
REMARKS ON THE EVOLUTION OF REASON

RONALD LEE HANCOCK

This writing is an extension of a concept on the reason for reality presented in a previous paper¹.

The idea that the ability to reason evolves parallel with the evolving brain is non-problematical and thereby prompts little discussion. Also one can usually ascertain such things as the cause of some effect and then conclude the reason for the result/effect.

Let us discuss “reasoning” for a moment. One may reason to determine a reason for something, although it is contended here that this is not a required process as will be discussed below. Reasoning/to reason is usually described in its purest sense as some logical approach to ascertain further knowledge. But additive to this reasoning usually requires less formal processes, subjective notions, reverse interpretations, etc., whatever is required to come to some conclusion. What proportion of logic that may be involved for this process is obviously variable.

However, the major issue presented here is the use of the term “reason” in the phrase “the reason for reality”, which curiously, does not necessarily require reasoning. Such a “reason” could be *a priori* and would exist whether or not any reasoning entities even existed. An inquisitive individual may discover the reason for reality but such a reason may have existed before its discovery. One would need to treat this “reason” as different from all others in that it would be considered as an ultimate reason. Such a reason would be a fundamental of reality and would be tantamount to concepts/paradigms for the origins of other guiding thoughts.

The generalization of reason in the universe is related to those universes that spawn further chemical evolution—not that all of these would be successful in evolving introspective entities. Those that did, however, would then have a gradient of “reason” attached to their being which gives that particular universe an essence of self- acquired meaning.

If one has a vast pool of non-evolving baryons in some universe that is incapable of evolving further because of some physical deficit, it would

The Nevada Institute for Theoretical Medicine, 1225 Westfield Ave. Reno, NV, 89509, USA. / rhancock@unr.edu

easily be assigned as having little significance as regards to a reason for its existence since its evolution would be “sterile” and stale-mated relative to introspective entities that can reason.

Universes with biospheres that are capable of helping unfortunates¹ would be considered to have developed reasons for their existence.

The notion of a constant production (relative to some time system) of singularities with or without further chemical evolution would be considered as spontaneous (although theological origins cannot be ruled out).

Evolved universes that present reason within their constructs are self-contained as to purpose.

Do universes reason? Or more precisely, does some subset of the universe in question reason? The answer is: some do (at least one does) and some do not. What is the probability of singularity-spawned universes presenting with a reasoning-type universe? The answer would be of interest in that the direction and purpose of overall macroevolution might be understood.

It seems odd to suggest that a system could have a reason before there is any existence of reasoning entities. But one could add that as the evolving reason occurs, and then by retrospect, such a reason eventually can be interpreted as being meaningful. Such a meaningful reason can then be analyzed in terms of a real system in which the thinking entity finds itself.

In summary, one reasons to obtain a reason. However, as suggested here, there is an exception to this process. I believe there may be a reason that exists *a priori* and independent of any evaluation of a reasoning entity and, as such, disregards any theistic reasons. One such reason was derived in a previous paper¹. Thus the reason for reality evolves with the evolution of a real system. Some realities may create within their own evolution more of a reason (more comparable significance) than others relative to introspective abilities for their existence.

In conclusion, the phrase “reason for reality” represents an evolved property of reality, giving a meaning for the phrase to some post-evolved introspective entity (who may or may not be reasoning).

REFERENCE

- 1 Hancock, Ronald Lee (2007), “The reason for reality [a non-theistic derivation],” *Ludus Vitalis* XV (27): 51-74.