

Religion and Evolution / Biocentrism and Nature: Thoughts

Derek Dey
September 16, 2016



A recent post on evolution stimulated some thoughts.

Religion and Evolution usually present a warlike stance towards one another. Darwin, however, was not simply a failed scientist he was also a troubled individual. He struggled with massive guilt and repression, for one thing, and it was made visible in his psychosomatic episodes and in the recorded blackouts that he suffered. This cannot be separated from his work because it affects perception and his conclusions. The self is an interactive agency, not separated bits and pieces, nor is it about cognitive dissonance which is

present. Studies show this problem in Darwin but, the Theory of Evolution has evolved, moved on, but it is still unsatisfactory.

Darwin's Origin of Species was a hurried response to a paper from Alfred Russel Wallace who already had it all down. John Eccles, of [Science Conference](#) fame, described himself as Darwinian but actually he belongs to Wallace. Between Darwin and Wallace there is a difference, a big difference. As Eccles explains: "Wallace felt that human intelligence could only be explained by the direct intervention of Cosmic Intelligence."-1989. Darwin was outraged by such speculations as these but Eccles, in turn, went on in his time to scientifically examine the neuron and said in '94 that the neuron must lie in participation with the quantum field if we are to posit 'mind.' Hence Eccles was really no Darwinian. Eccles also spun a narrative of the evolution of mind which came in sudden leaps and was directed teleologically. The idea of humanity emerging gradually from the ape was not Eccles preferred position; he leaned to a type of Christian eschatology in his thinking. Human persons, human behaviors, the human mind and its proclivities were all about just that – the human person, his story, his sudden emergence, and the qualities of an expansive and transcendent mind.

But in our argument, Creation is not religion. First, we need to understand it is nature that we speak of. Religion is predicated on the 'Fall,' the dystopian model; not the work of God or nature. That is one early problem staring us in the face. Creation is usually ascribed to Logos, and has been for thousands of years. We can see it in the math of Egypt, we hear of it from Heraclitus, and from Jewish Memra, and it pops up in the Renaissance as the golden mean. Whether one uses a term like design or patterns or archetypes, complexity or systems, is a moot point but Logos was the Founder's last 'addition' to the Principle. This comes up in [Original Substance of Divine Principle](#) and is discussed in [Unification Thought](#) (UT).

Creation starts from God's heart and intention, not the Big Bang. God's heart is the subject not evolution per se. First, Adam and Eve are fully conceived as His beloved son and daughter. Next, God thinks about a suitable environment for them. This follows, and is established in, a reductionist way (if I may use that expression). Looking at creation there is less in the world than there is in humankind, and so on to the Planck layer where we posit mental-like properties but similarities persist, which we can identify with; deep ecology runs all the way through like this. We are familiar with our cosmos.

Then when all the content and structure is established as Logos, all ideas are reconsidered and polished in the pre-logos function before sending everything off for creation. Bang! The world of phenomenology becomes visible but consciousness is never far away either.

Creation is these blueprints made immanent. Inherent Directive Nature keeps things on track, perhaps the Higgs. Then, when energy is translated to mass, evolution in the scientific realm begins and unfolds. Ideas become the world and consciousness and heart. Basic conscious-like properties are there at the start. They must be, they don't just suddenly appear. Evolution, therefore, does not come first; ideas and heart do. Adam and Eve as *the first idea*, present a case for some form of biocentrism to be further considered. As the first blueprint or model of cosmology, a deep examination of this biocentric self might help us to understand the rest of evolution in depth. The creative self, ideas in preconscious to conscious rationality, then whatever expression the idea takes, is Logos by definition. Psyche models itself on Logos and vice versa. Then, of course, there is much more discovery in biology and neuroscience about how the senses work in relation to creation. [The Good, the True, and the Beautiful](#) by Jean-Pierre Changeux is a neuronal approach and somewhat complex, but well worth a look. In his approach, mind and nature are configured to extract high ethical and virtuous conclusions from the overall field of existence.

So Logos nature and Logos creativity come up and the term implies both a conscious and heartfelt ethical designer; a parent if you will, with a lot of love in His heart. Logos is not layers but is an interactive agency, whereby energy makes itself present in various expressions and links to others synchronously. These are not simply empirical events, nor are they disconnected events. Systems are networked just as cell to cell is biologically networked. And nothing is truly random. Quantum says it is, so far as understanding goes, but quantum is now under review. Science is on it. In any case, random does not mean the road back to chaos.

Any artist worth his salt will tell you a work of art is tied to the original mind and to the original self (Logos again), if it is to be clear, and presented as Logos Creativity.

Artwork is first defined by heart and intention yet not rigidly controlled, as elements of chance and variables always come into play in a meaningful and synchronous way. Yet, in the end, these seemingly chance elements become part of the whole in a harmonious way. They are integrated whereby some form of synchronicity is at work; meaningful coincidence. Any seemingly random event in the evolution of an artwork holds to the same principle of evolution in a wider way thus allowing an advance into novelty, with creativity, and 'chance' elements woven in, yet without breaking any principle. In this way, a work of art is completed.

These ideas can be taken as the basic notion of participation with a universe rich in mental-like properties, rising to full consciousness in humankind. The model of unconscious ideas, to pre-conscious consideration/reconsideration, to conscious rational thought, is relevant to both Logos and the basic model of the dynamics of the psyche, as mentioned. Furthermore we talk of deep ecology and we talk of the cell being in participation with field consciousness in UT, so participation in a system like this is more akin to a healthy conversation (of sorts) with everything from cognition to the intuitive idea. In the case of the cell it is a more basic form of communication, but communication nevertheless. The failure to understand this results in ecological disasters and dystopian cultures as we have found.

Indeed, creation, as a systems theory suggests, prefers to be autopoietic by nature i.e. an interactive, relational, and a sustainable proposition. What this means is, like Logos, it is not fixed or deterministic when it moves to its dynamic expressions, rather as the preconscious layers in the human psyche and the Pre-Logos function (in the Korean version of UT), it is given to consideration, reconsideration and adaptation; moves are made towards refinement and perfection, yet not in contradiction to first principles. Therein lies the paradox of a living system; it is both by design as principles determine and by change and adaptations which flow and nature reveals. Seasons and the seasons of a man's life all come to mind here. There is a framework but what happens on the way is all about free will, choice and a lot of variables.

Logos is married to Eros, and Eros is nature and flow, and they dwell in harmony. Once you are on the ground nothing sits still for long yet nothing falls off the page either. Flow is predicated on the underlying order just as a stream is predicated to its underlying pebbles and rocks at the base. Seemingly random variables then become simply functions of a deeper order tied to the bedrock, which is not always visible, but there anyway. Random functions, here visible in the stream, do not take us back to unstructured chaos, rather to bedrock.

In Darwin's views we see a flawed system of a dystopian nature tied to his dystopian self; a broken theory never to be proven as it stands. The gaps are there because the gaps are there. So Neo-Darwinism doesn't do much better. If it's not true in theory it cannot define reality. It is also challenged by the absence of profound meaning and sacredness which cannot be extracted from a rock when designated in a materialistic stance. Nor does it define mind in the broadest sense as Eccles began to do. Virtues cannot be found here either. Heart is always missing from evolution.

In the original document, Pierre Teilhard de Chardin is presented as a religious man who did quite a bit to synthesize science with his faith. There is something to be said for de Chardin's work, but I daresay A. N. Whitehead's process theology and occasions of experience are rich too; perhaps offering more because he touches on meaning and heart. Whitehead has valuable pointers concerning our connectedness, which differs from Chardin. Whitehead says we are lured by beauty, never coerced to be with our God of heart. He places love into his cosmos as a central force. Then Whitehead says the relationship between our God and us is experiential and because he lay on the cusp of the quantum age he is therefore suggesting mind participates with some form of field-consciousness, Panexperientialism which goes all the way from cognition to subatomic particles. This just might be our bridge to such a higher realm; some form of connectedness. Through the science of mind to quantum we move to the creator of such a system and tip our hat to consciousness, connectedness, and ultimately heart.

Evolution has to be imbued with the internal qualities of nature as intended not the other way around. So what is our first principle?

There's a common idea running through DNA studies and Integral thinking that humankind has been around for some 300,000 years and we still have not got it right yet. One can argue dates but getting it

right has not appeared fully on the menu yet. Within an interactive system, problematic and fugitive agencies have an effect on the whole, just as healthy energy adds and creates positively in its own way. Empiricism takes no account of such issues. It mostly looks at material just as it is. Put simply, negative effects distort our field of reality with unnatural additions. Indeed in some cases the empirical method is flawed by its own description, by the total lack of concern tied to peculiar and isolated subjectivities (as the self is in Freud's Metapsychology). His model of self is dystopian and conflicted. Look Freud up. A lot of the 20th Century thinkers also flew their deconstruction theories on those winds. This is like trying to build a picture of a living system using a broken self from Enlightenment subjective thinking, and empiricism, to describe something whole and alien to such a problematic self. Nature, and its interior domains needs to be properly evaluated and fact separated from fiction if a true picture is to emerge. Principles and Integral both posit holism's not the subject self and not a materialistic world of its own making.

A lot of the 20th Century thinkers also flew their deconstruction theories on those winds. This is like trying to build a picture of a living system using a broken self from Enlightenment subjective thinking, and empiricism, to describe something whole and alien to such a problematic self. Nature and its interior domains need to be properly evaluated, and fact separated from fiction if a true picture is to emerge. Principles and Integral both posit holisms, not the subject self and not a materialistic world of its own making.

In short, some of the free elements of creation are not free; some belong to a deep order not fully understood. Products of dysfunctional agencies within the system do not belong to nature, and that needs to be sorted out. Like diseases, they have no original function as the Founder stated in Gloucester in 1987; diseases are a product of failures and dystopian agencies functioning like a rogue virus in what should be a healthy body and healthy mind by nature. Ecology already reveals what ignorance, exploitation and selfishness, wreak on a system. We are not clear, however, about what if anything has been changed in nature by untoward human agencies. Evolution doesn't tell us that. With the clearance of all this underbrush, however, the road ahead might become clear. Heart, health, and nature, might come to the fore as was intended in the first place.