

\*

How does one ~~become~~ come to be a catastrophist?

It is a question of importance as well as one of curiosity. For ~~some~~ <sup>some</sup> years, I ~~was~~ taught political psychology, and ~~have~~ <sup>was</sup> ~~been~~ able to profit ~~from~~ not only from <sup>personal</sup> experience but from ~~many~~ <sup>many</sup> studies ~~of~~ <sup>of</sup> political leaders such as Julius Caesar, Napoleon, ~~the~~ Hitler, <sup>Wilson</sup> Churchill, Franklin Roosevelt and numerous ~~other~~ <sup>such as Richard Nixon,</sup> characters whose lives have posed during a time of intense <sup>academic and</sup> journalistic interest in psychology ~~or~~ or psychobiography.

There is, unfortunately, no comparable degree of interest in the lives of catastrophists <sup>and somewhat more interest in</sup> ~~the~~ uniformitarians. However, two models come to mind that have different origins and may lead to some understanding of the process of acquiring the ideology that goes along with any <sup>to ideas</sup> commitment, even in science.

The easier one to explain, because it is generally understood already, is the catastrophist who is raised and trained in one of the great sacred traditions, all of which have a catastrophic or revolutionary ~~the~~ theory of primordial time. ~~These~~ Basic religious documents, taken literally, require a catastrophic viewpoint. The Copernic, once believed, must be defended or extended. To the degree to which a ~~person~~ <sup>believer</sup> is subjected to ~~criticism~~ <sup>criticism</sup> ~~with~~ <sup>with</sup> ~~unbelief~~ <sup>unbelief</sup>, he must be constantly prepared to argue with them in terms that they understand. It is not enough to him to recite his authorities, be they the Bible or The Vedas. He must assert the factual evidence, acceptable to any <sup>other</sup> party, supporting ~~the~~ events such as The ~~of~~ <sup>of</sup> Deluge ~~or~~ or The destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah.

If well-trained, he ends up looking distinct  
contradictions that must be ultimately acknowledged  
and built into the existing body of science as  
anomalies (the "unexplained") or acceptable incidents  
of natural and human history.

More difficult to explain is the character  
who is neither the true believer or a renegade or  
"backslider" from earlier training ~~etc~~ who holds  
remnants of beliefs. This character is trained  
in and believes in uniformitarian gradualism  
in all fields. Then for reasons often terribly  
perceivable he begins to alter his opinions. Here  
are some of the instances that I know of and  
what seems to me to be the occasions for their  
changes from unif. to catast.

Case 1: A ~~person~~ cherished (but non-religious) cause  
is being harmed by the uniformitarian view.

Case 2: A person holding catastrophic views is subjected  
to vituperation and ridicule, arousing the instinct  
for fair play.

case 3 Permeating the ~~changes~~ <sup>changes</sup> of science, a loss of faith in scientific <sup>progress</sup> ~~ideology~~ occurs & a ~~search for~~ <sup>receptivity</sup> ~~approach~~ to "strange" newsgroups.

case 4 Related: "The anti-anti-rationalist"

case 5 Discrepancies in a field of knowledge make a person feel rationally uncomfortable.

Biology

Vident universe

Terme

nuclear instabilities

Long age of stupid mankind

Ancient ~~high~~ cultures

This <sup>↑</sup> Almost never works by itself -- rationality not enough -- give e.g.'s of people in & out of Q movement.