

### ***THREE***

#### **DARWIN'S LOST THEORY**

Despite the wealth that both freed him and made others beholden to his gifts and good will, within the constraints of the knowledge of his time and the curtailing of his years, Romanes could only get started. Today we have the advantage of one hundred years of science and history since then—and it's high time we use them.

Although with Darwin long ago become another ghost at the birthday party, Romanes flings down this glove to challenge the future.

Why, he asks, did they “hide certain parts of Darwin's teaching, and give undue prominence to others?”

“I myself believe that Darwin's judgement with regard to all these points will eventually prove more sound and accurate than that of any of the recent would-be improvers upon his system.”

In the Prologue we took a brief look at what Darwin really had to say about survival of the fittest, selfishness, and other icons for the scientific detour that helped take us to the cumulating disasters of our time.

From where I left off in the Prologue I went on to discover the difference it makes if you come back to Darwin over 100 years later with an open mind.

It is my hope of course this trilogy may some day be hailed as a revolutionary work of scholarship. But really it is what anyone could have found if you approach *Descent* not with a mind shuttered by what already in his time Romanes saw beginning to close off the territory Darwin had opened up. It is what anyone today can find if you approach *Descent*, and his early notebooks, with an action-oriented mind expanded with the perspective of modern evolutionary systems science.

In other words, a startling world of difference opens up if, in addition to the fresh insights of progressive natural science, you bring to bear on Darwin the expansion for the mind of our species of progressive modern *social* science—plus the humanities and the perspectives of an old bug-bear become a potential ally, progressive religion.

To illustrate what Romanes didn't recognize—or couldn't have known because of all the growing up that science had yet to do—I will condense within only seven pages what so far has taken me four other books, plus chapters in books by others, plus many journal articles to uncover and report.

To begin with, I found that in his key book on *human* evolution, *The Descent of Man*, Darwin does continue to stress the by now well-established scientific evidence for the impact of natural selection on variation as well as the drive of selfishness. *But he goes on to insist that “other agencies” become of much greater importance at our species’ level of evolutionary emergence.*

Most important: he clearly outlines a compelling, carefully reasoned *moral* action-oriented *completion* for his theory of evolution.

### *The Lost Darwin*

Again, this is the central point for the Darwin we’ve been denied for over 100 years: The prime driver for *human* evolution—and completion for his theory of evolution—was and is *not* natural selection, or “survival of the fittest,” as popularized. It is our capacity for the “moral sense,” i.e., moral sensitivity, an evolutionary inbuilt thrust within us for the development of a sense of right versus wrong.

In probing the relation of love (95 times in *Descent*) to moral sensitivity (92 times, versus only twice for “survival of the fittest”), Darwin not only developed a biologically-based theory of the development of the moral sense in our species, which has been almost universally ignored. Since then it’s been massively confirmed by the carbon-dating, fossil and DNA analysis, and other amazing tools of modern paleontology, and by the research of one of the 20<sup>th</sup> century’s greatest brain scientists, Paul MacLean, and many others.

For Darwin, first came the primordial emergence of what he called the *sexual* instinct among organisms.

Fossils show this happened about a billion years ago with the emergence of meiotic sex, or the mating of two organisms for reproduction. For Darwin this explosive step up for the sexual instinct next led to the emergence of a *parental* instinct. Here again his pioneering insight has been confirmed by paleontology and brain research, which shows the capacity for caring for rather than eating one’s offspring did come next with the arrival of the early reptiles about 250 million years ago. This, then, for Darwin, led to emergence of the capacity to care for others beyond the fierce boundary of self and offspring. Fundamental to his theory thereafter he called this portentous arrival the *social* instinct. Here again, both paleontology and brain research have confirmed his insight, dating the the arrival of the mammals to about 216 million years ago. Last then for Darwin came the emergence of the capacity for *emotion* and finally *reason*, with their reasonably full flowering with the emergence of our species confirmed for somewhere between 100,000 and 200,000 years ago.

This burst of insight was first recorded in the long unpublished private notebooks into which Darwin poured everything exploding within his mind on his return to England from the worldwide voyage of the *Beagle* at age 28. Level by level precisely confirmed by the brain research of Paul MacLean, this is the evolutionary track from the hypothalamus, to the lower limbic system, to the higher limbic system, to the prefrontal cortex in the brain of every one of us.

This is the step by step sequence to which, in order to complete his theory of evolution, he returned in *The Descent of Man*. Most vital for Darwin in the completing his theory in *Descent*, this is the sequence for his development of the evolution of the *moral sense*— *not survival of the fittest*—as the ultimate prime driver for human evolution.

Once one takes the time to really read and ponder what he wrote in the light of modern research, in terms of structure, physical evidence, and logic, this “lost” completion for his theory not only contradicts but on the level of its ultimate relevance is by light years more compelling than what was seized up out of Darwin and degraded into “survival of the fittest” and “selfish genes.” For beyond this new foundation in biological evolution is the reach of what is of far more pressing importance for our species to understand today.

That is, what we need not only to know but to *teach* is how upon this biological foundation—for us completed with the emergence of our species over 100,000 years ago—our ancestors went on to construct the *superstructure*; how on the lower story was constructed the higher story of the world of all the problems and the opportunities that, every day from birth to death, face every one of us.

In a parallel analysis, Darwin develops his case for how the considerably different requirements for our *cultural evolution* unfolded. In keeping with the earlier implanting of our sexual, parental, and social instincts, in our cultural evolution first emerged the impact of *caring* for others. Given the capacity for emotion and reason, this then led to *reflection* on the consequences of one’s behavior. This, in turn, led to the development of *language* to share and compare insights. Then with the global spread of this capacity, and sharing of what seemed to better rather than worsen the situation for life on this planet, through the mind-binding impact of *habit*, with repetition and refinement over centuries, the guidance of right versus wrong reflected in our customs, norms, rules, values, and morals was—and is—cemented in place.

Stage by stage, this lost Darwinian conclusion is supported by modern brain research, cultural anthropology, linguistics, and the psychology of learning and developmental and social psychology.

So from this we can begin to see how and why the completed theory we have been denied

for over a century consists of two halves.

There is a foundation, primarily established by the interaction of natural selection and variation, the domain of natural science, of which Darwin wrote in *Origin of Species*. And there is a completing super-structure, the domain of social science, of which he wrote in his early notebooks and *The Descent of Man*.

Most vital for our bloody and rudderless time, in projecting the second half Darwin shows how, through a process of both personal and mass cultural maturation, the thrust of the *moral sense* unfolds.

For a familiar example across many fields today, here we can see how one hundred years earlier, Darwin clearly foreshadowed Abraham Maslow's defense, to growth, to metamotivational thrust for the development of humanistic psychology, and the still revolutionarily emergent and globally widening human potentials movement.

Point for point, this emergent pattern for both the foundation and superstructure for Darwin's theory of evolution is not only corroborated by the human potentials movement and the research of the modern scientific fields I've indicated. As an agent by default for Darwin and Romanes, I make this prediction. By the fact the lost Darwin has been uncovered, and through this book and others is becoming generally known, more experts in the relevant fields of science, in progressive theology, and among others who simply recognize what's needed for the grounding of sanity in the lunacy of this lonely age of confusion, will find this matches what the hearts, minds, and findings for many of us for a long time have told us is true.

In the lost Darwin I also found insights anticipating still leading edge aspects for science and society as we move into the maelstrom of the 21<sup>st</sup> century. Chaos and complexity theory, self-organizing theory, and out of the wasteful and senseless battle of old the new meeting ground between science and spirituality are among doors opening into a new liberation in language and in life I'll return to in Book III *Up Against the Paradigm*.

### ***Chaos and Complexity Theory***

A concept that in the late 20<sup>th</sup> century both seized the popular mind and opened science to the expanding power of chaos and complexity theory was the "butterfly effect." This is the idea that even a seemingly insignificant thing, like the stamp of a butterfly, can, through systems interconnections, influence change thousands of miles away.

This is an interesting case of how long it can take for official or scientific mind to catch up with reality. The idea was already there thousands of years ago in the ancient wisdom of the *I Ching* of China. It has been in the mind of harsh rulers ever since then—for example,

this for the mind of the tyrant. If embodied in the rebel “the stamp of the butterfly” can jolt the system, why obviously the rule for survival of the fittest—namely me—is to kill the rebel before his or her protest spreads to become the voice of the people. In 1935 Albert Einstein, Boris Podolsky, and Nathan Posen raised the related possibility of the operation of what became the concept of nonlocality in physics. In 1969 Edward Lorenz launched chaos theory by revealing how “the butterfly effect” works in the mathematics of weather change.

And back in Romanes’ time we find him stating the case for what he called *correlated growth*, which Darwin earlier called *correlated variation*.

Starting in *Origin of Species*, then accelerating in *The Descent of Man*, Darwin repeatedly brings this up. Just as today we can track how the hypothetical “stamp of the butterfly” can influence macrocosmic change in physics and in weather conditions, so did Darwin persist in calling attention to the fact that change in one part produces change in another part of a living organism.

Indeed, I still find haunting how he seemed to be anticipating the problem of becoming only the voice of a ghost. In the passages in which he writes of “correlated variation,” he also seems to be saying, “Look, friends, here is something of potentially profound importance that needs attention. Please do what I just can’t go much further with in my time.”

### *Self-Organizing Theory*

Here is another case of how long it can take for science to catch up to reality. In personal and political terms, the root idea is that we don’t have to put up with a raw deal, whether handed down from on top by “God,” Natural Selection, or by our “fellow man.” We can rebel. Thanks to evolution, we have a voice in shaping our own destiny.

This was the historical and religious significance of Moses and the exodus of the enslaved Jews from Egypt, later the emergence of Jesus. It was the scholarly activist assertion of Voltaire and other French Enlightenment thinkers that emboldened Washington, Jefferson, Franklin and the other founders of America. It thundered out of Marx and Engels in launching the science of activism. It quietly emerged as “functional autonomy” in the psychology of Gordon Allport. Then out of the spread of what became known as chaos theory it exploded as “autocatalysis” in the work of Belgian thermodynamicist Ilya Prigogine, “autogenesis” for Hungarian biologist Vilmos Csanyi and computer scientist Gyorgy Kampis, and as “autopoesis” in the work of Chilean biologists Humberto Maturana and Francisco Varela.

And what did I find in Darwin? So much I could see that if he had simply given it a name—a handy label, like “natural selection” or “sexual selection”—it might have had a

chance to endure beyond the page.

As I detail in *Darwin's Lost Theory*, he writes of his perception of “self-organizing” at work eleven times in *Descent*. As I followed his analysis of the process from thought to action within the mind of a bee, the image of a squirrel reveling over a nut meat in its paws came to mind. To provide a name for this nut meat, I decided to call it Organic Choice. “Organic” to reflect the idea that it operates in all living organisms; “Choice” to reflect the liberating idea, which comes down to us through all the years, that we ourselves and all other organisms have a choice in shaping our destiny.

### *Darwin and Religion*

Finally, Darwin was definitely *not* the enemy of religion. For him the ignorance, the violence, and the lunacy of regressive religion was an abomination. But science has been quick to forget that Darwin was originally formally schooled at Cambridge not for science, but for the ministry. Also generally overlooked is the number of ministers who were close lifelong friends. For *progressive* religion—e.g., across generations the slave-hating Unitarian church of the Darwin and Wedgewood family’s faith—he not only expressed a kinship but also a strong alignment.

As I wrote of this systematically “invisibilized” aspect in *Darwin's Lost Theory*:

It may seem inconceivable, beyond belief, off the wall. But what I found is the Darwin whose perhaps greatest contribution—wholly contrary to what we’ve been told—was in providing the scientific grounding for the “love thy neighbor” ethos of Jesus.

In other words, in the “lost Darwin” one finds a carefully reasoned, empirically grounded scientific expression of the supremacy of love and moral sensitivity, with even a good word for what we know today as progressive religion!

Impossible? All you have to do is actually read what he wrote and among corroborating passages there you will find that this man reviled as the enemy of religion actually wrote of, and I quote, “the ennobling belief in God.”

Contrary to the Satanic anti-Christ of the Creationists and the fiction for many of their opponents, any open-minded reading of what he actually wrote reveals that throughout his life there was a running battle, or love-hatefest, in his mind toward religion and spirituality.

As for the idea of God, while rejecting it for himself, he endorsed it as a source of comfort

and inspiration for others. In the end, moreover—wholly contrary to the view of both the Creationists and Neo and Super-Neo-Darwinian science—it becomes evident Darwin actually deserves a special place in the long line of highly practical visionaries linking morality to spirituality. For he was the first to provide a *scientific* grounding for the line from Jesus and Gautama to the Dalai Lama and the great German theologian Hans Kung, whose Global Ethic is a compelling update for our time.

To underline the point, here again is the integral quote of quotes, which I noted in the prologue comes up not buried in some obscure place easy to miss, but in Concluding Remarks in *The Descent of Man*.

“Important as the struggle for existence has been and even still is, yet as far as the highest part of our nature is concerned there are other agencies more important. For the moral qualities are advanced either directly or indirectly much more through the efforts of habit, by our reasoning powers, by instruction, by religion, etc., than through natural selection.”

So we’ve begun to know what Darwin originally knew and Romanes could glimpse before the battle for 20<sup>th</sup> century mind began. Now armed with the advantage of this new perspective, let’s go back for a new look at the struggle between the revolutionists and the counter-revolutionists that readied the ground for the battle for 21<sup>st</sup> century mind.