

Re: The Objectivity of Science

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.bio.evolution/2005-12/msg00289.html>

- *From:* "g" <gillawton@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Tue, 20 Dec 2005 21:00:19 -0500 (EST)
-

"Jim McGinn" <jimmcginn@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
[news:do6qgj\\$1orb\\$1@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:do6qgj$1orb$1@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)

>

> "g" <gillawton@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message

> [news:do5a9k\\$17br\\$1@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:do5a9k$17br$1@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)

>>

>> "Jim McGinn" <jimmcginn@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message

>> [news:dncvst\\$275p\\$1@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:dncvst$275p$1@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)

>>> I'm hesitant to stir up this bee's nest.

>>>

>> Jim,

>>

>> I empathize warmly and abundantly with that.

>>

>> This news group is about EVOLUTIONARY BIOLOGY, in which I am at once

>> enormously interested enormously ignorant and enormously desirous of

>> learning about it as it REALLY IS.

>

> Well, it's a bee's nest in a different way. But I feel like I can handle

> this bee's nest. But it's taken me a lot of hours in libraries to get to

> the level I'm at now.

>

> No easy way.

>

>>

>> In my family (out three generations and to first-cousin level, alone)

>> there

>> are multiple individuals working in "the sciences," (assuming we agree

>> that

>> physicians, surgeons, organic chemists, intra-cellular researchers and

>> space

>> reentry vehicle design quality control... are "scientists' at work").

>> Also

>> among us are some clergymen and one missionary. In fact One of us is

>> BOTH

>> a

>> clergyman and a scientist, and very astute on matters of both. Yet none

>> of

Re: The Objectivity of Science

>> us... not one... finds it necessary to lie to ourselves or others to
>> reconcile the two.
>
> I hope you realize this is a good thing and leave it at that.
>
>>
>> We are not INSECURE in ourselves and do not feel threatened by any search
>> for understanding.
>>
>> The search for understanding takes an open mind and does NOT attempt to
>> promote discord among others who seek understanding, by sewing
>> distortions
>> and lies.
>>
>> Thank you, Jim, for commenting. Your silence on the subject may speak
>> more
>> eloquently than my
>> words.
>
> Evolutionary theory is conflicting to us—most all of us—on a deeply
> emotional level. Many people find it confusing, couterintuitive, and even
> offensive. The more one understands it the more existential becomes their
> outlook on existence. And this is, unavoidably, depressing.
>
> One thing I've come to learn about evolutionary theory is that it is
> social
> poison. Handle it accordingly.
>
> Jim

Jim,

Any effort to "get it right" on any subject is a slap in the face to those who wish to live in a world of soft, warm, fuzzy, unexamined unreality.

My experience in this old world is that the unexamined life is the preferred one for many.

My own quest for meaning, beyond the mundane, drives me to work "THROUGH" philosophical barriers, including even the most sinister and threatening.

My expected life span, per the actuarilists, is another twenty years. And I have enjoyed the ride so far, despite no shying away from questions such as:

If the universe is intelligently designed, what was the designer thinking when he invented warts, psychoses, agony such as I saw a relative experience around the clock for months when death was inevitable and would not come, cancer, birth defects, suffering and death by innocents, and grandiose assholes who know little and think they know everything.

To me, the most unthinkable alternative is to look the other way, rather

Re: The Objectivity of Science

Re: The Objectivity of Science

than look into the pit.

Yet, as I gaze into the pit of harsh realities, I hold on blindly to faith, hope, love... and smile.

That may not work for most. All that matters is that it works for me.

All considered, I'm glad to be on this crazy ride. Would not wish to have missed it.

(:>)

• *References:*

- ◆ ***The Objectivity of Science***
◇ *From: whitesickle@xxxxxxx*
- ◆ ***Re: The Objectivity of Science***
◇ *From: Jim McGinn*
- ◆ ***Re: The Objectivity of Science***
◇ *From: g*
- ◆ ***Re: The Objectivity of Science***
◇ *From: Jim McGinn*

- Prev by Date: ***Re: Homosexuality***
- Next by Date: ***Re: Aids and Evolution***
- Previous by thread: ***Re: The Objectivity of Science***
- Next by thread: ***Re: The Objectivity of Science***
- Index(es):
 - ◆ ***Date***
 - ◆ ***Thread***