

Man and Nature

I am frequently impressed by the need for an entire wholesome theory of man and nature. Moving from one scientific journal to another, one encounters a great variety of words that exist for themselves or for some little group of men. One cannot often understand them, but the un-understanding is often superficial - that is, not an inability to understand what they are really saying and rather an inability to make all the verbal and technical adjustments required to merely "read" them. I find nothing (and this is most significant) that is "surprising" in an intellectual sense, nothing that is unassimilable or unrelated to the rest of thought. Men say "science or knowledge is now so specialized as to be unencompassable by a single mind." This I doubt strongly. I believe it is possible that a simple, basic theory of man and nature, joining physics, social science, and humanities can be constructed that will say the essentials of all sciences and thought as well as the present, disparate essentials of each discipline say them, and that such a system of essentials need not be vague or impossible to use in thought in action (any more than the infinite number of present-day special "essentials" are. The vast advantages of such a single essentials system can well be imagined!

Approaching the problem from another angle, we see how education flounders in respect to students, how it gives them no connections, even in so-called survey courses. Why cannot art, ethics, poetry, science (both natural and social) be related decisively and intelligibly to one another, so that a student may pursue knowledge as a broadening road, rather than as a series of rushes and breakdowns, wasteful overlaps, conflicts and fratricidal railings.

(Over)

Source of evidence and e.g.s. for physio-psycho-social linkage
concepts (the alternative uses of drugs and psychoanalysis)

1 A. Man's nature and the nature of values

- a. The organism's physiology
- b. The organism's neurology
- c. The organism's environment

First laws: the neutrality of experiencing chronology
(i.e. adult vs. infancy patterns fallacy)

The disposition of physio. and neuro.effort - patterns
emerging as e. g. identification, displacement,
attention, direction, etc.

- d. The nature of logic vis a vis first laws
- e. the nature of planning
- f. the hierarchizing or prioritizing of values
- g. the dissociation of logico-empiricism from values
(incl.the essential failure to dissociate)

Men's agreement = value, and - fact, also.

Some serious thought ought be given the "value block" and its significance in social science. If A dislikes B and refuses to consider liking B even when shown beyond shadow of doubt that B in every respect is consistent w/ A's other values, how should social science handle this value block? Can a science ever be built if such blocks are included as facts or as postulates? Or must social science assume a consistency of thought, or (which is quite different) non-blocking under controlled premise-postulation (i. e. suppositions of non-blocking) in order to get anywhere?

Dimensions of thought and action

Directive (ethical)

Existence

Fictions

Operationism in thought and action

ethical imperatives
conceptual imperatives

Two moral drives - To insist (as a value) on one's values
 To hold "accomodation premise" (as a value)
 and change one's values.

If latter is to be taken as the premise, then characteristic difficulties arise (apart from educating the first group):

a. Rulelessness

b. Apathy