

## THE NATURAL MORALITY OF RACIALISM

Chalmers Wayne Macleod

We see the evolution of life throughout the ages, from sea-living microbes to jellies, fish, amphibians, reptiles, mammals to humans, from barely perceptible consciousness to that of human beings. How natural to extend the process into future aeons and ask: will Life reach a stage of Ultimate Consciousness? We can attempt an answer by extrapolating from past life into the future. Irrespective of the trivial span of our individual lives, the life of our species lives on. *Homo sapiens* have been on Earth two hundred thousand years, and our evolutionary existence dates back millions of years. For almost three billion years life on Earth consisted of little more than single cells living separately in Earth's oceans, when some began to live *collectively* in colonies. These thrived, their symbiotic relationship becoming ever more integrated to evolve into the plants and animals we know, including human beings. Collective living is a recurrent theme in evolution, that we see with social insects and animals, all of whom display elevated intelligence over their genus relatives.

Do we see the same collectivity with human beings? Of course we do. But they have to respect each other. They cannot steal or covet the possessions of others. Rather, they must be charitable, even empathic with others suffering misfortune in their community. They must not display arrogance or pride in the face of others, nor be liars or gossipers. In other words, people most on the Path toward superior Life are *moral* people, and this is the behaviour sought by the major religions. We now have a rational understanding of moral behaviour that actually *defines* morality: it is behaviour leading to the emergence of human beings into a *collectivity* of Higher Life. We do that by integrating ourselves into a collectivity that survives well beyond our limited individual existence, by respecting the lives of others within that collectivity, even submitting our individual needs and wants to their needs and wants. As physical embodiments we know those collectivities as nations, civilizations and religions. This understanding of moral behaviour as *superior* human behaviour also derives from our insight that immoral people who give vent to anger, lust, gluttony and all manner of base emotion, act little better than *animals*. We can be so certain about this evolutionary process and its eventuality into Higher Life that we can give it a name: the *Cosmic Imperative*. What greater purpose could our lives have than participating in this Path of Life? Regardless of the particular belief, our moral systems have intuitively sought to direct humanity toward that fulfilment. Certainly without them we are left to the decay of time and regression back to the animal.

Contrary to our emergence into Higher Life, however, we know from daily living that the Universe does not always, or even often, tend toward order and complexity. More evident is the tendency toward chaos, disorder and dissolution which we see occurring repeatedly in Nature: the trend toward dispersion, dissipation and randomization in time. Examples are legion: a house becomes untidy, a plate smashes, a fence weathers, a machine breaks down, Murphy's Law, etc. All are due to probability because there are more disordered states than ordered ones, and with inevitable change in time a disordered state is more likely entered unless directed. The same happens when heat is lost to a cold environment, giving a loss of availability for work, a loss known in science as *entropy*, a measure of *randomness*, so we can think of naturally disordering events as examples of *random regression* that requires nothing more than *time*.

Not only natural change is the cause of random regression. Human beings can also be the cause. As vandals they might destroy a house. By doing so they become *agents* of random regression. It is the same with any crime. It is the same with any accident although these are not intentional and that difference gives us an understanding of *evil*, which is just random regression given intention. Whereas 'good' behaviour advances the Cosmic Imperative, 'evil' behaviour retards it. *The effects of error and accident in human life are the same as the effects of evil*. The meaning is not that random regression is the *cause* of evil, but rather that evil is our interpretation of human activity conducive to disorder in the world. Once we have this natural understanding spiritual notions of good and evil become superfluous.

A subjective understanding of 'good' and 'evil' arises because people do not always have an understanding of behaviour that is destructive or degrading of humanity. Without it human approval is very plastic. Regardless of the high caliber of philosophical thought in the Greco-Roman world, the Roman Empire was a slave empire, and we see the inconsistencies of moral standards in the public conscience that can vary from acceptance in one society to

outrage in another. Can the atheist's judgment of subjective right and wrong therefore be correct? The humanist tradition runs deep in the atheist movement, so without belief in an all-powerful Lawgiver atheists have no trouble accepting a subjective version of good and evil. It is when we attempt to find the place of human behaviour in Nature that we gain superior insight. In the long evolution of human life the beliefs of people must have tapped into the realities of the world, or they would never have survived. Examples of subjective morality can be judged according to their benefit or injury to humanity, that is, on whether they are conducive to human advancement or not, so we are still left with an absolute standard - the Cosmic Imperative.

Before the invention of automatic machines, slavery released talented people from the toil of mundane life, to perform the art, science and philosophy for which the Classical world is noted. Would it have been 'good' to deprive humanity of that progress, even in part? That would not have been in accord with the Cosmic Imperative, so we do not read that the philosophers of Classical Civilization condemned the slavery of their time. They intuitively knew that human sentiment is not a good judge of the Cosmic Imperative. Black slavery in the American South occurred at a time when automatic machines were taking over human labour, that made slavery a less efficient means of production. Human advancement would therefore have been retarded by the continuance of slavery, but we can be assured that without automatic machines slavery would still be practiced in the world today, and moral arguments would be given from pulpits to justify it, as they were in the Old South.

A feature of natural life is its *diversity*. Diversity makes a *world*. To destroy it would certainly constitute an act of *evil*, and we actually see that evil occurring with the disappearance of species today, estimated to be between 0.01% to 0.1% of all species per year, sufficient for geologists to label this Age of Man the "Anthropocene" - the world's sixth age of extinction. A most cursory glance at humanity also reveals its diversity. Many different cultures, nations, races, etc. make up human diversity the same as we see in Nature. To destroy that diversity would equally constitute evil, but ironically we have today the political narrative in Western countries that liberal "multiculturalism" *gives* diversity! What this narrative fails to recognize is that when races and cultures *mix*, street to street and door to door, diversity is *destroyed*, because history shows that under such circumstances races *interbreed*. If our liberal leaders truly wanted national diversity the one policy they would *not* promote is liberal "multiculturalism". Instead, a world of racial-cultural diversity is a world of racial-cultural *nations*.

The issue is far from being a subjective one, based on what we like or dislike. The racial mixing we see in the streets of Western countries today is not the incremental mixture of colours as in a painting, that might allow us to argue for a creation of diversity in the making. Instead it is profuse, where all races of humanity mix, and when all colours of a painting are randomly mixed we have a toned down sludge of no colour, a dull travesty of what the artist may have intended. Can the racial homogenization of liberal "multiculturalism" be any different, especially when it is the product of *time*? Surely such loss of diversity is an example of random regression, a step back in evolution, potentially applicable to all humanity if ever under a world empire, which on a global scale would be, from the Cosmos perspective, a most genuine expression of *evil*. (From it we should note how this moral understanding from Nature gives justification for racial nationalism *directly* from Nature, not from any notion of racist narcissism, and therefore can be politically acceptable to all peoples, which White supremacy is not.)

An example from our day of how popular sentiment can lead us astray is the stream of destitute people from impoverished parts of the world seeking refuge in developed nations. Scenes of fleeing families tug on the heart strings of well meaning people who implore their governments to lower national entrance barriers. Should their governments do so? If they should, then the same should follow for all nations, leading to a mixed race world. We know how that would conflict with the Cosmic Imperative. In liberal "multiculturalism" we have a deliberate policy that would *destroy* diversity, the assistant of evolution, contrary to our intuitive understanding of 'good' in the world. When applied to humanity, or any portion of it, we indeed have a most egregious form of *evil*.

Further reading on related topics is available on the Transhumanist website: [www.evolution.com](http://www.evolution.com).