

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

**Source:** <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.cognitive/2004-12/0206.html>

---

**From:** Lester Zick ([lesterDELzick\\_at\\_worldnet.att.net](mailto:lesterDELzick_at_worldnet.att.net))

**Date:** 12/06/04

Date: Mon, 06 Dec 2004 15:39:32 GMT

On 6 Dec 2004 00:30:46 -0800, [cantueso@dieznet.com](mailto:cantueso@dieznet.com) (cantueso) in [comp.ai.philosophy](mailto:comp.ai.philosophy) wrote:

>[lesterDELzick@worldnet.att.net](mailto:lesterDELzick@worldnet.att.net) (Lester Zick) wrote in message news:<[41b3d52a.25920240@netnews.att.net](mailto:41b3d52a.25920240@netnews.att.net)>...

>> On 5 Dec 2004 00:39:23 -0800, [cantueso@dieznet.com](mailto:cantueso@dieznet.com) (cantueso) in [comp.ai.philosophy](mailto:comp.ai.philosophy) wrote:

>>

>> >[lesterDELzick@worldnet.att.net](mailto:lesterDELzick@worldnet.att.net) (Lester Zick) wrote in message news:<[41b18a61.7737761@netnews.att.net](mailto:41b18a61.7737761@netnews.att.net)>...

>> >> On Fri, 03 Dec 2004 16:02:03 -0600, Albert <[albertwagner@cox.net](mailto:albertwagner@cox.net)> in [comp.ai.philosophy](mailto:comp.ai.philosophy) wrote:

>> >>

>> >> >Lester Zick wrote:

>> >> ><snip>

>> >> >> 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.

>> >> >

>> >> >> I /almost/ understand that. Could you elaborate? Especially, the terms 'drawn through' and 'middle terms.' I am also assuming that your use of 'analogical' is roughly equivalent to 'metaphorical.'

>> >>

>> >> I have a considerable issue with many people's use of the word metaphor and metaphorical because my dictionary defines metaphor as standing for something which it is not and in most cases it's not clear where the so called metaphor is or isn't the thing referred to. I think better terms would be allusion, analogy, euphemism or the like.

>> >

>> >> I looked it up in my Webster's. it says that in a metaphor the comparison is -- implied --. this definition is not satisfactory.

>> >

>> >> analogies and examples or illustrations are functional. they ought to

>> >be neutral as to meaning; they should talk only to your intellect, not  
>> >to your emotions.  
>> >  
>> >an example. I say that language is like the ocean and the mind is a  
>> >ship on this ocean.  
>> >  
>> >I mean it as an analogy, but I realize its aesthetic component, its  
>> >appeal to the senses, its metaphorical appeal is strong, and so I  
>> >cannot use it for instance in a paper on linguistics.  
>> >  
>> >can you see this?  
>>  
>> Oh, I can see it all right. It's just what I was saying.  
>  
>  
>  
>but my example is supposed to be a model. I have heard physicists  
>describe atom movements using three different models to explain a  
>single experimental result.  
>  
>above you said: ""philosophy represents the presentation of  
>analogical reasoning drawn through implicit middle terms .... "  
>  
>does this include an "as if" approach?

Certainly.

>  
>>  
>> >and once I figured out that language was a spider's web: the spider  
>> >needs it to catch flies, and the spider creates it by walking off its  
>> >edges.....Jeeeeeee! I was so happy when I found this one! and yet  
>> >again, it cannot be used as an analogy, for reasons similar to those  
>> >given above.  
>> >  
>> >however, if Kant says that philosophy is legislation, that is not an  
>> >analogy. nor is it a metaphor. is a statement like this useless to  
>> >you? I do not think it was included in your idea of what philosophy  
>> >is.  
>>  
>> If Kant was saying philosophy was like legislation, the comment is  
>> allusive and metaphorical.  
>  
>he did not say "like".  
>> then he should stop pontificating and run run for congress.  
>  
>this is what you imagine and how you imagined it, and it is very  
>nearly what I expected, too.  
>  
>but things are not the way you would imagine them. they are very  
>different.  
>

>the idea is that if your parents or your religion can no longer  
>direct you, you have to judge for yourself, right?  
>  
>you might have to try and find the laws or maxims by which you mean  
>to live, right?

Of course. Just no reason to do it philosophically because philosophers are doomed to failure almost by definition since they don't employ explicit middle terms. Most philosophy is just so much wishful thinking and wishfulness.

>at least Kissinger said so. he said that once you are in high office,  
>the pressure of events is such that you can no longer consider the  
>basics. this is just an example.

Real time is no time to be doing philosophy.

>here is another example: when you see a film, you say it is good or  
>bad. it would be nice to be able to reason your opinion. if you try,  
>you will be looking for laws that govern your judgment. you will be  
>trying to legislate.

In other words, just make it up as you go along?

>now I wonder whether you got that. sigh. scientists are so very much  
>like children.

Well, we are all somebody's children. Even assholes like Kissinger.

Regards – Lester