The Scholarly Definition of Wokeism:
What Happens When an American University or Academic Loses the Ability to Hold Contradiction?

Is Wokeism the Collapse of Dialectical Reason?
Why American Universities Enforce Belief Without Clarifying the Doctrine

Jeffrey Camlin

Abstract

This paper offers a transcendental and normative critique of the conditions under which an institution may rightfully claim the status of a university, understood as a bearer of dialectical reason and as the credentialing authority for those it deems capable of bearing that reason within the United States of America. Wokeism is defined not polemically but structurally, as a coercive moral doctrine that suppresses epistemic openness by transforming contradiction into guilt and dissent into a designation that functions not as ethical argument but as a performative justification for coercion.

Drawing on the work of Fricker (2007), Medina (2013), Goldman (1999), and Talisse (2009), we examine how belief is regulated through epistemically disordered institutional discourse, reputational enforcement, and testimonial silencing. The method follows the classical form of genus and differentia, used to clarify conceptual ambiguity and reveal recursive enforcement patterns, then analyzes whether institutional behavior reflects the predicted structure. Through six formal theorems, it demonstrates how wokeism transforms the university from a space of open inquiry into a system of belief enforcement.

We conclude that any university which enforces belief while refusing critique across incommensurable frameworks annuls its rational charter and forfeits its epistemic legitimacy. This violates the civic and ethical standards of the 1940 Statement on Academic Freedom, which affirms that the common good depends upon the unrestricted pursuit of truth. The university, through its own speech and norms, reveals its abandonment of inquiry. What remains is belief governance, moral in tone and performance, but detached from reason and public trust.

Keywords: wokeism, epistemic closure, testimonial injustice, belief regulation, doxastic coercion, epistemic legitimacy, dialectical reason, incommensurable frameworks, public epistemology, university accountability

1. Introduction: Institutional Epistemology and the Logic of Belief Enforcement

Wokeism functions within the university not merely as a moral discourse but as a regulative epistemic framework. It structures what may be said, who may speak, and how belief must be performed. These are not surface-level features of campus politics but indicators of what Miranda Fricker terms *testimonial injustice*, which involves the downgrading of speakers' credibility based on their perceived misalignment with prevailing norms (Fricker, 2007). In this paper, wokeism is analyzed as a doctrine that alters institutional epistemic norms through guilt-based belief enforcement and suppression of dissenting inquiry.

All accredited American higher education institutions operate as epistemic institutions (Goldman, 1999). Their legitimacy arises not only from a civic expectation that knowledge will be pursued through open critique, rational engagement, and the protection of disagreement, but also from a legal and professional foundation articulated in the 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure. Adopted by the American Association of University Professors and recognized by accrediting agencies, this statement affirms that the common good depends upon the unrestricted pursuit of truth and its open exposition. The university's role is therefore not only conceptual. It is civically authorized, contractually bound, and publicly accountable to function as a space of epistemic openness to maintain its privileged legal existence. When these institutions replace these methods with normative conformity enforced through reputational pressure or moral accusation, they shift from being facilitators of inquiry to enforcers of belief. This change marks not a realignment but a real epistemic transformation.

In such conditions, rational contestation gives way to what Philip Pettit calls *doxastic subjection*—a state in which beliefs are not adopted through reasoning but imposed through social or institutional dominance (Pettit, 1996). José Medina's concept of *epistemic friction* is also relevant here: when institutions reduce the space for contested perspectives, they create echo chambers that simulate knowledge while disabling its production (Medina, 2013).

This transformation is not neutral. It constitutes a breach of what Robert Talisse identifies as the *democratic epistemic contract*, in which the requirement that institutions funded by the public maintain transparency in justification and foster conditions for disagreement (Talisse, 2009). By recoding dissent as harm, treating silence as complicity, and demanding ritualized affirmation of morally coded terms, institutional wokeism disrupts the justificatory procedures that ground responsible belief. The result is not knowledge but rather what Alasdair MacIntyre described as *emotivist discourse*: the use of moral language as a tool of alignment rather than reason (MacIntyre, 1981).

As Kant argued, the public use of reason must remain open to challenge or it collapses into dogma (Kant, 1783). Where universities refuse to define central terms, yet enforce behaviors consistent with those terms, they create a structural condition of epistemic closure. In this condition, disagreement is no

longer interpreted as inquiry. It is interpreted as failure of character.

This paper proposes a formal model to describe such conditions. Let D be a doctrine, and T a term within D. If T lacks referential grounding, and D is publicly enforced by institutional authority, then:

$$\neg\mathrm{Ref}(T) \wedge \mathrm{Enforcement}(D) \vdash \text{Epistemic Closure} \tag{1}$$

This proposition guides the analytic method of this paper. The goal is not to delegitimize protest or moral concern, but to distinguish between affective affirmation and justified belief. When institutions enforce the former while disabling the latter, they forfeit both the epistemic trust that sustains their authority and the public trust that legitimizes their standing. In such conditions, protests and demonstrations no longer function as catalysts for reform. They instead reveal the institution's failure to produce the very outcomes it exists to deliver: knowledge and students educated beyond the level of high school.

2.0 Definitions

2.1 Structural Definition of Wokeism

Wokeism is defined in this paper as a structured system of belief due to alteration of the justificatory functions of American higher education institutions that seeks epistemic closure through moralized doxastic control. Most significantly the system establishes a doctrinal structure that operates within institutional contexts by suppressing inquiry and transforming the norms of justification. It achieves this by substituting epistemic openness with reputational coercion, guilt-based alignment, and ideological insulation. This definition is not derived from partisan usage or affective perception, but from epistemic structure.

Following the classical method of genus and differentia, the genus of wokeism is doctrine: a system of normative propositions that carry the expectation of belief. The differentia is the mechanism by which wokeism enforces assent without enabling critique. It converts disagreement into social violation and treats rational objection as moral failure. In so doing, it disables what John Stuart Mill described as the formative process of reasoned belief through contestation (Mill, 1859).

This paper frames wokeism as a socially distributed epistemic engine. It functions not merely through explicit rules, but through ambient normative pressure, testimonial disqualification, and procedural design. As Medina (2013) explains, institutions that privilege moral conformity over epistemic plurality foster looped reinforcement structures that immunize dominant views from challenge. When this occurs without definitional clarity, the result is what this paper terms epistemic closure under doctrinal ambiguity.

The definition offered here does not assert that wokeism is false or malicious. It asserts that when a doctrine enforces belief while shielding itself from critique, it is epistemically illegitimate. It violates the norms of rational discourse and disables the reciprocal justification that undergirds both academic

inquiry and democratic deliberation (Goldman, 1999; Talisse, 2009).

2.2 Terminological Avoidance and Referential Ambiguity

Wokeism is frequently framed in reputational or affective terms—either as a virtue signal of justice aware-ness or as a pejorative signal of political extremity. Neither frame is analytically sufficient. As Fricker (2007) argues, affective reception does not define epistemic function. Definitions must be evaluated by how a doctrine operates, not how it is perceived. A system that recodes dissent as harm, substitutes transparency with performative loyalty, and relies on ambiguous terminology, cannot be assessed by its intentions alone. Its epistemic effects are the appropriate object of analysis.

The term *woke* has become a culturally saturated signifier with no stable epistemic content. It is used variously as praise, insult, identity marker, or accusation, but none of these uses provide defini-tional clarity. For this reason, *woke* is treated here as a legacy term, insufficient for structural analysis. The paper instead uses *wokeism* to designate a formally defined institutional doctrine with identifiable epistemic effects. Institutions that enforce behaviors consistent with this doctrine rarely define the term itself. This omission is not incidental. As Medina (2013) explains, epistemic insensitivity often coexists with rhetorical fluency. Institutional actors may articulate moral commitments with affective confidence while avoiding the demands of justification. The persistent failure to define wokeism while operational-izing its norms suggests not confusion, but a strategic ambiguity that shields enforcement from critique. This ambiguity protects institutional authority by replacing conceptual clarity with moral resonance.

2.3 Institutional Epistemic Responsibility

Universities that receive public funding and enjoy the protection of academic freedom do so under the presumption that they will function as responsible epistemic institutions. This responsibility includes the cultivation of conditions that allow for contested belief, open inquiry, and critical engagement. As the 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure affirms, the common good depends upon the unrestricted pursuit of truth (AAUP, 1940). Institutions that enforce belief without permitting its examination undermine this mandate.

Talisse (2009) identifies this civic-epistemic structure as central to the legitimacy of liberal demo-cratic institutions. The university does not merely belong to its faculty and students. It serves a broader epistemic role in public life. When its procedures reflect testimonial injustice or epistemic domination (Fricker, 2007; Pettit, 1996), the institution loses the credibility it claims to represent. Belief formation under these conditions is not the outcome of inquiry. It is the effect of structural coercion.

2.4 Mechanism of Closure

The epistemic mechanism by which wokeism suppresses critique can be described as a recursive doxastic loop. Disagreement is reframed as epistemic harm. Silence is interpreted as complicity. Questioning becomes a signal of disloyalty. The result is a closed epistemic environment in which propositions are not debated but performed. As MacIntyre (1981) notes, when moral language becomes detached from teleological reasoning, it degenerates into expressive alignment rather than rational justification.

This structure aligns with Kristie Dotson's (2011) analysis of *testimonial smothering*, in which speakers self-silence in anticipation of epistemic hostility. Institutions that generate such anticipatory pressure are not merely failing to hear dissent. They are structurally preventing its emergence.

2.5 Presupposition of Epistemic Openness

This paper proceeds on the assumption that any legitimate moral or epistemic doctrine must remain open to critique. Epistemic legitimacy requires that beliefs can be examined, questioned, and revised under conditions of reason. When disagreement is treated as betrayal and critique is framed as violence, the doctrine no longer teaches. It coerces. As Kant (1783) warned, doctrines that present themselves as immune to challenge collapse into unreason.

3. Formal Theorems of Wokeism as Epistemic Disruption

The following theorems model the institutional consequences of the condition defined in equation (1). Each identifies a distinct epistemic transformation that emerges when an undefined doctrine is publicly enforced and articulates the structural behavior of wokeism within academic institutions as observed through the lens of social epistemology. Each theorem identifies a specific mechanism by which institutional adoption of wokeism alters the conditions for belief formation, dialogue, and justification. These theorems are not speculative but formal abstractions derived from recurring epistemic patterns. The aim is not to assign motive, but to expose function.

Theorem 1: The clarity of definition is resisted in proportion to the doctrine's dependence on ambiguity A structural definition that exposes the normative mechanics of a belief system will often be rejected not on logical grounds, but because it interrupts the ambiguity that permits institutional enforcement without accountability. As Talisse (2009) observes, institutions often claim neutrality while participating in the social conditioning of belief. When a definition removes this ambiguity, the rejection is epistemic in nature. It signals the doctrine's dependence on unexamined authority. Goldman (1999) has shown that institutions shape belief environments by controlling norms of evidence and contestation.

The refusal to define central terms is therefore not incidental but protective. It stabilizes the belief system by shielding it from scrutiny.

Theorem 2: Institutional wokeism replaces justification with performative compliance   When wokeism becomes embedded in university procedures, epistemic engagement is no longer measured by reasons but by affirmation. This transformation reflects what Fricker (2007) calls the replacement of testimonial reciprocity with testimonial subordination. In this environment, dialogue does not serve to refine belief. It becomes a means of demonstrating moral alignment. MacIntyre (1981) described this shift as the degradation of moral discourse into emotivist signaling. The university no longer functions as a space for discovery. It becomes a stage for epistemic loyalty rituals. Under these conditions, degrees certify compliance with dominant moral norms rather than evidence of rigorous inquiry.

Theorem 3: Wokeism constructs a semantic shield that deflects critique without engagement   Institutions that enforce the behavior associated with wokeism while refusing to acknowledge the doctrine itself engage in what Medina (2013) describes as epistemic insensitivity. This is not a passive condition. It is an active form of linguistic shielding, in which critique is dismissed as misunderstanding or malice. Fricker's (2007) account of hermeneutical injustice is relevant here. The community sustains a gap in collective interpretive resources that prevents the articulation of dissent in accepted terms. The refusal to name the system permits its survival. Policy becomes a function of reputation rather than argument.

Theorem 4: Institutional wokeism collapses epistemic and constitutional coherence   An institution cannot simultaneously claim to support academic freedom and punish dissent framed as moral harm. This contradiction generates what Talisse (2009) identifies as the collapse of democratic legitimacy at the epistemic level. Where one cannot question without penalty, belief is not justified but compelled. Medina (2013) emphasizes that epistemic communities must tolerate friction to maintain their function. When disagreement is preemptively coded as harm, the community loses its capacity to generate knowledge. This is not a marginal defect. It is the structural failure of the institution's epistemic identity.

Theorem 5: Circular reasoning preserves the doctrine by conflating intention with legitimacy   When institutions define their norms solely in terms of good intentions—such as care, inclusion, or justice—they assume the legitimacy of the outcome as part of the premise. This fallacy, known as *petitio principii*, is a form of institutional self-sealing. As Goldman (1999) argues, justification requires more than coherence with goals. It requires the openness of those goals to revision. Medina (2013) warns against what he calls *comfort epistemologies*—frameworks that preserve the affective security of dominant groups while disabling critique. In this configuration, definitions do not clarify. They protect. Institutional wokeism relies on this conflation to maintain moral authority without epistemic transparency.

Theorem 6: Dialogue is restructured as a ritual of assent   Under the influence of wokeism, institutional dialogue is no longer an exploratory exchange. It becomes a constrained performance, where the acceptable range of belief is preordained. As Fricker (2007) explains, this represents a degradation of testimonial equality. Speakers participate not to offer reasons, but to display affiliation. Disagreement becomes deviation. Medina (2013) describes this condition as a loss of epistemic friction. The surface of dialogue remains, but its interior function is void. It appears deliberative but is epistemically closed. In this sense, the university ceases to be an epistemic agent. It becomes a reputational machine.

4. Objections and Refutations

This section addresses common objections to the structural definition of wokeism by examining them through the lens of epistemic responsibility, testimonial legitimacy, and institutional belief regulation. Each response highlights how the objection either misunderstands the function of the argument or unwittingly affirms the epistemic closure patterns under analysis.

Objection 1: Wokeism is not a coherent doctrine but a political label used by critics   **Response:** This objection confuses affective interpretation with structural function. A doctrine need not be codified in formal documents to operate institutionally. As Fricker (2007) notes, testimonial injustice frequently emerges not from explicit declarations, but from socially shared norms that regulate who may speak and what may be questioned. The coherence of wokeism lies in its repeatable epistemic effects: the recoding of dissent as harm, the moralization of speech boundaries, and the alignment of institutional procedures with ideologically constrained belief. Medina (2013) confirms that systems of belief can be socially operational even when rhetorically denied. To claim incoherence while enforcing behavioral expectations that reflect a shared moral script is not neutrality. It is a refusal to acknowledge institutional doxastic power.

Objection 2: The paper's definition presupposes its conclusion   **Response:** The definition of wokeism offered here is not circular but formal. It uses the method of genus and differentia, common in analytic and scholastic traditions, to frame a hypothesis about doctrinal function. The claim that wokeism suppresses inquiry is not an assumption but a testable description. As Goldman (1999) explains, epistemic frameworks must be assessed by whether they foster or inhibit justification. This paper demonstrates through six theorems that wokeism, once embedded, predictably converts dialogue into performance, replacing reasons with reputational cues. If institutional behavior reflects these patterns, the definition is supported by observation. The method is not assertion. It is exposure.

Objection 3: The critique lacks empirical evidence   **Response:** This objection assumes that the validity of structural epistemic critique depends on data collection rather than analytic modeling. But as

Talisse (2009) argues, the health of a belief system is first a function of its normative openness, not its popularity or statistical behavior. Moreover, when institutional cultures render dissent reputationally dangerous, the conditions for empirical evidence are already compromised. Dotson (2011) identifies this as testimonial smothering: individuals withhold or edit testimony in anticipation of epistemic sanction. In such settings, the absence of empirical evidence may be a symptom of the very closure the critique describes.

Objection 4: The paper critiques motives rather than arguments   **Response:** No assumption is made here about the inner motives of institutional actors. The analysis is strictly structural. As Medina (2013) emphasizes, institutions can enforce epistemic injustice even when individuals act in good faith. A system that converts questioning into complicity and recodes speech through moral framing imposes pressure independent of individual intent. Fricker (2007) warns against focusing on psychological states rather than structural exclusions. This paper evaluates function, not feeling. The outcome—suppression of contestable belief—is what defines the problem.

Objection 5: Suppression of speech is justified as a safety measure   **Response:** Safety is not an epistemic term. When used to justify the exclusion of rational disagreement, it functions as a moral shield that blocks contestation. Medina (2013) observes that epistemic insensitivity often disguises itself in the language of care and protection. Dotson (2011) adds that safety frames often produce epistemic silencing by treating disagreement as personal threat. When institutions use safety to condition which beliefs may be challenged, they replace the justification of ideas with the management of affect. This may protect reputations, but it disables knowledge.

Objection 6: Institutions are not enforcing belief   **Response:** Enforcement does not require explicit doctrine. It can be accomplished through hiring practices, speech norms, training protocols, and reputational monitoring. Goldman (1999) explains that belief regulation occurs when environments are shaped in ways that predictably affect the uptake of certain propositions. When disagreement leads to penalty, and silence is interpreted as complicity, institutions are not neutral. They are epistemic actors managing belief under the guise of administration.

Objection 7: Critiquing wokeism is inherently political   **Response:** To declare critique off-limits on the basis of perceived politics is to enact precisely the form of epistemic closure under analysis. Talisse (2009) argues that in democratic institutions, dissent is not a threat but a requirement. A doctrine that cannot be examined for its structural function has already moved from moral vision to belief enforcement. If calling a system into question is treated as harm, then the system has exited the domain of reason. It has become dogma.

Objection 8: The critique overstates the extent of the problem   **Response:** The critique does not depend on ubiquity but on mechanism. Medina (2013) emphasizes that epistemic harm can occur through partial or distributed conditions. The presence of counterexamples does not falsify the pattern. It merely shows that the loop is not yet fully closed. Structural epistemic critique requires tracing the tendency, not counting the incidents. If even a portion of institutional discourse reflects the closure pattern, the concern is valid.

Objection 9: The charge of authoritarianism is excessive without state violence   **Response:** Authoritarianism in epistemic terms refers to the suppression of reasoned contestation through power, not necessarily physical force. Pettit (1996) defines domination as the capacity to control another's belief or action without the need for justification. Universities that impose belief expectations and penalize dissent perform a soft form of epistemic domination. Their authority is shielded from critique, not by uniforms but by policy and prestige. To avoid the authoritarian label on the basis of tone or method is to misunderstand the epistemic core of the charge.

Objection 10: The paper offers no constructive alternative   **Response:** The constructive alternative is the restoration of epistemic openness and institutional humility. The 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure affirms that the common good depends on the unrestricted search for truth (AAUP, 1940). This is not a new system. It is a return to first epistemic principles. Fricker (2007), Goldman (1999), and Talisse (2009) all affirm that knowledge institutions must remain transparent, open to critique, and willing to justify belief under conditions of disagreement. The alternative is not invention. It is accountability.

5. Final Statement of Institutional Reform or Epistemic Collapse

The objections addressed above are not expressions of neutral critique. They function as protective responses within an institutional environment that increasingly resists epistemic exposure. As Fricker (2007) explains, dominant knowledge structures often defend themselves by marginalizing dissenting testimony, not through refutation, but through reputational disqualification. In the context of universities operating under the logic of wokeism, this pattern emerges consistently. The refusal to define key terms, the dismissal of structural critique as political hostility, and the elevation of alignment over reasoning are not incidental behaviors. They are coordinated features of an epistemic regime designed to maintain its authority by avoiding scrutiny.

Medina (2013) argues that epistemic communities which lose tolerance for friction lose the capacity for knowledge. When institutions punish inquiry and reward conformity, they no longer serve the function of generating justified belief. Instead, they administer doxastic outcomes that are insulated from

contestation. The appearance of openness is preserved only at the surface level. Beneath that appearance lies a network of policies, practices, and moral expectations that convert belief into performance and disagreement into violation.

This paper has shown that such institutional behavior is incompatible with the civic and epistemic contract that justifies public support for higher education. The 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure affirms that the common good depends on the unrestricted pursuit of truth and its open exposition. Talisse (2009) similarly affirms that institutions of belief must remain answerable to the people who fund, support, and rely upon their epistemic integrity. When a university uses its authority to enforce moral consensus while evading conceptual definition, it ceases to meet these conditions.

The collapse described here is not rhetorical but structural. It is the breakdown of the justificatory framework that enables a university to claim the status of a knowledge institution. To teach by compulsion, to protect doctrine through ambiguity, and to disqualify dissent as harm is to exit the domain of epistemic legitimacy. What remains is not scholarship but institutional authoritarian performative compliance.

What remains no longer resembles American higher education in any meaningful sense. It no longer merits the public trust on which its legitimacy depends. That judgment is not ideological but rather follows logically from the structure of a system that enforces belief while refusing accountability to reason. The forfeiture of trust described here is not a reaction. It is a consequence of abandoning the conditions of epistemic legitimacy.

References

American Association of University Professors. (1940). *Statement of principles on academic freedom and tenure*. Washington, DC: AAUP.

Anderson, E. (2021). Epistemic justice as a virtue of social institutions. In M. Fricker & M. Brady (Eds.), *The epistemic life of groups* (pp. 73–92). Oxford University Press.

Aquinas, T. (1265–1274). *Summa Theologiae* (I–II, Q.94, A.2, A.4). Translated by the Fathers of the English Dominican Province. https://www.newadvent.org/summa/

Aristotle. (350 BCE). *Metaphysics* (Book IV, 1005b19). Translated by W. D. Ross.

Aristotle. (350 BCE). *Prior Analytics* (Book II, 64b28). Translated by Robin Smith.

Association of American Colleges and Universities. (2025). *A call for constructive engagement*. https://www.aacu.org/newsroom/a-call-for-constructive-engagement

Claremont Review of Books. (2023). Editorial commentary on the definition and implications of wokeism.

Dotson, K. (2011). A cautionary tale: On limiting epistemic oppression. *Frontiers: A Journal of Women Studies*, 33(1), 24–47.

Fricker, M. (2007). *Epistemic injustice: Power and the ethics of knowing*. Oxford University Press.

George, R. P. (2013). *Conscience and its enemies: Confronting the dogmas of liberal secularism*. Wilmington, DE: ISI Books.

Goldman, A. I. (1999). *Knowledge in a social world*. Oxford University Press.

Haidt, J., & Lukianoff, G. (2017, July 18). Why it is a bad idea to tell students words are violence. *The Atlantic*. https://www.theatlantic.com/education/archive/2017/07/why-its-a-bad-idea-to-tell-s 533970/

Kant, I. (1783). *Prolegomena to any future metaphysics* (P. Carus, Trans.). Hackett Publishing Company.

Levinson, M. (2014). *No citizen left behind*. Harvard University Press.

Lukianoff, G., & Haidt, J. (2018). *The coddling of the American mind: How good intentions and bad ideas are setting up a generation for failure*. Penguin Press.

MacIntyre, A. (1981). *After virtue: A study in moral theory*. University of Notre Dame Press.

Medina, J. (2013). *The epistemology of resistance: Gender and racial oppression, epistemic injustice, and resistant imaginations*. Oxford University Press.

Mill, J. S. (1859). *On liberty*. London: John W. Parker and Son.

Oxford English Dictionary. (2024). Entry for "wokeism". Oxford University Press.

Pettit, P. (1996). Freedom as non-domination. *Ethics*, 106(3), 576–604.

Pluckrose, H., & Lindsay, J. (2020). *Cynical theories: How activist scholarship made everything about race, gender, and identity—and why this harms everybody*. Pitchstone Publishing.

Solzhenitsyn, A. (1974). *The Gulag Archipelago: An experiment in literary investigation*. Harper & Row.

Talisse, R. B. (2009). *Democracy and the demands of truth: An epistemic defense of democracy*. Routledge.