

THE SUBJECT IS "WORTH":

alexis dolgorukii © 2000

In my recent essay on Democracy, and more extensively in my book: "Here We All Are" (volumes 1 & 2), I made the statement that while all people were entitled to be equal before and under the law, and that all people should be equally entitled to "freedom of possibilities", by which I mean opportunities for self-betterment. This freedom of possibilities, which is the most important of all freedoms, must never be limited by human action. It is however, self-limited by the abilities and talents of the individual and also by the degree to which that individual is motivated.

I also said that it was a tremendous mistake to regard all people of equal "worth". This of course, was like "waving a red cape in front of a bull" to those people who have been indoctrinated in the ideals of egalitarianism. I will be accused, by the unthinking but emotional, of elitism at the very least. And in at least one sense of the term "elitist", they'd be right. Evolution, after all is entirely "elitist".

Let me explain what I mean when I say that "all people are not of equal worth". I do not mean either individual or personal "worth", and I certainly do not mean financial "worth". I mean only "worth to society"; by which I mean to ask the question: does the individual make the world a better place in which to live. Now, "making the world a better place in which to live" covers an extremely wide spectrum of actions. There are people who make an immense contribution and people who make small but significant contributions, we can't all be Benjamin Franklin. That is what I mean to say when I state that: "all people are not of equal worth".

By way of example, let's look at Bill Gates. He's certainly of great financial 'worth', he's the richest man on the planet. He's certainly intelligent, and his efforts have made the world a much different place than it was, whether or not it is a better place remains to be seen.

It appears that by way of The Gates Foundation, he's at least trying. The future will judge the results.

However, it must not be forgotten that I also said, as did Socrates, Aristotle, and Voltaire before me, that egalitarianism spells the doom of Democracy. It is true that all people are, or should be, equal in the ways I mentioned above, but they are not of equal value to the society in which they dwell. To pretend that they are, is patronizing, condescending, and terribly cruel. Why is it cruel? It is cruel because it builds up totally false and unrealizable expectations whose only result is disappointment, disillusion and pain.

I think that anyone who is familiar with my writings knows that this is a recurring refrain where I'm concerned. It is my extremely strong belief that the absolutely

worst thing you can do to a person or group is inculcate false expectations, expectations that cannot be realized or met. It seems to me that the worst kind of false expectations are those which concern the individuals themselves. Leading people to believe that they are capable of things and activities that they cannot ever be capable of, is very very cruel. The reverse is almost but not quite as cruel.

Teachers and advisors in our schools today tend to limit their students by perceived racial stereotypes, this is both stupid and evil. But it's far easier to overcome than the opposite. To make a simplistic comparison, you can tell a person they can't swim but if they fall in the water they are very likely to find that they can. On the other hand telling that same person they can fly, is likely to have tragic results should they fall from a high place. To be blunt, telling a kid with a 65 I.Q. that he or she has capacities and potentials no different than someone with an I.Q. of 165 is simply vicious, no matter how well intentioned it may be.

Some people, tragically, except for their personal value to their families and loved ones, are of no worth or value at all to the society in which they live. There are people who are literally irrelevant to human society. They are born, they live a while, and they die, and no one notices except their immediate families and friends. Their children, unfortunately, tend to continue that process, usually at a lower arm of the downwards spiral. In our society today, these are the people, and their race is irrelevant, because they are of all races, who are unemployable for various reasons.

One of the most important of these reasons is not simply that they are free of all comprehension of technology, because those people who are innocent of all knowledge of technology can easily be given that knowledge; but the people I am talking about are incapable of apprehending technology. They are, and while this is ugly, it's true, stupid. It's hardly politically correct to say that, but it is completely true, and there are a great many more stupid people than there are geniuses. And as the world is moving today, stupid people have no future in the employment market because they have been, or soon will be, replaced by "machines". Others are members of this group, because of alcohol and other substance addictions and incurable mental-emotional malfunctions.

Lastly there are those with physical malfunctions and those who are incapable as a result of accident or illness. They will need to be supported. *That is not a thing that is optional it is the duty of the rest of society to support those who are unable to support themselves.* It is equally true however, that it is not incumbent upon society to support those who, for reasons acceptable to themselves, are unwilling to support themselves.

In fact, all of the people I just mentioned will need to be supported. Those who can, must do, and one of the things they must do, is extend a helping hand and open a compassionate heart to those who simply can't!

One of the most totally malicious and harmful notions, along with being entirely irrational, is the idea that everyone has "gifts" and "talents" and that all of these are fully equal to one another. The idea is, I believe, based on the utterly fallacious idea that as long as one is doing one's best, one's "best" is equal to anyone else's "best" no matter how different the activities are. This is sheer nonsense, some people have no "gifts" or "talents" whatsoever.

This is not something "new" brought on by the "computer revolution" and the "Internet explosion". It is a facet of human existence which has always been with humanity. There were those who, in a metaphorical way, "stayed in the trees" and didn't make the transition from animal-man to human (emotional man) The problem there is that the race is now beginning a transition to intellectual-scientific man, and in very rare instances, to something misleadingly called "Spiritual" man, by which is meant "abstract intellectual".

I'll close this essay by defining those terms. When I use the term "animal-man" I am referring to the beginning of the evolution of the race. Mankind started out as Ramepithicus the hunter-gatherer, and slowly over time evolved into mankind the city dwellers which was when the transition became widespread that I call from "animal-man" to "intellectual man". Now there's another transition occurring into "Abstract Intellectual man", a perfect exemplar of which is Dr. Stephen Hawking. Now that does not mean to say that there was no intellectual activity at all among the earliest exemplars of mankind, because that would be totally untrue. The most important characteristic of mankind, along with their busy little hands are their busy little brains. It is simply the foci of their thoughts that changes.

I think it safe to say that the immense period between earliest Ramepithicus and the development of Homo Sapiens-sapiens was one of the most inventive periods in human development. Just think of all the things those busy little brains and their attendant busy little hands learned and "found out" But the focus of all that inventive activity was survival.

Do you see what I mean? Today, the focus is on finding out what it all means, survival is pretty much assured; now mankind is going further a field.