

# ***DARWIN, MASLOW, AND THE FULLY HUMAN THEORY OF EVOLUTION***

**David Loye**

To provide the historical and transhistorical context for this exploration of what the full spectrum, action-oriented, or fully human theory of evolution should look like and how to build it, this prefatory chapter reports the startling results and implications of the discovery of a lost “top half” for Darwin’s theory of evolution. Instead of the prevailing “Darwinian” emphasis on selfishness and survival of the fittest, it examines the implications of the discovery that in actuality for Darwin moral sensitivity and love were the prime drives for human evolution. It projects the potential for student-teacher projects to build the theory and story attuned to the real Darwin and how to prevail against the entrenched power of the paradigm of PseudoDarwinian Mind that brought disaster to the 20<sup>th</sup> century and now threatens the 21<sup>st</sup>.

**Key words:** *altruism, biology of selfishness, blind chance, brain research, brain, caring for others, chaos theory, cognitive psychology, competition, consciousness, conservative, cooperation, cultural evolution, Descent of Man, developmental psychology, direction for evolution, economic evolution, economics, environmental and social urgencies, evolution theory, evolutionary systems science, evolutionary love, evolutionary psychology, full spectrum, action-oriented theory, fully human theory, habit, human*

*potentials movement, human agent, humanistic psychology, ideal forms, imagination, learning, liberal, love, metamotivation, mind, mission of science, models, moral development, moral sensitivity, moral evolution, mutual aid, natural selection, neoDarwinism, norm, Origin of Species, paradigm, personal evolution, planetary destiny, political science, political evolution, positive psychology, power of paradigm, progressive science, progressive economics, progressive education, progressive society, progressive science, progressive politics, PseudoDarwinian Mind, reason, religion, Robber Barons, SAT, self-organizing processes, selfishness uber alles, shift in paradigm, sociobiology, sociology, spiritual evolution, spirituality, superconscious, survival of the fittest, sympathy, the power elite, the Third Factor, the human ideal, Toronto Manifesto, transpersonal psychology, will.*

Among scientists today a matter many had assumed was long laid to rest is moving from the background to the foreground within the context of the grim prospects that face our species on which global leadership seems to have blanked out on or gone dead-headed. It is that what we call evolution theory requires a massive updating, integrating, and streamlining if it is to meet the needs of the 21<sup>st</sup> century if not indeed our survival itself over the long run.

On one hand here is a planet with threats to the lives of ourselves and all species everywhere on the rise. On the other hand here are the sciences, to which we look for answers on how to meet the threats, but here's the shocking fact it's time we faced. *Behind the popular assumption of a seamless storehouse of advanced computerized wisdom there, in fact, lies an abysmally widespread and chaotic disarray.*

Evolution theory— which supposedly provides the grounding for all science— is the prime example. For here behind an outdated and dangerously constricted assumption of unity, instead of any useful cohesion lies the generic bewilderment of a disparate and unfocused sprawl. How, with our feet mired in this academic swamp, are we to move toward the understanding needed to pull together science into a new clarity? And of greater and increasing urgency, how are we to build an evolution theory that can provide the practical guidance—or road map to the future— needed by our species at this time of exponentially escalating confusion?

The problem, one might say, is how are we to update a blithely parochial horse and buggy theory of evolution to meet the rocket speed global urgencies of the 21<sup>st</sup> century?

To act effectively within our dwindling time frame for action, a key strategic problem is to find an *inspirational beginning place* from which to move ahead. In the introduction to this book I propose a teacher-student driven, globally active alliance between evolutionary systems science and humanistic, transpersonal, and positive psychology to kick start what is needed. As most students as well as many of the rest of us find our greatest inspiration in the heroic human being, out of many prospects I will focus here on four who seem to me most pertinent to the challenge of this kick-start. The first three are Abraham Maslow, Roberto Assagioli, and Kazimierz Dabrowski for what became the fields of humanistic, transpersonal, and eventually positive psychology.

As their significance and that of these fields come to life in an exciting new way in relation to my fourth nominee for an inspirational beginning place, let's first look at this surprise then come back to them.

### ***Charles Darwin and the True Theory and Story of Human Evolution***

In terms of the best possible anchoring in evolutionary systems science for a newly meaningful theory of evolution it would be ideal if the logical choice could be Charles Darwin. But unfortunately history has left us with big problems with Darwin. By now to

perhaps a majority of those seeking to expand and update our understanding of evolution Darwin has come to mean everything about the “old paradigm” that both progressive science and progressive society is trying to transcend.

But what if Darwin was not the rigid exemplar for a biology of selfishness and blind chance, to which everything else about evolution must be reduced?

What if instead of being the scientific excuse for the idea of “survival of the fittest” that gave us Adolf Hitler and the Robber Barons of the 1890s and today, in actuality Darwin ranged on into the social sciences and the system science almost wholly excluded from mainstream evolution theory during the 20<sup>th</sup> century?

What if he was attuned to the brain research, similarly ignored by mainstream evolutionists, and the cognitive and developmental psychology of pivotal importance to the development of a fully human theory of evolution? What if over one hundred years ago he was already there before everybody else not only anticipating chaos theory but also uncovering the “self-organizing processes” that only in our time are being considered the completing principle for evolution theory at all levels?

What if in *Origin of Species* he set forth what we may now see was the prehuman foundation, or *first half*, of a theory for which in *The Descent of Man* and his long-unpublished private notebooks he sketched the human superstructure, or *completing half*? *And what if this completing half over 100 years earlier anticipated Maslow and humanistic, transpersonal, and positive psychology?* What if he even further ranged beyond the science of his time or ours to consider what briefly flares in the work of Assagioli and Dabrowski then fades through incomprehension and indifference—the *sine qua non* and bedrock relevance of *moral* development and a *spirituality* freed of deism and dogma to human advancement?<sup>1</sup>

In short, rather than being the dated and rather fuzzy-minded icon for the “old paradigm”—as universally he is perceived today—what if for a highly significant but almost universally neglected period during his youth and then again in old age Darwin was actually attuned to much of the full spectrum for thoughts, fields, and data now being

explored as we begin to grope through the sprawl toward the needed updating, integrating, and streamlining for evolution theory? Wouldn't Darwin be an enticing new candidate for an inspirational beginning point for a fully human theory of evolution?

And of the greatest strategic importance would be this—for we cannot move ahead with the speed necessary as long as traditional Darwinism hangs like an albatross around the neck of science, or like a stone within the schools and minds of the world at large. Had the Darwin I have sketched existed, wouldn't he be the ideal figure here at this turn into a new century to help ring out the old and ring in the new?

That what I have sketched is in fact the case with Darwin I began to uncover nearly a decade ago.<sup>2</sup> Yes, all of the above is fact, as incredible as that may seem. Since then, in what in relation to the urgencies that face us seems an incredibly slow snail's pace, I have been working to convince the skeptics that this new picture of Darwin is indeed the whole truth behind the prevailing half-truth.

The chief problem most face is how could all this possibly have been overlooked for a whole century. The answer I provide at length elsewhere is complex, but in a large part it reduces to this being one of the most haunting cases on record of the mind-binding and blinding power of paradigm to conceal from us at an earlier point what, after a cataclysmic wrench to conventional wisdom, can become obvious at a later point in history.<sup>3</sup>

In terms of the dynamics of scientific discovery, the problem with the "new Darwin" is that he both predates and is aligned to a massive shift in paradigm now slowly and with great difficulty underway across the board in both science and society. As Kuhn (1970) first noted in the perennial reference for every book and paper attempting to accelerate this movement, such shifts for science traditionally take anywhere from two or three decades to a full century. But because of the intercorrelated environmental and social urgencies, in our time this shift must now take place within relatively few years—some give us no more than a decade, some say a bit longer (Elgin, 2000).

For the kick start for the teacher-student theory and story building project I propose—as well as the kick start for our society more generally— where can we turn for getting up to speed? I will come back to more of the case for Darwin, but first let's take a look at the other three who, without knowing they were his direct heirs, came to embody and express so much of Darwin's lost theory and vision.

### ***Maslow, Assagioli, and Dabrowski***

The first is still well-known, the second already fading from the references, the third still barely known even today.

If one had to pick a single figure, most would agree that Abraham Maslow was the pivotal initiating visionary not only for humanistic and transpersonal psychology but also beyond question for positive psychology. But why should he be of transcendent importance in the building of an adequate or fully human theory of evolution? The reason is that more than anyone else he tried to pin down what increasingly looms as the crux to the construction of the adequate theory or telling of the adequate story. This is the challenge of defining the *human ideal*— or the normative end goal we seek to evoke and nurture as parents and as teachers in our functional but largely unconscious task of shaping the future.<sup>4</sup> Keying originally to his youthful worship of anthropologist Ruth Benedict and gestalt psychologist Max Wertheimer, this is the context of the larger meaning for Maslow's many years of identifying the normative characteristics of his *self-actualizers*. It is also what is newly meaningful about his life structural placement for all of us within the shift from defense, to growth, to metamotivation as the central drivers for personal, economic, political, and cultural evolution (Maslow, 1968, 1971).

We have only to stop and think for a moment about this and the purblind fumbling of what has passed for evolution theory for a century becomes horribly apparent. In constructing everything from houses and gardens to cities, our task is automatically shaped by the *models* for a range of *ideal forms* built up over thousands of years of the human discovery of what works best for the peculiar type of being we are on this particular kind

of planet. Yet ignoring the functional necessity that progressive religion and progressive philosophy recognized long ago, here we are in science after at least 600 years now still trying to construct a theory of evolution with no more sense of the practicalities of the norm and the ideal than a band of aliens newly dumped upon a strange planet. It is as though we were trying to tack together a house according to whatever the wind blew our way—with the consequence we shall see, when I get to more of the real rather than the fictional Darwin, of a basement on top and the roof underfoot.

The fading figure for this trio was the Italian humanistic psychiatrist Roberto Assagioli (1965, 1973). Not only did Assagioli have a fierce feeling for the functional relevance of evolution theory as a matter of *species* as well as personal development. But of most importance in line with where this paper is going, his concept of the *superconscious* as the higher counterpart to the concept of the unconscious embraced *moral* as well as *spiritual* evolution as the “roof” we seek to put in place for both shelter and fulfillment.

The third figure, mainly known today only to a comparative handful of psychologists and teachers concerned with the development of the gifted child, was the Polish humanistic psychiatrist Kazimierz Dabrowski (1964).<sup>5</sup> Again a man for whom moral as well as spiritual evolution was a matter of passion, Dabrowski was sufficiently advanced in his commitment to and comprehension of evolution theory that years ahead of the contemporary recognition of the importance of self-organizing processes at all levels of evolution he wrote firmly of the shallowness of theory based on genes and environment as the sole shapers for evolution. He wrote of “the third factor,” which for Assagioli was the *will*—or for both the impact of the *mind* of the human agent on the shaping of our planetary destiny.

So we may see here how in retrospect one can make a strong case for the use of these three pioneers for humanistic, transpersonal, and positive psychology as exemplars in launching a new move to build a “full spectrum, *action-oriented*” theory of human evolution. I know I speak for everyone who has ever been a student in saying it is people

like this, who become larger than life in retrospect, who bring science— and more importantly the *mission* of science— to life where it can otherwise lie there not only mystifying but dead and boring on the textbook page.

But this said, with the challenge of the kick start for the better theory and the better story in mind, in all realism we must now consider what the enthusiasm and the new burst of energy required for the kick start is up against.

### ***Up Against the Paradigm***

What the move this book sets forth is up against is the double paradigm, which one only comes to see clearly if one is trying to push for anything new. Long familiar to historians, sociologists, political scientists, and the working journalist is the control of most of us by all the hang-overs from the past that go by the name of paradigm, as well as their fueling and refueling by what C.Wright Mills (1956) called “the power elite.” In the case of anything to do with evolution theory, however, to this ancient stream of control by a shifting “Establishment” is added the incredible power of what I have found may best be characterized as the paradigm of PseudoDarwinian Mind.<sup>6</sup> Arising during the 20<sup>th</sup> century, this is the control of both the masses and a widespread, passive and compliant academic elite through the possession of television, publishing, and practically all other media by an economic and political power elite, which finds in old style survival-of-the fittest, selfishness *uber alles* Darwinism the legitimizing or excuse it prefers from and pays for in science.<sup>7</sup>

To the scientist, student, or teacher who has been “properly” indoctrinated to avoid “subjectivity” of any kind or any hint of, perish the thought, polemics in scientific writing, observations such as this and more as we proceed may at first be jarring. Is this edge necessary? It is vital to realize that for a century the supposedly sacred dictate of “cool it”



for writing about science, which arose out of and generally works for natural science, *is wholly out of place for social and systems science at a time of fundamental challenge to established paradigms*. It is vital to realize that, via the power of paradigm, stylistic inhibitions of this kind have been used to prevent the plain speaking that might otherwise expose and arouse those fresh to science and still unintimidated to rise up against all that presently imprisons the mind of our species.

It is this skillfully hidden and invariably conservative tandem power behind the scene that not only managed to either bury or hamstring the liberal social aspiration of the 1960s over the closing decades of the 20<sup>th</sup> century into now. It is this thrust that gave the PseudoDarwinism of sociobiology and then evolutionary psychology the power to help blank out of mass memory so much of the once joyful resonance to Maslow, and humanistic psychology more generally, as well as so much of the initially revolutionary hope for the human potentials movement.<sup>8</sup>

With a realistic sense of what this new move is up against, then, what or who can we turn for the shock and the jolt of a new source of vision and an exemplar sufficiently effective to tip the balance of power back our way— which is to say to *progressive* science with its inevitable link to progressive politics, progressive economics, and progressive education?

For a whole century now Darwin has been used by those empowered by the double paradigm as their “900 pound gorilla.” That is, they have used the Darwin of “survival of the fittest” and selfishness *uber alles* to legitimize themselves and their science and their social, economic, and political policies, and thereby intimidate, blind, and even strike dumb all who might dare question or oppose them.

Here is more of the case for why Darwin is actually a more socially enlightened, scientifically valid, and much nicer sort of 900 pounder who is actually *ours*?

## *Implications of the “Old” and the “New” Darwinian Theory*

As we all know, throughout the 20<sup>th</sup> century a cornerstone for mainstream evolution theory (e.g., neoDarwinism, sociobiology, evolutionary psychology, see *The Toronto Manifesto* in this book) has been that we are basically selfish, even driven by “selfish genes.” Socially and personally the implications are that whatever we may think is altruism is actually nothing more than selfishness disguised (Hamilton, 1963; Wilson, 1975; Wright, 1994).<sup>9</sup> Backed with what by now a majority of non-scientists have accepted as impregnable sophistication in experimental methodology and mathematics, for going on three decades this has been the direct claim of theorists for the self-avowed Darwinian paradigm.<sup>10</sup> Likewise—because of the way science is used by politics and economics— not coincidentally an increasingly popular belief during the heyday of late 20th and early 21<sup>st</sup> century conservatism is that to believe otherwise is to be a foolish liberal “do gooder.”

And what did Darwin actually believe and say? Over a 30 year span from his early youthful notebooks into the time of the writing of *Descent*— drawing on a lifetime of his own as well as the observations of countless other observers over by now thousands of years— he vigorously *disagreed* with this view. Specifically addressing the point, he actually lambasts “the base principle of selfishness” (Darwin, *The Descent of Man*, 1871/1981, p.98).<sup>11</sup> Elsewhere, he further identifies “the confinement of sympathy to the same tribe” as the chief cause of “the low morality of savages.” (Ibid, p.97).

Still more basic is the “Darwinian” tenet for mainstream evolution theory that everything in our lives both is— and further *should* be —determined by the “survival of the fittest.” And what did Darwin actually write in *The Descent of Man*?

Of “survival of the fittest” he writes only *twice* in this book of more than 800 pages of fine print. The first time he does this it is to apologize for perhaps exaggerating its importance in *The Origin of Species*! And the next time it is to tell us that as far as “the

highest part of our nature is concerned there are other agencies more important." (Ibid, pp.403, 404).

And what are these “other agencies” that are more important? Before considering them, we need to pause and think about the 20<sup>th</sup> century from which we finally escaped but a short time ago and now our world today. Above all, we need to think about all the wars and the global rape of our planet by predatory business and governmental interests ostensibly legitimized by the science of “survival of the fittest” and the principle of “competition” above all (Korten, 1996). And now consider the implications for both theory and society of the fact that in *Descent* only *nine* times does Darwin write of competition, but nearly three times as often—that is 24 times— of *mutuality* or mutual aid, which was the root concept of that time for what today we call *cooperation*.

Or of the fact he writes of *sympathy* 61 times. And then this, most astounding and perhaps of the greatest long range importance. For in line with the rediscovery of the theory of the now immensely popular Charles S. Peirce— in which Pierce (1992) identifies *evolutionary love* as one of the three prime principles for evolution— in *Descent* Darwin similarly writes of *love* 95 times!

What beyond the surface novelty does this tell us about the fully human theory and the fully human story of evolution that this “new” Darwin can help animate and reinforce? Doesn’t it tell us, simply stated, that although competition and “survival of the fittest” still remain and sometimes vitally so in the picture, what mainly drives ahead evolution at *our* level of emergence is *caring for others* and *cooperation*?

“But just because Darwin said this doesn’t make it true” is the comeback I frequently encounter. That is not the point. The point is that by now thousands of scientists in a wide range of disciplines, throughout the whole of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, but increasingly in the last quarter of this century, have reaffirmed and extended what at last can be seen was Darwin’s original vision. And again, as I extensively document elsewhere (1994, 2000a, 2000b), chiefly because of the entrenched power of the “old” paradigm, most of them have been similarly ignored or have faced an uphill struggle to gain even

peripheral incorporation of their findings or insights into what is known today as the “mainstream” theory of evolution.<sup>12</sup>

In the introduction to this book I mentioned Romanes, James, Baldwin, Dewey, Piaget, Lewin, Maslow, Assagioli, and Dabrowski in psychology, and for systems science von Bertalanffy, Boulding, Jantsch, Prigogine, and Laszlo. And what across fields binds them together as one?

### ***The Primacy of Mind***

It is truly mind-boggling to contemplate the fact that for much of a whole century, while our species staggered from one disaster to another for lack of adequate guidance from mainstream evolution theory as to what we are and where we should be headed, Darwin was used as the excuse for remaining fixated at the gene level. Yet what I finally myself stumbled on to only fully comprehend after years of research was what emerges from a simple word count that a computer literate eight year old can perform today.

In contrast to the impression we have been given by mainstream evolution theory, here is further what Darwin in actuality writes of in *Descent*:

“Mind,” 90 times

“Intellectual qualities and powers” = 58

“Intellectual powers” = 17

Reason = 53

Imagination = 25

Learning = 18

Consciousness = 15

Curiosity = 14

Instruction = 10

***Brain = 110***

***Habit = 108***

It takes no great treatise of many pages or year long sequence of brown bag colloquia to make it apparent this is the complex for *education and learning*. Nor, after pounding away at the difference that again and again was ignored and bypassed and shoved aside, is it difficult now to see that education and learning is what chiefly drives us at all the levels of activity explored by psychology, sociology, political science, economics, and all the other fields of social science, as well as all the areas of systems science, as well as the humanities and in all the probes of what we call spirituality, as well as in every other human activity that— as it most clearly *does* involve *evolution*— calls out for a newly-inclusive definition and a vastly expanded and updated theory and story.

In *brain and mind*, isn't it by now beyond question evident we are looking at the instrument whereby in all these fields we mine meaning from the stuff of life?

In *habit*—as established by the psychology of Alexander Bain in Darwin's time, ranging forward to William James, to Clark Hull, to B.F. Skinner and the thousands of 20<sup>th</sup> century psychologists who made a lifetime of its probing— isn't it by now further evident we looking at what in all these fields and areas of human experience locks the treasure of meaning in place in mind (Atkinson, 1964).

And if we put them together along with everything else emphasized in the lost top half for Darwin's theory, isn't the social delivery system apparent? Isn't it evident we looking at what we know as a working, interacting, dynamic and structural whole, filled not with the abstractions of a relentlessly reductionist science but rather with the aspirations and drives of real flesh and blood human beings of both genders and all ages, as *education and learning*? (Noddings, 2002; Miller, 2002; Eisler, 2000).

This begins to make apparent the immensely greater mind and vision of Darwin we may turn to for inspiration in the building of the full spectrum and action-oriented, or fully human theory of evolution. But still—and this was also for Maslow, Assagioli, and Dabrowski the single most important factor— there is more to go.

## *The Primacy of Moral Evolution*

Here I must confess that it is hard to know where to begin, for I still find this lost part of Darwin so overwhelming in what it reveals of the distortion of our past, the diminishing of our present, and the blotting or blanking out of the one thing offering our species our greatest, if not indeed our only, hope for the future. For this was the single aspect of most importance to Darwin, and yet most glaring in its absence from the theory that came to be called Darwinian, as well as from the society that to a significant degree was shaped by the original Darwinian revolution.

Again a simple word count flags the gulf between what we have been told was the Darwinian vision and this lost body of fact bearing on the prospects for our future.

Just short of 95 times for “love” are the *92 times* he writes of the operation and importance of *moral sensitivity* and *moral evolution* in *Descent*.

Indoctrinated by a “Darwinian” culture that sees schools as primarily factories for the training and survival of the fittest, we tend to think of intellect and a high IQ or SAT as both the highest goal for education and the highest aspect of human achievement. But Darwin in fact wrote that in terms of what most mattered in the evolution of our species the “moral faculties are generally and justly esteemed as of higher value than the intellectual powers” (Darwin, 1971/1981, p. 393).

Nor did he stop there. The best known tenet for mainstream Darwinism is, of course, that everything about us has been, is, and presumably ever will be determined by natural selection. But although he keeps natural selection in the picture in its foundational impact on the evolution of mind and morality at our species’ level of emergence—focusing specifically on this aspect of natural selection 23 times— in *Descent’s* pages he has something else to tell us that has now been bypassed or ignored for over 100 years. It is his insistence that the “moral qualities,” which to him are of most importance at our level of emergence, “are advanced either directly or indirectly much more through the effects of

habit, by our reasoning powers, by instruction, by religion, etc., than through natural selection" (Ibid, p.404).

Here, in a line of text undeniably written by Darwin personally and specific to the point, is further confirmation for the last word count we looked at. In view of the lambasting of the Creationists as well as the discomfort of traditional science, it is also startling to find the favorable reference to religion. Though much of what passes for religion today was anathema to Darwin, amplified by other long ignored quotes regarding the salutary effect of "spiritual agencies" on evolution, here is the lost part of Darwin that anticipates transpersonal psychology and the new scientific interest in spirituality by over 100 years.<sup>13</sup>

Moreover, there is this. In the sharpest possible contrast to the paradigm of blind chance and the impossibility of any meaningful direction for evolution other than increasing complexity— a supposedly iron-clad idea that shaped the educated mind of our species for much of the 20<sup>th</sup> century— Darwin in fact not only lashes out at the idea of blind chance. "The understanding," he writes with rare vehemence, "revolts at such a conclusion."<sup>14</sup> He also goes still further in asserting that our evolution is *moral* directional. Most specifically he tells us: "Looking to future generations we may expect that virtuous habits will grow stronger...and virtue will be triumphant." (Ibid, p.104).

Is this nothing more than the delusions of late Victorian optimism? Elsewhere he again insists "the social and moral qualities" will "tend slowly to advance and diffuse throughout the world."(Ibid, p.163).

And still again—inescapably directional in regard to the billions of years of the evolution of life on this planet, and the millions of years of the direct evolutionary line leading to our own species—there is this. It is the "fact of our having thus risen, instead of having been aboriginally placed in perfection here," Darwin tells us, "that gives us hope for a still higher destiny in the distant future."(Ibid, p.405).

## *Toward the Great Adventure and the Greater Theory*

Those coming fresh to a shift such as this in the picture for Darwin—and his theory, the story of human evolution, and the idea of hundreds of widely ignored modern studies now driving a second Darwinian revolution—generally have one or the other of two reactions. For some it is exciting news, quickly accepted. For others, however, it is at first hard to take or to believe.

“What’s specifically wrong with ‘the old paradigm’?” they may ask. “And why the pressing need for any so-called ‘new paradigm’?” These are understandable requests, but behind them lies the expectation that before we venture on we must fill the gap between the mainstream understanding and where we are now about to go by becoming mired in the popular debate between the sociobiologists and evolutionary psychologists and their critics that has become known as “the Darwin Wars.” Instead, I must point them to the list of references to this chapter for more on the “new” Darwin, to Appendix B for the Book List for “the Darwin Wars” involving Dawkins, Wilson, and Gould and other critics, to chapter eight for Foundation three and to all ten Guidelines for building the fully human theory, and to a helpful feature of the chapters that lie ahead.

For some of the authors of this book the inadequacy of the presently prevailing or mainstream theory of evolution, particularly as applied to humans, was established nearly half a century ago. As will be seen, however, they all generally briefly touch on what a book review in the flagship publication Science has called “The Corpse of a Wearisome Debate” as a take-off point. But from there on it is the excitement and the promise of this second Darwinian revolution that engages them, as it will, I believe, engage most readers.



For Darwin's, we may now see, was no mind driven to try to reduce everything to the evolutionary dynamics of the barnacle, or, as seized and blinded and wrung dry our time, the gene. This was a mind driven more perhaps than any other historically to embed the wisdom of past, present, and future in the grounding reality of the *full* wonder of nature. As both the young Darwin and the old Darwin, his was the mind that found in the ascendent wonder of the rise out of nature and the expansion of the human mind and the human capacity for love and caring what became the bannered goal for humanistic, transpersonal and positive psychology, as well as for evolutionary systems science, and for every other human endeavor at its best and highest.

It is for all these reasons that in the reality of the larger and long ignored Darwin is foreshadowed the full spectrum, action-oriented, and thereby fully human theory of evolution that it now becomes the responsibility of 21<sup>st</sup> century science to build.