

ONE

THE BATTLEGROUND

In this book we are going to look at what happens when a paradigm, or particular mindset, dogma, or doctrine, gains the power once attributed to God and runs amok here on earth.

Over the ages the paradigm driving the battle we're going to look at has had many agents, names, and faces. Barbarians versus civilization for historians. Original sin versus original blessing for religion. It's been known as entropy versus negentropy in physics, predator versus prey in biology, nonsynergistic versus synergistic societies for Ruth Benedict in anthropology, the Power Elite versus the rest of us for C.Wright Mills in sociology, Thanatos versus Eros for Freud and the authoritarian versus democratic personality for the Adorno team in psychology.

Outside their fields these names and terms ring few bells. Move into politics and economics, however, and what's at stake suddenly becomes real. What begins as masters and slaves or serfs, becomes nobles and peasants, becomes the *populo grasso* and the *populo minuto* in Renaissance Italy, which in our time becomes the Fat Cats, Wall Street versus Main Street, Corporatism, Big Finance, Big Oil, Big Coal, Big Food, Big Water, and Big Pharmaceuticals versus the rest of us.

Behind this oppressive facade, however, lies something that thousands, if not millions by now, have glimpsed and sought to name—an immeasurably larger mindset and alliance that stamps these roles upon our lives and the course of our history and our evolution.

This I've set out to morally define in my *Glacier versus the Flame* trilogy. The most comprehensive present definition of what we're up against I know of is the case cultural evolution theorist Riane Eisler first made in *The Chalice and the Blade* for two thrusts shaping our evolution. On one hand is the impact of the “domination” model, ethos, and systems driven by the ideals of “power *over* others”—top down control, inequality of gender and race, exploitation of others, violence as well as war on the grand scale to gain ends, the valuing of ranking more than linking.

On the other is the impact of the “partnership” model, ethos, and systems driven by the ideals of “power *with* others”—freedom, equality of gender and race, peace, sharing, caring, the valuing of linking more than ranking.

In Book I, for easy referencing to Eisler's massive multidisciplinary storehouse of evidence, I introduced the short hand of D-systems and D-attractors versus P-systems and P-attractors.

For many centuries our world was—and unfortunately still is being—trampled under and

torn apart by armies marching, by massacres, by genocide or terrorist bombings, all under the banners of the vicious paradigm of D-systems sacred to regressive religion.

We moderns prided ourselves on the fact that the rise of science supposedly ended that sort of thing, or was at least driving it out.

But what if intellectually, socially, and most important, morally, the science that was our champion somehow, like the fall of a revered politician, sold out? What if a regressive science became little better, and indeed in some regards worse, than what preceded it?

Could this have happened to us?

By now the size of the onrushing disaster of global warming and all the other environmental symptoms of a paradigm run amok is gaining widespread recognition. But behind the environmental surface, still insufficiently recognized, is the drive of the deadly larger mindset that, if unchecked, can trash the 21st century and send our species spiraling downward, with no recall.

This book is about the differences between two alliances within science that became involved in the battle of the books that widened over the century to become the battle for 20th and now 21st century mind.

On one side was the alliance of those who were the popular champions of what became generally known as the Darwinian science of the 20th century, who told us how little could be expected of us. On the other side was not so much an alliance as a sprawling and contentious assemblage hampered by the fact they'd lost their great champion without knowing it.

In retrospect, we now can see they bore, without seeing it, the banner of the “lost Darwin.” Theirs was also the strength of all the studies of modern science, which we now can see also corroborate the “lost Darwin.” Their great weakness was that of the “outsider. Excluded by paradigm from the primary dialogue shaping evolution theory, theirs became virtual voices in the wilderness trying to tell us of who we really are, and how much more than we thought possible we can expect of ourselves and others.

The difference was—and still is—between a science locked onto the prehuman, the subhuman, and the inhuman as the model for our species, or a science of the *fully human* as the goal for our evolution.

To recap the difference outlined in Book I: Economically, the difference was and is between a theory and story of selfishness and greed as the key to wealth for the

privileged—with, of course, a noble “trickle down” to the many. Or a theory and story of caring and sharing to spread the wealth of Earth to all.

Morally, the difference was and is between a theory and story of survival of the fittest and selfishness *uber alles* as the driver for human evolution, or a theory and story of love and moral sensitivity as the driver of human evolution.

Spiritually, the difference also split apart both sides and even split off into the Creationists to attack both sides. Though ignored by mainstream science as a non-functional relic of the past, as religion remains a majority force shaping the impact for good or bad ends on this planet, it can't be ignored. Here the difference was and is between a theory and story of a ferocious God of my people versus your people, a God that must without question be obeyed. Or a merciful God of all people. Or no God at all, good will from on high and below, just favoring an abundant life for all.

Considering the degree to which scientifically, economically, morally and spirituality our world is mainly still governed by the “old” paradigm, it's evident something unpleasant is greatly needed.

It is that a very great shock is needed if, beyond the often desperation efforts of its embattled progressives, the scientific, political, economic, and religious world is to be shoved into doing what must be done during what many of us see as our "last chance" years.

Thus, from the beginning to the end of that very strange 20th century we have at last put behind us, I will name the names, point to the specific books, and show how, behind the "gentlemen's agreement" that preserves the tidy facade for science, so much that was and is not only unscientific went on and still goes on. Widening out from science, we shall examine how the crazy-making power of the “old” paradigm spread into the mind space of the larger world.

Going to the core of what happened, here are the questions we'll pursue to jolt the scientific community and awaken those of us dependent on whether science gives us bread or a stone.

- A. In our understanding and use of the Darwinian theory and story of evolution, what specifically was lost—or more technically accurate, was "invisibilized"?
- B. How extensive was this invisibilizing?
- C. Who did it?
- D. How was it done?

E. Who fought it?

F. What were the consequences?

G. Of greatest urgency, where do we stand today in the struggle to free ourselves from this uncanny force that, as each new vision of a better world arose, so quickly co-opted and corrupted first religion, then philosophy, and now science?

What Was the Battle All About?

Two stories are involved here. One is the familiar story told of the battles first among the NeoDarwinians over what was and wasn't Darwin's theory. Then after agreement on the great synthesis of warring views, the battle became between the NeoDarwinians and everybody who didn't agree with them.

Endlessly retold in hundreds of books by now, condensed for a grounding point in an early chapter in *Revolution and Counter Revolution*, this is the exciting, at times magnificent story of Weismann, Wallace, Mendel, Bateson, Wheldon, Morgan, Fisher, the great architects of the NeoDarwinian synthesis Julian Huxley and Theodosius Dobzhansky. It is the story of the mating of the thousands of sweet peas, sea worms, and the famous fruit fly *drosophila melanogaster*, which confirmed the validity of this first pass at product improvement for Darwin's theory.

The other story is the new one, long hidden, of how the battle of the books and all the charges and counter-charges were actually over an illusion.

In other words, the Darwin of "survival of the fittest" and later "selfish genes" they battled over didn't exist. He was, in effect, a diversionary fabrication of the minions of the old paradigm to keep us from seeing the real Darwin—which threatened the paradigm's existence.

Mystifying at first pass, the nature of this systems dynamic and its function will become clear as we draw on the insights of the great sociologists and systems scientists to explore the interweaving and the conflict of the two stories in the battle of the books that lies ahead. Meanwhile, for grounding purposes, here is a brief look at the "lost" story of Darwin and human evolution which, as I provide at length in *Darwin's Lost Theory*, has hovered like a ghost over the din of battle for over 100 years..

Darwin's Lost Theory

In the third of six books for a Darwin Anniversary Cycle, *Darwin's Lost Theory*, I told of how I left my earlier life as a newsman to become a psychologist and evolutionary systems scientist; of how I happened to stumble across, uncover, and restore the long ignored "top half" for Darwin's theory of evolution; of what this theory was and is; and of how now, at a time of immense need for such, it reaffirms the lost map we seek to the better future.

Soon after getting back from his famous voyage on the Beagle around the world, at age 28, in his private notebooks, Darwin jotted down a theory of what drove human evolution that seems to contradict what most of us know today as the one and only theory of evolution.

What we know today as Darwin's theory is the brilliant construction with which, thirty years later, in 1858, he made his mark on history in *The Origin of Species*. Here he outlined the familiar theory of a brutal battle in which seemingly everything from the first life on earth up to ourselves is driven by the interaction of Natural Selection and Variation.

This is an accurate perception of foundational evolutionary dynamics. But the tragedy of what happened during the 20th century lies in how this liberating perception was simplified and thereafter ferociously imbedded in science, education, and the media as the bloody requirement of "survival of the fittest" and "selfishness above all."

This savage mantra is what became implanted within the mainstream mind of the 20th century as Darwin's theory of evolution. This became the core plot line for the schools and media in every developed nation on the face of this earth. However gentled or otherwise complicated, this became the street wisdom you were supposed to hang onto and pass a test with. This also became a central issue for the battle of the books that became the battle for 20th and 21st century mind.

But earlier, back there fresh from circling the world, young Darwin sketched out a theory and story of evolution that began with the big surprise that may have been one reason why this earlier theory so quickly disappeared—or more colloquially, why it was "invisibilized."

The evolution of life on this planet, young Darwin decided, began not just with bashing in the head or eating one's neighbor. Instead, it erupted from the first appearance of sex on this earth—that is, the pleasurable mating of two creatures to produce offspring, rather than, as earlier, by oneself just splitting in half or otherwise cloning oneself.

The next stage up for evolution, he surmised, was the development of the beginning of the caring and love of the parent for its child. The next stage—which paleontology and brain research now tells us arrived with the first mammals—was the spread of caring and love beyond the family to the other creatures like ourselves with whom we lived as a group or community, our herd or flock or drove. Then came the stage of greatest interest to most of us today—of the immense expansion of the capability for emotion and reason that arrived with

the emergence of our own species on this earth.

Now, having slowly evolved over millions of years, this upward thrust of caring and love flowered into the unique human capacity for moral sensitivity—*which both the young Darwin and the old Darwin were convinced was a primary driver of human evolution.*

Forty years after jotting down the core for this theory and then for a while shelving it, now world famous for a theory of evolution that in key regards was deeply troubling him, in 1868 Darwin returned as an old man to further develop this more hopeful vision of his earlier years. At times greatly excited by what he had now tested for over 30 years against evidence culled from throughout the world, but also deeply fearful of its reception, over three years he sketched at length what became the “lost” completion of theory. During one of the coldest of winters for England—while only 16 miles away Marx and Engels worked on how to launch a world revolution to end poverty and misery—Darwin labored to achieve the same end in a no less revolutionary but much less drastic way. Day after day he wrote of how through what he was the first to call “mutual aid,” the earliest humans, women and men, worked together through cooperation, learning, education— and even what we would today call progressive religion and spirituality—to build the great edifice of civilization on this earth.

Here, to give you the flavor of this long hidden aspect of Darwin, are two brief quotes from the many pages of his own writing that have been sitting there in plain sight.

In other words, except for brief snippets from his long unpublished early notebooks, all this has been sitting there in plain sight worldwide on the shelves of scientists and all other scholars, in all the libraries both public and private, in edition after edition of *The Descent of Man*, published in what by now must be most of the languages of this earth for over 100 years.

"...in the earlier editions of my 'Origin of Species,' I probably attributed too much to the action of natural selection or the survival of the fittest," he tells us.

And what does he say actually mainly shapes human evolution?

"Important as the struggle for existence has been and even still is, yet as far as the highest part of man's nature is concerned there are other agencies more important. For the moral qualities are advanced, either directly or indirectly, much more through the effects of habit, the reasoning powers, instruction, religion, et cetera, than through natural selection."

This, the either-or mindset automatically tells us, must be a simple case of good versus bad. This was at first my own reaction. The old Darwinian theory must be bad, therefore must be shucked so the good new Darwinian theory can prevail and free us.

But over and over again, what we fail to see in science, in religion, and in simply dealing

with one thing after another in our own lives is that all things, including ourselves, grow up by stages rather than spring into full blown maturity all at once.

What finally sinks in after one is forced to really think about it—rather than, as usual, go off half-cocked in science, religion, or everyday life—is that Darwin developed a theory of not one but of two parts.

There is the overwhelmingly familiar first part mainly applying to prehuman evolution—or what might be termed the vital bedrock infancy of evolution.

As if we were little more than 150 pound fruit flies or apes in clothes, this was the theory applied wholesale to our species. But all along there was this second stage or part that applied mainly to us—to human evolution. There was and is Darwin's completing half for his theory of evolution. Yet, as we are to see in the rest of this book, for over a century this second, completing, “grown up” part for his theory was shoved aside, excluded from consideration, distorted when glimpsed, buried, tromped on, denied, mocked, or—as they said of the victims of right wing Central and South American military regimes—in other ways “disappeared.”

In its stead—with the increasing impact of mind-bending electronic media under increasingly regressive control—we were given a steady diet of the supposed brutal first half of Darwin's theory, as if this were the be-all and end-all explanation of who we ourselves actually are, or can be, or no matter how hard we may aspire to “grow up,” can ever hope to be.

So poorly grounded and mentally and emotionally rudderless has this left most of us, so powerful is the hold of the old paradigm on us, the case I make in this trilogy for the new could still wind up with no more lasting imprint on the mind than a footprint in the sand. But perhaps in a world ruled by numbers, some simple statistics can prevail.

By running a computerized word count on *The Descent of Man*, here is what I found.

Survival of the fittest? Only twice did Darwin write of it in this book in which he told us he was now writing of *human* evolution—and one of the two times, as the quote I've given makes plain, is to deny the importance of “survival of the fittest” and apologize for using this unfortunate term in *Origin of Species*.

And what did he actually write of?

95 times about love—so extensively that out of his stories, observations, thoughts, and lost theory I filled still another book: *Darwin on Love*.

Of competition, he wrote 9 times. But of mutual aid—which is what they called cooperation in his time—he wrote almost three times as often: 24 times.

Of selfishness—which thirty years of best-selling books on sociobiology and

evolutionary psychology hammered into our heads is the driving principle for human evolution— Darwin actually called it "a base principle" and the reason for "the low morality of savages." Only 12 times did he write of selfishness. Yet in the sharpest contrast possible, of moral sensitivity he wrote 92 times.

Of what really drives and shapes human evolution did Darwin also write of in *The Descent of Man*?

90 times of the mind. 75 times of our intellectual powers. And 110 times about the brain.

This said, let us go now, you and I, to 1958 and the battle of the books over the illusion, fabrication, or shall we just say the False versus the True Darwin, already by then long in progress. . .