

Re: A Consortium of Scientists

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.bio.evolution/2005-07/msg00037.html>

- *From:* "g" <gillawton@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Fri, 1 Jul 2005 23:21:46 -0400 (EDT)
-

"Peter F" <notdisclosed@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
[news:da3sj2\\$1071\\$1@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:da3sj2$1071$1@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)
> "g" <gillawton@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
> [news:da243o\\$e0d\\$1@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:da243o$e0d$1@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)
> <snip>
>
>
> I don't think there is a realistic hope in hell (but if so, only a helluva
> small one)
> that we will ever see a wholesale authoritative exposure of, and remedial
> impact on,
> all these (different kinds of) obfuscations.

Peter,

There IS hope. Also, there IS some precedent. The scientific ideal IS alive and well, though it persist only the in the minds and hearts of but a few good and capable thinkers... whose ranks, however loosely knit, have lived and live on even now... and whose acquaintance we might bring ourselves in line to make if we are brutally self-honest and work hard at disciplining our thinking to gather reliable data, think rigorously hard about it, and never assume we know it all, nor have arrived at the ultimate diagnosis of all cases of ignorance.

Isaac Newton, himself, proposed a consortium although I have to say in all humility that it is rather an obvious need long before I learned he had given it serious thought and endorsement.

You and I are keenly aware of the "economics" and "politics" of research fundings and sanctions, but we know also that "widows and orphans" never are out of mind of some of science's most open-minded and open-ended. (No doubt you are familiar with the application of this expression to many things, including rare diseases which get opted out of funding because the spending of millions of dollars on finding a "pill" for one of them has a snow ball's chance of returning any recompense (profit) to the discoverer or marketer. You may even know that in the process of developing at least

Re: A Consortium of Scientists

one high end word processing program (Word Perfect) the term was applied to a date that would be cut into by word wrap at the end of a sentence, or a portion of a sentence beginning at the bottom of a page of print (which would be moved to the next page, where it would be together with the rest of the sentence and the rest of the paragraph.

Indeed, the need for an objective consortium on evolutionary biology, or Earth sciences generally, NOT paid to produce a "property" for sale, and NOT paid or sanctioned on condition of being politically correct... IS a causus bono... nevertheless. And, since our solar system's dynocentral star has enough helium remaining to go on as it is for a while, there is time for man to evolve into a species with a generalized capacity to hold more than one concept in mind at a time — whereas such specimens are a rarity up to now. So, let us not abandon all hope, who enter into the contemplation of solutions, even for widows and orphans such as the notion of an objective Earth Science "issues defining" consortium.

To that end, let me remind that weltenschaung (like the Newtonian view of the universe) is not of the nature of a still shot.

Just to mention one example of how things not only can change, but how ideas can feed a SPIRALING forward progress in which the main evolutionary actors are empirical learning and technological application, such that the learning informs technological advances which, reciprocally, enable greater acuity of observation (learning). It is NOT a cycle, but a helix (or, perhaps a conical helix, if we introduce the notion that hypertrophy is "progress," which is a subjective assessment... but nonetheless valid where it is recognized as such.

Anyhow, look at the fact that the notion of "moral intelligence" can be traced back more than 2,400 years, to Socrates. Does it surprise you that the notion has held different sway, in and out, over the centuries. Just looking at the past century, I am reminded of a piece of my life and thoughts when I became hyper focused (as I am prone to do) upon a band of issues known as "human behavior" and with a narrow aspect of that, known as "behavior modification."

It was in that parenthetical thought mode that I read a book by Hervey Cleckley

Re: A Consortium of Scientists

named The Mask of Sanity. Cleckley's focus was not upon human behavior generally, but more particularly the behavior/thinking of what is crudely classified as "psychopathic thought and behavior."

Nevertheless, in reading Cleckley I came across an observation of his that virtually EXPLODED into my conceptualization of human behavior generally, and has pervaded it (though not exclusively thank heaven) ever since.

It was this observation Cleckley made that fragged my prior thinking. He wrote (and I am sorry but must paraphrase... thought I put it in quotes to give him the credit):

A group of inmates of a criminal correction facility, in a psychiatrist-moderated group therapy setting, is as capable of discussing moral concepts of right and wrong as are the members of an adult Christian Sunday School Class. The DIFFERENCE (caps mine) between the one and the other is not one of distinguishing between the intelligence or the information to be considered by the one or the other; it is in HOW THEY FEEL about the subject matter.

We can appreciate what a veritable atom bomb this is.

(As a person who despises to see someone take a SINGLE, ISOLATED concept into mind and fail to understand that -- regardless of its relative impact on anything, or everything -- UNDERSTANDING its place in the real world requires grasping the whole DYNAMIC in which it is an actor... not in a "Eureka ! Now I know everything there is to know about human behavior..." kind of corruption of wisdom. But it IS a major player.)

Most everybody knows about Pavlov's legacy, so I will mention it only to mix with other intelligence to extend to saying, "A dog can be made to starve to death, by teaching him to fear the very food he needs to sustain life." Or to posit the idea a different way, the best of ideas involved in grasping a full dynamic, can be over-applied, and hence serve to distort and corrupt one's understanding, more than improve it, if that idea is allowed to be the ONLY stimulus given sway in the matter by the psyche. Enough said.

So, anyhow, at the time I was reading The Mask of Sanity the SUREST WAY to get laughed all the way to the door, and out it, was to pose as anything but a JOKE the possibility of any significance to the notion of "moral intelligence."

The joke in my mind is that the very same forums that would have laughed you out of their midst then, are all buzzing about "emotional intelligence" now.

Get it? Emotional intelligence. Emotion... feeling... how they FEEL about

Re: A Consortium of Scientists

it.

How fun it is to swim and dive and splash and laugh with ideas, and see them in both their finest glory and in their dirtiest and most ragged underwear.

Ideas, like humans, are not sacred icons, nor mysteries to be approached on eggshells. They are best when swum in, surfed over, relished as an entire dynamic no human is capable of conceiving of all at once, much less integrating fully. But WE CAN TRY. And weltenschaung DOES FLUCTUATE and propagate forward in helical or spiral symphonification...

So long as we can keep the intellectual child alive in our minds and hearts, there is hope.

g

- >
- > However, from where a sit and think, it all can be revealingly viewed and
- > powerfully "umbrella understood"
- > (in a necessarily Tolerance Principled manner – and perhaps also
- > necessarily in a *partly toilet–humorously concePTualizing* manner)
- > to be a result of the AEVASIVE facet of our phylogeny and functure.
- >
- > [BTW: Both our phylogeny and our functures stem from
- > the fickle 'substratum' that fundamental physicists are attempting to
- > theoretically describe and practically pinpoint.
- >
- > I liked to add this because I am a fascinated follower of what happens
- > in (and what fruits that fall from) the frontiers of fundamental physical
- > (amongst other fields) of Science;
- > And because I am smugly pleased that my Encompassing Philosophical
- > Terminology (of concePTual lenses/tools)
- > apply (or, more specifically, the didactic dichotomization of the
- > "Evolutionary Pressure Totality"
- > into adversity and opportunity type pressures applies) – i.e., only
- > philosophically, don't forget ;-) – to the origin
- > of, and the evolution 'within', our Universe. %-}]
- >
- > P
- >
- > P.S. Apropos my use of "functure":

Re: A Consortium of Scientists

- > In mathematical physics – which, b.t.w., relies on a far more abstractly
- > convoluted conceptual system than
- > EPT is – the concept of "functors", figures widely (or is commonly fielded
- > *without* any frowning from most players).
- >
- >
- >

- **Follow-Ups:**

- ◆ **Re: A Consortium of Scientists**
◇ From: Peter F

- **References:**

- ◆ **A Consortium of Scientists**
◇ From: g
- ◆ **Re: A Consortium of Scientists**
◇ From: Peter F

- Prev by Date: **Re: Article: Evolutionary biology: Males from Mars**
- Next by Date: **Re: Hamilton's Rule In The Mirror Evaded**
- Previous by thread: **Re: A Consortium of Scientists**
- Next by thread: **Re: A Consortium of Scientists**
- Index(es):
 - ◆ **Date**
 - ◆ **Thread**