

International Conference – Environment at a Crossroads: SMART approaches for a sustainable future

## Evolutionism. Logic, Language and Thought. On the “miraculous” order of the world

Alexandru Anghelescu\*

*University of Bucharest, Mihail Kogălniceanu nr. 36-46, sector 5, Bucharest*

---

### Abstract

Do other earthly forms of life evolved to the level of intelligent life? Cancer and resistance to antibiotics obliged to ask this question. Signs of intelligence are found at its simplest levels. We try to see if logic is *used* at these levels. Peter of Spain's *suppositio materialis* is applied to the chemical signals of cells. Dynamic Logic is used to understand these chemical communications. <System of communications> is used, instead of “language”. The development of life appears as the development of an axiomatic system. The rights of unborn humans and God's rights over His own creation appear as the most powerful arguments for conservationism.

© 2016 Published by Elsevier B.V. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).

Peer-review under responsibility of the organizing committee of ECOSMART 2015

**Keywords:** evolutionism; axiomatic system; temporal quantifications over relevant performing; conservationism

---

### 1. Introduction

This paper develops the 2013 paper on evolutionism - Evolutionism. Some logical-epistemological puzzles [1]. The so called Paradox of identity (in its soft version) would point to a kind of holistic logic, where the relations between intension and extension are described by different logically valid schemes.

The fallacy of misplaced knowledge shows that “strategy” comes after the intension-extension relations are established, as strategy presupposed the intension-extension duo. A strategy presupposes the part of reality it allows us to manipulate.

---

\* Corresponding author.

E-mail address: [angelealex@yahoo.com](mailto:angelealex@yahoo.com)

As for the instrument, we noticed that once criteria(s) is/are used to choose between competing instruments, criteria(s) encrypt knowledge. All these make the tabula rasa of empirists a quite difficult affair. If tabula rasa would go to humans or to amoeba it makes no difference for its existence.

As life seems to have evolved from simple to more complex forms, it is of interest if signs of intelligence are present at some of the simplest levels of life that we can access today. The search will also focus on cells, with the belief that simplicity might give us a hint of what life was in the beginnings.

On 30<sup>th</sup> of March 1952, Einstein wrote to Solovine on the “miraculous” order of the world [2]: “You find it strange that I consider the comprehensibility of the world (to the extent we are authorized to speak of such a comprehensibility) as a miracle or as an eternal mystery. Well, *a priori* one should expect a chaotic world which cannot be grasped by the mind in any way. One could (yes *one should*) expect the world to be subject to law only to the extent that we order it through our intelligence. Ordering of this kind would be like the alphabetical ordering of words of a language. By contrast, the kind of order created by Newton’s theory of gravitation, for instance, is wholly different. Even if the axioms of the theory are proposed by man, the success of such a project presupposes a high degree of ordering of the objective world, and this cannot be expected *a priori*. That’s the “miracle” which is being constantly reinforced as our knowledge expands”.

The MW’, of Angheliescu and Rozyłowicz [1] exploited these lines as an imaginary region of space where none of our knowledge can be applied and where the process of knowledge should start again, form zero.

Einstein’s “miracle” might be explained in these terms: if life started some billion years ago on this Earth [3] that we have and if we are the result of this process (where knowledge is encrypted into any seed of life that there is) then our own being is a Holy Grail of knowledge where outside and inside are one and Einstein meets Plato’s innate Ideas. Socrate’s “know yourself” and Lao Zi “without going out of the window you can know the world-under-the-heaven” are some of the oldest expressions of this idea [4].

Each being on this Earth discovered at least a part of the order of this world: it is that knowledge which allows that being to exist and send s/his existence into the future.

“Nature” and, mostly, “instinct” were the beloved children of evolutionism. Humans had reason (or intelligence or the sort of), non humans had a mysterious “instinct” present within and with the actions of “nature”. Decades of research sent this “instinct” into the paper basket. Two facts triggered this silenced revolution: cancer and resistance to antibiotics.

## 2. Logic

Using Logic and meditating on Logic might come together or not. If we do not break the barrier of language we can not know if non humans meditate on logic or not. As long as we do not break this barrier all that we can say is if logic is *used* or not.

In Angheliescu and Rozyłowicz [1] I showed that the know-how and know-that distinction must be understood in a different way. The common idea that the “know” - that is a sign of humanity - might prove to be false. Not only that the distinction has its limits, but it may be that it doesn’t even hold in some cases.

The evidence gathered till now [5] amounts to the conclusion that some parts of that that we humans call Logic are used by non humans. Dolphins use the intension-extension distinction and logically valid schemes; if our reality is one-sense (eye) constructed, it does not follow that a many-sense or not one-sense (eye) constructed reality cannot “lead” to logically valid schemes.

Would the holists (e.g., Quine) meet the innateists (e.g., Chomsky): knowledge (be it language and /or logic) come together like the words in a dictionary, but it develops some inborn “structures”? Would we have to introduce another element into our analysis to cope with Einstein’s expanding knowledge?

The vaccine-virus puzzle [1] shows that the main issue at stake here is: <what “know” is?>. For, if my organism knows the ways of defence, but I don’t ( and that’s the puzzle), would we have to say that the organism knows-that, but I, the author of these lines, don’t ?

On the platonic scheme of body-mind (soma-nous), logic would go to the nous/mind/intellect and it is innate. Is this knowledge of the organism innate? What would innate be, now? Or is it a know-how? Or, to better put it, the distinction does not even work here and some new concepts are needed to explain the vaccine-virus puzzle? I would rather go for the last option.

Another obvious choice was to use some notions from Dynamic Logic [6, 7], meant to deal with computer programs: first do X then do Y, repeat X a finite number of times, do  $\alpha$  followed by  $\beta$ , do  $\alpha$  or  $\beta$  non –

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/4401707>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/4401707>

[Daneshyari.com](https://daneshyari.com)