

## Darwin and Its Ramifications for a Viable Republic

(C)2021 P.K. Carlisle

Fundamental underlying beliefs of a society can either suggest that a society is growing stronger or that it is fracturing. While the immediate visceral reaction of the citizens of that society is to preserve that society, a longer view may lead to the question of whether that society, in its current form is worth saving. This paper will consider that question in a narrow context, that of Darwinism, and will touch very briefly upon the necessary implications of that examination.

A contextual examination of Darwinism must have some groups against which is must be weighed, that is to consider which group would have, or feel that it had, natural characteristics beneficial to its survival. For the purpose of context for this examination, the proposed groups will be woke<sup>1</sup>, woke<sup>2</sup>, rationalist<sup>1</sup> and fundamentalist<sup>1</sup>. An examination of the fundamental values of these groups suggests that all of them would perhaps best be served, not by preserving a fracturing society, but by hastening that fracture. Any fracture which is deliberate permits understanding, planning, and a limit to the unintentional destructiveness which may accompany a more random event.

### Woke<sup>1</sup>

Let woke<sup>1</sup> be what is popularly known as woke. It has several underlying beliefs, which can be considered in the context of Darwinism, and from examining Darwinism through that lens, it is possible to decide if or whether woke<sup>1</sup> would accept or desire a societal fracture. Woke<sup>1</sup> claims to believe in science, but that belief is limited to, and science defined as, that which supports the underlying woke<sup>1</sup> belief set. Whether or not this perspective in fact is consistent with the classically accepted definition of the scientific method is not relevant for the purpose of this examination. It is sufficient that the woke<sup>1</sup> model accepts it to be valid.

Woke<sup>1</sup> beliefs which are relevant include that

*there is and cannot be final objective truth,*

*there is only emotional truth in the absence of objective truth,*

*Western thought (objectivity, empiricism) is consequently pointless,*

*Western thought is also systematically racist, and therefore morally repugnant as well as suspect.*

If these principles are true, then Darwinism, based as it is on objective, empirical observation and logical extrapolation, being an established part of Western thought, and having been developed by a white man, has no value to the woke<sup>1</sup> belief set. It is a fiction at best, insidious

manipulation at worst. These principles are toxic to the woke<sup>1</sup> belief set, and as such, have no meaning with regard to the viability of a society. Woke<sup>1</sup> could be said to be ambivalent to Darwinism, and certainly would not wish to apply it in any meaningful context. To the degree that any principle remotely resembling Darwinism can be said to apply, its context is that of the success of an emotional society rather than in any objective material or political sense. Woke<sup>1</sup> would have no opinion on a societal fracture in the context of Darwinism.

## Woke<sup>2</sup>

Let woke<sup>2</sup> be what is customarily known as the woke elite. Woke<sup>2</sup> beliefs superficially reflect woke<sup>1</sup> beliefs, and in that sense woke<sup>2</sup> must engage in what is variously called cognitive dissonance or, politically, doublethink. While simultaneously denying that Darwinism is anything other than a malign intellectual trick, they are also the thought leaders of the woke movement, and in that context they need to believe that a societal fracture is the best idea for all involved in order to direct the woke<sup>1</sup> movement in that direction.

Objectively, a woke society can be said to have evolved according to woke principles (always assuming that objective consideration of a woke society is not in itself an oxymoron). It has no interest in objectivity, meritocracy, empiricism, equality, and it is working on its racism problem. A society with these qualities is the more advanced society according to woke philosophy.

From the woke<sup>2</sup> perspective, a societal split has another decided if less obvious advantage: long term, it cannot function smoothly, either economically or politically. A society without hope, opportunity or merit is doomed to want and uncertainty and strife. From the woke<sup>2</sup> perspective, this is a desirable state of affairs if the woke elite is to maintain both their own position as elite and to keep the woke<sup>1</sup> class in a predictable and malleable state of childlike fear. Woke<sup>2</sup> would have no objection to a societal fracture in the context of Darwinism.

## Rationalist<sup>1</sup>

Let rationalist<sup>1</sup> be what is politically any people to the right of woke, up to what is classically called the far right (what will be denoted fundamentalist<sup>1</sup>). Rationalist<sup>1</sup> includes libertarians, independents, conservatives, precise political leanings are not especially relevant. Rationalist<sup>1</sup> people believe in personal freedom, self determination, small government, meritocracy, equality, the established definitions and parameters of science, religion, mathematics, philosophy, history, essentially, the classic principles of Western civilization. To be certain, with such a wide range of adherents, not every rationalist<sup>1</sup> will believe in all of these elements in the same order or to the same degree. Ultimately individual hierarchy of beliefs is not as important as are the beliefs held in common.

Rationalist<sup>1</sup> people have important core beliefs in common. They do not believe that their society is perfect by any means, but they do believe in the fundamental principle that they can, incrementally, make it a better society. Like the woke movement, rationalist<sup>1</sup> people do not believe that their society is or ever will be perfect, unlike the woke movement, rationalist<sup>1</sup>

citizens believe that the effort, the betterment or evolution, of society is possible and fundamentally worth the effort.

Rationalist<sup>1</sup> people, while accepting ultimate imperfection, believe that science, logic, meritocracy, and opportunity, etc., will make a rationalist<sup>1</sup> society a better place in the present, with constant room for improvement in the future. As rationalist<sup>1</sup> history has demonstrated unequivocally, social evolution is often a messy and contentious process. Rationalist<sup>1</sup> society should have no reason to believe that this will change in the future, only that the continual benefit is worth the continued struggle.

Since rationalist<sup>1</sup> society embraces history where woke society rejects it, it follows that rationalist<sup>1</sup> society has a greater body of history and complexity on which to draw with regard to social evolution. As examples, one can consider George Washington's Farewell Address on the need for religion as a basis for morality or Carnegie's Gospel of Wealth as philosophical engines for the final rejection of the woke movement. Far from the simplicity the woke movement prefers, this abundance of ideas can be said to strengthen rationalist<sup>1</sup> society rather than detract from it; rationalism flourishes only as it is used.

Specifically as regards a rationalist<sup>1</sup> philosophy, believing as it tends to in both an abstract overarching and time honored moral sense and Darwinism itself, the question arises as to whether a rationalist<sup>1</sup> society has a duty to rescue woke society from its, as the rationalist<sup>1</sup> sees it, self destructive philosophy. It could be argued in this regard that Western society was, in the twenty-first century and prior to the advent of increasing censorship, a society where information was not only freely available, but one in which every effort was made to encourage people to avail themselves to it. A rationalist<sup>1</sup> can therefore take comfort in the knowledge that the woke model is not only a product of free will, but is both virulently, indeed violently, defended by its adherents. As such, the rationalist<sup>1</sup> can rationally be excused any further moral duty to rescue those who expressly refuse their help.

Rationalist<sup>1</sup> people are and can be diverse. Rationalist<sup>1</sup> people are religious or not, may or may not be politically active, well or poorly educated, and derive from all different races and socioeconomic levels. They will very likely have a variety of primary motivators regarding their rationalist<sup>1</sup> beliefs. These beliefs will continue to make themselves felt in a dynamic evolving rationalist<sup>1</sup> society, and a rationalist<sup>1</sup> citizen will respect, if not the individual beliefs of the cohort, then the reality that the society which protects one protects all. Rationalist<sup>1</sup> people are defined by beliefs above all else, and finally and fundamentally value a rational society, believing that their social model is more viable than woke society. The rationalist<sup>1</sup> should have no objection to a societal fracture in the context of Darwinism.

Fundamentalist<sup>1</sup>

Let fundamentalist<sup>1</sup> people be those which are classically referred to as the alt-right or hardliners or fanatics of one stripe or another. The fundamentalist<sup>1</sup> does not identify with any of

the preceding groups and diverges more widely from the woke movement than from the rationalist<sup>1</sup> belief set.

Fundamentalist<sup>1</sup> people may indeed pose a threat to a peaceful, dynamic and evolving rationalist<sup>1</sup> society, and while that must never be forgotten, it is less of a threat than most presume, and may even provide a peripheral social benefit. Fundamentalist<sup>1</sup> people provide a constant reminder of where extremism leads, and provides a lens through which social protections can be examined as a rationalist<sup>1</sup> society evolves. An example of this argument is the truism that free speech exists and should exist foremost to protect unpopular speech.

While it is tempting to wish that there would be no fundamentalist<sup>1</sup> people in a rationalist<sup>1</sup> society, this is probably not possible as a practical reality, and one can take comfort from the fact that if fundamentalist<sup>1</sup> people must exist as a fringe element of rationalist<sup>1</sup> society, at least rationalist<sup>1</sup> society is the stronger for examining, understanding, and rationally rejecting fundamentalist<sup>1</sup> philosophies, and thus protecting itself against their brand of extremism. Finally, however repugnant or excessive their beliefs, fundamentalist<sup>1</sup> people, if they have little use for the civil niceties of rationalist<sup>1</sup> society, have no interest whatever in woke society and would have no objection to a societal fracture in the context of Darwinism.

## Conclusion

The question may still be asked whether there is anything at all, any saving grace to resist the logical direction of encouraging society to divide cleanly rather than to fracture randomly if it needs must do one or the other. The logistical consideration alone would be stupendous, but logistics are merely problems, and problems exist to be solved, and it could be argued that a problem faced forthrightly and head on has a better chance of being solved with a minimum of damage and disruption. Socially, the woke and rationalist movements see ever decreasing value in one other, and in fact see one another with ever increasing suspicion and dislike. Politically, America has a hard fought civil war in its past and does not want another; but unlike in the nineteenth century, today both sides have a more clearly defined and arguably mutual interest in separating.

Finally, both sides believe in the superiority of their social models, and as such, believe that they are the next best evolutionary bet, and, to the degree that they accept Darwinism, that the other social philosophy is not evolutionarily viable. To quote Abraham Lincoln, "Both may be, but one must be, wrong". If this is true, there perhaps has never been a better time for two peoples with increasingly diverging worldviews to consider going their separate ways.

-----

Contact: [go.carlisle.pk/mailform](mailto:go.carlisle.pk@mailform)

*(All communications become the property of P. K. Carlisle)*