

Intro Note: I did an interview with Laurie Huston and Evita Ochel and Donna Aveni several months ago and talked about a process for shifting need-based relationships to love-based relationships. This topic (a future chapter in a future book) was triggered by a note on my web site that states that I am working on a future book called “Primal Male, Primal Female”it promises to look at gender from a perspective with no cultural belief overlays. It is intended to become a fundamental view of the basic facts of gender and how these facts then play out in our culture (thus the chapter on relationships). I thought there was a big need for some “ground truth” on the subject of gender. A few months ago, Blue Sky Symposium tossed me this interview question: “When stripped back of our fears and belief systems, what remains of men & women? Differences and commonalities?” So I decided, since the cat was already wiggling out of the bag, to talk more about the “future book” Attached is a fragment of the backbone of the skeleton of this new book. My audience was interested in feminist viewpoints, so it leans a bit toward addressing those particular issues. . – Tom Campbell 4/20/2013

First glance: New book, Primal Man Primal Woman

Criteria for physical evolution: Survival and procreation: Since one must survive to procreate, these two become entangled, and their combined criteria become:

Forwarding ones genes in the gene-pool

That is generally agreed to by scientists to be the evolutionary imperative for all lifeforms in PMR.

Males and female humans each have evolved their own strategies (instincts evolved genetically over millions of years) to accomplish that evolutionary imperative. This “genetic programming” is embedded in our physical bodies, in our biology and biochemistry, in our brains and central nervous system, in every cell of our body.

Understanding the context:

Our Evolution has taken place over millions of years and all but the last eye-blink in time were very harsh. Shelter and food were hard to come by, survival was problematic, life span was about 35 years, puberty occurred at about 17 to 18 Kids were more or less independent and carrying their own weight very early. Life was simple and straightforward. There was little social stratification -- everybody was more or less in the same boat. Close intra-tribal relationships and cooperation were essential to both survival and successful procreation. Women probably outnumbered men (as they do today). This then, is the situation for which we are genetically programmed – i.e., the conditions under which our instincts evolved. This logical derivation is limited to the average or typical man and woman – i.e., only those who fall under “the fat part of the probability curve”. **Those with feelings, attitudes, and bio-chemistry falling under the tails of the probability curve will not be discussed in this post.**

All rights reserved -- future book “primal Male – Primal Female” by Thomas Campbell (Feb 2013)

Asymmetry in physical body size and sexual function leads to asymmetry in strategy for Forwarding ones genes in the gene-pool:

The two sexually related asymmetries are: 1) Women are physically smaller and weaker than men. 2) Men impregnate the women and the women have the babies. Pregnant Women and women nursing and caring for children are less able to take care of themselves and their children than they would be if they were not pregnant and/or had no children. Conclusion: In such a harsh physical environment, the women and children will need some help from the men and the men and children will need some help from the women to individually optimize their (men's', women's, and children's) probability of forwarding their genes in the human gene-pool.

Forwarding ones genes in the gene-pool -- **Male evolutionary strategy:** in the form of evolving genetic programs. A genetic program is also called an instinct.

Hardwired – Men 2 strategies:

- 1) A numbers game: **Have sex with as many physically attractive women as are available to him.** (define “attractive” [Lower standard] – one criteria: basically good genetic and physical health. (apparent good physical health and body symmetry)
- 2) Secure highest quality available women to invest in: Pair bond with as many physically attractive [higher standard] females as possible to ensure their survival and the survival and success of their offspring. (From the male point of view, “pair bond” implies that he, because of his investment, expects her to limit her sexual activity to him and in return he will help take care of her and he children). He is looking for a woman who commits herself to him (thus strengthening the genetic value of pair bonding)

Logical consequences:

Males problem: He wants to find women who will have sex with him and also find an attractive woman with good reproductive potential) who will accept him as her mate. He is hardwired to initially see women as sex objects but also, at the same time (more as he matures), is looking for quality worth committing to and investing in. Also, after the children are self sufficient and no more are on the way, the original point of the sexual programming ends while the programming continues forever (mid life crisis).

One might think that a male would theoretically do better genetically if he could support and protect several female mates (polygamy) who remained faithful to him (father more children to carry his genetic material forward) However.... the resources to provide for and the ability to protect were very difficult to deliver at that time and, even if that problem were solved, it is very likely that such a man would end up investing some of his resources to boost the genetic success of his competitors (taking care of children who are not his). All in all, the practical difficulties and risks make the potential benefits unlikely – thus, the best statistical choice, within the fat part of the curve, was to pair bond with one woman.

Because there is no widespread significant practical genetic advantage to polygamous arrangements (at least under the fat part of the curve where most of us average humans live), there is no **genetic** imperative for, or against, this alternative (one man with several wives).

Summary: Men, are attracted to (are pushed by their genetic programming to) have sex with any attractive female who might make herself available to him; also, men feel responsible to protect and take care of their wives and children. They expect their pair bonded mate to limit her sexual activity to him to protect his investment. They are somewhat competitive with each other to attract who they consider the best choice for mate but since they choose firstly on the criteria of satisfactory physical attractiveness – they usually have many potential choices if the tribe is large enough. Men have a need for their women to demonstrate to them that they are valued as a sexual partner and a good provider/protector. (to validate their success at accomplishing their genetically driven mission)

Note, that though it is easier and less complicated to have a single woman satisfy both strategies, there is no **evolutionary** hard-wired requirement to do so. Thus, having a wife does not conflict **fundamentally or primarily** with a man having a lover.]

Forwarding ones genes in the gene-pool -- **Female evolutionary strategy:** in the form of evolving genetic programs

Hardwired -- Female 3 strategies

- 1) Bear most survivable children -- Secure highest available quality sperm: Be sexually attractive as possible (to men in general) and **induce** the one that is most **attractive to have sex with her thus optimizing survival/success of offspring**. (Define “attractive”: has best quality sperm = most attractive -- [two criteria: 1) good mental, physical, and genetic health [similar to that of the men]. 2) would produce offspring with qualities that are optimal for survival/success.)
- 2) Form pair bond with and remain attractive to highly survivable/successful and reliable men so that they will take care of and protect both her and her children for the long term. (From the female point of view, “pair bond” implies that he commits to taking care of her and her children, i.e., that he thinks she is “special” (he is committed to her) and will put her above and ahead of other women and other women’s children)
- 3) Her numbers game: Have as many healthy and well cared for children as practical conditions allow

Logical consequences:

[Females problem: she must find an attractive man (one with good reproductive potential -- and a man with good provider and protector potential. She is hardwired to be attractive (at least superficially look like a sex object) and to use that “female power” to secure both superior quality sperm and protection and support for herself and her children. Also, after the children

are gone and no more are on the way, the original point of the sexual programming ends while the programming continues forever (mid life crisis and empty nest syndrome). She is looking for a man who commits himself to her (thus strengthening the genetic value of pair bonding).

One might think that Females and their children would do better if they could have several males **cooperatively** taking care of and protecting them (polygamy). However...males find it genetically counterproductive to invest in other males offspring... and... She must meet all of her men's needs as well as keep the peace – maintain their cooperation with her and with each other -- (typical males tend to fight or compete for dominance which could lead to a steeper down side than upside --- more actual risk than potential benefit). Because there is no widespread significant practical genetic advantage to polygamous arrangements (at least under the fat part of the curve where most of us average humans live), there is no **genetic** imperative for, or against, this alternative (one woman with several husbands).

Note, that though it is easier and less complicated (more convenient) to have a single man satisfy strategies 1 and 2, there is no **evolutionary** hard-wired requirement to do so. Thus, having a husband does not conflict **fundamentally or primally** with a woman having a lover.

Interestingly: Their evolutionary strategy drives both sexes to directly want/require a commitment **from** their mates – but not the same commitment. He requires sexual fidelity to cover his investment in her and her children and she wants long term commitment to her and her children. This desire/expectation for commitment from the other, which leads to and supports pair-bonding, is part of their genetic programming, however, there is no **direct evolutionary** advantage for either sex to have or keep this commitment **to** their mates -- **other than** as a strategy for pleasing and thus keeping their mates. Furthermore, this motivation (keeping their mates), though very large and important, turns out to be more driven by specific circumstance rather than direct genetic programming.

Remember that women were of child bearing age throughout most, if not all, of their adult lives because life expectancy was generally short. If a woman without children left her mate (or was left by her mate) she would have a good chance of securing another mate if she were attractive enough or if there were enough available men (a lower probability since there were usually more women than men). If a man left his mate (or was left by his mate), he would have a good chance of securing another mate if he were attractive enough or if there were enough available women (a higher probability) and continue on with his evolution strategy for moving his genetic material forward in the gene pool.

However, if a woman who was pregnant and/or had children, left (or was left by) her mate, she and her children could be in big trouble. Because life was so hard, finding another man who could and would take care of her children might be difficult. For this life threatening reason, long term commitment from her man was (and still is) a very vital and important issue. Thus, if a woman (with a typically low quality of consciousness) is aware that her mate is having an affair with another woman she is hit with a double dose of fear. His sexual infidelity is not the main

issue but it indirectly indicates two serious failures: 1) a failure in his commitment to her that could have been life threatening to both her and her children and 2) a failure in her feminine attractiveness's ability to keep him bound to her (her failure at being a successful woman).

Likewise, if a man (with a typically low quality of consciousness) is aware that his mate is having an affair with another man he is also hit with a double dose of fear. 1) Her sexual infidelity directly breaks her commitment to him to protect his investment in her; and 2) a failure in his masculine attractiveness's ability to keep her bound to him (his failure at being a successful man). In both cases, if a man or woman had outgrown his/her fear, ego, beliefs, and expectations (had a high quality of consciousness), then spousal affairs would be of little to no concern to such a man or woman since they would necessarily be either exceedingly unlikely or constitute a clear advantage.

Why a clear advantage? It is a fact of existence that very high quality of consciousness entities almost always eventually land on their feet smiling -- and with an advantageous situation. Furthermore, the transition from sad problem to smiling within an advantageous situation typically doesn't take that long. The key is having no fear -- and being all love. Such individuals don't often seek change, nor do they avoid it -- they simply deal effectively with whatever happens.

Thus, given individuals living under the fat part of the curve (typically with a low quality of consciousness), if secrets could be kept, there is no **direct** genetic evolutionary penalty for (no direct primal programming against) either sex having one or more lovers. There may be an **indirect** penalty (based entirely on individual circumstances) if fear is allowed to destroy or permanently injure what otherwise could be a successful relationship.

Although there are direct genetic advantages to both males and females who have well chosen extramarital affairs and/or who are polygamists, the circumstantial indirect penalties incurred by those living under the fat part of the curve more than cancels them out, leaving monogamy as the arrangement of choice for the masses. In the margins (under the tails of the probability curve), it can be a different story depending on how those circumstances play out for each individual. Here "circumstances" include, among other things, the cultural beliefs, quality of consciousness, available resources, attitudes, and goals of all participants within a relationship.

Summary: Women are driven (pushed by their hardwired genetic programming) to be as sexually attractive as possible (want men in general to **want** to have sex with them) while reserving the right to be able to choose who and when. Women are very competitive in their sexual attractiveness to get and keep a man. However, physical attractiveness is only half (the lesser half) of the "attractiveness criteria" they apply to men. More importantly, they also rate men on their internal and external "personal power" (a dominate man who will father more survivable offspring and be a better provider -- Initiative, taking charge, strength, brightness, intelligence, confidence, social status, pecking order among peers, ability to provide and protect, physically fit, athletic, independent, aggressive, gumption, resourcefulness, competency, a plan for the future, ambition, knowledge, potential to accrue necessary resources, as well as depth of character, empathy, and sensitivity). A woman has a need for her man to demonstrate to her

that he is committed to her, to taking care of her and her children, and to seeing her as special and valued above all others and most certainly above other women. He must clearly demonstrate that he values her above himself because putting her first is the only clear and accurate sign of genuine love. Gaining this commitment from him validates her success at accomplishing her genetically driven mission.

Today, a minority of women (particularly if immature: young or unable to develop herself due to family, social, or cultural disadvantages) often have trouble translating their hardwired sense of male attractiveness from cave dweller days to apartment dweller days. Attributes such as dominant, aggressive, independent, secure, physically big/strong, wealth, social status, political power (office, home, or community), potential or actual financial power, or simple popularity (singers or movie stars) – may singly or in combination ring genetically programmed bells that turn out to be dysfunctional in today's culture. They find themselves being physically and emotionally attracted to men who are of exceptionally poor quality as long term mates and have a low quality of consciousness.

It is sometimes difficult for young women **not** to confuse their genetically programmed sense of what constituted attractive male personal power in the stone-age with contemporary male arrogance, confidence, condescension, dominance, bluster, and casual indifference. Many young women filter out the “nice guys” with real personal power in today's world and are instead attracted only to jerks, jocks, and hot shots -- self centered, self-promoting manipulators who know how to manipulate female hardwired genetic sexual programming – generally losers and duds with high opinions of themselves and little real personal power beyond self-promoting bluff and bluster.

“Nice girls” and “nice guys” who have a higher quality of consciousness, are not into manipulating others in this way because they want **valuable** relationships, not simply the ability to use another person to satisfy their most basic needs. Consequently, nice guys with real personal power in our contemporary culture are often seen by females (who are lost in their genetic programming) as potential friends but not potential lovers or mates. Likewise, nice girls, often find out that the not-so-nice girls have a large competitive advantage in attracting the most desirable males because young males (lost in their genetic programming) seem unable to tell the difference between nice and not so nice females. The point is that sometimes these ancient programs can be counterproductive.

That males and females (especially when young) both have difficulty distinguishing between low and high quality members of the opposite sex; and that both are easily manipulated by a member of the opposite sex who knows how to push their primal programming buttons is one example of how programs developed in the stone age may no longer be as useful as they once were, and can, in some circumstances, be quite dysfunctional.

In many ways, not all that much has changed at the fundamental survive-and-procreate level of male-female relationship. Nevertheless, a few fundamental things clearly have changed like the

nearly universal availability of effective birth control, or are in the process of changing like our moving away from a culture based upon war and scarcity toward one based on cooperation and abundance. Also, the human lifespan has more than doubled since our instincts were formed. Will these still nascent fundamental cultural changes take root and then last long enough to generate new genetic programs? How long does it take to generate significant changes in our fundamental instincts? A decade, a century, a millennium, a hundred millennia?

In the Darwinian model, a hundred millennia (as during the stone age) is the most likely answer, however, in the MBT model where individual consciousness leads and the virtual body follows, it is **possible** that the duration of a single decade within the emerging information age would be sufficient to get the ball rolling and three or four generations enough to solidify the change in hardwired programming.

Note: How can we change our instincts so quickly? Primarily because consciousness is fundamental while physical reality is a virtual creation of the larger consciousness system. We are not trapped by physical process. We are consciousness playing in a 3D virtual reality entropy reduction trainer. The VR, a probabilistic simulation, can, within rule-set constraints, evolve to meet the needs of the players. The virtual “physical” environment simulation (including our bodies and brains) provides only constraints for our expression within the virtual PMR consciousness evolution game. If we the people widely exhibited sufficient growth in our quality of consciousness to support (require) a change in our virtual brains and DNA so that we could properly and fully express our new level of growth in PMR, then our brains and DNA would quickly change to meet that need.

It is my best guess that such a “sufficient growth in our quality of consciousness” **could possibly** be accomplished in a future decade within the information age if realization and awareness spread virally to a “ready” population. (The words: “could possibly” as used above, simply means that it is not impossible). Furthermore, it seems reasonable that 3 or 4 generations would be plenty of time to allow such a required “physical” change in our DNA to be fully physically expressed in our virtual brains without running afoul of the psi uncertainty principle. Since there is still much uncertainty about how our brains/instincts function on a physical level, small adjustments should be easy to implement within the simulation.

We are no longer in the Stone Age and much is possible within our virtual reality if our collective consciousness quality undergoes a major shift. However, I said only that it has now, in the emerging information age, become “**possible**” to make dramatic changes (progress or regress). Whether that change is **likely** or not, or positive (evolution) or negative (de-evolution) for our species, is entirely dependent on the quality of the choices we humans make – that is, on the amount of fear, ego, and belief that drive our daily decision making processes.

Any potential programming shift in our genetics is likely to occur first within a local culture or sub-culture as a change in attitude and understanding (acquiring a bigger picture) that delivers a clear advantage in forwarding the most and best genetic material of the members of that local culture into future generations of humanity. If this new knowledge was one of education, lifestyle, and social attitudes (for example, a low entropy culture that had optimized gender

relationships, child rearing practices, and public nutrition within a social structure based on cooperative abundance), other cultures (if they were able to integrate the new knowledge) would quickly and widely copy this advantageous behavior. If it were technological (for example, genetic engineering of some sort), all manner of fighting is likely to erupt between those wanting to design and dominate the human gene pool as well as with those who's freedom and relevance to the gene pool is being unfavourably altered by such designs.

What is clear is that we do have free will and are capable of overriding or suppressing our genetic programs whenever that is clearly in our **personal** best interest. On the other hand, unless some specific fundamental change is "perceived" by the relatively slow process of evolution to be in the best interest of the species, no species wide programming change will occur.

We as a species are culturally converging and integrating due to globe-shrinking communications and transportation technologies. In the mainstream, people and cultures merge and mix as never before, and this trend is likely to accelerate. As the world effectively shrinks, humanity will eventually become one tribe. Fundamental diversity will still flourish vigorously in the margins as the human tribe redefines the bounds of what is "normal" and "expected" within the *uber*-culture. Why? Because human evolution in the information age (cultural as well as physical) is becoming a global rather than a local process. The evolutionary process, working at a global level, will eventually modify or discard any mainstream attitudes and beliefs that do not contribute to a broad optimization of the viability of our species.

This transition will not be all sweetness and light. Expect violent resistance to change. Efforts of a particular culture to suppress our natural human instincts in a specific way that is not directly and clearly beneficial to the survival and procreation of the vast majority of individuals in the human race **will eventually fail** and the people within such a culture will suffer the disadvantage of having to swim against the strong current of their genetic programming as they are marginalized and discounted by the larger tribal society of humankind. If your local culture is asking you to continually swim upstream in the name of arbitrary or antiquated cultural attitudes and beliefs that are directly incompatible with your evolving human genetic programming, you should be aware of the eventual global disadvantages and likely outcome: You individually and your local culture become an inefficient, ineffective, backward member of the human tribe and are eventually destined to either change or become irrelevant and marginalized for some period of time before eventually becoming extinct.

The instincts discussed above are not to be taken lightly. Nor can they be easily overpowered or suppressed by a desire to be otherwise – and that is true for individuals as well as cultures. Ignoring or denying the genetic programs that are running in your and everyone else's head is asking for big trouble. However, after we take our instincts into account and listen attentively to their advice and urgings, we have not only the right, but the responsibility to do what we think is right. It is our responsibility to make the best, most informed, highest quality choices we can. Sometimes, saying "no" to our genetic programming may be the right choice. But, let's make those choices fully informed, in full awareness of **all** the inputs, instead of being jerked around by a semi-conscious gang war between our intellect, belief, fear, ego, desires, expectations,

needs, and instincts. The excuse: "My genetic programming made me do it" is in the same league as: "The devil made me do it". You must always take full responsibility for everything you do, say, or intend as well as celebrate or suffer the consequences.

Because our genetic programming represents the tried and proven successful product of a million years of evolution, it has the inertia and staying power to persist, basically unchanged (low consciousness quality driving choice within a threatening environment of scarce resources), for many hundreds of generations yet to come unless we, the human tribe, move together in a direction that continually improves the consciousness quality of humanity while maintaining our place and function as the caretaker and protector of planet Earth. This defines the direction of positive evolution for humanity. We have mastered everything on this planet but ourselves. Any short sighted little picture ideas about what human purpose and nature should be (as opposed to what it is) will be eventually discarded by the evolutionary process. Our descendents will have plenty of chances to get it right even if we do not.

A million years of evolution has spawned different attitudes, approaches and ways of interpreting and dealing with the world.

These differences express successful variation within the evolutionary process and lead to a broad range of sometimes overlapping characteristics for both males and females. Due to this evolutionary diversity, probably no statement or description of any meaningful sort will universally apply to all women or to all men. However there are some female characteristics that do apply to many or most women and some male characteristics that do apply to many or most men. We will now explore a few of these typical female and male attributes to facilitate a discussion of several widely experienced contemporary gender issues.

Men are hardwired to direct their energy towards the mastery of the outside world. This exterior focus optimizes their ability to protect their tribe, mates, and children through team work and cooperation with other men. Male interaction is thus primarily with the outside environment and requires focus and attention to big picture outside strategy and little picture outside details.

He guides, forms, and manipulates his reality to suit him by asserting his skill and power in the outside world in order to take care of his tribe, mate, children and himself. Most of his interaction in the world is focused on manipulating the outside environment to provide for himself and those who depend on him.

Males apply their intellect to the outside environment in order to dominate the outside world with skill, power and force. However, they tend to stumble or feel their way through the inside environment of personal relationship.

Women are hardwired to direct their energy towards mastering the inside world of personal relationship -- building, maintaining, and networking with others – including her man and his family/social connections. These relationships optimize her ability to keep her man focused on her and her children – they represent the connectedness and responsibility that creates the nuclear family and the glue that holds it together. Additionally, such relationships and networks provide her with assistance as needed, generate a social system of encouragement, support, and solace, as well as bind the male to a shared responsibility within a meaningful set of family relationships.

She guides, forms, and manipulates her reality to suit her through the relationship she builds with her man, personal connections, and a network of friends. Most of her interaction and strategy in the world is focused on the “inside environment” of profitable connectedness (relationship).

One very simple example to illustrate the point -- let's look at career choices: Over the last 70 years, the career choices available to males and females have lost much of their previous gender bias. Though a female can make as good an engineer, experimental physicist, carpenter, or mechanic as any man, exceedingly few females decide to become engineers, experimental physicists, carpenters, or mechanics – jobs that focus on manipulating the outside environment. Likewise, though a male can make as good a nurse, secretary, or kindergarten teacher as any woman, exceedingly few males decide to become nurses, secretaries, or kindergarten teachers – jobs that focus on the people skills required by the “inside environment” of relationship.

It is not about **if** men and women **can** do these things but rather **do** men and women under the fat part of the curve **want to** do these things and what sort of careers do they find fulfilling and satisfying – a good fit to their natural inclinations. A second question is: how much of that “want” or “don't want” of a particular career is driven by cultural as opposed to genetic proclivities. The cultural inhibitions, though still present, have relaxed greatly in the workplace while the shift in the kind of careers men and women feel attracted to, comfortable in, and fulfilled by, has changed much less than has the wide availability of career fields to both females and males. That fact indicates that we are looking at influences that run much deeper than cultural expectation.

A few characteristics, driven by her genetic programming, that fall under the fat part of the bell curve:

The need to spread her focus simultaneously over many tasks, necessitates the development of an ability to Parallel process.

She is nudged by her genetic programming to develop and maintain female support group, a clique of relationship “insiders” who encourage, console, and generally support each other.

Females tend to divide people into two groups: “Insiders” who are the special people in her life with whom she has developed a special bond. She protects and supports these insiders (her man, her friends, her children, all those who “belong” to her. Everyone else is classified together as “outsiders”. She is as sensitive and attentive to the needs and problems of her “insiders” as she is indifferent to the needs and problems of outsiders.

Relationship primarily depends on communication, thus females are prodigious communicators who typically speak two to three times as many words each day than the average males does.

Females apply their intellect to the inside environment in order to create potential personal value/advantage for herself and her children through her relationship with those who could directly influence the lives of her and her children. She gets by in the outside environment with the assistance of those with whom she has established a relationship.

Thus, it has been explained, in terms of our genetic programming, why women appear to be from Venus while men appear to be from Mars.

Women dominate and speak the language of the inside environment of personal relationship (the implicit or indirect power of personal relationship that is necessary for a physically smaller woman (with several children to care for) to genetically succeed in the evolution game).

On the other hand, men dominate and speak the language of the outside environment of personal power -- the explicit or direct power to succeed in the outside world in order to control and accumulate sufficient security and resources to ensure the survival and continuance of both the tribe and one’s family.

Note that the male, who among other things shoulders the task of defense (ensuring physical survival), has a first priority responsibility to the tribe because, during the time when these genetic programs were established, no nuclear family would likely survive for long without the cooperative efforts of the tribe. Today, this ancient genetic program nudges young men to leave their wives and families and go off to war.

Cultural consequences (all different for different women): fidelity, expectations and roles, limitations (men don’t cry and ladies don’t belch in public), fashion – also different **value** is given to men and women by our culture, and differing cultural **values** (taking charge, nurturing) drive gender behavioral expectations

Two facts: 1) We have a male dominant culture. 2) The great majority of both males and females are very much fear and belief driven – insecure, immature, with lots of ego.

There is much cultural derived fear surrounding both relationship and sexuality (and much of that is created by the dissonance between our genetic programming and our cultural values) – but because ours is a male dominant culture this fear takes a much larger toll on females than males. Women find a male dominant culture confusing (For example, the culture tells them to be Hot, Hot, Hot in some roles – and Not, Not, Not in other roles).

It may be interesting here to explore what a non-male dominant culture would look like and how we might evolve to a Gender neutral culture where neither sex is dominant.

Because of our male-dominant culture's image of women (fact 2 above implies that this would be an image generated by insecure, immature, ego driven males), our culture sees women as sex objects who take care of children and do domestic work. Women are culturally undervalued by this lopsided shallow view. It is a view that sees only part of what a woman is all about and fails to adequately value and appreciate the rest. Women, of course, know, deep down (often beneath the intellect), that they have personal value, personal quality, beyond this limited vision.

The result is that, in our culture, women form an underclass whose personal worth is not fully validated by male-made cultural feminine stereotypes. Cultural beliefs tend to be absolute and accepted at the being level – which creates identity issues and self-worth issues and, for many, leaves a systemic low level tension between the sexes, because any underclass resents being an underclass even if the average members of this underclass fully accept the situation as natural or as just “the way it is”. This tension, on one hand, creates a subtle subconscious chip on the shoulder attitude, a nonspecific uneasiness and a lack of trust of men and their cultural dominance – a fear of being used or taken advantage of – a wariness -- all usually simmering beneath the intellect.

A fundamental problem arises when the female's entirely rational feelings of mistrust and uneasiness due to our limiting and patronizing cultural attitudes appears to be in direct conflict with her genetic programming (to be an attractive sex object to men and a support person for the family). Her genetic programs (her natural urges and inclinations) appear to simply reinforce the shallow male–dominant vision of women. Women appear to be trapped between an abusive male-dominant vision of women that just doesn't feel right (it's not the way it is supposed to be) and genetic programming that tells them that what their culture offers them is indeed their natural role. They feel led by their own drives and their culture into a role that feels incomplete and limiting. Something is wrong...something is missing. This conflict creates identity confusion, self worth issues, feelings of inadequacy, insecurity and anger.

Insecurity creates fear: of being too **hot** and too cold – a fear of being not exactly **whatever** it is a female should be – a model that is only shallowly provided by the culture. **The value of Being female is defined in our culture primarily in terms a female's expected services to others rather than in terms of her individual quality of being.** Those “services to others” are mostly given to men and children)

Fear creates anxiety and ego-reactions (from: “don't tread on me” to “I am only good for being tread on”) and confusion – all rolled up into an undefined stress and anxiety -- women feeling

insecure and inadequate for reasons that they cannot quite put their finger on. Many eventually make an accommodation with their culture and their men -- but the solution never quite feels right or complete – something they learn to live with

A sizable minority begin to feel bad about themselves. One may counter feeling insecure and inadequate by trying to be perfect.... which may lead to an ego needing to be perfect.... being a perfectionist must lead to **failure** since no one can be perfect.... which reinforces one's feeling bad about one's self and feeling inadequate..... a vicious downwards spiral ending in great distress (personal dislike and depression) and a prescription for Prozac. Why do so many more women than men take depression medication? Partly because they are more open to doing so, but mostly, I suspect, because they live in a low quality of consciousness male dominant culture that values their body parts and domestic services more than it values them. – many demands but no firm ground for an authentic self to stand on -- the perfect situation for generating anxiety.

Or course, the problem is that the male dominant culture, because of its limitations, appreciates only a fraction of the value that women bring to the table in securing the viability, balance, and success of the human race. Redress is not in denying that women have evolved to fill the roles our culture gives to them, but rather in enabling the culture to see that our present narrow cultural view of women represents only a fraction of what women have to offer our culture, only a shadow of what women do for us every day, only a shallow caricature of what it means to be a woman. Redress is in establishing a more realistic and productive gender balance within our culture requiring both men and women to become more appreciative of the value of women and more aware of the fundamental drivers, contributions, and limitations of both sexes. That men and women together with equally valuable and critical (but not necessarily the same) contributions make us a viable species.

Redress comes through changing the male dominant view to fully appreciate women for who they are, the value of what they contribute, and what they can do, not by changing women -- women **acting** more male-like so that they can effectively integrate themselves into the twisted male-dominant world of low quality male consciousness. It is better to eliminate the twisted male bias in our culture than to sanctify that bias as the sole measure of individual value through the elimination of female values from the cultural equation (i.e., degrading the value of being female). One diminishes the value of women in our culture by turning them into something more like men -- females who tone down their femaleness, try to take on some of the attributes and attitudes of the dominant male culture, go (without their children) to work in the male side of the jungle during the day so they can be successful (by the male definition of success) in the twisted male-dominant world they find themselves in.

Sort of a: “if you can't beat them join them” attitude that downplays female value in favor of male value – a change that delivers a great deal of unhappiness, stress, and lack of fulfillment to almost everyone under the fat part of the curve. Of course, we have free will and evolution is

not a done deal, everything can change (and much of it should). However, if that change is temporarily forced to adapt itself to the low quality of consciousness (fear, ego, beliefs, expectations), which pervade both the males and females under the fat part of the curve, then we will have a rocky road ahead for some time before and after the result of our poor choices self-destructs.

The way forward is to enhance the general perception of female value within our culture to the rightful place it deserves, as opposed to devaluing and slowly eliminating the absolutely necessary and vital female contribution to our species (beyond just bearing children) by squandering irreplaceable female-power to turn cogs designed for men in the male machine that defines the outside world. It is not that women cannot or should not turn cogs in the outside economy – and that is not at all the point I am making here -- women in the workforce are absolutely necessary to both women and the economy. The point is that the male dominant outside economy needs to make changes such that a woman does not have to let go of even a smidgen of her female proclivities to turn that cog. The culture must honor the woman's true value by making the workplace female, family, and baby friendly – **by making the job more compatible with the woman, not by making the woman more compatible with the job.** That is what I have been talking about. Forcing a female to chose between having a good job and taking care of her baby or her family is not a choice that a balanced culture could tolerate.

Making the workplace female friendly only seems impossible because we are blinded to the possibilities by our long history as a male-dominant culture. The solutions are not that difficult to imagine or implement (simply ask the women and follow their advice). The larger difficulty is in our growing up (improving the quality of our consciousness) sufficiently to appreciate the problem enough to want to fix it. Redress must lie in changing the culture to appreciate the true value of women; not in masculinising women so they can function like males in the outside male-dominant economic machine.

If we fail to grow up enough to solve this issue, our culture will slowly disintegrate. Women being women (fulfilling the female role) is just as important and fundamental to the success of our culture (and to the success of the human race) as it is that men fulfil the male role. If that male-female balance, that synergistic interplay of male and female interests and skills (as it is most clearly represented by our genetic programming), gets too far out of equilibrium, our culture, due to a fundamental dysfunctionality at its core, will begin to tear itself apart. This slow process of cultural disintegration has already begun decades ago. The only question remaining is will we reverse it before the roof caves in.

The mechanics of gender dominance within a culture:

There are two facts, or set of circumstances, that determine whether or not a culture has a dominant gender (the dominance factor), and if so, which sex is the dominant one (the sexual factor).

The dominance factor is a function of the quality of consciousness of the individuals (males and females) within the culture. If the quality of consciousness is generally low (decisions primarily based upon fear, ego, belief, needs, wants, desires, and expectations) then that sets the condition allowing one gender to dominate the other. If, on the other hand, the quality of consciousness is generally high, decisions will be primarily based upon love, caring about other, compassion, and, long term system optimization (i.e., cultural growth, value, productivity, creativity, high standard of living, happiness, etc.). This condition of a population with overall high consciousness quality sets the condition for a culture that is optimized for all of its members -- dominance is automatically discarded as a suboptimal, dysfunctional, high cost, low productivity social arrangement.

Given a dysfunctional culture populated by mostly low-quality-of-consciousness individuals, then, if that culture's (and the individual's within the culture's) most pressing current and historical needs are safety, security, and the procurement of sufficient resources (outside environmental problems), then that culture will be dominated by males since they have the genetic hardwiring to address these issues (sexual factor). The value of being female will be defined within that culture primarily in terms of a male viewpoint (given the initial conditions of this example – that would be a fear, ego, belief and expectation driven male viewpoint). Such a male viewpoint would be in terms of the expected services that men would want and expect from females (mostly services supporting the needs of the men and their children).

The history of the human race has been primarily one of a struggle for survival. Certainly, that was the case during the time that our genetic programs evolved. Security and the procurement of adequate resources (food, shelter, etc.) for both individuals and groups has been the most pressing and challenging problem of humanity until very recently. Thus one would expect that human social history is primarily a history of male dominance. Likewise, one would expect that male dominant social structures would constitute the vast majority of present-day social structures throughout the world and within many diverse cultures. Also, one would expect that both males and females are well socially and psychologically adapted to this condition (the males are in charge and the females are the facilitators). Thus male-dominant social structures have deep roots in history, tradition, and in genetic programming tied to basic survival needs.

Trying to change this outcome at a fundamental level is unlikely to be more than superficially successful unless those “most pressing current and historical needs” change. By force of intellect and education we can make behavioural changes -- we act better, more gracious and civilized – but there is a big difference between being and acting. Acting for a long time might eventually “bleed through” to the being level superficially, but such “leakage” is unlikely solid for the long run and can be rolled back quickly. That is why it is said that polite civilized society represents a thin veneer covering a rougher, more violent and self-centered humanity lurking

just beneath the surface. Cultural programming can run counter to genetic programming, but mostly only at a superficial (polite) level.

On the other hand, given a dysfunctional culture populated by mostly low-quality-of-consciousness individuals, then, if that culture's (and the individual's within the culture's) most pressing current and historical needs are relationship and networking based issues (inside environmental problems), then that culture will be dominated by females. The value of being male will be defined within that culture primarily in terms of a female viewpoint (given the initial conditions of this example – that would be a fear, ego, belief and expectation driven female viewpoint). Such a female viewpoint would be in terms of the expected services that women would want and expect from the men (mostly services supporting the needs of the women and their children).

Consciousness quality has no gender association so it would be exceptionally unlikely that a culture would be populated by one gender with a predominately low quality of consciousness and the other gender with a predominately high quality of consciousness, especially since a low quality in one sex would tend to aggravate and thus develop a low quality in the other (such an unbalanced asymmetric state would not be stable (would not last long)). There would be a very high probability that the males and females in any given culture would be of similar quality of consciousness. However, there are some inquisitive readers with good imaginations, or perhaps strong biases, who would like to explore the possibilities anyway.

In a hypothetical culture where only the females maintained a high quality of consciousness, the men would be treated with as much unconditional love and caring support as conditions would allow, much as the women might treat their young sons who run about the house in superman costumes pretending to save the world. High quality consciousness could not act in any other way. The men in such a loving and supportive environment would have an optimal situation in which to grow up and most would probably grow up very quickly to a high quality of consciousness similar to that of the women.

The opposite condition would work just the same way. The high quality of consciousness males would treat the low quality of consciousness women with as much unconditional love and caring support as conditions would allow, much as the men might treat their young daughters who often play house by serving and teaching a deserving family of rag dolls. The women in such a loving and supportive environment would have an optimal secure situation in which to grow up and most would probably grow up very quickly to a high quality of consciousness similar to that of the men.

Do you see why I suggest to those couples who wish to evolve their relationships from need based to love based that the men initiate this evolution by eliminating their egos and giving themselves up entirely to love (or whatever his female thinks love is), thus, giving their women a sincere, rock steady environment of unconditional love in which to flourish, to grow themselves? Because females in our male dominant culture are likely to be a tad insecure, uneasy and not entirely trusting of the beneficence of male intentions, it is not reasonable to ask females to be the initiator in this process of giving herself up entirely to love (or to whatever a male from a

male-dominant culture thinks love is). Expecting her to initiate this process would, for most women, be asking too much. It is clearly the men who need to lead this process within our culture. More reasons follow:

Could a female lead this process? Of course! But it will be less likely that the male, in a male dominant culture will respond as quickly, or as productively as the female is likely to respond if the male is the initiator.

You see, in our culture, if the male initiates this process to move to a love based relationship, he is inviting the female to enter a relationship situation (her speciality) that she has dreamed of and hoped for her entire life (total commitment from him) and that resonates grandly with her genetic programming. Her immediate response, once she believes his invitation to be genuine and sincere, is to make sure that she will always be worth it to him, that he never changes his mind or sees her any other way. And to accomplish that, she will gladly grow and change to meet his needs – because that is smart relationship building and building relationships is her thing.

Women come with a genetically programmed proclivity to “give themselves up” for love: their children absolute require this of them on a daily basis. Likewise, it feels natural for a woman to give herself completely to her man to keep the relationship strong and to keep him focused on her because this is who women are, what they do, and how they are when they feel secure, happy and fulfilled as women. It is their role to create the relationship-glue that holds the family (and the culture) together. However, if the smooth running of this particular female program is stymied by a man who does not make her feel secure, happy and fulfilled as a woman, she becomes insecure, withdrawn, unhappy, and stressed. Remember, as we said at the bottom of page 5: “A woman has a need for her man to demonstrate to her that he is committed to her, to taking care of her and her children, and to seeing her as special and **valued above all others** and most certainly above other women“. He must clearly demonstrate that he values her above himself because putting her first is the only clear and accurate sign of genuine love. And genuine love is the only clear and accurate sign of full serious commitment.

Her security and thus the security of her children (in as much as he can provide it – which is why she has that third criteria in how she defines an “attractive” man) is only guaranteed by his love -- by the depth of his commitment to her. For her to generate that security based on her meeting his needs rather than her having his love, makes for a very risky alliance and would only be accepted by a woman if she was very confused or if nothing better was available. If he is likely to put his needs and wants equal to or ahead of hers, then, when the going in the family gets tough (e.g., inter-tribal war, sickness, or scant food or shelter, his needs (focused on himself first) will prompt him to take off to find an easier more comfortable life elsewhere...perhaps start another family where conditions are easier and more fun for him. A man’s Commitment to a woman means to her that he will put her happiness and welfare first in all things for all time -- Period! (Above himself, his job, his friends, his childhood family, his hobby, his football games and favorite TV programs, his own wants and needs, etc.) Thus, if in a romantic male-female relationship the man puts his needs first, ahead of hers, or even equal to hers, the instincts of genetic programming that allow her to feel secure, happy and fulfilled as

a women evaporate into uncertainty and her “give-herself-up-completely-to-her-man” program crashes.

So guys, it is pretty obvious what you need to do and why it is you that have to do it. It’s simple: **get rid of the ego**, love her, make her happy (it’s always about her, never about you) and you will create a secure environment wherein her “give-herself-up-completely-to-her-man” program will eventually boot back up. And you and your woman will both be secure, happy, and fulfilled beyond your wildest dreams. All that, **if** you can just get rid of enough of that fear and to truly love her. It is a much better deal with a much larger return for everybody than the alternative: entering into a negotiation and compromise focused on getting mutual fears balanced and needs met.

If the female initiates the move to a love based relationship within this male-dominant culture, she is inviting the male to enter a new relationship situation (he has no solid sense what that means) that he has always assumed was his due, his birthright as a male. If his woman initiates, he thinks that things are now the way they should have been all along. Why should he change anything at this point? Life is now great on the home front – the rule is: don’t change what isn’t broken. His genetic program and cultural program are satisfied and no big internal push to grow is triggered at the being level or the intellectual level because all this relationship stuff just is however it is – there is really nothing anybody can do about it. Let the good times roll!

Many men and women today **are** very confused about male-female gender issues and, consequently, relationships **are** a very risky business. As just one example: both sexes require commitments of the other but the commitment the female needs the male to make to her is entirely different than the commitment the male needs the female to make to him. She wants his total long term commitment to put her first and he wants her commitment to protect his investment in her by not having sex with other men (at least once he figured out the correlation between having sex and having children – which may not have been obvious for some time and thus a newer part of the program).

Males and females are told that within their relationship everything should be equal. It would be better advice if if they were told that everything should be based on love rather than equal needs, fear, belief, and ego. “Equal” in the sense of: “equally important and significant” and “of equal value”, as well as “equal under the law” are absolutely necessary. All the coffee cups in your cupboard may be equal in value and function and may also be the same and thus interchangeable, however, “equal” does not **necessarily** imply sameness! Like the engine, wheels and breaks in your car – all represents parts of your car that are of equal value, significance, and importance to the proper functioning of the car, but each serves a unique function and each brings a critical ingredient to the success of their interactive relationship. Though this automotive analogy does not describe your set of tiffany coffee cups, it does accurately describe men and women within our culture and within the human race.

This may sound so obvious that it isn’t worth mentioning: A fundamental equality of importance, significance and value does not justify a **belief** in the parts being interchangeable – i.e., four

engines bolted to the wheels and a tire under the hood for power is completely absurd. Yet, we perpetrate this same absurdity with well intended but badly implemented concepts of “gender equality” in the workplace. Somehow, we have mistakenly equated “equal” with “interchangeable” and have already begun harvesting the social dysfunction and disintegration within our culture because of our ill advised war on Mother Nature for the sake of efficiency and higher corporate profit margins.

Women want and deserve equality; instead they are being given interchangeability with men. Unfortunately, most feminist leaders do not understand the difference between “equality” and “interchangeability”. Consequently, while many feminists are celebrating this ongoing victory of false equality, the potential for gaining the real equality they initially sought is eroding more quickly than ever because interchangeability, a concept that actually **denies** women’s value to our male dominant culture, is picking up social and economic steam. Young women are being pushed socially and economically to abandon their hardwired programming upon which our culture and our race depends in exchange for a pay check and a heartache leading to depression. If women do not become aware of this bigger picture, let go of toxic interchangeability, and demand and get real equality, **they will eventually lose everything of real value to women**. And everybody will lose, eventually even the corporations, as the culture continues to disintegrate around us.

Women under the fat part of the curve just saying; “NO!” to their genetic programming is a recipe for disaster for both men and women – and most of all for children. That we should base our choices, strategies, and laws on the erroneous belief that males and females are the same (more or less interchangeable) except for a few anatomical peculiarities, constitutes very bad advice given by people who don’t understand the basics of what it means to be male or female. The genetic encoding that informs a man and a woman of what their gender means at the being level is not based on equality. It is based on using the different skills, interests, and attitudes that evolved together interactively in both sexes to optimize the survival and success of the human race. In nature, equality is never an issue – things evolve to be as they are because that optimizes a shared existence.

As the old saying goes: we must be careful not to throw out the baby (real female equality within our culture) with the bath water (females being undervalued within a male-dominant culture). In any pitched battle against the natural way of things, everybody always eventually loses. It matters not if the combatants don’t understand that they are battling against their own self interest. After the combatants fade away due to self-inflicted wounds, Mother Nature, and Evolution, being very patient parents, simply start over with whatever is left and hope that some lessons have been learned that will be applied to the future.

So what do we do now? Women must question and search the deepest levels of their being to clearly define what is of real value to them. In times past, this may have been easier work, but today there is much confusion over the meaning and significance of gender. Today, women must look beyond what our culture advises (after all, what credibility would a male-dominant culture have in determining what women truly require and need to feel whole, fulfilled and secure in their femaleness).

What is it that women most treasure, need, and want? Collectively, women must come to this understanding among themselves before female core values have eroded within our society to the point that they become nearly impossible to access accurately because of all the cultural overlays. I would hope that this book might spark that debate – a conversation that is absolutely essential before any real progress can be made.

An overly simplistic model may help focus our attention on what matters most to us: The men have the role and responsibility to take care of the women first and then the children. The women have the role and responsibility to take care of the children first and then the men. The children have the role and responsibility to grow up physically and emotionally healthy so they might become men who are supremely capable of taking care of women first and children second and women who are supremely capable of taking care of children first and men second. It is up to each individual man and woman to discover what each instance of “taking care of” means.

In the interest of not generating additional self-inflicted wounds and in reducing confusion and stress, I would suggest that men and women begin this discovery process by aligning their sense of appropriate gender roles with the facts of hardwired genetic programming (human instinct). From this fundamental understanding of how the world **is**, as well as an understanding of the depth, strength and tenacity of human instinct, individuals can make adjustments, as needed, to produce personal lifestyles that express how they think their world should be.

We should all celebrate diversity. Embracing diversity optimizes both freedom and opportunity for all. The purpose of a book like this one is not to tell you how or what to be – you must decide that yourself – its purpose is simply to provide information that may help you make more informed choices.

Now, as we move from the industrial age into the information age, our Western culture (mostly “first world” countries) has arrived at, or is approaching, the point where a majority of the population is no longer in a desperate struggle for survival. The struggle has moved to the quality and dignity of that survival rather than survival itself. The most pressing problems of our culture are in the process of changing from scarcity and security to getting along with each other productively (relationship building) -- or at least a mixture of the two. Thus, the initial conditions required for making fundamental progress toward a culture with no gender dominance have been steadily growing stronger over the last 200 years or so.

However, the inertia of a few million years of scarcity has institutionalized itself within our culture. Old habits and attitudes resist change. It is changing these habits and attitudes (beliefs) of scarcity and insecurity (both fearful attitudes) that hold the key to elimination of cultural male-dominance. Trying to force change in the symptoms of male-dominance rather than eliminate the cause may encourage a little more of that “thin veneer of polite civility”, but it will not fix the problem and is likely to aggravate it making things worse. It is a trick of the ego to

believe that one can use hostility to end hostility. The only way to end hostility is with love (a higher quality of consciousness).

Focus on moving the culture from the mindset of scarcity and physical security, to the mindset or relationship building, and the male-dominance within our culture will slowly melt away on its own – and not cosmetically, but fundamentally. The genetic programming of both sexes will eventually ensure that result.

So what sort of gender neutral culture can we create given the general low quality of consciousness that we live in? And how do we go about creating it? First and foremost: We need to raise the level of consciousness in the general population. Secondly, we need to reduce the level of fear in our culture by reducing the level of fear in ourselves. As quality raises and fear diminishes, our agendas will automatically shift from fear of scarcity and lack of security to the now more important business of relationship building. In the short run (the immediate future), it would be good to ratchet down the contentious rhetoric on both sides and begin an effective educational program that starts with a basic understanding of our genetic programming and cultural-social programming. One must always begin with an understanding of the truth of the present situation.

Although manipulation of the outside world can potentially provide needed resources as well as safety and security, which is absolutely essential to everything else, we must understand that a continual culture of scarcity and of fear will generate and maintain a culture with a lopsided male-dominant viewpoint.

We must learn that our connectedness and interaction with others (relationship) is central to our evolution and growth. That it is relationship, not the manipulation of the material world, which provides the primary learning ground of consciousness evolution.

We, as individuals need to learn what it means and what it is like to be male and female in this culture -- to appreciate the view from both sides and begin to dismantle (gently over a long term view) the cultural (manmade) structures that stand in the way of optimizing our system/culture for all people.

We can improve our personal relationships by realizing that need-based relationships are but a scant shadow of the real thing (love-based relationship). As we put unconditional love back in our personal lives more and more, we will begin to accelerate our process of consciousness evolution, thus adding both fuel and fire to burn away the heavy stultifying dross of fear and belief that so limits us, our culture, and our species.

As was said above, first and foremost we must raise the level of consciousness in the general population – and we accomplish that best by raising our own consciousness quality.

Some Q&A feedback thus far:

Q: You suggest that we are fundamentally monogamous, and though you **qualify** your statement that having a lover does not fundamentally or primally conflict with our evolutionary hardwire characteristics, might this be misunderstood or too controversial? I don't think the French, or most Europeans would have a problem understanding this, but because of the very things you want to strip away from our cultural beliefs, some may misinterpret this as something not good. But, you must state things exactly as you see them.

A: You are right, this will be contentious and raise a few eyebrows, but with 75% of males and 63% of females (and climbing) claiming to have had an extramarital affair, it would seem self-evident that there is some underlying proclivity generating these statistics. Also about 10% of middleclass nuclear families (where the parents have never been married to anyone else except each other) have a child with a father who is not the husband. Does it seem likely that all of this is just circumstantial with no underlying reason supporting it? Perhaps another one of those inconvenient truths – in this case where cultural beliefs conflict with the fundamental truth of who and what we are.

Q: On the point of we are hardwired to have as many children as possible (the Pope would like this one :) , there are cultures that embrace this still. Modern society does not. Even though it comes from our basic hardwire and is not applicable to today, is this also something that would be misunderstood?

A: Yes, this is another area that will raise a fuss. These hardwired instincts are just there in the background nudging us, and we need to be aware of that, but we still have free will to make choices that make better sense for us now – today's environment is a bit different than the environment of a million years ago. There is no reason (other than ignorance and stupidity) for us to be slaves to our instincts. Some people will always resent being made aware of truths that they would rather not be aware of.

Q: There are many valuable insights here to how things work at the basic level. It will raise awareness to issues many struggle with everyday. Perhaps better choices and solutions will result.

Think of all the ads that feed the fears from these basic instincts.

A: Exactly! That is my hope and the reason for writing this book.

Q: Your statement on men shouldering the task of defence is very interesting. The ancient genetic program explains the natural desire to go off to war. This was exploited on a big scale.

A: Yes, I think we were warrior-gatherers long before we were hunter-gatherers. Hunting was not very practical until after we domesticated fire and by then many of our instincts were already set. I think our biggest and deadliest enemy through all of our evolution as a species was/is other humans. Lions, tigers and bears (oh no!) etc. probably account for much less than 1% of cave men violently killed. The easiest and quickest way to gather is to take what others have already gathered. Think how much fear and ego and general meanness is at large in the world today – now regress our consciousness quality evolution backward a million or so years in time and look around – I don't think you would find much love, peace, and light being passed around among tribes of humans competing for survival and dominance of the gene pool. Fortunately for us, warrior skill sets overlap almost entirely with hunter skill sets. We didn't trade one for the

other; we just eventually added hunting to our resume. It is very likely that over the last decade, century, or millennia, the greatest cause of violent death within humanity is still other humans.

Q: Overcoming fear seems to be a common thread not only in positively evolving consciousness, but in raising awareness to our everyday roles and the problems that arise from them, and the "solutions" we seek.

A: The more foundational your understanding, the more likely you are to succeed in this game of life. The more awareness you have, the more truth you grasp, the less likely you are to make poor choices. Success in the big picture is all about the quality of the choices you make.