

## *Short Paper*

# A Note on Evolution

Jan-Erik Lane<sup>1\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Professor Emeritus, University of Geneva, Geneva, Switzerland

\* Jan-Erik Lane, University of Geneva, Geneva, Switzerland

Received: December 22, 2020    Accepted: January 7, 2021    Online Published: January 25, 2021

doi:10.22158/jrph.v4n1p33

URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.22158/jrph.v4n1p33>

### **Abstract**

*Evolutionary theory has attracted great interest recently in biology and game theory. What about the humanities and social sciences? Are we to explain human action with new natural science concepts?*

### **Keywords**

*selfish gene, new one reality, intention, Weber, Dawkins and Searle*

## **1. Introduction**

R. Dawkins advocates an advanced form of Darwinism, focusing on selfishness. He adds genetics to Darwin's survival of the fittest principle. If one can say that the selfish gene chooses or is the most effective gene, could one then say that people with an effective genome is an evolutionary outcome?

At the same time, the hunt is on for finding the most basic UNITS of the universe whatever that may be: quarks, strings or quantum waves. How about the humanities and the social sciences? Human evolution means what?

Dawkins emphasizes that his selfish gene has no conscious drive or motive. But he talks incessantly about the strategy of genes.

## **2. Human Action**

Max Weber was basically a philosopher of science. His Collected Papers in the Philosophy of Science is a book published after his death in 1920, making him one of the most influential philosophers of science besides Popper, Nagel, Hempel and Kuhn.

Weber identified the basic micro unit in social science analysis as intentional behaviour. The emphasis for Weber was upon intention—*Sinn* or meaning—the inner side of behaviour: thought, belief, will, etc. When outer behaviour was directed by complex *Sinn*, there was *Sinnzusammenhang*.

### 3. Dawkins

Advanced Darwinians argue that an animal tends to select the best gene from the gene pool from the point of view of survival. It is not a choice or decision, but clever selfish evolution by the individual animal-automatically. The elegance as well as effectiveness of Dawkins' arguments make one ask if human actions can be analysed and explained similarly?

Selfish and altruism are well known concepts in political philosophy.

### 4. Interpretative Understanding

Dawkins interprets animal evolution as natural selection of selfish genes. Is there a circular argument here? Consider:

- 1) Animal x survives
- 2) Animals that survive are selection optimal.

-----

Animal x is selection optimal.

Is the conclusion correct? Yes, because animal x has survived!

Dawkins speaks of selfish genes being selected from a huge gene pool. By itself? By the genome?

Contrary, the humanities and social sciences understand outer behaviour by advancing intention or motive. Weber called it "deutend verstehen".

This emphasis on the basic subjective nature of human activity opens up for the analysis of ideas, plans, hopes, etc.

In the animal kingdom there are hardly such motives. Intention or reason is key: Action = intention + behaviour. Animal behaviour lacks intention for Dawkins. Maybe intention is superfluous also for human activity?

### 5. Philosophy Denying Intention

If the world only consists of words and objects (Quine, 1960), where to place beliefs? The philosophy of mind has no recognition that goals drive behaviour. Where are they located: in brain neurons or synapses (Searle)?

Searle argues now on YouTube Lectures that we have: new realism—one reality. Earlier Searle admitted that intentions could be "ontologically subjective" phenomena!

### 6. The Actor Approach

Weber declared that every action could be analysed with the means-end framework for understanding the inner aspect. This is weak rationality with few restrictions on how means and ends are related. Is intention merely *teleological* relation? That is just beliefs. Or causality in true beliefs about means and

ends. Weber's action model is nothing but the rational choice framework when utility and probability is introduced.

Searle lives in a so-called material world, whatever this may be: matter, atoms, waves, strings. Weber lived in the sense data world.

### 7. How Large Is Subjective Meaning?

Intention is mind phenomenon. So what is the mind? It is all mental. So what is mental! The classic 3 division may be employed:

- (A) Cognition
- (B) Volition
- (C) Emotio

Subjective meaning is present in all humanities and social sciences as well as economics-the Menger subjectivism. It implies consciousness.

Meaning or intention is not in the external world except in the sense that actor x's *Sinnzusammenhang* is outside of actor x's *Sinnzusammenhang*. Other people's mind is outside of me but not merely brain or neurological interactions.

### 8. Conclusion

The animal kingdom consists of selection machines in Dawkins. What about humans, running selection games for at least 2 million years?

Selfishness Implied Epicurean philosophy with Hobbes and Spinoza. Altruism countered Grotius and Locke.

Perhaps human evolution takes place at the level of state, favouring power?

### References

- Anscombe, GEM. (1957). *Intention*. Oxford: Blackwell
- Jacob, P. (2002). "Intentionality", in *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*.
- Putnam, H. (1975). *Philosophical Papers: Mind, Language*.
- Quine, W. (1960). *Word and Object*. Cambridge: Harvard U.P.
- Searle, J. (2004). *Mind*. Oxford: OUP.
- Weber, M. (1978). *Economy and Society. I-II*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Weber, M. (2012). *Collected Methodological Writings*. London: Routledge.
- Weber, M. (1922). *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Religionssoziologi. I-III*. Tübingen: Mohr.