



Lecture / Open Discussion • Inspired by the writings of LUDWIG WITTGENSTEIN

“What?”— “I Mean Love”

Facilitated by JUSTIN CARMEN • Hosted by SPINDERIHALLERNE



“What?”—“I Mean Love” V.01

1. I would like to start with the title of this evening’s salon. I want to first call attention to the title—that it is both a question and an answer. The question asks simply “What?” And the answer begins “I Mean”—which tells us that this evening I want to discuss *meaning*. “Meaning” is followed by “Love”—which I would like to keep as our primary subject through which we investigate *meaning*.
 2. In addition to love I think it will be necessary to deviate to explorations of other ‘private experience’ in order to maintain the right perspective toward both *meaning* and *love*. Quickly, I’ll say that I want to spend some time on Wittgenstein’s exploration of *hoping* and *grief*, for example.
 3. This evening I would also like for us to consider *where* and *when* this *meaning love* is. And why these questions seem peculiar to meaning, generally.
 4. Now I feel I should set some expectations for this evening. First, I think an introduction is necessary—which we are already in the middle of now. In the second portion I will lecture on *meaning love* as observed phenomenon—this will be a summary of the ways in which the sciences might handle love. Finally, the last portion will be an open discussion. I will present only six quotes from Wittgenstein. And here, with the languages of the scientific behind us, I hope we will be free for philosophizing on love as a ‘private experience’.
 5. Now, it might seem like the quotes I have chosen for us to reflect on this evening dodge the issue of *meaning love*. But I have chosen passages from Wittgenstein exactly because these quotes promote the *activity of philosophizing*. His method is perfect for guiding a salon. In Wittgenstein’s *Culture and Value*, there is one note which reads, “Anything
- your reader can do for himself leave to him.”¹ This evening we will be Wittgenstein’s *reader*. I hope that the exercises performed on the quotes this evening suggest a silhouette which we might call *meaning* a ‘private experience’ such as love.
6. But, at first, doesn’t the investigation into *meaning love* seem overly obvious? I think we all have some rough idea about what is meant when someone says, “I love you.” And it’s not like asking about *meaning love* should satisfy any hypothesis. I admit, I have no hypothesis about love in mind for this evening, nor should any of us. Philosophy is not a science. And it’s not that philosophizing doesn’t benefit from a hypothesis and scientific approach—it’s that the scientific method is inappropriate to philosophizing.
 7. And so, given the fact that I have no hypothesis, why call attention to this question/answer structure in the title? To *mean love*, this requires no *explanation*—that is until the question is asked, “What?” Then a *description* is asked for. The answer, “I mean love” could be replaced by a description of something like a ‘private experience’ or of ‘external’ phenomena. You could say that a description is a *logical picture* which relieves the mental discomfort provoked by a question.
 8. Now, as many of you know I’ve been studying philosophy as a hobby for the past seven years. I began with Nietzsche whose work was a life affirmation. He spoke highly of the artist and creator, and claimed this spirit as *the human spirit*. After a while of studying his major works, I wanted to know more about what I was reading. I felt I that to better understand what Nietzsche was getting at I needed a better understanding of the philosophers which he was critiquing—Kant and Schopenhauer for sure. I also

¹From Peter Winch’s translation of Ludwig Wittgenstein’s *Culture and Value*, page 77e.

attempted Hegel, with no luck! But in my exploration of the discipline of philosophy I turned to Heidegger, not because Nietzsche had written about him (Heidegger came later) but because I had read what had been said of him—that everything that is interesting in philosophy today comes from Heidegger, and that Nietzsche’s thought is a foundation on which Heidegger built his system.

Well, reading Heidegger is a mind blowing experience. He changed the way I was able to look at the world. There is an amazing lecture series on Heidegger by Hubert Dreyfus on iTunes. In one of the first lectures in the series, Dreyfus discuss with his students which courses in the philosophy department might aid in an understanding of Heidegger. He mentioned the philosophers which Heidegger stands against—Descartes and Kant—but said that taking Kant and Heidegger in the same semester would be academic suicide! Then he mentioned the name Wittgenstein, not as a contrast to Heidegger’s thought, but as a compliment. I hadn’t heard of him otherwise.

So, I picked up Harper Perennial’s *Major Works* of Wittgenstein and I don’t think I really understand a word of it. His sentences didn’t seem to make any sense—strange for a philosopher who was trying to make commentary on meaning and sense! His sentences were like half sentences. Then, after reading a secondary text on Wittgenstein by Daniel D. Hutto, I think that I began to see what Wittgenstein was trying to get at. I returned to his *Major Works* and his sentences finally started to make some sense. I’m not saying that I fully understand them today, but maybe that is what you can help me with this evening.

9. Heidegger and Wittgenstein remain my favorite authors. Both place emphasis on this question/answer/understanding structure. Wittgenstein makes use of the term *logical picture*. His *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus* presents a full-blow “meta” logical picture. And like a movie with a plot twist near the end, the conclusion at the end of his *Tractatus*

makes clear that there can be no “meta” logical picture of the entirety of the world. Though, Heidegger’s *Being and Time* can account for how these logical pictures come into being. Roughly, we use language to make a description as needed to overcome the discomfort of the question. This language then guides our everyday functioning. And our way of functioning then lays a foundation for the type of questions we can encounter, and so on. The study of this circle of understanding is hermeneutics, and if anyone is interested in reading more, then *Being and Time* is your book.

10. Ok, so let’s get down to investigating *meaning love*. And let’s take the most common way of questioning phenomena today. I think anyone would easily admit that physics is the logic most commonly appealed to today. I would like to call this logic *physiology*.
11. But first, I’d like to say just a few words on *logic* generally, before investigating *physiology* in particular. This will help us think about the sciences in the right mind, before considering the particular sciences of physics.
12. Heidegger makes a clear exposition of the Greek *logos* in the introduction of *Being and Time*. There he seeks to qualify his method of phenomenology. “This expression [phenomenology] has two components: ‘phenomenon’ and ‘logos’...Taken superficially, the term ‘phenomenology’ is formed like ‘theology’, ‘biology’, ‘sociology’—names which can be translated as ‘science of God’, ‘sciences of life’, ‘science of society’...”² “...Thus the term ‘phenomenology’ is quite different in its meaning from expressions such as ‘theology’ and the like. Those terms designate objects of their respective sciences according to the subject matter which they compromise at the time. ‘Phenomenology’

²From John Macquarrie and Edward Robinson’s translation of Martin Heidegger’s *Being and Time*, Introduction 2, section 6, page 42.

neither designates the objects of its researches, nor characterizes the subject-matter thus comprised. The word merely informs us of the 'how' with which 'what' is to be treated in this science gets exhibited and handled."³

13. Now, when we observe love in a lab, then we might be able to say this-or-that chemical within the brain produces this-or-that physiological change—maybe increased heart rate, deeper breathing, etc. And certainly this is not what one means to say when one says, "I love you."—just thinking that one could *mean* "my heart rate is increased" when one says "I love you" feels ridiculous.
14. Now, neurology will be tempted to find tokens in the brain which correspond to "love behavior": brain states when a loved one enters the room, or when one is expressing memories of love, etc. Therefore, the neurologist could map our private experiences, such as 'love' onto the brain, thus giving thoughts and memories a location in natural space. And this initiative is appealing in that it seems to close the gap in the mind/body or soul/body dualism. However, this only eliminates everything that is interesting about feelings and thoughts from the questioning—it doesn't say anything about their content! Certainly, it tells us nothing about *meaning love*.
15. What can psychology say about love? Well, I would imagine that the methods of psychoanalysis and psychotherapy could hardly have anything interesting to say about love. Therapy only treats cases of emotional distress or deviant cases—perhaps cases where one abuses another by expressing 'love' but not meaning it. Or other cases where actually meaning love results in perverse consequences unknown to the one expressing it. Instead, I want us to think on the positive cases of *meaning love*.

16. Psychology might also take up a behaviorist perspective—which can also be extended to populations of people. This logic is called *anthropology*. Here we can see how the scientific method shares much in common with the democratic method. I like to say that the democratic method is the scientific method applied to government.

17. I actually have a personal experience which might help relate the anthropological approach to investigating love. I used to be part of a rave culture which used the expression "PLUR"—an acronym for "Peace, Love, Unity, and Respect." Now, even though it is an acronym, the individual words still mean something within it. So, someone pursuing under anthropological methods might want to pool the members of this culture to find what was common among those members who meant love as part of the expression, "PLUR."

But this would only result in replacing one expression for a set of other words. And of course, the first set of words did the job just fine within the culture. The second set may have only helped the anthropologists understand. But in investigating *meaning love* this evening, we are not interested in replacing our own words. We actually want to *use* our own words. This whole anthropological approach leads to something like a *definition of love*—the method of defining is also scientifically oriented. And *meaning*, not *defining*, is our interest for this evening.

18. Anthropology might want to take up a teleological explanation, saying that love exists for the purpose of natural selection or sexual selection. Or we could apply the Darwinian revolution in thought—Darwin removed teleological expressions from biology. Therefore, the language of biology became more objective, "Animals which experience love are more likely to..." But again, this tells us nothing of *meaning love*, only the hypothetical utility in biology.

³From John Macquarrie and Edward Robinson's translation of Martin Heidegger's *Being and Time*, Introduction 2, section 7, page 59.

19. But perhaps you might be asking yourself if these limits on the sciences are warranted. Can't some science explain *meaning love*? Well, I think most scientists would admit that physics should not be able to inform us about *meaning love*. Consider what Richard Dawkins has written about the nihilism (an absence of all purpose) which follows a reading of his own work, *The Selfish Gene*,
20. "Presumably there is indeed no purpose in the ultimate fate of the cosmos, but do any of us really tie our life's hopes to the ultimate fate of the cosmos anyway? Of course we don't; not if we are sane. Our lives are ruled by all sorts of closer, warmer, human ambitions and perceptions. To accuse science of robbing life of the warmth that makes it worth living is so preposterously mistaken, so diametrically opposite to my own feelings and those of most working scientist, I am almost driven to the despair of which I am wrongly suspected."⁴
21. After reading this quote, I am left with the feeling that Dawkins openly admits that the rules which he believes governs the entire universe (physics) cannot explain all that there is to experience. Now, physics does describe material and the mechanics of that material very well, but unfortunately, he does not acknowledge any interest in describing the "warmer feelings" beyond this naïve expression. Nor does he even seem to want to consider a more holistic understanding which might govern both. On this point I would like to give another salon on Heidegger's writings, which outlines what I would like to call a *descriptive understanding*—which is an attempt at holism—and contrast this to an *atomistic understanding*.
22. Now before proceeding I should say that neither Heidegger nor Wittgenstein want to devalue the sciences.

Surely, both admit that scientists are making remarkable progress in their respective sciences. There is a procedure for replacing my leg with a prosthetic if it is amputated. We are traveling long distances in very short periods of time. All the mechanical possibilities within time and space are being used to benefit our lives. But the sciences can only answer *mechanical problems*.

23. Now, what happens if we take a step back from any of these highly appealed to types of logic in the sciences? Well, we enter into philosophizing. We are interested in *meaning love*. So, let us consider a few of the common ways in which we use the word *love*. This list is not meant to exhaust the uses of love.
24. True love
25. Love at first sight
26. Falling in love or finding love
27. Brotherly love
28. A mother's love
29. The pleasures or pains of love
30. In light of all of these diverse uses, love feels nearly reduced to an arbitrary word with multiple meanings. But we shouldn't put up walls here—perhaps this very multiplicity might help reveal something about *meaning*. Remember our motto, *think openly*. We should not make things too easy on ourselves.
31. Now, I have to admit that this salon has been inspired primarily by one work, Wittgenstein's *Zettel*, as translated into English by G.E.M. Anscombe. Quotes from this work will direct our thoughts for the rest of the night. Love is usually considered a feeling. So, I would like to consider a passage from *Zettel* on love as feeling, then move on to

⁴The *Selfish Gene* by Richard Dawkins, *Introduction to the 30th Anniversary Edition*, page xiii.

other explorations of 'private experiences'.

32. "Love is not a feeling. Love is put to the test, pain not. One does not say: 'That was not true pain, or it would not have gone off so quickly'."⁵
33. Now, from what I have read, Wittgenstein has said a lot about feeling, emotions, sense data, but he hasn't had much to say about love in particular. I came across a few instances, but in those he was making a point about something other than meaning a 'private experience' or phenomenon. But we can reflect on love as an experience from other explorations he has made in *Zettel*. So, let's look into his exploration of *grief*.
34. "'Where do you feel grief?'—In the mind.—What kind of consequence do we draw from this assignment of place? One is that we do not speak of a bodily place of grief. Yet we do point to our body, as if the grief were in it. Is that because we feel a bodily discomfort? I do not know the cause. But why should I assume it is a bodily discomfort?"⁶
35. Compare the bodily discomfort of grief to the pain of a physical wound. And then think of the pains of love, and compare them to the pain of a physical wound.
36. I find it revealing that we use the expression, "My heart aches" when talking about the pains of love. We feel the pain in our heart when we are in love. We could say that the *feeling* in the heart is a *symptom* of being in love, but not that the love is located there itself. And this seems to be the best expression we have for describing the spatiality of love!
37. "If anyone asks whether pleasure is a sensation, he probably does not distinguish between reason and cause, for

otherwise it would occur to him that one takes pleasure in something, which does not mean that this something produces a sensation in us...

...It is quite possible that the glands of a sad person secrete differently from those of someone who is glad; and also that their secretion is the or a cause of sadness. But does it follow that the sadness is a sensation produced by the secretion?

But here the thought is: "After all, you feel sadness—so you must feel it somewhere; otherwise it would be a chimera". But if you want to think that, remember the difference between seeing and pain. I feel pain in the wound—but colour in the eye? If we try to use a schema here, instead of merely nothing what is really common, we see everything falsely simplified."⁷

38. Here Wittgenstein is additionally calling attention to the visual field. And I take it that the feeling of love or grief is similar to the visual field—likewise it does not have a location.
39. You could say that 34 through 38 touch on the spatial dimension of love, or possibly the uncertainty of its spatiality. But we can also think on love temporally.
40. "I whistle and someone asks me why I am so cheerful. I reply 'I'm hoping N. will come today'.—But while I whistled I wasn't thinking of him. All the same, it would be wrong to say: I stopped hoping when I began to whistle."⁸
41. While this exploration is extremely interesting, I don't think we are inspired to think on love temporally. Instead, this exploration continues to question the constitution of 'private experience.' For example, is love a thought?
42. "How do I observe my knowledge, my opinions? And on

⁵Zettel, section 504, page 89e.

⁶Zettel, section 497, page 88e.

⁷Zettel, section 507-510, page 90e.

⁸Zettel, section 64, page 13e.

the other hand an after-image, a pain. Is there such a thing as uninterrupted observation of my capacity to carry out the multiplication...?”⁹

43. Think of the similarity between *love*, *knowledge*, *my opinions*, and *the capacity to carry out a multiplication*.
44. Is love a disposition?
45. What does verifying meaning even look like? This is extremely peculiar.
46. “If I have two friends with the same name and am writing one of them a letter, what does the fact that I am not writing it to the other consist in? In the content? But that might fit either. (I haven’t yet written the address.) Well, the connexion might be in the antecedents. But in that case it may also be in what *follows* the writing. If someone asks me ‘Which of the two are you writing to?’ and I answer him, do I infer the answer from the antecedents? Don’t I give it almost as I say ‘I have toothache’?—Could I be in doubt which of the two I was writing to? And what is a case of such a doubt like?—Indeed, couldn’t there also be an illusion of this kind: I believe I am writing to one of them when in fact I am writing to the other? And what would such a case of illusion look like?”¹⁰
47. This quote is a beautiful example of Wittgenstein’s method. He poses a question while he himself does not hold an answer. He suggests *how* to answer: actualizing the possibility of doubt and illusion—only the content is to be described.
48. In conclusion I hope that these quotes have challenged us to think on our holistic understanding of the world. If we let a mechanical understanding overcome us and we

orient ourselves exclusively with this language, another discomfort persists. The question is usually formulated like this, “With all of this lifeless and dead physical matter, where does meaning come from?” And here we answer by appealing to an occult substance—a mind or soul where meaning must occur. And the mind or soul must be located in the brain or in the body.

But is this language biased in a common way of understanding the world?—a logic of common *things*. To answer this we have to ask, “Are we using a language suited to the phenomenon itself?”

Open Discussion

⁹Zettel, section 77, page 16e.

¹⁰Zettel, section 7, page 2e.

UTIFULLY
TIMED,
OUNDED
RENT
RS AT
AME
ENT...



BROUGHT
BACK?
DID YOU
W I...

NO QUESTIONS,
DARLING!
JUST HOLD
ME!

OF ALL THE CRAZY
NIGHTS THIS HAS BEEN!
FIRST, A **PRANK PHONE**
CALL-- AND THEN **YOU**
TURNING UP...

I KNOW,
ANGEL, I
KNOW... AND
YOU'LL NEVER
BELIEVE THE
EXPLANATION!

Appendix A: Addressing a Creationary Answer to Meaning Love

In asking about *meaning love*, someone may answer me, “Meaning comes from God.” And I should attempt to address this answer—not by reflecting on the theological content of the answer, but by addressing the question/answer structure.

Consider if one asks, “Where do apples come from?” And another answers, “Well, from God, of course!” I find this answer peculiar. One asks, “Where?”—which asks for a location. And so, the answer demands that one think of God as though another were speaking of a location. And, of course, one can use this language, since speaking in this way *does* ease the discomfort expressed in the question, “Where?” But to talk of the creator of ‘the world’ as a location equally causes discomfort—one then wants to ask for the constitution of God. I think this uncertainty—this haziness in expression—is also the cause of Christianity’s ‘occult’ character. The moment of dialog does not sustain long enough to allow subsequent questions. In this way, Christianity offers answers *ad hoc*—yet *how* these answers hang together does not get addressed in everyday moments of dialog—therefore I experience something ‘occult’.

Now, instead of asking for the constitution of God (questioning the answer, if I assume that God *is* the right answer) I would instead challenge the question. If I challenge the question, then I can see that the answer “God” succeeds a different source—“Who created apples?” But this question doesn’t allow the opportunity for an answer which could relieve the discomfort. The answer is presupposed in the question and therefore doesn’t even express any discomfort!

But isn’t it funny to ask for a location anyway? When we ask, “Where do apples come from?” Aren’t we really asking how the apples came to be seen *here*—right in front of me? And then one can say, “God” is our answer, and also does not ask for a constitution of God. “How did apples come to be seen by

me?”—“Well, God created them.” But if this is our answer, then religion and philosophy do not oppose each other, each only offers different explanations. (Perhaps philosophy is not suited for everyday moments of dialog!) Consider if in asking “How did apples come to be seen in *here*—right in front of me”—one meant to ask, not merely for the orchard which produced the apple, but also for a description of the type of tree which the apples grew from, or an explanation of the process by which the tree grew the apples. Now, consider the answer in the title of this evening salon, “I mean love”—this answer could, similarly, be substituted by either a description or explanation. Either can be answered with varying degrees of meaning, which is dependant on the medium in which the question and discomfort appears (and most likely not the degree of discomfort expressed in the question!)

—Justin Carmien, August 14th, 2014

Appendix B: Text from the preparation for “What?”—“I Mean Love”

In preparing for the lecture, Eva Sommer Hansen had challenged me to teach a little of Ludwig Wittgenstein in order to dispose my audience to the understanding required for the lecture. After reading my notes for the lecture, she posed two questions:

What problems motivated Wittgenstein?
Why is Wittgenstein relevant today?

I would like to start off by saying something like, “To note first

“What?”—“I Mean Love”

is Wittgenstein's project to set philosophy straight. Grammatical confusion had led the metaphysical philosopher astray..." But to be honest, I cannot bring myself to assume this authoritative language which is required for proscribing ideas to Wittgenstein in order to *teach* Wittgenstein. Likewise I cannot assume that excitement over his work should be demanded from anyone living today. However, I hope to satisfy these questions using a more experiential language.

Now, when studying Wittgenstein one will surely encounter explorations of this 'grammatical confusion'. Consider the following taken from a translation of Wittgenstein's *Blue Book*,

Consider as an example the question "What is time?" as Saint Augustine and others have asked it...Very often the way the discussion of such a puzzle runs like this: First the question is asked "What is time?" This question makes it appear that what we want is a definition. We mistakenly think that a definition is what will remove the trouble...The question is then answered by a wrong definition; say: "Time is the motion of the celestial bodies." The next step is to see that this definition is unsatisfactory. But this only means that we don't use the word "time" synonymously with "motion of the celestial bodies". However in saying that the first definition is wrong, we are now tempted to think that we must replace it by a different one, the correct one.¹

Consider if someone asks, "What time is it?" This question is similar to "Is it yet an appropriate time for...?"—diner, speaking aloud, or celebrating a birthday, for example. In any of these uses, the meaning is clearly understood. However, we should not expect any overlap in the meaning of this question and the meaning of another question such as, "What is time?" The English makes clear the possible confusion. This question asks for an entity named *time*—and this is of a completely different *meaning* than in the first use.

It is easy to see how the confusion regarding time is then generalized in another passage appearing just a few pages later

in the *Blue Book*,

...the characteristic of a metaphysical question being that we express an unclarity about the grammar of words in the *form* of a scientific question.²

In itself, the critique of the misuse of our language is surely profound in the exegesis of philosophical texts. Yet, I have not made use of this practice in my life. In this, I have not found inspiration in this critique and I think the typical person-off-the-street might find the same difficulty.

Now, in reading Wittgenstein's *Blue Book*, I do find myself bothered by a slight annoyance. *There is an explicit lack of importance made to the multiple definitions which we might give to entities.* Each *definition* of an entity alludes to an understanding in which that entity has meaning—and this is true even in the case when someone might 'mistakenly' ask, "What is time?" Each understanding gives us *a way of speaking about phenomena, a sub-language itself* which makes use of *a world of entities*.

In this, the *manifest critique* of the metaphysical philosopher anticipates another—a *foundational critique* which can be read into many of Wittgenstein's published notes. (These notes rival the passion of Friedrich Nietzsche's polemics and I am tempted to say that the critique of the metaphysical philosopher in Wittgenstein's writing is solely a 'preparation'.)

Undoubtedly, the possible ways of defining entities are multiple—for sure, our languages are multiple (imagine the language which permitted understanding in your 4-year-old-self with the understanding you have today.) The same can be said of the languages of the sciences. The entities that make up a particular science compose one world, the entities of another science, yet another (and it should make no difference to this argument that some of these worlds are more comprehensive than others—even if they are not complete 'world pictures'.)

Now, if one takes it (as I do) that the spirit of the western

¹From Harper Perennial's *Major Works* of Ludwig Wittgenstein, *Study for 'Philosophical Investigations'*, *Blue Book*, page 117 and 118.

²From Harper Perennial's *Major Works* of Ludwig Wittgenstein, *Study for 'Philosophical Investigations'*, *Blue Book*, page 129.

scientist is *the* spirit which embodies our culture today, Wittgenstein assumes the role of a cultural critic—concerned not with academic philosophical exegesis, but with a change of popular perspective on the entirety of experience.

Whoever does not find this profound is likewise one who has not 1) awakened to the inadequacy of mechanics to explain the entirety of experience, and 2) desired to ground the multiplicity of understandings.

The first difficulty is this: the mechanics of time and space do not offer rules for the entirety of entities expressed in language. Consider what Richard Dawkins has written about the nihilism which some accuse him of following a reading of his own work, *The Selfish Gene*,

Presumably there is indeed no purpose in the ultimate fate of the cosmos, but do any of us really tie our life's hopes to the ultimate fate of the cosmos anyway? Of course we don't; not if we are sane. Our lives are ruled by all sorts of closer, warmer, human ambitions and perceptions. To accuse science of robbing life of the warmth that makes it worth living is so preposterously mistaken, so diametrically opposite to my own feeling and those of most working scientist, I am almost driven to the despair of which I am wrongly suspected.³

It seems, at least here, that Dawkins does not acknowledge any interest in describing the “warmer feelings” beyond this naïve expression. Nor does he even seem to want to consider the second difficulty: a more holistic understanding which might govern both. Contrast this to Wittgenstein's note published in *Culture and Value*,

It is all one and the same whether the typical western scientist understands or appreciates my work, since he will not in any case understand the spirit in which I write. Our civilization is characterized by the word 'progress'. Progress is its form rather than making progress being on of its features. Typically it

constructs. It is occupied with building an ever more complicated structure...I am not interested in constructing a building, so much as in having a perspicuous view of the foundations of possible building.

So I am not aiming at the same target as the scientists and my way of thinking is different from theirs.⁴

To entertain multiple understandings requires an epistemic *humility* which the Westerner has lost with the decline of Christianity and the advent of science. And this humility demands a healthy *diplomacy*. I will conclude this preparation to the lecture with a passage from Wittgenstein's *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus*.

At the basis of the whole modern view of the world lies the illusion that the so-called laws of nature are the explanation of natural phenomena.

So people stop short at the natural laws as at something unassailable, as did the ancients at God and Fate.

And they both are right and wrong. But the ancients were clearer, in so far as they recognized one clear conclusion, whereas in the modern system it should appear as though *everything* were explained.⁵

—Justin Carmien, July 10th, 2014

³The *Selfish Gene* by Richard Dawkins, *Introduction to the 30th Anniversary Edition*, page xiii.

⁴From Peter Winch's translation of Ludwig Wittgenstein's *Culture and Value*, page 7e.

⁵From Ludwig Wittgenstein's *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus*, 6.371-6.372.

Think Openly, Existentially



No portion of this work may be reproduced or distributed without written permission from the copyright holder.

For usage rights, contact:

justincarmien@terminusmechanicae.com

