

Site miroir du Centre
d'Etude et de Recherche sur
la Bipédie Initiale

-- BIPEDIA - BIPEDIA n°176; 15 --

BIPEDIA

n°176; 15

BIPEDIA 15.7

**Comments and
responses**

by Horst FRIEDRICH

Première publication : septembre 1997, et mis
en ligne le lundi 30 juin 2003

Résumé :

COMMENT on BONET BETORET's article in : BIPEDIA, 14 : 11-19, March 1997

Carlos Bonet Betoret's fine - because thought-provoking - piece EVOLUTION, DETERMINISM, MATERIALISM to my mind, clearly shows the limits of what Western science and philosophy can do for our understanding of the universe. His definition of determinism ("*l'évolution biologique et historique suit le principe général de produire des structures de plus en plus compliquées*") provokes several questions. Like Christian theology, it is characterized by the central idea of "progrès". Isn't such an evolution, then, simply the product of "*theologizing*" linear Western thinking ? Isn't cyclic cosmic evolution a much more realistic proposal ?

Besides, my COLLINS gives quite another definition of determinism : "*The philosophical doctrine that all acts, choices, and events are the inevitable consequence of antecedent sufficient causes*". This sounds like the Eastern concept of "*karma*" (but is rather a weak imitation). Should, then, Bonet Betoret have inserted "*inevitable*" into his definition ? But is there really anything inevitable in the universe ? We cannot say, because as yet we do not really understand it. Could Sheldrake's "*morphogenetic fields*" be of some help here ? Maybe, but I fear that for our good friend Bonet Betoret the concept will not be materialistic enough. Continuing in this vein, will we ever arrive at a true understanding of what "*evolution*" is all about ? I see the grave danger that we stray into the realm of quasi-philosophy and quasi-science, into the realm of confused thinking.

We will have to integrate courses in crystal-clear Vedanto-Buddhist philosophy into the *curricula* of our scientists ! Decidedly, I feel that, we Westerners should - once for all - throw the concept of materialism overboard, because it leads to the untenable idea of a mechanistically, machine-like functioning universe. The age-old concept of consciousness as the "stuff", from which the universe is made, has infinitely greater explanatory potential.

Then : Darwinism ! Charles Fort, that arch-enemy of ideological Neo-Scholasticism, stated already in 1919 : "*... but Darwinism of course was never proved : The fittest survive. What is meant by the fittest ?... There is no way of determining fitness except in that a thing does survive. Fitness, then is only another name for survival. Darwinism : That survivors survive*". How can we still call Charles Darwin "*le plus grand homme de science de tous les temps*" ?

The late Prof. Joachim Illies, in his posthumous *Magnum Opus* DER JAHRHUNDERT-IRRITUM, has super-abundantly shown that Darwinism is a materialistic ideology, masquerading as serious science. As Prof. Max Thürkauf writes in its foreword : Darwinism is not a scientifically, or experimentally, verified truth, but belongs to the realm of pure speculation ! And speculation (though, *per se*, quite legitimate in science) should not be "sold" to the general public as a verified truth ! Likewise, the great palaeontologist Prof. Oskar Kuhn, in his : DIE ABSTAMMUNGSLEHRE, TATSACHEN UND DEUTUNGEN, writes : "*Heute ist Darwins Lehre als falsch erkannt*". And he adds the remarkable observation : "*Schon allein die Tatsache des Fehlens fast aller präkambrischen Dokumente ist, Grund genug, vorsichtig zu sein bei der Frage, ob wir es mit, einem einzigen, allumfassenden Evolutionsprozess zu tun haben*",