

SEVEN

Q & A, AND A NEW LANGUAGE FOR EVOLUTION

At this point, roughly midway through the 20th century, we've reached what history now reveals was the pivotal juncture for the development of both scientific and social mind in the 20th century. For now, with the body blow impact of World War II, the atom bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, and the Cold War threat of nuclear holocaust, the split in mind affecting more than science was moving into every aspect of the lives of our species and all species on this planet.

We're looking at what looms in retrospect as the crunch point for both the theory and story of evolution—the rough point in time where, with the addition of ever more rapid environmental devastation, the size of the threat to survival began to run so far ahead of theory that only a monumental blinding and hamstringing of both science and society could sustain the disparity.

Beyond the scientific board room the questions of the customers and shareholders in NeoDarwinism, Inc. are beginning to pile up. From here on rise the questions that science, now at times deeply concerned, began to nibble at during the final years for the 20th century, to which we'll turn in Part III. But far more important now, these are the questions that at last must be answered if the 21st century is to take us anywhere near where we *must* go if all embodied in the word humanity is to survive.

Why, for example—at this midpoint for the 20th century—had every attempt to free the mind and let it roam been fenced in, hamstrung, or otherwise grounded?

Certainly, one cannot fault the focus on prehuman evolution or on genes to provide the proper grounding for an understanding of human evolution. But by now it was obvious that something much larger is at issue.

As noted earlier, Darwin wrote 200 times of brain and mind in *Descent*. Romanes and Morgan had initially focused on the study of *intelligence* in animals. Why, then, was this thrust of interest so readily side-railed to focus almost

exclusively on the study of prehuman, even hypothetically pre-sentient evolution?

Why was the concept that briefly surfaced as the idea of initiative by the organism, or “self-adaptation”—clearly articulated in Darwin over 100 years in advance of the development of self-organizing theory in our time—fiercely resisted, and only very late in the game accepted by a reluctant minority among Neo-Darwinians?

This omission is striking when we consider that in case after case the innovators themselves—Fisher versus Pearson, for example—were vivid examples of this factor of mind at work in their own drive to go up against the prevailing paradigm.

And why, if from Darwin on, among the scientists themselves the loaded term “survival of the fittest” was avoided or deplored, did it persist?

Why did this psychologically, socially, politically, economically, and morally destructive phrase become not only the main but, mostly and automatically, the *only* explanation for evolution passed along by the media and people in all walks of life?

Why did this fixation prevail despite the expenditure of millions of dollars and billions of woman and man hours on education globally?

And how and why was social science automatically and for so long excluded by the Neo-Darwinian monopoly for evolution theory? How and why can it be said that functionally the social sciences were “relegated, like children, to the sand box, while the grown ups went off to rule the world.” And why did social science allow this? Why was opposition to the Neo-Darwinian monopoly almost exclusively grounded in biology so easily turned back and the voices of both social science and the humanities so readily stilled?

As I show in detail in *Darwin's Lost Theory*, along with Herbert Spencer, Darwin himself set out to provide the grounding for, and in his final years point the discourse toward, application of the vast range of science beyond physics and biology to evolution theory. Thereafter, as we've seen, from Romanes on came the spread of this embryonic Darwinian vision into development of the new reach of psychology, sociology, and the rest of social science on into a systems and evolutionary systems science. Thereafter, within social and systems science, erupted the questions, WW II and atom bomb driven, of customs, beliefs, ideology, values, and above all, morality.

Yet why, then, if there at the beginning was Darwin's architectural sketch for this larger reach *and* responsibility for the development of evolution theory, have

we had to wait until the 21st century for the logical partnership to begin to form between natural and social science to move beyond the foundation to build the vital *superstructural* understanding of evolution?

And what is the place of religion in all of this?

At this point in our retrospective America had been captivated by the heady drama, in 1925, of the Scopes “Monkey Trial,” pitting Clarence Darrow and the pro-evolution “city folks” against William Jennings Bryan and the anti-evolution “yokels.”

And what happened thereafter? With nearly a century of public and private education since then, why has Creationism grown until by 2009 a Gallup poll on Darwin’s 200th birthday found that only 39 percent of Americans believe in evolution versus 43 percent for God and Creationism? Or that earlier polls found two-thirds of Americans want creationism taught along with evolution in schools?

All of which raises still another pertinent question. Why, with the exception of the years of Morgan’s fruit flies, and the obligatory attention to Darwin and evolution every year on or around the time of his birthday, has time-wasting story of Creationists versus Evolutionists been about the only thing the media ever covers on evolution?

And why did so much of what was later rediscovered and acclaimed by his successors, remain buried in the body of the lost Darwin? Why had apparently only Romanes and Kropotkin notably perceived and declaimed the potential disastrous consequences of this loss?

When for Darwin his case for the moral sense as the prime driver for evolution at our level of emergence was a matter of passion, why during the years that locked in place the Neo-Darwinian monopoly was what constitutes our sense of right versus wrong mainly pursued by the tragic and scandal-ridden J.M. Baldwin?

Finally, both obscuring and underlining all of this, is the question NeoDarwinism, Inc. forced the world to face: What is the connection between both scientific and religious theory and the raw impact of real world events. Increasingly bearing on where we are headed in evolution and the battle for human survival, it is the fundamentally moral question raised by the eugenics movement of *human engineering*.

What kind of human do “we” nurture or manufacture? What kind of society do we liberate or control?

This is the ultimate question running through all of the above. It’s further

the question we earlier raised of the over-riding something or other within the history we've examined, which at times seems everywhere to lurk around the corner. Beyond armchair philosophy or mere imagery, what is this dark presence that from time to time seems to act like a giant invisible puppet master dipping down or slipping in to nudge the discourse and the action invariably backward rather than forward in human evolution?

What could a new and bedrock practical level for evolution theory tell us of this force or process, which seemingly out of nowhere plops down on stage a Hitler, Stalin, Pol Pot, Idi Amin, or within democracies smiling puppets to front for the regressive Powers That Be?

In short, what drives us ahead, checks us in place, or drives us backward in evolution?

Could answers to these questions be found within the mindspace of biology prevailing for NeoDarwinian evolution theory?

Obviously not. And so fitfully but steadily the second Darwinian revolution gained momentum. The findings of progressive brain research, psychology, sociology, anthropology, economics, political science, *evolutionary* systems science—above all, a new science of moral mind and action, which out of the lost Darwin nudges at us today—hammered at the gate to evolution theory demanding entry and room for expansion.

But to be heard you must speak with a language those you must reach can understand. In the rest of the chapters for this section we will look at the problem faced by the revolutionaries, but fuzzed by the counter-revolutionaries, of a language that across all fields could be understood.