

Re: Darwin, Evolution, the Animal Kingdom, and Man

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.cognitive/2004-12/0080.html>

From: Lester Zick (lesterDELzick_at_worldnet.att.net)

Date: 12/03/04

Date: Fri, 03 Dec 2004 15:48:02 GMT

On 3 Dec 2004 00:40:45 -0800, cantueso@dieznet.com (cantueso) in comp.ai.philosophy wrote:

>lesterDELzick@worldnet.att.net (Lester Zick) wrote in message
news:<41affd03.62730149@netnews.att.net>...
>> On Sun, 28 Nov 2004 15:56:16 GMT, lesterDELzick@worldnet.att.net
>> (Lester Zick) in comp.ai.philosophy wrote:
>>
>> >On 28 Nov 2004 01:12:27 -0800, cantueso@dieznet.com (cantueso) in
>> >comp.ai.philosophy wrote:
>> >
>> >>lesterDELzick@worldnet.att.net (Lester Zick) wrote in message
news:<41a0bf12.12119545@netnews.att.net>...
>> >>> On 20 Nov 2004 11:16:43 -0800, zzbunker@netscape.net (ZZBunker) in
>> >>> comp.ai.philosophy wrote:
>> >>>
>> >>>
>> >>> Directed evolution isn't the issue. The issue I raised merely concerns
>> >>> whether man is categorically different from animals and explanations
>> >>> for those differences.
>> >>
>> >>>it would depend on your definitions and on your intentions, because
>> >>>in fact you would be looking for MEANING and the direction of your
>> >>>question is metaphysical, not biological; or who would establish the
>> >>>criteria?
>> >
>> >It also depends on the issue I raised which wasn't directed evolution.
>>
>> For those who are interested in what the original issue of this thread
>> was, it was that Darwin's principle of natural selection and evolution
>> of man from animals did not, as is often assumed, contradict the idea
>> that there are categorical differences between man and animal. What it
>> contradicted was creationist religious
> and mythopoeic explanations for
>> those differences.
>

sci.cognitive: Re: Darwin, Evolution, the Animal Kingdom, and Man

- >exactly. it simply took some religious authorities a long time to
- >re-formulate some official position.
- >
- >the problem is philosophical: would you agree to that?

No, the problem is philosophy. The distinction I draw is that philosophy represents the presentation of analogical reasoning drawn through implicit middle terms whereas science represents the presentation of conclusions drawn through explicit middle terms.

- >and I have a quote from some anonymous internet source: """"You
- >probably won't admit it, but you are constantly trying to
- >bootleg the concept of God and His Creation into rational
- >discussion. Cal, that dawg won't hunt.""""
- >
- >well, and you and many others are constantly trying to bootleg God and
- >His Creation out of rational discussion....
- >
- >
- >
- >>
- >> Regards – Lester

Regards – Lester