pre-RNA world." As for what we have failed to consider, Schopf noted a problem with what he called "the pull of the present"—it is extremely difficult to model the early earth's atmosphere and the biochemistry of early life because we are so accustomed to conditions today.

Rumsfeld's heuristic was summoned again at the end of the conference by University of Georgia evolutionary biologist Patricia Gowaty, in response to Stanford University biologist Joan Roughgarden, who declared that Darwin's theory of sexual selection is wrong in its claim that females choose mates who are the most attractive. "People are surprised to learn how much sex animals have for purely social reasons and how many species have sex-role reversal in which the males are drab and the females are colorfully ornamented and compete for the attention of males," Roughgarden said. Gowaty agreed that exceptions to Darwin's theory exist and that there are many unknowns. But, she added, since Darwin much has been learned about mate selection and competition.

Between these Rumsfeldian bookends, scientific skepticism was rampant. University of Massachusetts Amherst biologist Lynn Margulis said that "neo-Darwinism is dead," because "random changes in DNA alone do not lead to speciation. Symbiogenesis—the appearance of new behaviors, tissues, organs, organ systems, physiologies or species as a result of symbiont interaction—is the major source of evolutionary novelty in eukaryotes: animals, plants and fungi." University of California at Berkeley paleoanthropologist Timothy White suggested that his colleagues have engaged in far too much species splitting in classifying fossil hominids. American Museum of Natural History paleontologist Niles Eldredge explained how punctuated equilibrium—the idea that long periods of species stability are punctuated by rapid bursts of speciation—better accounts for the fossil record than the theory of slow and steady gradualism.

During the conference, I had a nightmarish thought: creationists could have a field day yanking quotes out of context while listening to a room full of evolutionary biologists arguing over specific issues. In point of fact, such debates are all within evolutionary theory, not between evolutionary theory and something else. And this boundary between the known and the unknown is where science flourishes.

Michael Shermer is the publisher of Skeptic (www.skeptic.com). His latest book is Science Friction.

Disputation is at the heart of robust science.
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Letters to the Editors & Michael Shermer
Scientific American
415 Madison Avenue
New York, New York 10017-1111

Subject: Special Issue, September 2005, SA Perspectives and Skeptic, “Wisdom in Intelligence Reports”

Dear SciAm Editors and Mr. Shermer:

I am writing in response to the September Special Issue and the idea of “Science at the Crossroads” from the perspective of a skeptic of the magazine’s intent. What caught my attention was the Skeptic article by Michael Shermer as I was flipping through the pages deciding if I had time to get into the details of “Science at the Crossroads.”

Shermer did something I would not have expected of the modern Prophet of Skepticism. He proved the existence of Amun, the ancient God of Egypt. The Egyptians called Amun “the unknowable one.” They identified the Universal Creative Intent with the utchat. This is an eye with two tears. The front tear is a fixed “first impression.” The second tear is a spiral of experience. The meaning of the utchat is given in the numerical values of the components of the eye. These components represent a series of halving fractions; 1/2, 1/4, 1/8, 1/16, 1/32, 1/64. The last fraction in the sequence is the front tear, the “fixed first impression.”

It should be clear from the numerical progression of the light through the “Eye of God” that the sum of the fractions can never reach the value of unity. Half step progress will always keep the journey a half step away from becoming one. The metaphor is profound. But, more importantly, the metaphoric journey stops at the first negative impression; the one with the tear drop hung on the eye. Besides saying that the Eye of God means “Unknowable One,” it also says that progress ceases when recalcitrant tears cause vision to get hung on unacceptable light. In other words, skepticism kills wisdom.

Disputation is at the heart of robust science.

During the conference, I had a nightmarish thought: creationists could have a field day yanking quotes out of context while listening to a room full of evolutionary biologists arguing over specific issues. In point of fact, such debates are all within evolutionary theory, not between evolutionary theory and something else. And this boundary between the known and the unknown is where science flourishes.

Skeptic – Michael Shermer

This is the skeptic’s tenet. Unfortunately, this tenet was completely disproved before man became civilized. The cause of civilization was not the desire to “get at the heart” of Mother Nature. The evidence in the archeological record is that the ancients strived to live in harmony with Mother Nature. The Egyptians recorded this process as the Golden Age and the archetype of Osiris. After man learned the processes of intelligent
culture, the non-creative members of the culture cut the “heart of Osiris” to pieces. The brother of Osiris, Seth, was the archetype of the defensive survival instinct. Evolutionists imitate the archetype of Seth in their defense of the follies of “natural selection” and “survival of the fittest.” They repress the archetype of the Unknown Known, which the Egyptians comprehended through the myth of Osiris. It states that “intent” precedes “judgment” by “natural selection” and “survival instinct,” because Osiris intended order to come out of chaos at the “First Occasion.” The Eye of Horus enumerates the path to the tear of First Impression through experiential wisdom.

In his article “Rumfeld’s Wisdom” Michael Shermer demonstrated the way to kill the Unknown Known. That is what caught my attention. Knowing the evolutionary path of human perspectives on Creation, I could see Shermer cutting the heart out of a more robust science than the one he defends. I am writing in response to his article and to the SA Perspective article “Science at the Crossroads” by “The Editors.”

---

**Science at the Crossroads**

Geographer Jared Diamond’s recent book Collapse documents past civilizations that could not recognize or bring themselves to change unsustainable ways. Largely because of science, our civilization has the chance not only to avoid their fate but to enter an age of unprecedented prosperity. Science is not and should not be the sole factor in decision making; others, such as moral values, are also crucial. *But we need to go into these decisions with our eyes open to what is going on in the world.*

SA Perspectives — THE EDITORS

---

These articles were well coordinated for the Special Issue. There is no doubt from my perspective that the Unknown Known is the symbiogenesis of this coordination. The Unknown Known in my perspective is my Unknown and the Known of The Editors and Michael Shermer. Because I accepted the potential of the “unknown intent” at SciAm, I could “see” the wisdom in what I had not known. Thus, for me, the Unknown Known was proven by The Editors and Michael Shermer. The words of heartless scientific skepticism regarding Rumsfeld’s Wisdom prove the existence of the God of Abraham, the “Unknown One,” the God of Moses, the “I Am That I Am,” the God of Jesus, “I and the Father are One,” the God of Muhammad, the “Great One,” and all the archetypes of these evolving images of The Universal Being passed down through the Ages.

I suspect that the skepticism and heartlessness—insensitivity to physical senses—of SciAm and Shermer will result in the repression of what I have said, but I must follow the wisdom of the Nefer Rohu Prophecy declared to be the motive of Snefru, the Pharaoh of Egypt who began the pyramid construction process (http://www.EyeOfSiloam.com/NeferRohu/nfrrohu3.html). The prophecy says, “Reconstruct, O my heart, thou bewailest this land in which thou didst begin! To be silent is repression.” In other words, skepticism cuts out the heart of robust sacred sciences by repression of the Unknown Known. To overcome the prophecy of scientific repression, the Egyptians built ever lasting monuments to the Unknown Known. Within the monuments is the architectural design that reveals the symbiogenesis of evolving organic life, what Jung called Synchronicity.

To understand what was Known in the beginning and is now Unknown, Science and Religion need to experience a Paradigm Shift back toward the Common Sense from which they came. The change in perspective will come when First Impressions of creation evolve into an Ancient Knowing that has been denied, recalled, cut to pieces, and repressed for the last three millennia. This was the myth of Osiris. It was the history of cultural evolution to the pyramids builders. It is our story today. The difference between modern and ancient understanding is in the acceptance of the Unknown Known. Skeptics simply reject the potential for cosmic self knowledge.
At a February 12, 2002, news briefing, Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld explained the limitations of intelligence reports: "There are known knowns. There are things we know we know. We also know there are known unknowns. That is to say, we know there are some things we do not know. But there are also unknown unknowns, the ones we don't know we don't know."

Michael Shermer’s Article: “Creationists and outsiders often mistake the last two categories for signs that evolution is in trouble or that contentious debate between what we know and do not know means that the theory is false. Wrong. The summit revealed a scientific discipline rich in data and theory as well as controversy and disputation over the known and unknown."

... “During the conference, I had a nightmarish thought: creationists could have a field day yanking quotes out of context while listening to a room full of evolutionary biologists arguing over specific issues. In point of fact, such debates are all within evolutionary theory, not between evolutionary theory and something else. And this boundary between the known and the unknown is where science flourishes.”

In this way, Skeptics declare the folly of the Unknown Known.

The Creationist’s Folly was illustrated in the SA Perspectives article “Science at the Crossroads.” To see it we have to remember the past. Yet, the past is the folly of the Creationists who seek the return of the Golden Age of the Unknowable One by Blind Faith in man’s ability to interpret the Unknown Known.

The Editors: “Geographer Jared Diamond's recent book Collapse documents past civilizations that could not recognize or bring themselves to change unsustainable ways. Largely because of science, our civilization has the chance not only to avoid their fate but to enter an age of unprecedented prosperity. Science is not and should not be the sole factor in decision making; others, such as moral values, are also crucial. But we need to go into these decisions with our eyes open to what is going on in the world.”

Blind Faith is the Tenet of The Editors who confuse the words moral and morale. In short, do not forget the Wisdom of the Ages, and Paradise will be the reward of all sentimental memories.
The remarkable fact of Rumsfeld’s Wisdom paradigm is Shermer’s repression of the missing quadrant. Skeptics, and skeptical science, reject the provable fact that Reality is Self Knowing in a left handed swipe against reality. On the right hand, Creationism “blames” forgetfulness for the loss of the Garden of Eden. It claims that humans forget the Word of God. The implication is that communication with the Unknown Known, which is the Universal Intent, is denied. Thus, Shermer proved the contention of the loss of Paradise, the Known Known, by repression of the fourth quadrant in Rumsfeld’s Wisdom. Shermer would have been better served if he had realized that the DOD is involved in covert activities. These are the quadrant of the Unknown Known, e.g., Saddam Hussein’s weapons of mass destruction and DOD espionage, and Hurricane Katrina. Rumsfeld, and all government sages of war, cannot reveal the Unknown Known. Politics and material sciences are the left hand of righteousness. Creationism is the right hand of leftist socialism.

The Skeptic path of evolution is toward Universal Knowledge through a route that begins with the assumption that Reality cannot be self expressive from a position of knowing. Reality is unintelligent in the Skeptic’s Fantasy.

If the RNA-DNA knowledge is given to the next generation at physical conception, then symbiogenesis writes an “intelligent report” from the past. The symbiotic relationship is an experience of reality through consciousness that modifies the genes. It is more than survival. It is a quest for higher relativity in the rationalizing mind of the beast. The mind of man fantasizes itself into creation while denying the “intelligence report” that evolved into the mind of man. Modern Science is repression of Nature’s Day of Judgment.

In the symbiotic relationship the organism of the beast does not mutate, it creates new genetic knowledge in an “intelligence report.” The whale goes ashore and the whale returns to the sea. The process was not driven by the Unknown Unknown in the abyss of a chaotic Big Bang. It was intent for the sake of Kingdom Come, i.e., offspring. The parents created the organisms of the children with the assistance of profound dreams that transcend the journey of the genes. The Synchronicity of the genetic heritage across family lines within a single genetic Tree of Life is evidence of the guidance by the Unknown Known. The genes pass on the Unknown Known within the “intelligence report” of the DNA.

The vast multiplicity of evolved organisms does not imply chaotic survival. It implies vast opportunity for the rationalizing pre-consciousness. The Freudian Id and the Egyptian Osiris are metaphors for past organic “intelligence reports,” whose paths have been forgotten. Revival and reincarnated successes steer the genes in darkness by Moon Beams of reflected Enlightenment in the Valley of the Shadow of Death.
If science is to get across the crossroads between the Unknown Unknown and the Known Known, then evolution and creationism must be accepted as alternative paths. These rationalizations are religions of the mundane and sacred sciences. When we knew less about our universe, we had greater capacity to sense the folly of Skepticism. That is why Creationism was the original form of human civilization. Before we can repress wisdom we have to create it. But, humans did not create the universe; they fantasized the creation of a new life form in which the beast of man entered the realm of the mind of man. This proves that the universe is self created. The problem for science and religion is to create a paradigm that allows the Unknown Known to exist in opposition to the Known Unknown. This is the jaywalker’s path. This is the path which the Laws of Science and the Laws of Religion forbid. Thus, the problem is in the creation of these laws. The laws must change before Science and Religion can get beyond the crossroads that separate them, or Diamond's *Collapse* will become our story through “punctuated disequilibrium.”

The first step is to go back and accept the obvious fact that cultures that can build Stonehenge and the Great Pyramid were not ignorant of boundaries between the Unknown Unknown and the Known Known. Our ancestors got us to where we are because they had an intelligent conscious symbiotic relationship that was synchronous with the laws of the Zero Point Field ([http://twm.co.nz/zpf_haisch.htm](http://twm.co.nz/zpf_haisch.htm)). They learned, from experience, how to cause substance to come from darkness. Then they paid attention to their elders through traditions of cultural “intelligence reports.”

Science after the “Age of Reason” is incapable of witnessing the intelligence in ancient monuments. If Science had not repressed the ancient capacity for wisdom, then a president would not have chased interns in the White House while Al Quida was planning the destruction of the World Trade Center, and New Orleans would not have been drowning in prescient denial of Mother Nature’s wrath. The intent of Al Quida before September 11, 2001 was an Unknown Known to the Department of Defense. The hurricanes of the eastern Gulf of Mexico in 2004 were an Unknown Known to the City of New Orleans. America knew these chaotic thoughts from external intent were coming, but leadership in America failed to witness reality with open eyes and traditions based upon Common Sense, i.e., “intelligence reports.” Greek Socratic wisdom told the leaders that rational thought could resolve all problems as they systematically ignored their senses and the reality for which only the senses have access to the “intelligence reports.” The “Age of Reason” denied that rational knowledge can be Non Sense and Common Sense.

“Science is not and should not be the sole factor in decision making; others, such as moral values, are also crucial. But we need to go into these decisions with our eyes open to what is going on in the world.”—The Editors

It is unconscionable for Science and Religion to bear arms of Skepticism in light of the destruction that has come 2000 years after the birth of the calendar that proclaimed that the resurrection of the Golden Age would come after two millennia of repression. Advocates of self creation must recognize that Senseless Skepticism is a knife circumcising Mother Nature’s Father. Blind Faith in a Creator is a crippled eye in denial of the material womb of Father Nature’s Mother. Without a model for Nature’s Mother-Father, human beings will remain fancy filled beasts in a puppetry of fungal ancestry. Before the fungus began the journey on our biosphere, the Universe had to know where it was headed. The proof is written in the stars. Ancient cultures made it a point to pay attention to “intelligence report” in this Language of Birds. They pointed their monuments to the patterns of stars that spoke of the journey to Kingdom Come in the Golden Paradise of the Known Known. All alternatives are revoked in the Unknown Unknown. Nothing in the Universe can change this fact of life. Skepticism and Blind Faith are simply motes in the eyes of usurping sciences, one mundane and one divine. The Unknown One expresses Itself by “intelligence reports” in the humble eyes of Common Sense at the Crossroads of the Unknown and the Known.

Sincerely,

Rush E. Allen