

## **A BIRD IN THE HAND IS WORTH TWO IN THE BUSH**

Marvin E. Kirsh

[Kirsh2152000@yahoo.com](mailto:Kirsh2152000@yahoo.com)

With regards to the referral “our own theory of language” I, first, would be able to find no better starting point for all theory. Second, find that a deflating influence exists upon the common citizen with regards to the great complexity of ideas put forth upon himself and the environment that he must not only endure, but find his continuance from a positive application of its’ resources. A division between the human spirit, his theology, philosophy, and the creations of science from theory created and assembled as a (scientifically)dedicated subset of language that is composed from the perspectives of persons representing a small sample of a total possible diversity in language, is apparent. Science method, technology, with its’ mechanical logic as logically appealing, become instantiated, hence oppressive, and individually repressive psychologically to a more diverse outlook. Though humorous in suggestion, this conflict (of interests) might best, in as few words as possible, result as an entailment of the common phrase “a bird in the hand is worth two in the bush”-as science puts into the hand new tools , contrivances to endure nature, improve the human lot where as the gains of theology are always in the “proverbial bush”. It is in this sense that mankind comes to abuse natural resources, and replace his own resources with those defined by others. One’s impression of even an artistic creation, cannot be supplanted with the description and intention of the creating artist. Science, in order to find any empirical application must begin with the empirical. It is my opinion that it also cannot transcend the empirical enroute to explanation, and that in doing so is violating to the self as the creator of theory, and that such described theories are not valid. Objectivity, in terms of science, has no source of self objectivity but his own witness as a universally instantiatable fact and lingual theory creation which is also a universally instantiatable fact but diverse on each unique individual basis, in that no other appearing more tangible and constant-consistent theories can or do exist, but of the innate and self constructed ones employed in the processes of witness and social intercourse. *Ontology must be a good process of ornithology*, perhaps we should not attach ourselves to the first bird that falls into our hands(from science theory), or to over look one that already exists that is common, comprehensible, and self created. In this respect it would be perhaps wise to avoid a compulsive dependence on rationality and logic to seek a category and ordering for each discovery in a universal domain. I do not think that in final analysis the language of science will find validity as a genuine or acceptable subset of human communication . Science theory we compose, of extrapolation and imagination will be found misaligned in category, topic and title, to contain irrational meaning derived of the elements of a route that traverses beyond the empirical and witnessable world. *With it we will ultimately damage our personal resources and diversities , the language theorizing employed to construct language*, which exists as the unique and only empirically true and valid footing of inquiry and progress. A burning bush sheds of the objective, physical light only. One burning at both ends, a process(of time related change - motion) of a very similar nature, is potentially indistinguishable from the other, and potentially leaves no route to a subject darkness that may reside beyond a linguistically created assimilation-the existence of a unique burning source from which the remainder is innately construed, in the immediate sense, as derived. Again, *ontology must be a good process of ornithology*.

## **ABOUT ME**

Marvin E. Kirsh

[kirsh2152000@yahoo.com](mailto:kirsh2152000@yahoo.com)

About Me: I am a Masters Student in Philosophy at the California State University. New to the Liberal Arts I hold a B.A in natural sciences from The Johns Hopkins University (1972), a PhD in Biochemistry from the City University of New York (1986). I did not ever achieve employment in my chosen specialty, though I continued to

pursued, on my own, personal interests in science, mathematics, philosophy, literature, armed with only advanced study about matters pertaining to the technical chemistry of the life sciences.

Within the writing, referred poetry, presented here, I have hoped to present an account, from my perspective, of the intellectual progressions of civilization-what motivates our thoughts and intellectual pursuits, and what kind of ideas do we come up with; how level are they with respect to emotion/mood, verses sound logic and common sense: what are our blind spots, how(by what mechanisms) might they have come to chronically plague us.

My favorite intellects are Parmenides, Hegel, Nietzsche, Albert Einstein, Bertrand Russell, and the apparently frustrated and still controversial George Berkeley (on the nature of mind and matter).

All knowledge rises from contrast-a ( any or all) definition(s)/fact(s) does(do) not exist without an entity of contrast, as well as the self, which can be the only grounding referral possible. it is then of this realization, of self realization, where in we stumble chronically, that it (self realization) does not require complex introspections (which actually arrive to some other nameable topics), but of a blindness to a simplest idea of a sameness to ourselves of everything, that beginning with ideas of geometrical perspective/distances and time, the world can be, in one additional step, said to be the element of time alone, -i.e. the same time that passes through our heads. Discussions of unity and the universe have grown to such great complexity, to be almost or totally pure and very advanced mathematics only that are diverged from the particulars of life and the actual world. This is not to say that they are so complex that they are unsuited for the common and ordinary, but that they are invalid/false. In my many presentations, I have hope to present/investigate this notion, and to lightly investigate human behavior in relation to it. The ideas presented are succinct, the presentations are not intended as curt, but hopefully as non invasive to each or any in light of contrasts always existing between individuals, so that the works may be read and understood unambiguously, they are intended to communicate both rigorously and perceptually, so that others might learn and create from their own perspectives and perceptions, maximally. That some things are common to all is beyond dispute, and I hope I have accomplished my task of elucidation with respect to this.

With regards to this presentation, my wishes to be read, compared and judged with a free and open perspective, and in appropriate places with the ideas of others, it is always to be remembered, that whether one discusses scientific law, morality, ethics, matters of legality, or world history, philosophy, sociology, it is always intention that is 90 percent of the law, and wherein only, any or all meaning can be extracted..

A collection of my illustrated, scientifically slanted, poetry is also available at:

<http://www.authorsden.com/marvinelikirsh>

My own created scientific and philosophical manuscripts are available here (presentations) and as well at

<http://www.wbabin.net> or <http://cogprints.org>.

Blogs and discussion (where I have contributed) are available at:

<http://network.nature.com>

<http://news.nature.com>

<http://time.com>

<http://www.scienceblogs.com>

<http://www.sciam.com>

Four of my current works(2007) are in peer review, they are available here, and if accepted for publication appropriate references will be provided.