

## Re: Review of The Extended Phenotype

**Source:** <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.bio.evolution/2004-09/0140.html>

---

**From:** Malcolm ([malcolm\\_at\\_55bank.freemove.co.uk](mailto:malcolm_at_55bank.freemove.co.uk))

**Date:** 09/09/04

Date: Thu, 9 Sep 2004 03:17:59 +0000 (UTC)

"Malcolm" <[malcolm@55bank.freemove.co.uk](mailto:malcolm@55bank.freemove.co.uk)> wrote

>

> *I think that the current academic climate is very hostile to philosophy.*  
> *Certainly it is hard to name a single work of philosophy produced in the*  
> *twentieth century that will still be a household name at the end of the*  
> *twenty-first, unless you count works by political dictators.*

>

> *[moderator's note: Popper? Russell? Godel? Wilkins? Need I go on?*  
> *I could add Dewey, Goodman, and a host of others in various areas*  
> *of endeavor. – JAH]*

>

The challenge was to name a single work which will definitely be a household name by 2100. You responded with a list of philosophers. Telling.

To keep us on topic, I think that any philosophy of the human condition has got to accept the fact that Darwin was right, and "psychology is put on a new foundation". So Daniel Dennett is asking the right questions. This is most of the battle, but not quite all of it. Personally I cannot see Dennett emerging as a "great philosopher". However "Consciousness Explained" is at least a title most people have heard of. I never got my money back after I bought a copy expecting to find the explanation of consciousness.