FREEDOM
-EXPANDED-

Book 1 – The Biology

Freedom Expanded **is an elaboration by Jeremy Griffith on the breakthrough biological explanation of the human condition that he presents in his main book,** ***FREEDOM: The End Of The Human Condition*****.**

Freedom Expanded **comprises two books:** ***Book 1*** **which focuses on the biological explanation of the human condition; and** ***Book 2*** **which focuses on how that explanation is able to transform the human race.**

www.HumanCondition.com

"I have no doubt this biological explanation of the human condition is the holy grail of insight we have sought for the psychological rehabilitation of the human race."

Professor Harry Prosen, former president of the Canadian Psychiatric Association, from Part 2

BLANK PAGE

FREEDOM
-EXPANDED-

Book 1 – The Biology

Jeremy Griffith

Freedom Expanded is an elaboration by Jeremy Griffith on the breakthrough biological explanation of the human condition that he presents in his main book, FREEDOM: The End Of The Human Condition.

Freedom Expanded comprises two books: Book 1 which focuses on the biological explanation of the human condition; and Book 2 which focuses on how that explanation is able to transform the human race.

World Transformation Movement®

Freedom Expanded: Book 1 – The Biology, by Jeremy Griffith

Published by WTM Publishing and Communications Pty Ltd (ACN 103 136 778)
First published in Australia 2009

Minor Additions and Editing July 2020

All enquiries to:
WORLD TRANSFORMATION MOVEMENT®
Email: info@worldtransformation.com
Website: www.humancondition.com or www.worldtransformation.com

The World Transformation Movement (WTM) is a global not-for-profit movement represented by WTM charities and centres around the world.

ISBN 978-1-74129-011-0
CIP – Biology, Philosophy, Psychology, Health

COPYRIGHT NOTICE
This book is protected by Australian copyright laws and international copyright treaty provisions. All rights are reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced by any process without written permission from the copyright owner. The moral rights of the authors Jeremy Griffith, Tim Macartney-Snape and Harry Prosen are asserted.

Freedom Expanded copyright © Fedmex Pty Ltd (ACN 096 099 286) 2009-2020.

The drawings and charts by Jeremy Griffith, copyright © Fedmex Pty Ltd (ACN 096 099 286) 1977-2020.

Trade marks: WORLD TRANSFORMATION MOVEMENT, WTM, the arms-raised man before the rising sun logo, Foundation for Humanity's Adulthood, FHA and the Foundation for Humanity's Adulthood logo are registered trade marks of Fedmex Pty Ltd (ACN 096 099 286).

Cover computer graphic by Jeremy Griffith, Marcus Rowell and Genevieve Salter, copyright © Fedmex Pty Ltd (ACN 096 099 286) 2009.

Edited by Fiona Cullen-Ward.

Typesetting: designed by Jeremy Griffith, set by Lee Jones, Sam Belfield & Brony FitzGerald. Font: Times; main body text:12pt on 15pt leading; quote: 10pt bold; quote source: 9pt; comment within a quote: 11pt; digits and all caps text: 1-2pts smaller than body text. For further details about the typesetting, styles and layout used in this book please view the *WTM Style Guide* at <www.humancondition.com/style-guide>.

Freedom Expanded is dedicated to the future of the human race by the World Transformation Movement's founding members: Annabel Armstrong, Susan Armstrong, Sam Belfield, John Biggs, Richard Biggs, Anthony Clarke, Lyn Collins, Steve Collins, Lachlan Colquhoun, Eric Crooke, Emmα Cullen-Ward, Fiona Cullen-Ward, Anthony Cummins, Neil Duns, Sally Edgar, Anna Fitzgerald, Brony FitzGerald, Connor FitzGerald, Tony Gowing, Jeremy Griffith, Simon Griffith, Damon Isherwood, Felicity Jackson, Charlotte James, Lee Jones, Monica Kodet, Anthony Landahl, Doug Lobban, Tim Macartney-Snape, Simon Mackintosh, Katrina Makim, Sean Makim, Manus McFadyen, Ken Miall, Tony Miall, Rachel O'Brien, James Press, Stacy Rodger, Marcus Rowell, Genevieve Salter, Will Salter, Nick Shaw, Wendy Skelton, Pete Storey, Ali Watson, Polly Watson, Prue Watson, Tess Watson, Tim Watson, James West, Stirling West, Prue Westbrook and Annie Williams.

Contents

Book 1 – The Biological Explanation of The Human Condition

PAGE

Part 1 A 4-minute Introduction ..... by Jeremy Griffith 15

Part 2 The World Transformation Movement 17

2:1 Introduction ..... by Tim Macartney-Snape 17

2:2 Commendation from former President of the Canadian Psychiatric Association 18

2:3 'A joy without limit' ..... by Jeremy Griffith 19

2:4 The sunrise of our species' FREEDOM ..... by Jeremy Griffith 25

2:5 The Propositions by Jeremy Griffith 29

2:6 Brief history of the World Transformation Movement .... by Tim Macartney-Snape 39

Part 3 The Human Condition Explained Part 3 onward by Jeremy Griffith 51

3:1 The agony of the human condition 51

3:2 The accountable, true biological explanation of the human condition 53

3:3 Only understanding of the human condition could end the march to ever greater levels of upset 57

3:4 But what was humans' original instinctive orientation? 60

3:5 We can now know that not only are humans good, we are the absolute heroes of the story of life on Earth 70

3:6 Science is the liberator of humanity 77

3:7 The depth of our anger 80

3:8 The anguish of Resignation 86

3:9 The awesome courage of the human race 108

3:10 Brief description of the TRANSFORMATION of the human race 110

3:11 Stages of humanity's journey to enlightenment 123

3:11A Infancy and Childhood 128

3:11B Sobered and Depressed Adolescentman 134

3:11C Adventurous Adolescentman 145

3:11D Angry Adolescentman 173

3:11E Pseudo Idealistic Adolescentman 178

3:11F Hollow Adolescentman 184

3:11G The last 11,000 years 187

3:11H The final 200 years 194

3:12 Anticipations of the arrival of our species' liberation from the horror of the human condition and resulting TRANSFORMATION of the human race 214

3:13 The difficulty of the 'Deaf Effect' when reading about the human condition 231

3:14 The non-falsifiable situation 235

Part 4 The Old Biology: The history of biology up to the arrival of the psychosis-addressing-and-solving, *real* explanation of the human condition 237

4:1 To explain the human condition science had to be invented, a process Socrates, Plato and Aristotle initiated 237

4:2 Even with the development of science, it wasn't until Darwin introduced his idea of natural selection that it finally became possible to explain the human condition 239

4:3 Since the human condition could be explained once Darwin presented his idea of natural selection in 1859, why did it take well over a century for it to be explained? .. 241

4:4 Six Unconfrontable Truths blocking access to understanding of the human condition 243

4:4A Firstly, we have been unable to confront the issue of the human condition itself, the issue of why aren't humans cooperative, selfless and loving? 243

4:4B Secondly, upset humans have had to deny the truth of Integrative Meaning 244

4:4C Thirdly, we have had to live in denial of what consciousness really is 249

4:4D Fourthly, the upset human race has had to deny the truth that our species once instinctively lived in a completely integrated, cooperative, harmonious state .. 252

4:4E Fifthly, the upset human race has had to deny the differences in upset between human individuals, races, genders, generations, civilisations and cultures. 257

4:4F Sixthly, the upset human race has had to deny that nurturing played the all-important role in both the maturation of our species and in the maturation of our own lives 263

4:5 The history of the search for understanding of the human condition 264

4:6 First Category of Thinker: Those who admitted the involvement of our moral instincts and corrupting intellect in producing the upset state of the human condition . 265

4:7 Second Category of Thinker: Those who admitted the involvement of our moral instincts and corrupting intellect in producing the upset state of the human condition and who attempted to explain how those elements produced that upset psychosis 277

4:8 Third Category of Thinker: Those who recognised the involvement of the elements of instinct and intellect in the psychosis of our human condition, but who avoided the issue of the human condition by denying we have moral instincts 292

4:9 Fourth Category of Thinker: The great majority of the human race who avoided the whole issue of a psychosis in our human situation by simply blaming our selfish and aggressive behaviour on supposed brutish and savage animal instincts within us that our intellect supposedly has to control 297

4:10 The danger of excessive denial/ dishonesty/ alienation in science 301

4:11 Darwin stopped short of participating in biological denial 306

4:12 The great denials in biology of Social Darwinism, Sociobiology, Evolutionary Psychology, Multilevel Selection and Eusociality 311

4:12A Denial-based mechanistic biology was bound to lose its way 311

4:12B Brief summary of the development of order of matter on Earth 313

4:12C The full description of the denial-based biological theories, beginning with Social Darwinism 317
4:12D Sociobiology 318
4:12E Evolutionary Psychology 340
4:12F A backlash of revulsion develops towards Sociobiology/Evolutionary Psychology's denial of our moral instincts 345
4:12G The by-products of natural selection explanation for our unconditionally selfless moral instincts 349
4:12H The Multilevel Selection theory 356
4:12I The Theory of Eusociality—the most dangerous lie in human history 379
4:12J Desperationville/End Game/Terminal Alienation 405
4:12K Science became a farce 412
4:13 Summary of why biology had not made any real advance since Darwin 415
4:14 Understanding of the human condition has had to be independently developed and promoted 418

Part 5 Our Denials Exposed 423
5:1 How understanding of the human condition was found 423
5:2 Descriptions of our lost state of innocence and the extent of our denial of it 438

Part 6 The Solution to Exposure 451
6:1 Although the upset state of the human condition is now explained and defended, how is the human race supposed to cope with having the immense extent of its corrupted condition suddenly revealed? 451
6:2 The initial reaction of intolerant resistance to the exposing truth, which Plato anticipated 455
6:3 The threat of terminal levels of alienation 460
6:4 The dysfunctional 'Power Addicted' state 461
6:5 Autism and Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD) 473
6:6 Our libraries are all going to become museums but the same 'let's get out of here' solution applies 476

Part 7 How Upset the Human Race Became 479
7:1 The battle of the sexes 479
7:2 How Angry did we become? 494
7:3 How Egocentric did we become? 498
7:4 How Selfish did we become? 501
7:5 How Alienated did we become? 518

Part 8 The New Biology: The denial-free, *real* biological story of life on Earth 543
8:1 Integrative Meaning and our necessary denial of it 543
8:2 The history of the development of order of matter on Earth 561
8:3 Elaborating the reproducing individual 567

8:4 How humans acquired our moral soul and conscience—our original instinctive orientation to behaving unconditionally selflessly 573
8:4A Introduction 573
8:4B Love-Indoctrination 578
8:4C A brief summary of how consciousness emerged 589
8:4D Self-selection of integrativeness through sexual or mate selection 593
8:4E Fossil evidence confirming the love-indoctrination process 608
8:4F Bonobos evidence the whole love-indoctrination, self-selection of integrativeness through mate selection process 614
8:4F The fragility of the love-indoctrination, mate selection process 624
8:4H Humans' development of integration through love-indoctrination and mate selection 635
8:4I A summary of how humans acquired our unconditionally selfless moral soul . 641
8:5 Denial of the all-important role of nurturing in human development, and of the truth that our species once lived in a fully integrated state 646
8:5A 140 years of madness 646
8:5B John Fiske's 1874 recognition of the obvious truth that nurturing created our moral sense 648
8:5C The problem has been that the nurturing origins of our moral soul has been devastatingly, unbearably, excruciatingly condemning 656
8:5D To deny the importance of nurturing, the Social Intelligence Hypothesis was invented 659
8:5E Dismissing maternal love as training to manage complex social situations still left the extraordinarily cooperative lives of bonobos, and of our ape ancestors, to somehow be explained 664
8:5F Fossilised evidence of our species' cooperative past has also been dismissed and then ignored by mechanistic science 666
8:5G The Social Ecological Model 668
8:5H The Self-Domestication Hypothesis 676
8:5I End play for the human race 684
8:5J *The* great obscenity 686
8:6 Summary of the history of efforts to seek support for—and the subsequent rejections, vilification and lack of acknowledgment of—the biological explanations for the human condition, for the origins of our moral soul and conscious mind, and for the truth of the integrative meaning of existence that are contained in this book .. 690
8:7 Consciousness 696
8:7A What is consciousness? 696
8:7B Why, how and when did consciousness emerge in humans? 705
8:8 How our particular instinctive orientation greatly compounded our upset 720
8:9 Summary of our journey to enlightenment 723
8:10 Nurturing now becomes a priority 724

Part 9 The Transformation of the Human Race 739
9:1 The TRANSFORMED LIFEFORCE STATE 739
9:2 The TRANSFORMED LIFEFORCE STATE metamorphoses the human race 746
9:3 How the TRANSFORMED LIFEFORCE STATE will quickly repair the world 752

Part 10 The Nature and Role of Denial-Free Thinking 759
10:1 Abraham, Moses, Plato and Christ 759
10:2 The Three Varieties of Thinkers 792
10:3 Unresigned Prophets 794
10:4 Sir Laurens van der Post's Vision 798
10:5 Sir James Darling's Vision 807

Notes to the Reader

- While Jeremy Griffith's 2016 book *FREEDOM: The End Of The Human Condition* is the main presentation of his breakthrough biological synthesis on the human condition, and the resulting transformation of the human race, *Freedom Expanded: Books 1 & 2* present the expanded account of Jeremy's insights.

- *Freedom Expanded: Books 1 & 2* are freely available to be read, printed or downloaded at <www.humancondition.com/freedom-expanded>. For printing and binding suggestions for your copies of *Freedom Expanded: Books 1 & 2*, see <www.humancondition.com/free-to-read-print-bind>.

- Other books by Jeremy Griffith referred to in this presentation, including *FREEDOM*, are freely available to be read, printed or downloaded from the World Transformation Movement's (WTM) website at <www.humancondition.com/publications>. Alternatively, copies can be purchased from good bookshops or online booksellers such as Amazon.

- The WTM also has 'Freedom Essays' which provide an easy way to access these world-saving understandings in wonderfully illustrated bite-sized portions. These are freely available at <www.humancondition.com/freedom-essays>. You can also listen to them as audios.

- The WTM also provides a number of introductory and other videos that discuss both the biological explanation of the human condition and the resulting transformation of the human race. These can be freely viewed and/or downloaded at <www.humancondition.com>. We highly recommend you start with *THE Interview That Solves The Human Condition And Saves The World!* at <www.humancondition.com/the-interview>.

- The WTM has a Frequently Asked Questions facility on our website at <www.humancondition.com/frequently-asked-questions>, and we very much welcome your further Questions and Feedback at <www.humancondition.com/contact>. With the understanding of the human condition finally found, the horizons that now open up for the human race are absolutely boundless, and immensely exciting—so find out what others are thinking and doing and become involved by visiting <www.humancondition.com/community> and help bring about the now urgently needed transformation of the world.

- There is no index in *Freedom Expanded* because both books can be freely accessed at <www.humancondition.com/freedom-expanded> and any word or phrase easily searched electronically.

- Unlike most books, there is no bibliography at the conclusion of either book because the source is provided in small text at the end of each quote, so the reader can immediately see when, where and by whom the quote was made—it is particularly interesting to see how much knowledge has emerged in only the last 150 years. Also, rather than give the particular edition and/or publisher of the book that the quote comes from, the page number where the quote appears and the total number of pages of the particular edition used for the source is provided. This enables the reader to find the comparative place of the quote in any edition.

www.humancondition.com

BLANK PAGE

Book 1
The Biological Explanation of the Human Condition

Please note, the following presentation incorporates a *much expanded* transcript of the 2009 Introductory Video to the biological explanation of the human condition that was filmed in Sydney, Australia in October 2009. You can watch this video at <www.humancondition.com/2009-intro-video>. In fact, while large sections of this book do closely follow the video presentation, there are sections that have been very greatly added to, and others that appear in a different order.

Part 1
4-Minute Introduction

Part 1 **<u>'This is the most exciting moment in human history'</u>**

© 2009 Fedmex Pty Ltd

In recent times environmental issues have dominated our concerns, but we have only been focusing on the *symptoms*. To fix all the runaway problems we are surrounded with—in fact to stop the destruction of our world and the disintegration of society that is happening everywhere we look—we have to fix the *cause* of the problems, which is *us* humans. *We* are the problem: our out-of-control egocentric, selfish, competitive and aggressive behaviour.

We are sometimes told that humans are wired this way—competitive, aggressive and selfish—because of our animal heritage: that we have savage animal instincts that make us fight and compete for food, shelter, territory and a mate. But that's just the excuse we have had to use until we found the *real* reason for our divisive behaviour. For a start, it conveniently overlooks the fact that our human behaviour involves our unique fully conscious thinking mind. Descriptions of our behaviour, such as egocentric, arrogant, deluded, optimistic, pessimistic, artificial, hateful, mean, immoral, guilty, evil, depressed, inspired, psychotic, alienated, all imply a consciousness-derived, *psychological* dimension to *our* behaviour. *And* it overlooks the fact that we humans have altruistic, cooperative, loving *<u>moral instincts</u>*—what we recognise as our '*conscience*'—and these moral instincts in us are *not* derived from reciprocity, from situations where you only do something for others in return for a benefit from them, as evolutionary psychologists would have us believe. And nor are they derived from warring with other groups of humans as advocates of E.O. Wilson's theory of Eusociality would argue. No, we have an *unconditionally* selfless, *fully* altruistic, *truly*

loving, *universally*-considerate-of-others-not-competitive-with-other-groups, *genuinely* moral conscience. So yes, the *real* issue—the *psychological* problem in our thinking minds that we humans have suffered from—that had to be addressed and solved in order to fix our divisive behaviour is the dilemma of our so-called *human condition*, the issue of our species' 'good-and-evil'-afflicted, less-than-ideal, imperfect, even 'fallen' or corrupted state or predicament. Why, when the ideals of life are so clearly to be cooperative, selfless and loving, are we so competitive, selfish and aggressive?

And the truth is, humans have always intuitively known that the real problem we have to understand about ourselves is the issue of the human condition—the difficulty, however, has been that unable to explain the dark side of ourselves we have coped by living in almost complete denial of the issue, blocking it out of our mind, because to think about it was too depressing and, until now, an answerless and thus futile exercise. In fact, we only ever mentioned the term 'human condition' when we were being really profound, and even then it sent shivers down our spine.

I have used the phrase 'until now' because through the advances made in science it is now at last possible to overcome this impasse and make sense of this deepest and darkest, previously off-limits issue of the human condition. Yes, that greatest of all days in our human journey of conscious thought and enquiry—in fact, the day that we have lived in hope and faith and trust would one day come—when biology would finally be able to provide redeeming understanding of our less-than-ideal existence and allow us to at last explain the psychological origins of our species' deeply troubled predicament or condition and by so doing ameliorate or heal that condition has now, and in the nick of time, arrived!

So while there has been much talk of the need to love each other and to love the environment, the *real* need on Earth has been to love the dark side of ourselves, to find the reconciling, redeeming and healing understanding of that—and it is precisely that all-important understanding of ourselves that is going to be presented here.

You are about to hear the explanation of the human condition and, as you will see, the answer is *so* redeeming and relieving that it TRANSFORMS us, and thus our world—hence our organisation's name: the WORLD TRANSFORMATION MOVEMENT.

In summary, what is to be presented is the first-principle-based biological understanding that lifts the ancient debilitating, so-called 'burden of guilt' from our species' shoulders and, by so doing, heals our troubled souls and sets us free—and this is not one of those mind<u>less</u>, dogma-based, 'New Age' false starts to a new world for humans that can't and doesn't last. This is the mind<u>ful</u> *understanding* that alone could bring about the *real* and *lasting* repair of ourselves and our planet. We humans are conscious beings, we needed brain food not brain anaesthetic. We needed *answers*, especially the answer to the crux question of why we have been the way we have been, less-than-ideally behaved, and it is that answer of answers that will be presented here.

This is the most exciting moment in human history!

You are now invited to watch and/or read a more formal introduction to the WORLD TRANSFORMATION MOVEMENT, before the all-important liberating explanation of the human condition is presented in Part 3.

Part 2
The World Transformation Movement

Part 2:1 Introduction, by Tim Macartney-Snape AM OAM

© 2009 Fedmex Pty Ltd

Welcome everyone to the WORLD TRANSFORMATION MOVEMENT (WTM).

My name is Tim Macartney-Snape and I would like to introduce to you this presentation by my very close friend and fellow Patron of the WORLD TRANSFORMATION MOVEMENT, Jeremy Griffith. Jeremy is an Australian biologist and the author of many books and publications about the human condition.

The issue of the human condition, which is humans' capacity for what has been called 'good' and 'evil', is really the agonising core issue that we humans have needed to understand about our behaviour—and it is that all-important biological understanding of the human condition, which the discoveries of science have at last made possible, that Jeremy will be presenting here today. The ability to understand this essential aspect of ourselves is what makes the TRANSFORMATION of humans possible, and with that TRANSFORMATION of ourselves comes the TRANSFORMATION of our world—hence the name of the organisation that has been established to support and promote these understandings: the WORLD TRANSFORMATION MOVEMENT.

What you are about to hear is nothing less than the culminating insight of *all* human enquiry into the nature of our world and our place in it.

As Jeremy has said, the eternal hope, faith, trust and indeed belief of the human race has been that one day the all-clarifying, reconciling, healing and TRANSFORMING explanation of human nature would finally be found, freeing humans at last of their insecure, troubled, good-and-evil-afflicted so-called human condition. And as incredible as it is, it is that greatest of all breakthroughs that *has* finally been achieved. It is *this* dreamed of explanation that you are about to hear!

And it comes not a moment too soon, for *only* the clarifying, dignifying and redeeming biological understanding of the dilemma of the human condition—the understanding of our species' extraordinary capacity for so-called 'good and evil', the understanding of why we humans have been so competitive, aggressive and selfish when the ideals are so clearly to be cooperative, loving and selfless—could heal the underlying insecurity of that condition, and by so doing bring an end to all the devastation, distress and suffering in the world.

Indeed, the great Swiss psychoanalyst Carl Gustav Jung (1875-1961), who early in his career had been a follower of the founder of psychoanalysis, the Austrian Sigmund Freud (1856-1939), was forever saying that **'wholeness for humans depended on the ability to own their own shadow'** because he recognised that *only* understanding of our species' dark, human-condition-afflicted state could reconcile and relieve the guilt and resulting psychosis of that situation and make us **'whole'** again.

Similarly, the ancients had emblazoned across their temples the words **'Man, know thyself'** because again it was only understanding of the psychological reason for why we humans have not been ideally behaved that could heal that condition.

So, knowledge, specifically self-knowledge, is what the human race has been tirelessly working towards since the dawn of consciousness in the hope that some day, some where, some time someone standing completely upright would truthfully and boldly walk right through the middle of all the confusion and seeming madness of our human situation and make sense of it all—and again, amazing as it is, that is what has happened. On the shoulders of all the eons of human enquiry and effort (and indeed benefiting from the courageous efforts of all humans who have ever lived) Jeremy has done just that. That day of days, that greatest of all breakthroughs has at last arrived! That holy grail of the human journey of finding first principle-based, biological understanding of the human condition has finally been found. Ameliorating or healing understanding of ourselves is now here.

From a situation of bewildering confusion and darkness about what it is to be human we have broken through to a world drenched in the light of relieving understanding. The dawn of enlightenment has arrived; the sun is finally coming up to drain away all the darkness from our lives. This is *the* most amazing moment.

Part 2:2 Commendation from Professor Harry Prosen, former President of the Canadian Psychiatric Association

At this point I might ask Professor Harry Prosen, via Skype from the United States, for his view of these understandings of the human condition that Jeremy will be presenting.

Harry Prosen is a professor of psychiatry who has worked in the field for over 50 years, including chairing two departments of psychiatry and serving as president of the Canadian Psychiatric Association. Professor Prosen was recently appointed one of 500 Specially Selected Distinguished Life Fellows of the American Psychiatric Association. He is also psychiatric consultant to the Bonobo Species Preservation Society. In fact, to listen to a brief 2012 radio interview of Professor Prosen talking about his amazing psychiatric work with bonobos, click on Professor Prosen's photo on his Wikipedia page.

Hello Professor Prosen, welcome to Australia.

Professor Prosen:

'Thank you Tim, it's nice to be with you all in Australia. As Tim has said, I have been a student of psychiatry for *many* years. What I have to tell you is that I have no doubt this biological explanation of Jeremy Griffith's of the human condition is the holy grail of insight we have sought for the psychological rehabilitation of the human race. I cannot urge you strongly enough to listen to what Jeremy Griffith has to explain. My message is as simple as that. This is all so exciting; I'm quite overwhelmed to be here on Earth when these answers are finally found. Thank you for the opportunity to speak with you.'

Tim Macartney-Snape:

Thank you very much Professor Prosen for speaking with us.

I will now ask Jeremy Griffith to speak.

Part 2:3 'A joy without limit', by Jeremy Griffith

Thank you so very much Professor Prosen and Tim for your appreciative words, and thank you all for coming along.

The issue of the human condition *has* been the real 'elephant in the living room' of our lives—the great unmentionable subject on Earth, the most important yet least acknowledged subject in human life. Indeed, it will be revealed that the human condition has been *the* dominating psychological influence in human behaviour since human consciousness fully developed and we became a self-managing species some two million years ago, and the underlying issue in *all* human affairs—so influential in our lives, in fact, that being able to explain the human condition, and by so doing understand and ameliorate or heal its effects, brings about a fundamental TRANSFORMATION of humans of the most dramatic and wonderful kind.

As Tim said, the issue of the human condition—our species' capacity for what has been called 'good' and 'evil'—is the agonising core issue that we humans have needed to understand about our behaviour. Essentially, human nature, as it has been, was not something

immutable or unchangeable, as it is often thought, but rather the product of an underlying *psychological* condition that we humans have always intuitively held a hope, faith and trust would one day be able to be understood and thus alleviated, and it is that wonderful day of liberation from the agony of the human condition that has finally arrived.

I have used the word 'intuitively' because this underlying psychological condition is not something we humans have been able to openly admit to, even to ourselves, let alone discuss with each other. In fact, the human condition has been such a distressingly difficult subject for us humans to confront that, after being under some pressure to acknowledge its existence, I have heard it referred to as **'the personal unspeakable'**, and as **'the black box inside of humans that they can't go near'**. And these are not outrageous exaggerations, for the truth is the subject of the human condition—the issue of the extreme imperfection of human life—*has* been so distressing and depressing that until it could be explained a practice of near total denial of the subject had to be adopted. For example, while 'human nature' appears in dictionaries, 'human condition' never does. It was only in moments of extreme profundity that we even mentioned the dreaded term 'human condition', and even then it was only ever a vague, glancing reference. For instance, the mission statement of the Fetzer Foundation, a philanthropic organisation in the United States, contains lofty words about its dedication to research, education and service, and spliced in amongst them are the words: **'as we press toward unique frontiers at the edge of revolutionary breakthroughs in the human condition.'**

(Note, this situation where the subject of the human condition has been virtually unmentionable changed significantly with the publication in 2012 of the American biologist Edward (E.) O. Wilson's book, *The Social Conquest of Earth*, in which he claims to explain the human condition. But, as it is fully explained later in Part 4:12I, this 'Theory of Eusociality' (as E.O. Wilson has termed this supposed 'explanation' of the human condition) doesn't truthfully explain the human condition at all, rather it attempts to dismiss it as nothing more than a conflict between supposed selfish and selfless instincts within humans. It is not a profound, fully accountable, truthful, *real* explanation of the *psychological* dilemma involved in the human condition, but a completely false—indeed fake—superficial trivialisation of the subject. What E.O. Wilson has done is put forward a supposed explanation of the human condition that nullifies it, that makes it appear benign, nothing profoundly distressing at all, when, as the author Olive Schreiner so honestly acknowledges in her writing that I will be referring to in a moment, the human condition is a fearfully distressing subject. Indeed, descriptions provided in Part 3:8 of adolescents going through Resignation, during which they try to face down the terrifying issue of the imperfect state of our human condition, make it more than clear that the human condition is, in reality, a profoundly deep, extremely dark and fearful—indeed terrifying—*psychological* issue. As will be described in Part 4:12, in devising such theories as Social Darwinism, Sociobiology, Evolutionary Psychology, Multilevel Selection and now Eusociality, mechanistic/reductionist science has become masterful at finding new ways to avoid the true nature of the human condition. The unfortunate result of the fake trivialisation of the human condition in E.O. Wilson's theory of Eusociality is that people will now be inclined to refer to the subject in a way that doesn't recognise and respect its true nature. The issue of the human condition has been so belittled by this new

dishonest account of it that it has lost its dread, but the *true* horror of this immensely dishonest interpretation of the human condition is that it has taken humanity to the brink of terminal alienation. *That* is how serious the repercussions are of misrepresenting this core issue in being human—this most profoundly important subject of all—as benign, virtually inconsequential, which is what this new theory of Eusociality in effect does. It leads us away from the truth about ourselves at the very time we need to be facing that truth and, by so doing, finding a genuine psychologically ameliorating understanding of it. As emphasised in Part 4:12I, E.O. Wilson's dismissal of our human condition as inconsequential is the most sophisticated and thus dangerous denial to have ever been developed on Earth. More will be said about Eusociality shortly in Parts 3:2 and 3:4, but what I am concerned with achieving here is informing readers that while E.O. Wilson has now dismissively trivialised the subject of the human condition, what I said here in 2009, and what I say throughout my writings, about it actually being a fearful subject still holds true for humans whenever they truthfully engage with the issue.)

The fact remains, we humans have lived in such fear and thus denial of even the term 'human condition' that when people are asked what it means most say they don't really know, while others who do think they know say it refers to our *physical* predicament, all the poverty, disease and pollution in the world, when in truth those problems are merely by-products of the human condition, which is our species' *psychological* predicament—our inability to understand *why* we have not been ideally behaved, why we became corrupted, **'fell from grace'** (derived from the title of Gen. 3, **'The Fall of Man'**), and as a result were **'banished…from the Garden'** (Gen. 3:23) of our species' state of original innocence.

The reality has been that as humans grew up they soon learnt to avoid, to block out, to put up 'blinkers' to the whole subject of the incredible imperfection of human life because to think about it has been far too distressing, and above all—*until now*—an answerless and thus futile exercise. Adults have learnt to live in denial of the whole depressing issue of the human condition.

So it is not surprising that we need a child's innocence, with all its honesty, to reconnect us to the truth of the utter hypocrisy of human life and the fundamental question that had to be solved of 'Why?' The child I refer to is Olive Schreiner, a famous South African writer who, on her deathbed in 1920, wrote a deeply reflective essay in which she was able to recall her childhood struggle with the issue of the human condition. She told how, as a little girl **'not yet nine years old'**, she was overcome with distress about all the selfishness, meanness and cruelty in the world. Remarkably, while Schreiner wasn't able to find understanding of all the wrongness in human behaviour, she did manage to achieve, through the inspiring beauty of nature, some peace of mind by realising that a greater meaning did lie behind all the apparent wrongness and suffering in human life.

I would now like to relate what Schreiner wrote because it not only reconnects us with the issue of the human condition, it also wonderfully illustrates what both Tim and Professor Prosen have said about how incredibly exciting it is that science has finally made it possible to explain the human condition and, through doing so, bring about the **'rehabilitation'** of our species.

For brevity's sake, I will read just the main passages from Schreiner's essay: **'When a child, not yet nine years old, I walked out one morning along the mountain tops on which my home stood.**

The sun had not yet risen, and the mountain grass was heavy with dew…I walked till I came to a place where a little stream ran…I had got up so early because I had been awake much in the night and could not sleep longer. My heart was heavy; my physical heart seemed to have a pain in it, as if small, sharp crystals were cutting into it. All the world seemed wrong to me…Why did everyone press on everyone and try to make them do what they wanted? Why did the strong always crush the weak? Why did we hate and kill and torture? Why was it all as it was? Why had the world ever been made?…The little sharp crystals seemed to cut deeper into my heart.

And then, as I sat looking at [the stream]**…the sun began to rise. It shot its lights across the long, grassy slopes of the mountains and struck…**[a] **little mound of earth** [at the water's edge]**…All the… flowers and grasses on it turned bright gold, and the dewdrops hanging from them were like diamonds; and the water in the stream glinted as it ran. And, as I looked at that almost intolerable beauty, a curious feeling came over me…I seemed to *see* a world in which creatures no more hated and crushed, in which the strong helped the weak, and men understood each other, and forgave each other, and did not try to crush others, but to help…And there came to me, as I sat there, a joy such as never besides have I experienced…a joy without limit…**

[T]**his feeling** [that] **came to me, a feeling…not easy to put into words…was like this: You also are a part of the great Universe; what you strive for something strives for…you are moving on towards something…**

In the long years which have passed, the adult has seen…the greed, the ambition, the cruelty and falsehood of the individual soul…in so hideously enlarged and wholly unrestrained a form that it might be forgiven to one who cried out to the powers that lie behind life: "Is it not possible to put out a sponge and wipe up humanity from the earth? It is stain!"…[Very honestly, Schreiner also conceded that even **'Within my own soul I have perceived elements militating against all I hungered for'**.] [She went on]**…I have tried to wear no blinkers…I have tried to look nakedly in the face those facts which make most against all hope—and yet, in the darkest hour, the consciousness which I carried back with me that morning has never wholly deserted me…**

That which was for the young child only a vision…has, in the course of a long life's experience, become a hope…which a growing knowledge of human nature and human life does endorse. Somewhere, some time, some place' (*Somewhere, Some Time, Some Place*, from a 1987 collection titled *An Olive Schreiner Reader: Writings on Women and South Africa*, ed. Carol Barash, pp.216-220 of 261).

'Somewhere, some time, some place' is almost the same phrase Tim used.

I think that passage is as clean a take on the fundamental situation we humans have been in as you could hope to find.

Having, as Schreiner said, **'tried to look nakedly in the face of those facts which'** seem unequivocally to deny **'all hope'** of there being meaning in all the suffering and apparent wrongness in human life, she then, in that state of complete openness to all the possibilities, saw the sparkle on a stream in the early morning sunlight and, through that beauty, was connected to the greater truth that there *is* a purpose and destiny to human existence—that we have been **'moving towards something'**. That **'something'**, she said, was **'a growing knowledge of human nature'** that will **'somewhere, some time, some place'** bring about an incredible TRANSFORMATION of humans where **'the strong helped the weak, and men understood each other, and forgave each other, and did not try to crush others, but to help'**, and that the coming of that time would bring about **'a joy without limit'**.

Believe it or not, this **'somewhere'** and **'some time'** and **'some place'** when **'a growing knowledge of human nature'**—science, in fact—would make possible reconciling, redeeming, healing and transforming understanding of ourselves—when, as Professor Prosen said, **'the psychological rehabilitation of the human race'** could begin—is happening right now, and right here in what you are about to hear!!

I should emphasise again that what is to be presented is not another romantic, unrealistic, pseudo-idealistic, superficial, futile, got-us-nowhere, dogma-based Marxist, socialist, left-wing demand for utopia—or, for that matter, some think-positive, feel-good, motivational New Age treatment of our human situation. Quite the opposite. To reach the truth about our human situation we have to go, and indeed will be going, into the very heart of the darkness plaguing this planet, down into the depths of our species' psychosis. We are going into that deepest, darkest and previously off-limits subject of the human condition and safely out the other side to our species' FREEDOM. This will be no superficial account of humanity's journey, or of our lives as part of it, but rather a deeply profound presentation of the biological origins, effects and, most importantly, resolution of the underlying issue in all human affairs of our species' extraordinary capacity for both 'good' and 'evil'.

Earth has certainly presented some extremely hostile and forbidding realms for humans to attempt to explore, such as the sulphurous volcanic vents recently discovered at the bottom of the oceans, but the *REAL* frontier for human endeavour to conquer was never the inhospitable parts of our landscape or even the remote reaches of outer space, it was always inner space, the domain of 'self', the realm of the human condition. Indeed, Joseph Conrad's famous novel about an adventure up the Congo River into **'the heart of darkness'**, as the 1902 book was titled, was actually a metaphorical anticipation of this greatest of all journeys that we are now, in this very presentation, about to embark upon.

So this is *some* journey we are going on into the darkest of subjects, for we are going to be addressing the historically psychologically terrifying issue of the human condition, BUT, we are going to make it both successful and thus safe by, as Tim said, flooding it with the light of dignifying, uplifting, liberating, redeeming, relieving and TRANSFORMING biological understanding.

Importantly, this is about the *fulfilment* of humanity's freedom-from-dogma-dependent, heroic search for knowledge, *not* about abandoning that heroic search by oppressively imposing unrealistic ideal values. Indeed, this is all about the end of dogma—even of faith—and the beginning of knowing. Olive Schreiner's vision was dependent on the arrival of *knowledge*—**'knowledge of human nature'** is what she said—the ability to understand ourselves at last, and it is that particular knowledge, and nothing else, that could, and now does, bring about a new, TRANSFORMED world for humans.

In summary, what is to be presented is the most heroic story ever told, the story of us, the story of the human race: our species' journey through the long cold night of having to live in a state of ignorance—most particularly, ignorance about our worthiness or otherwise—to finally reaching enlightenment. We humans had this awesome computer put in our heads, our fully conscious, thinking brain, but we were not given the program for it; instead we were left to wander this Earth searching for the program in a terrifying darkness of confusion and

bewilderment. Well, as Tim said, from that terrifyingly cold darkness we can now emerge into the warm sunshine of dignifying, redeeming, relieving and TRANSFORMING *understanding*.

Yes, this journey that we are about to go on leads to the most astonishingly wonderfully FREE, peaceful, happy and exciting TRANSFORMED existence for all humans. In fact, it is the human-condition-free, exhilarated and empowered, truly alive lifeforce state that we have always dreamt of one day being able to achieve. Although we haven't been able to acknowledge it, our psychological struggle with the human condition has been *so* dominating, *so* destructive and *so* oppressive of our lives that in solving it we are effectively solving all of our own problems and those of the world. It is *that* significant and impacting a breakthrough! Finding understanding of the human condition brings about the liberation of the human race and the TRANSFORMATION OF THE WORLD, a situation that is so wonderful that it brings us humans, as Schreiner said, **'a joy without limit'**!

At this point, some of you watching this video, or reading this transcript, might wish to go straight to the biological explanation of the human condition and follow that main discussion, which is presented in Part 3.

Alternatively, you can continue with Part 2, where shortly I will put forward Five Propositions on what will happen now that understanding of the human condition has been found. Tim Macartney-Snape will then conclude Part 2 with a brief history of these ideas and of the World Transformation Movement.

Before either moving on to Part 3 or continuing with Part 2 I would, however, like to advise the reader and/or the viewer to be prepared to re-read and/or re-watch the presentations a number of times. This issue of the human condition has been *so* difficult for humans to look at that we have practiced almost total denial of it and this practiced denial makes taking in or 'hearing' discussion about the subject very difficult. What happens initially is that our mind goes into shock when discussion of the human condition begins and finds it very difficult to absorb what is being said, as evidenced by these reader responses: **'When I first read your books all I saw were a lot of black marks on white paper'**; and **'When I read your book I found the content very difficult to absorb, so much so in fact I found it impossible telling someone what the book was even about'**; and **'please send me an executive summary of your book because I can't understand what it's about.'** This comment from an internet blog also summarises the difficulty: **'reading Griffith is like reading another language—you know its English, you can understand the words, but the concepts are so basic and so different that they are almost incomprehensible—its a paradigm shift of a read.'** What is so **'basic'** and **'different'**, and such a **'paradigm shift'**, is that the historically unconfrontable, off-limits, even toxic issue of the human condition is finally being addressed and explained. This response describes the problem clearly: **'The words in your books have in my experience brought up emotional reactions in people and their minds reject the information, they are not able to get behind the words and experience the profundity of where you are coming from…Your insights are so head on as to cripple people.'**

So my strong advice is to be prepared for what we call the 'deaf effect' that this information about the human condition causes when you first start to read/hear discussion of it, and to be prepared to continue to re-watch these presentations, and/or re-read these transcripts. In fact, the best way to overcome the initial 'deaf effect' difficulty of reading about the human condition is by taking the WTM Deaf Effect Course which can be accessed at <www.humancondition.com/wtm-deaf-effect-course>. You'll be astonished at how you do begin to absorb what is being put forward, when initially it is very difficult. Of course, once you are able to access the information sufficiently to evaluate its accountability, you then have to make sure you maintain a healthy balance between the extent to which you continue to study it and how much self-confrontation you can cope with. You can read more about this 'deaf effect' and how best to manage it in Part 3:13.

Part 2:4 The sunrise of our species' FREEDOM, by Jeremy Griffith

Our WTM poster, copies of which are freely available at <www.humancondition.com/wtm-posters>.

Before continuing, I would like to say that there are some members here in the audience from the WORLD TRANSFORMATION MOVEMENT (WTM). I should say there are certain people I must thank for their enduring support of this all-important project for the human race of bringing understanding to the human condition, especially our founding directors: my partner of 30 years, Annie Williams; my brother Simon Griffith; Tim Macartney-Snape; Tim Watson, and Stacy Rodger. No less critically important has been the support and resolve of the other 50-strong founding members of the WTM. All that has

been achieved—and as will become apparent, an immense amount has been achieved—in the last 26 years since 1983 when the FHA/WTM was established and the present, 2009 (at the time of filming), is due to the efforts of these precious few people. The fact is the opposition to our work has been so great, and our dedication to match it has had to be so great, that we have not even been able to have children. There are so many children in the world and yet there has never before been any answers to the fundamental questions facing humanity about the human condition, so obviously when those answers finally *do* arrive it is of the utmost priority that we defend them, especially in light of how vulnerable these understandings are to everyone's rampant insecurities about their own human condition. Trying to address the issue of the human condition when, as I will soon explain, humanity's historical, age-old way of coping with the issue has been to determinedly avoid it, has meant that we have been committing a very great heresy, and to do that has required extraordinary courage, tenacity, self-sacrifice and self-sufficiency. We are a very proud organisation indeed. While this project will remain in some jeopardy until substantial support builds for it, we thankfully feel that the horrifically difficult pioneer stage is over and that the extreme self-sacrifices, such as not having children, won't be necessary for subsequent members.

The WORLD TRANSFORMATION MOVEMENT is so named because its objective is to TRANSFORM the individual, the human race and the world through bringing dignifying and ameliorating or healing understanding to the human condition. Details about the WORLD TRANSFORMATION MOVEMENT can be found on our website: <**www.worldtransformation.com**> or <**www.humancondition.com**>—possibly humancondition.com is easiest to remember.

What is to be presented is a first principle-based, rational, testable, scientific understanding of the human condition. We are going to be throwing light on that deepest of all issues and through doing so bring about the liberation and amelioration of that underlying psychosis in our species' situation. And it is the dawning of this liberating knowledge about our species that the rising sun in the background of these images behind me (our WTM poster, which was included at the beginning of this Part, and our FREEDOM poster, which is shown at the start of Part 3:5), and the gold colour of this theatre, symbolises. The sun has historically been a symbol for knowledge—light equals knowledge—and its emergence over the horizon symbolises a dawning of a new era for humanity based on our ability to finally understand ourselves.

The following photograph of the founding members of the WORLD TRANSFORMATION MOVEMENT (which will be presented again shortly in a larger format), each with their arms stretched up in the air, is another effort to imitate the sun rising over the horizon.

I should also say that it is natural to be somewhat or even entirely sceptical that what is going to be presented will finally explain the human condition and TRANSFORM humans, but since what is to be presented is all rational, understandable knowledge, you're on safe ground. There is no dogma, or faith, or belief, or mysticism, or superstition, or any abstract concepts involved in the explanation. This is all about knowledge that either stacks up or it doesn't—and if it doesn't you should reject it. What I have to explain will either make sense to you or it won't.

While you have to discover for yourself if what is to be presented does unlock the mysteries of our human situation, the certainty that I and Tim and Professor Prosen and many, many others familiar with these understandings have that what is presented is indeed the long sought after explanation of the human condition comes from the explanation's ability to make sense of every aspect of the human condition, indeed of every aspect of human behaviour. The great

German-born physicist Albert Einstein (1879-1955) recognised humans' ability to establish the validity or otherwise of ideas when he said, **'truth is what stands the test of experience'** (*Out of My Later Years*, 1950). Indeed, the following image of a key unlocking someone's mind is very emblematic of the power of this idea to finally make sense of ourselves and unlock our long repressed potentials. In fact, we used the symbol of a key held aloft as the logo of our movement when it was previously called the Foundation for Humanity's Adulthood.

© 2023 Fedmex Pty Ltd

So, with the human condition at last solved, as we are claiming it is—and in truth the human condition has been such a dark and unapproachable subject that it couldn't be addressed so freely as it is if it hadn't been solved—what is going to be discussed is something that has never before been freely spoken about in all of human history. As I said, the human condition has been the great unmentionable—*the* 'elephant in our living rooms' that we have lived in such deep fear and thus denial of that we are virtually unaware of its existence. But that all changes now. With understanding of the human condition found we can now safely

acknowledge the issue of the human condition—and, as will later be described at some length, manage the confronting truth of the extent of our corruption of self (that the explanation of the human condition necessarily exposes) in a most effective, TRANSFORMING way.

Part 2:5 The Propositions, by Jeremy Griffith

The overall submission I am making today is that through the finding of understanding of the human condition your life, and the lives of all humans, can at last be TRANSFORMED from a human-condition-afflicted state to a state that is effectively FREE of the human condition. As extraordinary, even outrageous, as this statement sounds, over the next few hours I plan to validate it by establishing the following fabulous propositions—and I want to outline these propositions now because while they may seem bold now, when I come back to them at the end of this presentation you might in fact find you agree with them:

The First Proposition is that what is to be presented will explain the fundamental paradox of the human condition—explain how we humans could be good, wonderful and worthwhile when all the evidence seems to unequivocally indicate that we are the very opposite of good, wonderful and worthwhile.

Cartoon by Michael Leunig, Melbourne's *The Age* newspaper, 8 Oct. 1988

This masterpiece by the Australian cartoonist Michael Leunig truthfully depicts all the horrors of the human condition. What is so brave about this cartoon is that it defies the historical and now deeply habituated practice of denial of the issue of the human condition and instead fully resurrects and confronts us squarely with the issue. Leunig has been contributing cartoons to and writing for Australian newspapers since 1965 and in that time has produced innumerable brilliantly honest, insightful and therapeutically revealing cartoons about all aspects of our species' troubled condition. This one, which first appeared in Melbourne's leading newspaper, *The Age*, on 8 October 1988, is in my view one of his best.

This is not a picture of a lovely ordered city park where people peacefully and happily enjoy themselves, as we all too easily prefer to delude ourselves that the world we have created is like. Rather, it shows a mother and child approaching the **'Gardens of the Human Condition'** with an expression of bewildered dread on the face of the mother, and in the case of the child, wide-eyed shock. With this cartoon, Leunig has boldly revealed the truth that we humans have been a brutally angry, hateful, destructive, arrogant, egocentric, selfish, mad, lonely, unhappy and psychologically depressed species. He has people fighting, beating and strangling each other, drunk out of their minds, depressed, lonely, crying, hiding and suiciding, going mad and egocentrically holding forth—reflecting, in effect, every aspect of the human condition. And he has further highlighted the issue of the extreme imperfection of our lives by identifying all this behaviour as actually being the issue of our human condition, labelling the park the **'Gardens of the Human Condition'**.

Even more exposing—and confronting—is his reference to **'Gardens'**, which suggests that our behaviour now is an extremely corrupted version of an original, innocent, idyllic, pre-conscious and thus pre-human-condition-afflicted **'Garden of Eden'** state that the Bible (and indeed all our mythologies) maintain our pre-conscious ancestors once lived in. If the human race has departed from a state of original innocence and we haven't been able to explain why it did, then it is no wonder we are insecure about the imperfection of human life now; the issue of the human condition *would* elicit unbearable condemnation for being such a mean, brutal and savagely behaved species now. And, in fact, what will be explained in Part 3:4 of this presentation is that there *was* a time before we became a fully conscious species when we were free of egocentricity, anger and alienation—a time of innocence before there was even an issue called the human condition. And as a result, we *do* carry a very deep insecurity and resulting psychosis about our species' current extremely imperfect, less-than-ideal behaviour—and because of that, we *have* lived in denial of the human condition.

The reality is it hasn't been psychologically safe for humans to confront, admit and address the issue of the human condition until it could be explained and understood. So with this cartoon Leunig broke all the rules. He bravely put the term 'human condition' up front and centre, and honestly depicted it as relating to the bewildering mystery of the extreme imperfection of human life now—in fact, to the psychological anguish that our capacity for anger, selfishness, cruelty and meanness, our extraordinary capacity for 'inhumanity' towards each other, has caused us, *if* we allowed ourselves to think about it.

The fact of the matter is we have lived in near total denial of not just the issue of the human condition, but any thoughts that even remotely brought it into focus. And we certainly evaded the most difficult aspect of the human condition—how it relates to us personally, to our own imperfections, to the issue of 'self'.

I should also say that not only is the human condition the most difficult of subjects for humans to think about and look at because it involves self-confrontation, it is also a difficult subject for humans to engage in because it is the area of enquiry where religion and science, faith and reason finally overlap. When our objective, scientific analysis of the mechanisms and workings of our world finally finds the insights that make it possible to explain the human condition, science at that moment enters the subjective domain of the human condition where our spiritual faiths and beliefs have operated—reason and faith are finally reconciled. Objectivity and subjectivity, materialism and spiritualism meet when the human condition is addressed and explained, but this collision of two previously very separate domains can cause great anxiety, about which more will be said later.

Involving as it does these difficulties of self-confrontation and the massive religion-and-science-reconciling-paradigm-shift, it should not come as a surprise that the human condition has been the most contentious of subjects—*so* contentious that some people even believed it was a subject that could never, and should never, be opened up. The entry for 'sin' in *The Bible Reader's Encyclopedia and Concordance*, for instance, maintains that **'The problem of the origin and universality of sin…is probably one of those problems which the human mind can never satisfactorily answer.'** The American spiritual teacher Ram Dass held the same view in his 1977 book *Grist for the Mill*, when, in posing the question **'Why did we** [fall from grace] **in the first place?'**, he answered, **'That is the question which is the ultimate question** [and] **your subject-object mind can't know the answer to that question.'** But while the issue of the human condition *has* been so terrifying that some people believed it could never be addressed, the truth is at some stage it *had to be* addressed and explained for there to be a future for the human race. To bring about the peaceful, integrated, environmentally considerate world we all seek we ultimately had to address and find understanding of our less-than-ideal, divisive competitive, aggressive, selfish nature—because without the reconciling, ameliorating explanation for *why* we humans have been divisively behaved the underlying insecurity about being divisively behaved would only continue; humans would, in effect, be condemned to a life of perpetual insecurity and thus ever-increasing levels of upset, angry, divisive and destructive behaviour and, consequently, ever-increasing levels of deadening denial or alienation to cope with the horror of that behaviour. *Only* the clarifying, dignifying, reconciling and redeeming biological understanding of the dilemma of the human condition could heal the underlying insecurity of that condition and, by so doing, bring an end to all the devastation, distress and suffering in the world.

But until we were able to explain the human condition and thus lift 'the burden of guilt', reconcile 'good' and 'evil', make sense of the dark side of ourselves, explain why we became so competitive, aggressive and selfish, we could not pacify our troubled nature, dismantle our psychosis; we would not feel, as it were, 'welcomed back into God's fold', feel accepted on Earth, feel understood and appreciated. We needed to find the reconciling, redeeming understanding of ourselves—and it is precisely that crucial, all-important understanding that is going to be presented.

The overall point to be made here is that we humans have an unspeakable history of greed, hatred, brutality, rape, torture, persecution, murder and war—a propensity for deeds of shocking violence, depravity, indifference and cruelty. Despite all our marvellous

accomplishments, we humans have been the most ferocious and destructive force the world has ever known. And yet the very first proposition I'll be making here is that what is going to be revealed is that we humans are, in fact, not just fundamentally good, wonderful and worthwhile, but the absolute heroes of the story of life on Earth! So that's the extreme paradox of the human condition that I am proposing we are going to make sense of: how we humans are good, even divine beings, when we appear to be the complete opposite.

Cartoon by Michael Leunig, Melbourne's *The Age* newspaper, 17 Mar. 1984

In yet another brilliant cartoon, Michael Leunig has succinctly dared to ask this fundamental question of 'What does the chaotic, traumatic and strife-torn life of humans all mean—how are we to make sense of our existence?' He's done so by placing a very perplexed and distressed gentleman behind an 'understandascope', through which he peers into a sea of apparent madness. Everywhere he looks there is tumultuous congestion: there are people furiously arguing and fighting with each other; there is a church where people pray for forgiveness and salvation; and there are vehicles polluting the chaos with fumes and noise. *And*, in this 1984 drawing Leunig even seems to have predicted a climactic demonstration of all our human excesses and frustrations when, on September 11, 2001, terrorists flew planes into the tall, square-shaped towers of the World Trade Center in New York City!

Well, it is precisely this great mystery of 'What is wrong with us humans?'—'How are we to understand it all?'—'How are we to make sense of human existence?'—that is going to be answered. The explanation to be given *is* the 'UNDERSTANDASCOPE' we have always wanted, needed and sought.

Indeed, the following picture of endless grey suburbia in California is just another example of what we need an 'understandascope' to make sense of, for it depicts the apparent destiny of the world—I suggest—since California sits at the cutting edge of supposed world progress.

An article from *TIME* magazine (2 Nov. 2009) bears out these fears. The cover features the heading, **'Why California is still America's Future'**, underneath which the editors have added the aside **'and that's a good thing too'** in brackets. This subtext has seemingly been included because arguing **'Why California is still America's Future'** leaves the reader thinking, 'Well, if California is at the cutting edge of development and progress, and it is in dire straits, then surely that is a terrifying prospect for us all.' To avoid that reaction the editors evidently realised they needed to add a pre-emptive, 'No, no, what we're trying to say is that it is going to be a positive story.'

Despite the article's positive spin, about cutting edge developments, like clean technologies, being pioneered in California, it does begin with some honesty: **'California, you may have heard, is an apocalyptic mess, soaring unemployment, mass foreclosures and political paralysis. It's dysfunctional. It's ungovernable. Its bond rate is barely above junk…The media portray California as a noir fantasyland of over-crowded schools, perpetual droughts, celebrity breakdowns, illegal immigration, hellish congestion and general malaise.'** It also mentions **'California's wipeout economy'** ['Why California Is Still America's Future (And That's a Good Thing Too)', Michael Grunwald, *TIME* mag. 2 Nov. 2009].

While the article goes on to paint a positive picture, its descriptions of an end play situation unfolding in California are closer to the truth. Shortly, however, when the human condition is explained, it will become apparent *why* we have always had to maintain a positive, brave front—for deep within the human make-up, there is an intuitive belief that one day we would be able to find the liberating, redeeming and totally TRANSFORMING understanding of ourselves and although the situation became more and more desperate each day, we have always had to cling onto that hope, keep believing in a positive outcome for the human race.

This situation of needing to find that much hoped-for redeeming understanding of the human condition before we destroyed ourselves and our planet was perfectly summarised by the Australian journalist Richard Neville, when he wrote that **'The world is hurtling to catastrophe: from nuclear horrors, a wrecked ecosystem, 20 million dead each year from malnutrition, 600 million chronically hungry…All these crises are man made, their causes are psychological. The cures must come from this same source; which means the planet needs psychological maturity…fast. We are locked in a race between self destruction and self discovery'** (*Good Weekend* mag. *Sydney Morning Herald*, 14 Oct. 1986). This is a precise description of the situation the human race has been in—we have been **'locked in a race between self destruction and self discovery.'**

Catch phrases of our time such as 'self-discovery', 'human potential' and 'self-esteem' stress this yearning for psychological maturity, self-realisation and self-justification, but the ability to appreciate and love ourselves ultimately depended on being able to understand ourselves—discover *why* we have been less than ideally behaved, in fact capable of horrific atrocities.

So while these cartoons and news articles provide some indication of the dire straits the world is in, it is the ability to turn this dire situation into one where all the problems faced by the world are solved through finding redeeming understanding of the human condition (as we have always hoped, even at the eleventh hour, that they would be) that is the basis of the next proposition.

The Second Proposition is that the seemingly hopeless situation facing the human race is going to suddenly be made entirely hopeful, in fact incredibly exciting.

Improved forms of management such as better laws, better politics and better economics—and better self-management, such as new ways of disciplining, organising, motivating or even transcending our troubled natures—have all failed to end the march towards ever greater levels of devastation and unhappiness. Indeed, as the article on California illustrated, we have entered an end play or end game situation on Earth where the planet cannot absorb any further devastation from the effects of our behaviour, nor can the human body for that matter endure any more debilitating stress and alienation.

Clearly only a change at the fundamental level of human behaviour can redeem the situation, save us from the prospect of terminal destruction. The following are some quotes I would like to read to you along those lines—that we need a fundamental change, that *only* a fundamental change can make a difference, because without the dignifying, reconciling, redeeming biological insight into our species' good-and-evil-afflicted condition, humanity would forever remain, as it has been, besieged and stalled by the distress of that condition, rapidly festering—dying in fact.

The first quote comes from the British historian Eric Hobsbawm described the stark predicament facing humanity when he wrote that **'The alternative to a changed society—is darkness'** (*Age of Extremes*, 1994). The 1991 film *Separate but Equal* also accurately articulated our plight as a species through the dialogue of one character: **'Struggling between two worlds; one dead, the other powerless to be born'**—words which echo those of the Italian philosopher Antonio Gramsci: **'The crisis consists precisely in the fact that the old is dying and the new cannot be born; in this interregnum a great variety of morbid symptoms appears'** (*Prison Notebooks*, written during Gramsci's 10-year imprisonment under Mussolini, 1927–1937).

Yes, until understanding of the human condition was found we *were* **'powerless'** to change our society—**'the new cannot be born'**. The Australian politician Lionel Bowen alluded to the futility of trying to reform our lives and world without first finding the ameliorating understanding of ourselves when he said, **'I think it's just impossible to bring about change until such time as some new civilisation develops to allow change'** (*Sydney Morning Herald*, 10 Sept. 1988).

Only a whole new way of thinking, in particular the reconciling, redeeming and healing way of understanding ourselves, and resulting new TRANSFORMED civilisation could alter our species' plight. We had arrived at a situation where humanity *desperately* needed clear biological understanding of ourselves, understanding that would make sense of our divisive condition and liberate us from criticism, lift the psychological burden of guilt, give us meaning. There *had* to be a scientific, first-principle-based, biological reason for our divisive behaviour and finding it had become a matter of great urgency. The **'race'** that Richard Neville so accurately identified we were **'locked in…between self destruction and self discovery'** had reached crisis point.

Stranded in a state of insecurity about our worthiness or otherwise was to be stranded in a terminally upset, psychologically immature state of arrested development, as Benjamin Disraeli, the Prime Minister of Great Britain in 1868 and again from 1874-1880, recognised, **'Stranded halfway between ape and angel is no place to stop.'** The Anglo-Irish essayist Jonathan Swift's anguished cry to **'Not die here in a rage, like a poisoned rat in a hole'** (Letter to Bolingbroke, 21 Mar. 1729) did not exaggerate the truth of our species' plight. The Spanish cellist Pablo Casals similarly emphasised the danger of our stalled state when he said, **'The situation is hopeless, we must take the next step'** (at a press conference in Madrid, on the occasion of his 80th [approx.] birthday). The Australian journalist Doug Anderson made the same point when he said, **'Time may well be dwindling for us to enlighten ourselves…Tragic to die of thirst half a yard from the well'** (*Sydney Morning Herald*, 31 Oct. 1994). In saying **'enlighten ourselves'**, Anderson was intimating that only understanding ourselves, understanding the human condition no less, could make the difference that was needed. In quoting clinical psychologist Maureen O'Hara, the science

reporter Richard Eckersley acknowledged that **'humanity is either standing on the brink of "a quantum leap in human psychological capabilities or heading for a global nervous breakdown"'** (*Values and Visions: Western Culture and Humanity's Future*, Address by Richard Eckersley, Nov. 1995; Accessed 11 Nov. 2009 at: <http://centreforchange.org/webmagart6a.html>). I think I like this last quote best of them all, but all express the seriousness of the situation.

It is precisely this **'enlightenment'** of **'ourselves'** that makes possible a **'quantum leap in human psychological capabilities'** that I'm asserting is going to be presented—yes, finding understanding of the human condition is the *real* game-changer the human race has been waiting for, such that when only yesterday the levels of human suffering and distress and anger and environmental degradation from the effects of our horrifically troubled, upset human condition seemed irredeemable and irreversible, and all looked hopeless, suddenly people are going to appear who are inspired and TRANSFORMED, *so* inspired and TRANSFORMED in fact they are super-charged on a super-highway to a fabulous future for the human race.

The Third Proposition is that once the incredible opportunity to be TRANSFORMED to a state free of the horror of the human condition (which understanding of the human condition at last makes possible) catches on, support for this WORLD TRANSFORMATION MOVEMENT will sweep the world and carry all before it. In fact, so quick and complete will be the change from a world of conflict and suffering to a world of peace and happiness that it will seem instant—as if one day the human race is living in a state of immense turmoil, bewildering confusion and utter despair and the next day it's all over: an entirely new peaceful world will have emerged.

The Fourth Proposition is that in the future all schooling will begin with the basic presentation that is going to be given today—and all classes and grades thereafter will simply keep fleshing out the concept, as we will also begin to do today. So instead of lots of different subjects, all information will be integrated under one subject: explanation of the human condition. Instead of learning apparently unrelated subjects like mathematics and history and chemistry and spelling, all knowledge will be taught in the context of the human condition; it will be about understanding ourselves and our world, and be presented in a structured, authentic way, beginning with who we humans are. All knowledge will be integrated properly. We will have a consilience or reconciliation of all knowledge.

The Fifth Proposition is that this information will make sense of and reconcile all the opposites in the human situation. It will reconcile:

—'good' and 'evil'
—yin and yang
—light and dark
—idealism and realism
—instinct and intellect
—'I feel' and 'I think'
—soul and mind
—heart and head
—emotion and reason
—conscience and conscious
—ignorance and wisdom
—the pure and the corrupted
—the innocent and the guilty
—the happy and the upset
—the light-hearted and heavy-hearted
—the unembattled and the heroic
—the selfless and the selfish
—altruism and egotism
—the cooperative and the competitive
—the gentle and the aggressive
—the loving and the hateful
—the integrative and the divisive
—the 'Godly' and the 'unGodly'
—the secure and the insecure
—the sound and the alienated
—the honest and the dishonest
—the natural and the artificial
—the non-sexual and the sexual
—the financially poor and financially rich
—the spiritually rich and spiritually poor
—spiritualism and materialism
—young and old
—the unresigned and the resigned
—women and men
—blacks and whites
—religion and science
—instinctualism and intellectualism
—holism/teleology and mechanism/reductionism
—left-wing and right-wing
—socialism and capitalism
—country and city

And we could go on. Basically all the duality of the human situation, all the poles of the human condition, will be reconciled by this explanation. This is because when understanding of the human condition is found, as you are about to discover it now has been, it is as though a great impasse in the human journey of conscious thought and enquiry has been breached, allowing access to an absolute flood of answers to *all* the fundamental questions we humans have been asking since time immemorial about ourselves and our world—in particular: 'Does God exist and if so what exactly is God and why does he allow suffering, and why is he referred to as male, and why are we all equal before his eyes; what does our existence all mean; why was I born; what is the point and purpose of our lives; what are we doing on

Earth; who are we and where are we going; what is the meaning of existence; what is "life" and how did it begin; what is our soul, how did we acquire it, and what has happened to it; did the human race once live in a Garden of Eden innocent state and, if so, why did we have to leave it, and most importantly how can we return to it; where does our moral sense or conscience come from; what is consciousness, intelligence and thought; are we shaped by nature or by nurture; how are men and women different; why do we fall in love; how do we explain sex as humans practice it; what is our sense of humour based on; why do we live such superficial, artificial, material lives; why is there so much loneliness, suffering, unhappiness, inequality and hunger and will they ever end; can we ever become truly moral beings; what causes human alienation, aggression, selfishness, competitiveness, envy, greed, hate, lust and egocentricity; how do we explain the dark side of human nature, or, in religious terms, what is the origin of 'sin', how do we explain the existence of 'good and evil' in the world, and is this duality in the human make-up going to continue forever; what does "left" and "right" wing in politics actually mean, and why do we have politics; why are people racist, sexist and elitist; why are children neglected the world over; why wars and will they ever stop; why did those people fly those planes into those buildings; why are humans religious and were prophets such as Christ humans like everyone else and, if so, why did they become so revered and even deified; what happens and where will I go when I die, and why do I have to die; what and where is "heaven" and "hell"; and are questions of "will the world and even the universe end and if so how" meaningful?' And as astonishing as it sounds, *all* these questions, and many more, *are* going to be answered and explained in first-principle-based, scientific, biological terms in the presentation you are about to hear.

So, the overall submission is that over the course of the next two hours or so we are going to introduce an understanding that will TRANSFORM the lives of all humans, the effects of which:

❑ will transform the world for its complete betterment
❑ will bring complete hope to what can seem hopeless
❑ gives rise to a movement that will sweep the world
❑ will introduce a new paradigm of understanding around which all knowledge can be integrated
❑ will reconcile all the opposites in the human situation

As I said, I will return to these propositions at the end of this presentation to see if you agree with each one.

WTM Patron Tim Macartney-Snape will now give you some background information about the WORLD TRANSFORMATION MOVEMENT.

Part 2:6 Brief history of the World Transformation Movement, by Tim Macartney-Snape

As I mentioned, Jeremy Griffith is an Australian biologist and the author of many books and publications about the human condition, the subject that has previously been described as the most hostile and forbidding realm of all for humans to venture into.

Published writings by Jeremy Griffith
(All these publications are freely available on the WTM website to be read or printed.)

© 2024 Fedmex Pty Ltd

Tim Macartney-Snape AM OAM, the first Australian to climb Mount Everest, on 3 Oct. 1984. This photo, with the FHA flag on the summit, was from Tim's solo sea to summit second ascent in 1990

So while I'm known for climbing mountains—this photo from my 1990 Sea to Summit ascent of Everest is a self-portrait of me holding the banner of the Foundation for Humanity's Adulthood (FHA) that gave rise to the WORLD TRANSFORMATION MOVEMENT—Jeremy is renowned for scaling far more difficult and, in truth, treacherous terrain, the mountains of the mind. In Part 5 of this presentation Jeremy will explain how he has managed to do so, however, in the interim I think it will help everyone to know something of Jeremy's background and the initiatives he was predominantly involved in that led to the establishment of the WORLD TRANSFORMATION MOVEMENT.

Jeremy, his brother Simon and other members of the FHA/WTM, including myself, are all beneficiaries of the influence of the soul-rather-than-intellect-cultivating, Platonic, education system established by Australia's greatest ever educator, Sir James Darling, at Geelong Grammar School in Victoria—the school that the future King of England, HRH The Prince of Wales, was sent to the other side of the world to attend for part of his education.

Jeremy was born on the 1st of December 1945 and raised on a sheep station in central New South Wales. He was a student at Geelong Grammar School some ten years before me, so we didn't meet until 1987 when I became fascinated with Jeremy's thinking about that greatest of all mysteries of the human condition.

Jeremy played a lot of rugby union football in his earlier days and in 1967, prior to completing his biology degree at Sydney University in 1971, he made the trials for the national side, the Wallabies (see <www.humancondition.com/jeremy-rugby>). This is a photo of three players from the New South Wales Country Week Rugby Carnival at Newcastle in 1967 who were chosen as having prospects for national selection. Jeremy is in the middle. On his right is Hugh Rose, who did go on to play for Australia and later became headmaster of Toowoomba Grammar School in Queensland. Bob Grant is on the left; he went on to become headmaster of Shore school in Sydney.

Forecast: Fine, warm; early fog (page 4).

High water: 6.23 a.m., 7 p.m. Sun: Rises 6.22, sets 5.24.

Newcastle Morning Herald

AND MINERS' ADVOCATE

NEWCASTLE, SATURDAY, APRIL 22, 1967

TRAINING ON THE SAND

Training for the first time on beach sand are, from left, New England Rugby Union players Bob Grant, a centre, Jeremy Griffith, breakaway, and Hugh Rose, lock. The New England players were the last of the country teams to arrive in Newcastle for the country carnival to begin at Nos. 1 and 2 Sports Grounds this afternoon. The New England players went from their hotel on arrival yesterday afternoon to Newcastle Beach for a training run.

Over a six-year period in the late 1960s and early 1970s Jeremy undertook the most thorough search ever conducted for the now believed to be extinct Thylacine or Tasmanian Tiger, the extraordinary marsupial equivalent of the wolf. The tiger's jaws were capable of this incredible gape.

The Examiner 131st YEAR

Launceston 31 5111, Devonport 24 1711, Hobart 34 5011, Burnie 31 2664

Vol. CXXXI. No. 70. Launceston, Friday, June 2, 1972. 24p. 7c

TIGER, TIGER...

• This photograph of a Tasmanian tiger with its mouth at full s tretch has never been published before. Now the property of a Hobart photographer it is not known who took it or where. It is on show at the Tasmanian tiger exhibition in Launceston.

Money could help them find it

THE TASMANIAN Conservation Trust yesterday launched a public appeal for finance to continue the search for the Tasmanian tiger.

The chairman of the trust's Northern branch (Mr P. Fleming) said that Mr J. Griffiths, of Armidale, N.S.W., and Mr J. Malley, of Trowutta, had come to the end of their resources in their long search for positive sightings of the animal.

This is some rare black and white footage of 'Benjamin', the last known tiger who died in Tasmania's Hobart Zoo in 1936.

Setting off with nothing but his own enthusiasm, initiative and ingenuity—as these next photos illustrate—Jeremy tried to rediscover and save the tiger from extinction.

© 1967-1974 Fedmex Pty Ltd

© Fedmex Pty Ltd 1967-1974

Jeremy with his window display for his 'Tiger Centre' in Launceston in 1972

In time his efforts began to draw a lot of support, in particular from James Malley and Bob Brown, who appear on the right in this photograph. Bob of course went on to found and lead the Australian Green Party in Australian politics.

THE EXAMINER, Tuesday, July 4, 1972—3

$2600 GRANT TO TIGER MEN

SEARCH IN N-E FIRST

THE BRITISH Tobacco Co. yesterday gave two Tasmanian tiger trackers $2600 to help in their search.

The trackers intend to rough it in thick bush in the North-East and elsewhere in the State for six months in the hope of finding a tiger.

Sydney zoologist Mr Jeremy Griffith and Trowutta farmer-naturalist Mr James Malley both believe the tiger is still alive.

Both have said that they believe they could find one within six months.

"The money means we can once and for all solve the question of the Tasmanian tiger's existence and its predicament," Mr Griffith said.

"It means we can live and search in the bush for six uninterrupted months."

Last week the Minister for Agriculture (Mr Costello) said he did not support the continuation of the tiger search and was not prepared to help the searchers financially.

Early last month the idea of the search almost collapsed because of lack of finance.

To increase interest and in an attempt to raise the

They have already been donated a Land Rover and radio equipment.

Mr Sanderson said when presenting the cheque that the British Tobacco Co. wanted to promote the search to prove whether the tiger did exist.

"If the animal still exists, we want to be associated with the proof that it does," he said.

"If it does not — and that possibility runs strongly against the evidence presented to us — then that regrettable fact should be proved.

"British Tobacco, as a company strongly identified with North-Eastern Tasmania, accepts a corporate responsibility to involve itself in the interests of all Tasmania.

• At yesterday's presentation of $2600 to help with the tiger search are (from left): Mr P. J. Sanderson, State manager of W. D. & H. O. Wills & Co.; Mr S. F. Howard, manager of the North-East Pastoral Co.; tiger searchers Jeremy Griffith and James Malley, and Dr R. Brown, a supporter of the search.

In 1972 *Natural History*, the official publication of the American Museum of Natural History, published a story written by Jeremy about his search for the Tasmanian Tiger—and in 1973 an episode in the highly regarded Australian television series *A Big Country* was shown about Jeremy's tiger-seeking adventures in Tasmania. For a more detailed account of Jeremy's remarkable search for the Tasmanian Tiger, go to <www.humancondition.com/tasmanian-tiger-search>.

The Search for the Tasmanian Tiger

Do the continuing reports of sightings mean that this primitive carnivore is not extinct?

by Jeremy Griffith

The Tasmanian tiger is—or was—one of the largest marsupial carnivores in the world. It was once plentiful throughout Australia's island state of Tasmania, persistently tracking its

An article by Jeremy Griffith in *Natural History*,
the magazine of The American Museum of Natural History, Dec. 1972

In 1973, after reaching the sad conclusion that the tiger was indeed extinct, Jeremy began manufacturing furniture to his own natural designs. Not only was it Jeremy's ideas about the human condition that first attracted me, it was also the simplicity and remarkable ingenuity of his furniture. In fact all the furniture in this theatre is from Jeremy's Griffith Tablecraft furniture business.

The pole framed showroom, museum and restaurant co that adjoined the massive framed workshop with its w up into the workshop

© 1976 Fedmex Pty Ltd

Text from the Advertisments :

Imagine - Wood furniture that is free of processed materials! No screws, nails, bolts, staples, glue, stain, plastic, paint or metal. Wood worked as it was originally worked, naturally, with dry joints using pegs, wood pins, straps and rope.

- Pieces fully demountable, with elements straight and in multiples of one thickness, free of curves, carving, moulding or turning. The beauty of the furniture is its very Australian ingenuity and simplicity.

- The wood is not reconstituted by being pulped, laminated or hammered back together, but is left in glorious wide boards. We mill our logs into bark-to-bark flitches and build as simply as possible from there.

Griffith Tablecraft advertisements that appeared in home decorating magazines

When Jeremy sold his interest in the business in 1991 it had a staff of some 45 people and his extraordinary pole framed workshop and showroom complex was one of the major tourist attractions on the north coast of New South Wales. For a more detailed account of Jeremy's successful furniture business, go to <www.humancondition.com/griffith-tablecraft>.

Jeremy began writing about the human condition in 1975 and he has steadfastly continued his practice of writing about the subject (which he does in the early hours of the morning) to the present (which at the time of recording this presentation is late 2009). This means there are some 35 years of intense work behind the ideas that Jeremy will be presenting today.

In 1983 Jeremy established the Centre for Humanity's Adulthood for the study of the human condition. Jeremy had to establish his own institution because, as he will explain in his presentation, the strategy of conventional mechanistic, reductionist science has been to avoid, not confront, the issue of the human condition. In 1991 the Centre was incorporated as the Foundation for Humanity's Adulthood (FHA), of which I am a founding Director and now a Patron. The FHA, now the WORLD TRANSFORMATION MOVEMENT (WTM), is a non-profit organisation with the aims, as set out in its memorandum of association, of **'understanding the human condition'** and **'ameliorating the human condition'**.

""" The Rising Sun """

Founding Members of the World Transformation Movement behind Norman and Jill Griffith's Memorial Tree, Sydney, 13 December 2008

L to R: Back Row: Sean Makim*, John Biggs, Tim Macartney-Snape, Will Salter, Tony Gowing, Sam Belfield, Neil Duns, Anna Fitzgerald, Anthony Cummins, Tess Watson, Anthony Landahl. 3rd Row: Monica Kodet, Prue Watson, Andy Colquhoun*, James Press, Tony Miall, Ken Miall, Richard Biggs, Pete Storey, Connor FitzGerald, Emmα Cullen-Ward, Nick Shaw, Lee Jones, James West, Eric Cooke, Tim Watson. 2nd Row: Felicity Jackson, Fiona Cullen-Ward, Marie McNamara*, Damon Isherwood, Ali Watson, Anna Zilioli*, Stirling West, Susan Armstrong, Polly Watson, Doug Lobban, Dave Downie*, Sally Edgar, Charlotte James, Manus McFadyen, Annabel Armstrong, Genevieve Salter, Marcus Rowell. Front Row: Katrina Makim*, Simon Griffith, Jeremy Griffith, Annie Williams, Lachlan Colquhoun, Anthony Clarke, Wendy Skelton, Brony FitzGerald, Prue Westbrook, Sarah Colquhoun*, Liz Collins, Sam Collins, Amanda Purdy*, Stacy Rodger, Simon Mackintosh*. Also present in spirit, our adored Founding Member Rachel O'Brien. (*Supporter or Friend of the WTM.)

For profiles of the WORLD TRANSFORMATION MOVEMENT'S founding members, visit <www.humancondition.com/memberprofiles>.

The WTM is based in Sydney where we have a long-standing foundation membership of some 50 individuals supporting the activities of the WTM on a full time basis.

Although it is the underlying issue in all human affairs, and the issue that had to be addressed for there to be a future for the human race, the issue of the human condition is

an extremely difficult subject for humans to face. As Jeremy mentioned earlier in Part 2:3, it has been described as **'the black box inside of humans that they can't go near'**! The problem at the end of the day is that it is the subject of 'self'. Furthermore, not only is the human condition the most difficult of subjects for humans to think about and look at because it is the issue of 'self', it is also the area of enquiry where religion and science, faith and reason—the ideal values of life and our enquiry into those values and our species' lack of compliance with them—finally overlap.

For these reasons the human condition is the most contentious of subjects with many people believing it is a subject that can never and should never be opened up. But despite the resistance our work has encountered because of its extremely confronting nature, it is, as I said, the all-important issue that *had to be* addressed and explained for there to be a future for the human race.

The South African philosopher Sir Laurens van der Post has been the greatest influence in Jeremy's work. This is a photo of Sir Laurens with Jeremy and me when we visited him in London in 1993. Sir Laurens once said, **'We really know nothing about the nature of man, and unless we hurry to get to know ourselves we are in dangerous trouble'** (*Jung and the Story of Our Time*, 1976, p.239 of 275). What you are about to hear is precisely this all-important missing knowledge about the nature of us humans.

Jeremy Griffith and Tim Macartney-Snape with Sir Laurens van der Post in London in 1993, a few years before Sir Laurens' death in 1996

The purpose of the Foundation for Humanity's Adulthood was to lay the foundation for a human-condition-reconciled new world for the human race—basically to endure the inevitable initial onslaught of resistance to having this most contentious of all subjects of the human condition opened up. With that stage now completed after some extremely harrowing experiences, it becomes appropriate to take understanding of the human condition to the next stage of actually ameliorating or healing that condition. For

this next stage, the FHA has this year, 2009 (at the time of filming), become the WORLD TRANSFORMATION MOVEMENT.

As Jeremy will explain, the human condition—this issue of 'good and evil' in our human make-up—has long seemed inexplicable: how can we possibly make sense of the bewildering confusion of paradoxes in our human make-up or condition, especially the question of 'good and evil'? But it is the answer to this supposedly inexplicable dilemma that is going to be presented.

© 2009 Fedmex Pty Ltd

I would like to close my introduction with this simple analogy, which serves as an accurate metaphor for untangling the human condition. This is one of my climbing ropes, which has been coiled in a way that makes it easy to undo, but, nevertheless, when it is lying in a heap like this it looks like a mess that you could never hope to untangle. In fact once you find the unlocking start point, which I have here, it all easily unravels as if by magic. So the inference is, that by finding the unlocking point of the seemingly impenetrable human situation it too will easily unravel.

You are going to be absolutely amazed by what you are about to hear, by the power of the idea to make sense of our human situation. It is truly the ultimate information arriving to you via the ultimate communication technology of the internet, and at the ultimate time for humanity—no one can disagree with the fact that it's desperately needed.

What you are about to hear *is* going to change the world.

I will now hand you back over to Jeremy to explain his biological understandings of the human condition that, as the subtext to our movement's name states, **'ends our species' underlying psychosis and transforms the human race'**.

Jeremy, before you start I think it would be a good idea to show people something of the simplicity, originality and freshness of your furniture designs. It will give people an insight into the simplicity and cleanliness of the way you think.

© 2009 Fedmex Pty Ltd

Jeremy Griffith: This is a carver chair because it has armrests. Like all my designs, this chair is designed as simply as possible. After seasoning the slabbed logs in a solar kiln that we built, we took the biggest and best slabs to make the tables and we progressively sliced the other slabs up into multiples of the thickness of the basic slab. So that's a single thickness on the legs, that's a double thickness on the sides, there's triple thickness in the sides of lounges and so forth—so all the parts are multiples of this one thickness—so it's very simple. There are no curves, carving, molding or turning, there's no glue, or nails or screws—it's all dry jointed and simply put together with pegs. So this leather backrest just slides off and it all comes apart. The seat cushion slides off it like that. These are slats tied on to the frame that the seat slides over. The frame is held together by what is called a Spanish windlass, which is a twitched rope, which is very powerful. Then it all packs up into these squares.

So that's a carver chair. Over here is a side chair, which is even simpler. A chair is the hardest part in a range of furniture to design but we made sideboards, book cases—there's a small one there—tables; we made the full range of furniture all based on this simple idea of dry joints and straight, clean pieces of wood.

I might just say that trying to save a threatened—well, tragically now extinct—species and trying to build a range of furniture that is simple and free of escapist, materialistic ornamentation and embellishment was all very well, but I came to realise there was a much, much deeper and far more serious issue and problem to address in the world, and that is: why are we humans so destructive and needing such escapist, materialistic embellishment in our lives? So these are the very profound and serious questions that we are going to be dealing with next.

Part 3
The Human Condition Explained

Parts 3 onwards are by Jeremy Griffith

Part 3:1 The agony of the human condition

Here on Earth some of the most complex arrangements of matter in the known universe have come into existence. Life, in all its incredible diversity and richness, developed. And, by virtue of our mind, the human species must surely represent the culmination of this grand experiment of nature we call life. As far as we can detect, our species is the first organism to have developed the fully conscious ability to sufficiently understand and thus manage the relationship between cause and effect to wrest management of our lives from our instincts, and even to reflect upon our existence. In a world ravaged by strife it is easy to lose sight of the utter magnificence of what we are; yes, the human mind must be nature's most astonishing creation.

One of the greatest demonstrations of this intellectual brilliance was sending three of our kind to the Moon and back. How far we have come. *But what a state our world is in*. Despite our magnificent capabilities and capacity for immense love and sensitivity, levels of personal and environmental wellbeing are at unprecedented lows. Every day brings with it startling evidence of the turmoil of the human situation. Michael Leunig's exceptionally honest cartoons that were included in Part 2:5 revealed something of the *real* horror of our human situation. The truth is we have an unspeakable history of greed, hatred, brutality, rape, torture, persecution, murder and war—a propensity for deeds of shocking violence, depravity, indifference and cruelty. Conflict between individuals, races, cultures and countries abounds; there is genocide, terrorism, mass displacement of peoples, starvation, runaway diseases, environmental devastation, gross inequality, racial and gender oppression, crime, drug abuse, obesity, family breakdown and epidemic levels of depression, unhappiness and loneliness. And an exploding world population is rapidly exacerbating all of these problems.

Try as we might to deny it, behind every wondrous scientific discovery, artistic expression and compassionate act lies the shadow of humanity's darker accomplishment as undoubtedly the most ferocious and destructive force that has ever lived on Earth. And, as I emphasised earlier, improved forms of management such as better laws, better politics and better economics—and better self-management, such as new ways of disciplining, organising, motivating or even transcending our troubled natures—have all failed to end the march towards ever greater levels of devastation and unhappiness.

So, unable to cope with the truth of the extent and seriousness of our destruction of the world around us and within us, we humans have had no choice but to live in denial of it. We had to, as we say, 'put on a brave face', 'keep our chin up', 'stay positive', 'keep up appearances', 'keep calm and carry on', etc, etc. This delusion sustained us but it also

blinded us to the true extent of the devastation about and within us. We are unable to see the seriousness of the situation—see that the human race is entering *end play* or *end game*, where the Earth cannot absorb any further devastation from the effects of our behaviour, nor the human body cope with any more debilitating stress, or, most particularly, our mind endure any more psychosis and neurosis or our soul any more alienation.

In recent times environmental issues *have* dominated our concerns, but we have only been focusing on the symptoms. To fix all the runaway problems we are surrounded with—in fact, to stop the destruction of our world and the disintegration of society that is happening everywhere we look—we have to fix the *cause* of the problems, which is *us humans*. *We* are the problem: our out-of-control egocentric, selfish, competitive and aggressive behaviour. The underlying real question that had to be answered if we humans were ever to find relieving, redeeming, healing understanding of ourselves was *'why have we humans been the way we have been, less than ideally behaved, in fact capable of horrific atrocities?'*

The fact is, the greatest of all paradoxes has been the riddle of human nature. As has been emphasised, we humans are capable of immense love and sensitivity but we have also been capable of shocking acts of atrocity. This duality of what has historically been referred to as 'good' and 'evil' has troubled the human mind since we first became fully conscious, thinking beings: are humans essentially 'good' and, if so, what is the cause of our 'evil', destructive, insensitive and cruel side? The eternal question has been why 'evil'? In metaphysical religious terms, what is 'the origin of sin'? More generally, if the universally accepted ideals are to be *cooperative, loving and selfless*—ideals that have been accepted by modern civilisations as the foundations for constitutions and laws and by the founders of all the great religions as the basis of their teachings—then *why* are humans *competitive, aggressive and selfish*? Does our inconsistency with the ideals mean we are essentially bad? Are we a flawed species, a mistake—or are we possibly divine beings?

The agony of being unable to truthfully answer this question of why we are the way we are, divisively instead of cooperatively behaved, has been the particular burden of human life. It has been our species' particular affliction or condition—our *'human condition'*. (Note, the reason I said we have been *unable to truthfully* answer the question of why we have been divisively behaved is because we have frequently used the excuse that we humans are competitive, aggressive and selfish because of our animal heritage; that we have savage animal instincts that make us fight and compete for food, shelter, territory and a mate. Of course, this cannot be the *real* reason for our divisive behaviour because descriptions of our human behaviour, such as egocentric, arrogant, deluded, optimistic, pessimistic, artificial, hateful, mean, immoral, guilty, evil, depressed, inspired, psychotic, alienated, all recognise that our species' unique fully conscious thinking mind is involved in our behaviour—that there is a *psychological* dimension to *our* behaviour. We have suffered from the *human* condition, not the *animal* condition.)

Good or bad, loving or hateful, angels or devils, constructive or destructive, sensitive or insensitive: *what are we?* Throughout history we humans have struggled to find meaning in the awesome contradiction of our human condition. Neither philosophy nor psychology nor biology has, until now, been able to provide a truthful, clarifying explanation. For their part, religious assurances such as 'God loves you' may have provided temporary comfort but failed

to explain *WHY* we are lovable. So, yes, *WHY* are we lovable? How could we be good when all the evidence seems to unequivocally indicate that we are a deeply flawed, bad, even evil species? What is the answer to this question of questions, this problem of 'good and evil' in the human make-up, this dilemma of the human condition? *What caused humans to become divisively behaved and, most importantly, how is this divisive behaviour ever going to be brought to an end?*

Part 3:2 The accountable, true biological explanation of the human condition

Before presenting the fully accountable and thus true biological explanation of the human condition it should again be mentioned that in 2012 the American biologist Edward (E.) O. Wilson published a book titled *The Social Conquest of Earth* in which he claimed to have explained the human condition. As is fully described later in Part 4:12I, this 'Theory of Eusociality' (as E.O. Wilson has termed this so-called explanation of the human condition) doesn't truthfully explain the human condition at all, rather it attempts to nullify and dismiss it as nothing more than a conflict between supposed selfish and selfless instincts within humans. Unlike the explanation of the human condition that is about to be given, it is not a profound, fully accountable, truthful, *real* explanation of the *psychological* dilemma involved in the human condition but a completely false—indeed fake—superficial trivialisation of the subject. As will be documented, all our mythologies, religious teachings, influential thinkers and great writers have recognised, our human condition arises from a consciousness-derived-and-induced *psychological* insecurity about our fundamental worth and goodness—something this new theory of Eusociality doesn't even acknowledge, which is, of course, its great appeal; it says, in effect, 'There is no great underlying insecurity and resulting psychosis and neurosis involved in our so-called human condition, we simply have selfish and selfless instincts that are sometimes at odds.' With this interpretation, the human condition is rendered benign, virtually inconsequential, which *is*, of course, immensely relieving, but, nevertheless, an escapist lie. As will be described in Part 4:12, in devising such theories as Social Darwinism, Sociobiology, Evolutionary Psychology, Multilevel Selection and now Eusociality, mechanistic/reductionist science has become masterful at finding new ways to avoid the true, deeply troubled, insecure, fearful, real *psychological* issue of our human condition. But the reality is the human condition is far from a benign, inconsequential subject for us humans—it has been a *profoundly* deep, *extremely* dark and fearful, indeed *terrifying*, psychological issue, and it is this truthful deep, dark, historically terrifying *real* human condition that is now going to be properly confronted, explained, reconciled and permanently healed. *Real* understanding, and, with it, *real* love, is going to be brought to our human situation. Dishonest, dismissive, escapist denials of the true nature of our species' unique condition have got the human race nowhere; what we needed was the truth about ourselves—*but it had to be the full, compassionate truth, and that is what is about to be presented*. The underlying psychosis in human life is finally going to be compassionately fully explained and, by so doing, ameliorated—with the result that human life will be wonderfully TRANSFORMED, as was always the expectation of what would happen when our human condition was finally truthfully and thus properly understood.

I am going to start this fully accountable, truthful, penetrating explanation of our real, psychologically upset human condition with a very simple idea and then keep fleshing it out. What I suggest will happen is that it will gradually become more and more apparent that this explanation really *is* the unlocking insight into our human behaviour—the key to making sense of this deepest and darkest issue within ourselves of our less-than-ideally-behaved, good-and-evil-afflicted, seemingly highly imperfect, supposedly 'evil' human condition; and, following that, that it is the key to understanding all of our human world; and, beyond that, the insight needed to ameliorate or heal our psychologically troubled lives.

Before doing so, however, I should reiterate that the great mystery of our species' destructive behaviour has seemed to some to be a mystery that could never be explained. For instance, the entry for 'sin' in *The Bible Reader's Encyclopedia and Concordance* maintains that **'The problem of the origin and universality of sin…is probably one of those problems which the human mind can never satisfactorily answer.'** But while the real, psychological issue of the human condition *has* seemed inexplicable and thus unapproachable to many people, it should be remembered that although the question of the origin of the variety of life on Earth was a far less confronting subject to have to look into than the issue of the human condition, it too seemed inexplicable before Charles Darwin explained it; even he described it as having been **'that mystery of mysteries'** (*The Origin of Species*, 1859, p.65 of 476). Indeed, prior to finding their explanation, many mysteries can seem overwhelmingly difficult to explain, but certainly none have been as difficult to unlock as the psychological dilemma of our human condition.

Ironically, however, another common trait of mysteries is that often their answer, when finally found, is amazingly simple—despite the difficulties encountered in actually reaching it. In the case of the concept of natural selection it was, in hindsight, such a simple explanation that when the biologist Thomas Henry Huxley first heard it he was prompted to exclaim, **'How extremely stupid of me not to have thought of that!'** (*The Life and Letters of Thomas Henry Huxley*, Leonard Huxley, Vol.1, 1900, p.170). Throughout history simplicity has been a hallmark of insightful thought. As the pioneering biologist Allan Savory once observed, **'whenever there has been a major insoluble problem for mankind, the answer, when finally found, has always been very simple'** (*Holistic Resource Management*, 1988). The biographer George Seaver also made this point in his biography of the theologian, missionary and physician Albert Schweitzer: **'Naturalness. That is the keynote of Schweitzer's thought, life, and personality. The ultimate thought, the thought which holds the clue to the riddle of life's meaning and mystery, must be the simplest thought conceivable, the most natural, the most elemental, and therefore also the most profound'** (*Albert Schweitzer The Man and His Mind*, 1947, p.311). So while the crux question facing the human race of the nature of 'good and evil' has always seemed inexplicable, it too has an amazingly simple answer. The *implications*, however, of this explanation could not be more significant, far-reaching or exciting.

In presenting the explanation, an analogy involving migrating storks is helpful. (The following picture of *The Story of Adam Stork* depicts this analogy.)

Many bird species are perfectly orientated to instinctive migratory flight paths. Each winter, without ever 'learning' where to go and without knowing why, they quit their established breeding grounds and migrate to warmer feeding grounds. They then return each summer and so the cycle continues. Over the course of thousands of generations and migratory movements, only those birds that happened to have a genetic make-up that inclined

them to follow the right route survived. Thus, through natural selection, they acquired their instinctive orientation.

The Story of Adam Stork

Drawing by Jeremy Griffith © 1991 Fedmex Pty Ltd

Consider a flock of migrating storks returning to their summer breeding roosts on the rooftops of Europe from their winter feeding grounds in southern Africa. Suppose in the instinct-controlled brain of one of them we place a fully conscious mind (I call this stork Adam, because we will soon see that this story parallels the Biblical account in Genesis of Adam and Eve in the Garden of Eden). So, as Adam Stork flies north he spots an island off to the left with a tree laden with apples. Using his newly acquired conscious mind, Adam thinks, 'I should fly down and eat some apples.' It seems a reasonable thought but he can't know if

it is a good decision or not until he acts on it. For Adam's new thinking mind to make sense of the world he has to learn by trial and error and so he decides to carry out his first grand experiment in self-management by flying down to the island and sampling the apples.

But it's not that simple. As soon as Adam deviates from his established migratory path, his instinctive self tries to pull him back on course. In effect, it criticises him for veering off course; it condemns his search for understanding. All of a sudden Adam is in a dilemma. If he obeys his instinctive self and flies back on course, he will remain perfectly orientated but he'll never *learn* if his deviation was the right decision or not. All the messages he's receiving from within inform him that obeying his instincts is good, is right, but there's also a new inclination to disobey, a defiance of instinct. Diverting from his course will result in apples and understanding, yet he already sees that doing so will also make him feel bad.

Uncomfortable with the criticism his newly conscious mind or intellect is receiving from his instinctive self, Adam's first response is to ignore the temptation the apples present and fly back on course. This makes his instinctive self happy and wins back the approval of his fellow storks, for not having conscious minds they are innocent, unaware or ignorant of the conscious mind's need to search for knowledge. In the drawing above, we see Adam's wide-eyed innocent instinctive self (and the other storks), represented by the stork on the right, demanding Adam's conscious thinking self, depicted on the left, fly back on course. The instinct-obedient stork is following the flight path past the island. Further, since Adam's instinctive self developed alongside the natural world, it too reminded him of his instinctive orientation, in effect, contributing to the criticism of Adam for his rebellious decision.

Flying on, however, Adam realises he can't deny his intellect. Sooner or later he must find the courage to master his conscious mind by carrying out experiments in understanding. This time he thinks, 'Why not fly down to an island and rest?' Again, not knowing any reason why he shouldn't, he proceeds with his experiment. And again, his decision is met with the same chorus of criticism—from his instinctive self, the other storks that were ignorant of the need to search for knowledge, and the natural world. But this time Adam defies the criticism and perseveres with his experimentation in self-management. His decision, however, means he must now live with the criticism and immediately he is condemned to a state of upset. A battle has broken out between his instinctive self, which is perfectly orientated to the flight path, and his emerging conscious mind, which needs to understand why that flight path is the correct course to follow. His instinctive self is perfectly orientated, but Adam doesn't *understand* that orientation.

In short, when the fully conscious mind emerged it wasn't enough for it to be orientated by instincts. It *had to* find understanding to operate effectively and fulfil its great potential to manage life. Tragically, the instinctive self didn't 'appreciate' that need and 'tried to stop' the mind's necessary search for knowledge, as represented by the latter's experiments in self-management. Hence the ensuing battle between instinct and intellect. To refute the criticism from his instinctive self, Adam needed to understand the difference in the way genes and nerves process information; he needed to be able to explain that the gene-based learning system can, through natural selection, give species orientations to their environment, but that those orientations are not understandings. This means that when the nerve-based learning system gave rise to consciousness and the ability to understand the world, it wasn't sufficient to be orientated to the world—*understanding* of the world had to be found. The

problem, however, was that Adam had only just taken the first, tentative steps in the search for knowledge, and thus had no ability to explain anything. It was a catch-22 situation for the fledgling thinker, for in order to explain himself he needed the very understanding he was setting out to find. He had to search for understanding, ultimately self-understanding, understanding of why he had to 'fly off course', without the ability to first explain why he needed to 'fly off course'. He couldn't defend his actions. He had to live with the criticism from his instinctive self and, without that defence, was insecure in its presence.

To resist the tirade of unjust criticism that he was having to endure and mitigate that insecurity, Adam had to do something. But what could he do? If he abandoned the search and flew back on course, sure, he'd gain some momentary relief, but the search would, nevertheless, remain to be undertaken. So all Adam could do was retaliate against the criticism, try to prove it wrong, or simply ignore it—and he did *all* those things. He became angry towards the criticism. In every way he could he tried to demonstrate his self worth, to prove that he was good and not bad. And he tried to block out the criticism. He became angry, egocentric and alienated or, in a word, upset.

As mentioned, the *Concise Oxford Dictionary* defines 'ego' as **'the conscious thinking self'** (5th edn, 1964), so ego is another word for the intellect. Thus the word 'egocentric' means the intellect became centred or focused on trying to refute the instincts' criticism; it became focused on trying to prove its worth, prove that it was good and not bad. Adam Stork became preoccupied trying to validate himself, looking for a win, any positive reinforcement that would bring him some sense of worth.

In summary, Adam Stork had no choice other than to resign himself to living a life of anger, egocentricity and alienation as the only three responses available to him to cope with the horror of his situation, his condition. It was an extremely unfair and difficult, and indeed tragic, position for Adam to find himself in, for we can see that while he was good he appeared to be bad and had to endure the horror of his associated psychologically distressed, upset state or condition until he found the defence or reason for his 'mistakes'. But suffering upset was the price of his heroic search for understanding—it was the tragic yet inevitable outcome in the transition from an instinct-controlled state to an intellect-controlled state. His uncooperative, divisive aggression and his selfish, egocentric efforts to prove his worth and his need to deny and evade criticism became an unavoidable part of his personality. Such was his predicament, and such has been the human condition, for it was within our species that the fully conscious mind emerged.

Part 3:3 Only understanding of the human condition could end the march to ever greater levels of upset

Ideally what would have happened when Adam Stork began his search for knowledge was that he would have sat down with his instinctive self and explained to it why he had to fly off course. He would have explained that he was now a fully conscious, self-managing or self-adjusting being that had to experiment in understanding in order to master his conscious mind. He would have explained that he was using a fundamentally different information processing or learning tool to the one that developed instincts. And he would have explained that through

the process of natural selection the gene-based learning system gave his instinctive self its perfect orientations to the world around it, but that the conscious mind that he was now using to manage his life was a product of the nerve-based learning system and its effectiveness depended on being able to understand the world around it.

To elaborate, nerves were originally developed for the coordination of movement in animals, but, once developed, their ability to store impressions—which is what we refer to as 'memory'—gave rise to the potential to develop understanding of cause and effect. If you can remember past events, you can compare them with current events and identify regularly occurring experiences. This knowledge of, or insight into, what has commonly occurred in the past enables you to predict what is likely to happen in the future and to adjust your behaviour accordingly. Once insights into the nature of change are put into effect, the self-modified behaviour starts to provide feedback, refining the insights further. Predictions are compared with outcomes and so on. Much developed, and such refinement occurred in the human brain, nerves can sufficiently *associate* information to *reason* how experiences are related, learn to *understand* and become CONSCIOUS of, or aware of, or *intelligent* about, the relationship between events that occur through time. Thus, consciousness means being sufficiently aware of how experiences are related to attempt to manage change from a basis of understanding.

What is so significant about this process is that once our nerve-based learning system became sufficiently developed for us to become conscious and able to effectively manage events, our self-adjusting conscious intellect was then in a position to wrest control from the instinctive orientations we had acquired through the natural selection of genetic traits that adapted us to our environment. Moreover, at the point of becoming conscious the nerve-based learning system *should* wrest management of the individual from the instincts, which, up until then, had been controlling our lives, because such a self-managing or self-adjusting system is infinitely more efficient at adapting to change than the gene-based system, which can only adapt to change very slowly over many generations. However, while consciousness is the ability to understand the relationship of events that occur through time sufficiently well to attempt to manage and manipulate those events—and thus usurp management of the individual from the instincts—it still has to be able to identify the correct and incorrect understandings.

The problem, or catch-22 referred to earlier, was that when consciousness first appeared and wrested management from the instincts, the conscious mind had absolutely no understanding of genes and nerves and the different ways they process information. To use the analogy, Adam Stork had no ability to explain why he had flown off course, why he had defied his instincts. He was only just setting out on the great journey to find knowledge, ultimately sufficient knowledge to explain himself. He had no capacity to explain anything because the ability to explain and understand his world was what he was setting out to find. He needed knowledge to explain, defend and bring to an end his corruption, but he first had to suffer becoming corrupted through the process of finding that knowledge. At any time he could fly back on course and feel the relief of not being criticised, but to do so would mean abandoning the necessary search for knowledge.

The gene-based learning system can orientate species to situations but is incapable of insight into the nature of change. Genetic selection of one reproducing individual over another reproducing individual (in effect, one idea over another idea, or one piece of information

over another piece of information) gives species adaptations or orientations—instinctive programming—for managing life, but those genetic orientations, those instincts, are not understandings. Thus, when the conscious mind emerged it had to set out in search of the knowledge it needed to manage change. It follows then that when our conscious mind emerged it was neither suitable nor sustainable for it to be *orientated* by instincts. It *had to* find *understanding* in order to operate effectively and fulfil its great potential to manage change, manage life. Since the conscious mind must surely be nature's greatest invention, its failure to fulfil its great potential would, in truth, represent a failure of the whole story of life on Earth. The problem, however, was that when the conscious mind began to exert itself and experiment in the management of life from a basis of understanding in the presence of already established instinctive behavioural orientations, a terrible battle broke out between the two.

Our intellect began to experiment in understanding as the only means of discovering the correct and incorrect understandings for managing existence, but the instincts—being in effect 'unaware' or 'ignorant' of the intellect's need to carry out these experiments—opposed any understanding-driven deviations from the established instinctive orientations: they 'criticised' and 'tried to stop' the conscious mind's necessary search for knowledge. Unable to understand and thus explain why these experiments in self-adjustment were necessary, the intellect had no way of refuting the implicit criticism from the instincts even though it knew it was unjust. Until such time that the conscious mind found the redeeming understanding of why it had to defy the instincts (namely the scientific understanding of the difference in the way genes and nerves process information, that one is an orientating learning system while the other is an insightful learning system), the intellect was left having to endure a psychologically distressed, upset condition, with no choice but to defy that opposition from the instincts. As just stated, this defiance expressed itself in three ways: it attacked the instincts' *unjust criticism*; it attempted to prove the instincts' *unjust criticism* wrong; and it tried to deny or block from its mind the instincts' *unjust criticism*. In short, humans' upset angry, egocentric and alienated human-condition-afflicted state appeared. Our 'conscious thinking self', which again means 'ego', became 'centred' or focused on the need to justify itself. We became egocentric, self-centred or selfish, preoccupied with aggressively competing for opportunities to prove we are good and not bad—we unavoidably became selfish, competitive and aggressive. The so-called Seven Deadly Sins of the human condition, of lust, anger, pride, envy, covetousness, gluttony and sloth, are in truth all different manifestations of the three fundamental upsets of anger, egocentricity and alienation.

Significantly, while we could learn to manage our upset, find ways to contain, restrain and thus slow its pace, the increase in upset could only ever be stopped through finding understanding of why upset occurred. In the Adam Stork analogy, Adam couldn't silence the upsetting criticism emanating from his instinctive self until he could explain why he had to fly off course. A terrible journey of suffering lay ahead for conscious humans because, as will be explained later, it took the human race some two million years of enquiry to finally assemble the liberating true explanation of our psychologically distressed, upset human condition.

The human condition is shot through with paradox: to become happy we had to first endure unhappiness; we appeared to be bad but believed we were good; we are intelligent, smart and clever but, by all appearances, behave in a most unintelligent, stupid way that

has brought the world to the brink of destruction. The human situation appeared to be so complicated and insoluble, which is why Tim's climbing rope analogy is so powerful. How could we possibly make sense of the seemingly impenetrable mystery of human life, and yet the answer—the 'unlocking point'—seems so simple and obvious in hindsight. Recall Huxley's famous response to Darwin's idea of natural selection: **'How extremely stupid of me not to have thought of that!'**

Part 3:4 But what was humans' original instinctive orientation?

The Adam Stork analogy does of course raise the very important question of 'But what was *our* species' original instinctive orientation?' It certainly wasn't to the migratory flight path that Adam Stork is instinctively guided by, but, nevertheless, we humans must have had an instinctive orientation to life before we became a fully conscious species. All animals have an instinctive self and so do we. Carl Jung termed humans' common, shared-by-all instincts **'the collective unconscious'**, as the following quote makes clear: **'Jung regards the unconscious mind as not only the repository of forgotten or repressed memories, but also of racial memories. This is reasonable enough when we remember the definition of instinct as racial memory'** (*International University Society's Reading Course and Biographical Studies*, Vol.6, c, 1940). Yes, we must have had an original instinctive orientation to life, and indeed that instinctive orientation must still exist within us, so *what was* our species' original instinctive orientation—and what impact did it have on our human condition?

The answer to the first part of the question is that our instinctive orientation was to behaving in a completely cooperative, unconditionally selfless, fully altruistic, truly loving, genuinely moral, kind, considerate way. While we have learnt to deny this truth because it made living with our present immensely upset, corrupted angry, egocentric and alienated condition unbearable, all our mythologies, such as the story of the Garden of Eden, recognise that there was an upset-free, pre-human-condition-afflicted, innocent time in our species' instinctive past, a time before the fabled 'fall', before we became, as we acknowledge, 'corrupted'. In his 1990 book *Memories & Visions of Paradise*, the American author Richard Heinberg provides ample documentation of how our mythologies acknowledged the truth of a cooperative, pre-human-condition-afflicted, innocent past for humanity, writing that **'Every religion begins with the recognition that human consciousness has been separated from the divine Source, that a former sense of oneness…has been lost…everywhere in religion and myth there is an acknowledgment that we have departed from an original…innocence'** (pp.81-82 of 282). The eighth century BC Greek poet Hesiod also recognised this 'Golden Age' in our species' past in his poem *Works and Days*: **'When gods alike and mortals rose to birth / A golden race the immortals formed on earth…Like gods they lived, with calm untroubled mind / Free from the toils and anguish of our kind / Nor e'er decrepit age misshaped their frame…Strangers to ill, their lives in feasts flowed by…Dying they sank in sleep, nor seemed to die / Theirs was each good; the life-sustaining soil / Yielded its copious fruits, unbribed by toil / They with abundant goods 'midst quiet lands / All willing shared the gathering of their hands.'**

So while we have learnt to deny the truth of an upset-free, pre-human-condition-afflicted past for the human race, deep down we do all intuitively know that our species *did* once live instinctively in a harmonious, cooperative, loving, idyllic way that was free of, and thus

unaware or innocent of, upset—because we are all aware of that 'voice' within us, of our ideal-behaviour-expecting, fully altruistic, instinctive, 'moral conscience'.

As has been emphasised, we humans have an undeniable capacity for brutality, hatred and aggression—which we can now understand is our psychologically upset state—but it is also very true that we have an enormous capacity for love, kindness and compassion. Furthermore, it is clear that we have an inbuilt awareness that such kind, considerate and caring behaviour is good and to be aspired to—after all, how could we have a sense of guilt, shame, recrimination and disgust about unkind thoughts and deeds committed by ourselves and others unless some deeper intrinsic part of ourselves felt at odds with such behaviour? The fact that we have called our born-with, instinctive awareness of what we have termed 'right' and 'wrong' behaviour our 'moral' sense, and its 'voice' or expression from within us, our 'conscience', is also indicative of this innate knowledge. This moral sense, this inclination to be caring and considerate of others, amounts to a social conscience. It is a capacity, in situations where the need arises, to behave altruistically, to put the welfare of others, ultimately of our community, above that of our own welfare—such as when we are prepared to volunteer to fight and, if necessary, die for our country in war. Indeed, while the most important question of all—'the Holy Grail of the whole Darwinian revolution', as some have described it—has been to explain the dilemma of the human condition, the other, almost equally great mystery facing biologists has been to explain the origins of this altruistic, unconditionally selfless moral sense in humans, for it is a truly extraordinary and special part of our makeup. So special, in fact, that the philosopher Immanuel Kant was inspired to have these fitting words inscribed on his tomb, **'there are two things which fill me with awe…the starry heavens above us, and the moral law within us'**. Charles Darwin was equally impressed when he said, **'the moral sense affords the best and highest distinction between man and the lower animals'** (*The Descent of Man*, 1871), acknowledging here that our moral sense is something unique to humans.

Biologists have long recognised that there are situations in nature where organisms appear to behave in an altruistic, unconditionally selfless way towards each other, such as worker bees and ants selflessly slaving for their colonies—*and* in situations such as those described above, where humans behave selflessly towards each other, such as soldiers giving their life for their country in war, or charity workers helping the poor. But in the case of worker ants and bees, biologists now recognise that their behaviour is a case of <u>reciprocity</u>, where favours are given only in return for another, which means the behaviour is not truly unconditionally selfless, genuinely altruistic. Being sterile and thus unable to reproduce themselves, the worker bees and ants ensure the genes for their existence are reproduced by selflessly helping their colony and its fertile queen, which means their selflessness is not *unconditional* because it is done to ensure their reproduction. Such reciprocal selflessness is not altruism but a subtle form of selfishness. <u>So, in the case of humans, when *we* sacrifice ourselves for others are we similarly merely concerned with selfishly fostering the reproduction of our genes, or is our moral sense truly altruistic in nature? Both Kant's and Darwin's comments infer that our moral sense is something extraordinary in the natural world, that it is unique to humans and therefore *not* the subtle form of reciprocity-based genetic selfishness that occurs in other social species such as bees and ants—that our moral nature *is* a</u>

truly altruistic, *unconditionally* selfless capacity to act out of *genuine* love and concern for the greater good of humanity, and indeed *all* the constituents of our planet.

However, as mentioned in Part 3:1, virtually all biologists since Darwin have attributed humans' competitive, selfish and aggressive behaviour to savage animal instincts within us that supposedly date from a time when we had to fight and compete for food, shelter, territory and a mate.

While excusing and thus relieving of our upset, divisive, competitive, aggressive and selfish behaviour, the problem with this so-called Social Darwinism 'explanation' was that while it is true that we humans are capable of being extremely competitive, selfish and aggressive, we do seemingly have unconditionally selfless moral instincts—an instinctive nature that doesn't comply with this Social Darwinist 'selfish-competition-and-aggression-is-what-happens-in-nature-and-that's-why-we-are-selfish' account. As is fully described later in Part 4:12, in order to somehow explain this anomaly what many biologists initially tried to do *was* actually claim that our apparently unconditionally selfless moral instincts *are* a derivative of the same reciprocity-based, conditional selflessness that occurs in bee and ant colonies! Yes, the theory of Sociobiology and its progeny, Evolutionary Psychology, actually argued that human acts of selflessness, such as charity workers helping the poor, *were* actually a product of humans selfishly, albeit indirectly, fostering the reproduction of their own genes by helping others who share their genes—in which case the argument that nature is fundamentally selfish and that's why we are was maintained.

Aside from the fact that the vast majority of those benefitting would be individuals entirely unrelated to those behaving selflessly, the other obvious problem with this reciprocity-based, *conditionally*-selfless 'explanation' for our moral nature is that it is entirely inconsistent with what we all know to be true if we are honest, and which all our mythologies, religious teachings, profound thinkers and great writers like Kant, and eminent biologists like Darwin, have recognised to be true, which is that we humans have an extraordinary *unconditionally* selfless, *genuinely* moral instinctive nature. Our moral instincts aren't at all selfish, they are *fully* altruistic, *truly* loving.

As is fully described in Part 4:12I, when Sociobiology/Evolutionary Psychology fell out of favour amongst some biologists because of its inability to account for our *unconditionally* selfless, *genuinely* moral instinctive nature, yet another theory was devised to supposedly explain how we acquired *unconditionally* selfless, *fully* altruistic, *truly* loving, *genuinely* moral instincts. Put forward by E.O. Wilson in his aforementioned 2012 book *The Social Conquest of Earth* as an explanation for the human condition, this 'Theory of Eusociality' proposes that humans not only have selfish, savage, animal instincts derived from competing for food, shelter, territory and a mate, but also unconditionally selfless, genuinely altruistic instincts, and that these two opposing instinctive orientations are what cause the conflicted state of our human condition.

To very briefly describe how E.O. Wilson went about explaining how we acquired these unconditionally selfless, genuinely altruistic instincts it is first necessary to explain the basic biological difficulty in establishing selfless instincts—which is that if an unconditionally selfless trait does emerge in a species it will seemingly always be exploited by those who are selfish. If someone in a group says, in effect, 'I'm going to help others', the others are going to, in effect,

reply, 'By all means, go right ahead because it can only help me reproduce my genes—but don't expect me to help you.' Seemingly, whenever selflessness appears it is, in all likelihood, going to be undermined by opportunist cheaters or free riders. But what the theory of Eusociality (which emerged from what is referred to as Multilevel Selection theory, which was developed by David Sloan Wilson and other biologists) argues is that while *within a group* the selfish are more likely to prevail, in competition *between groups*, groups of selfless altruists are more likely to succeed, so in situations of between-group competition selflessness *can* be selected for. The idea is that where you have two groups competing against each other, as it is claimed occurred between groups of our early ancestors, groups with selfless, cooperative members will out-compete groups with selfish, non-cooperative individuals, and that it was through the selection of such successful cooperativeness in between-group conflict that our unconditionally selfless, moral instincts emerged. This is the argument E.O. Wilson commandeered to supposedly explain that we not only have selfish instincts derived from competing for food, shelter, territory and a mate, but also selfless instincts, and that the presence of these two instinctive states for supposed 'nastiness'/'sin' and 'niceness'/'virtue' is what produced our conflicted human condition. What E.O. Wilson has basically done is add selfless instincts to the supposed selfish instincts that Social Darwinists had already assigned us and claim that the presence of these two conflicting instincts within us explains the human condition.

This theory of Eusociality 'explanation' for our species' unconditionally selfless moral nature and conflicted human condition is completely dishonest, for reasons that are provided at length in Part 4:12I and which I will very briefly recap here.

Firstly, even *if* between group competition *could* overcome the problem of selflessness always being exploited and thus eliminated by selfishness, which is in itself extremely doubtful, the idea that our moral instinctive self or soul is a product of aggressively attacking other groups of humans doesn't equate at all with what we all know about what our born-with, instinctive moral conscience wants us to feel and behave towards *all* humans, indeed all of life. No human who is prepared to be honest would accept that our species' unconditionally selfless, moral instinctive orientation to life is driven by an extremely selfish, competitive and divisive cause, namely to give warring groups a competitive advantage. Also, we are all aware, if we are prepared to be truthful, that our instinctive moral nature is one of *universal* benevolence, not one where we have instincts for both niceness and nastiness. We have a *completely* consider-the-good-of-the-whole-of-your-community-above-yourself, *fully* cooperative, *all*-loving, *utterly* harmonious, *totally* empathetic, *absolutely* innocent original instinctive orientation, which, as has been mentioned, the story of the 'Garden of Eden' in religious teachings and awareness of a 'Golden Age' state of original innocence that is referred to in all our mythologies recognises. Further, as has been emphasised, the idea that our selfish behaviour comes from selfish, savage, animal instincts derived from competing for food, shelter, territory and a mate overlooks the fact that our human behaviour involves our unique fully conscious thinking mind. Descriptions of our behaviour, such as arrogant, deluded, optimistic, pessimistic, artificial, superficial, guilty, depressed, inspired, psychotic, alienated, all imply a consciousness-derived *psychological* dimension to *our* behaviour. We humans suffer from a consciousness-derived, psychological HUMAN CONDITION, *not* an instinct-controlled ANIMAL CONDITION—it is unique to us fully conscious humans.

In short, the competition-for-survival explanation for our selfish behaviour completely failed to recognise that our instinctive orientation is not to behaving selfishly, but to behaving in a *completely* unconditionally selfless, all-loving way and that, as the Adam Stork story explained, our selfish behaviour results from a consciousness-derived-and-induced *psychologically* insecure and upset state in which we have been selfishly egocentrically trying to prove our goodness and worth, and selfishly seeking relief through material reinforcement.

Basically, E.O. Wilson has failed to acknowledge, let alone account for, all the fundamental aspects that we know are involved in the human condition, which are summarised in that most voted-for-for-its-truth document in human history, the Bible—that **'God created man in his own image'** (Gen. 1:27) (we did once live in that *completely* integrated, unconditionally selflessly behaved, cooperative, loving ideal state), and then we took the **'fruit' 'from the tree of…knowledge'** (Gen. 3:3, 2:17) (became conscious), and then we **'fell from grace'** (derived from the title of Gen. 3, **'The Fall of Man'**) (became corrupted, psychologically upset; egocentrically selfishly preoccupied trying to prove we are good and not bad all the time), and, as a result, were **'banished…from the Garden of Eden'** (Gen. 3:23) state of our original innocence (became insecure/guilt-ridden) and became **'a restless wanderer on the earth'** (Gen. 4:14) (became psychotic—our instinctive self or soul became repressed because it condemned our conscious intellect; and neurotic—our conscious intellect became distressed because it couldn't explain itself) until we could find the reconciling, healing understanding of the **'good and evil'** (Gen. 3:5) in our make-up and, by so doing, become **'like God, knowing** [understanding of our] **good and evil** [afflicted lives] (ibid)**'**. (Note, all biblical references in *Freedom Expanded: Books 1 & 2* are from the 1978 *New International Version* translation of the Bible.)

Of course, it is not only in religious texts that we find accounts of the true story of humans' journey from innocence to the emergence of consciousness and, with it, the corruption of our original innocent instinctive state, to the eventual finding of the reconciling, ameliorating, soundness-resurrecting understanding of the human condition. The following description from more recent times comes from the Russian philosopher Nikolai Berdyaev's 1931 book, *The Destiny of Man*: **'The memory of a lost paradise, of a Golden Age, is very deep in man, together with a sense of guilt and sin and a dream of regaining the Kingdom of Heaven which sometimes assumes the form of a Utopia or an earthly paradise…We are faced with a profound enigma: how could man have renounced paradise which he recalls so longingly in our world-aeon? How could he have fallen away from it?…The exile of man from paradise means that man fell away from God** [cooperative ideality]**…Not everything was revealed to man in paradise, and ignorance was the condition of the life in it. It was the realm of the unconscious…Man rejected the bliss and wholeness of Eden and chose the pain and tragedy of cosmic life in order to explore his destiny to its inmost depths. This was the birth of consciousness with its painful dividedness. In falling away from the harmony of paradise and from unity with God, man began to make distinctions and valuations, tasted the fruit of the tree of knowledge and found himself on this side of good and evil'** (tr. N. Duddington, 1960, p.36 & 38 of 310). Further on, he wrote that **'man is an irrational, paradoxical, essentially tragic being…Philosophers and scientists have done very little to elucidate the problem of man'** (p.49), and that **'psychologists were wrong in assuming that man was a healthy creature, mainly conscious and intellectual, and should be studied from that point of view. Man is a sick being…the distinction between the conscious and the subconscious mind is fundamental for the new psychology'** (pp.67-68). Earlier in *The Destiny of Man*, Berdyaev

also described very clearly why **'Philosophers and scientists have done very little to elucidate the problem of man'** and, by so doing, bring about **'the new psychology'**—the reason, of course, being humans' great **'fear'**, in fact, **'primeval terror'**, of confronting the truth of our psychologically **'sick'** condition; as he wrote, **'Knowledge requires great daring. It means victory over ancient, primeval terror. Fear makes the search for truth and the knowledge of it impossible. Knowledge implies fearlessness…it must also be said of knowledge that it is bitter…Particularly bitter is moral knowledge, the knowledge of good and evil** [which is the issue of the human condition]**. But the bitterness is due to the fallen state of the world…it must be said that the very distinction between good and evil is a bitter distinction, the bitterest thing in the world…There is a deadly pain in the very distinction of good and evil, of the valuable and the worthless. We cannot rest in the thought that that distinction is ultimate. The longing for God in the human heart springs from the fact that we cannot bear to be faced for ever with the distinction between good and evil'** (pp.14-15).

Yes, to not be **'faced for ever with the distinction between good and evil'** we HAD TO face the **'deadly pain in the very distinction of good and evil'**—BUT while the great *flaw* in E.O. Wilson's Eusociality account of our human condition *is* that it doesn't deal with this real, **'painful'**, **'ancient, primeval terror'** of the *psychological* issue of our human condition, for E.O. Wilson that is its greatest *asset*, for it offered a way to supposedly explain the human condition *without* having to acknowledge and engage the agonising, real, true, alienated, core, **'deadly pain'** of the psychological condition within ourselves! The truth is, E.O. Wilson's theory of Eusociality is a completely fake, deliberately trivialising account of the human condition. And, in being so dishonest he was effectively condemning humanity to be **'faced for ever with the distinction between good and evil'**—because, as Berdyaev said, such **'fear'** of the real human condition **'makes the search for truth and the knowledge of it impossible'**. *Only* the **'fearless' 'search for truth'** could deliver the actual, human-race-liberating explanation of the human condition, which has now been carried out with this, the fully accountable, ameliorating **'truth and the knowledge'** about our condition, the product. As emphasised, all this and much more is explained when the theories of Social Darwinism, Sociobiology, Evolutionary Psychology, Multilevel Selection and Eusociality are presented in detail in Part 4:12I.

So the question is, what is the actual, accountable, *true, real* explanation of the origin of our unconditionally selfless moral instinctive self or soul? Prior to the emergence of consciousness and, with it, our upset angry, egocentric, alienated human-condition-afflicted state, how did we acquire what Darwin recognised as being **'the best and highest distinction between man and the lower animals'**, or what Kant referred to as our **'awe'**-inspiring instinctive moral nature?

The core biological question that has to be explained is that if reciprocity and between-group selection don't explain our moral nature, which they don't, then *how* did humans develop an *unconditionally* selfless, *fully* altruistic, *truly* loving, *genuinely* moral instinctive self or soul? If conflict between groups of early humans doesn't explain how the basic biological problem of selflessness being subverted by selfish opportunism was overcome, what does? How can unconditionally selfless traits be developed genetically when such self-sacrificing traits tend to self-eliminate, that being what unconditionally selfless, self-sacrifice means? The seeming reality in nature is that the most selflessness that can be developed genetically is reciprocity, where, as mentioned, an animal behaves selflessly

on the condition it will be treated selflessly in return, thus ensuring its continuation from generation to generation, which means the trait is intrinsically selfish, not unconditionally selfless like our moral instincts.

So how did humans develop an original instinctive orientation to behaving in an unconditionally selfless, fully altruistic way? The following answer to this question is an abridged version of a more complete presentation that is provided later in Parts 4:4D and 8:4B.

While self-eliminating genetic traits apparently cannot develop in animals, there was one way such unconditional selflessness could develop, which was through *nurturing*—a mother's maternal instinct to care for her offspring. Genetic traits for nurturing are intrinsically selfish (which, as stated, genetic traits normally have to be) because through a mother's nurturing and fostering of offspring who carry her genes her genetic traits for nurturing are selfishly ensuring their reproduction into the next generation. However, while nurturing *is* a genetically selfish trait, from an observer's point of view the nurturing *appears* to be unconditionally selfless behaviour—the mother is giving her offspring food, warmth, shelter, support and protection for *apparently* nothing in return. This point is most significant because it means that from the infant's perspective, its mother is treating it with real love, unconditional selflessness. The infant's brain is therefore being trained or conditioned or indoctrinated or inscribed with unconditional selflessness and so, with enough training in unconditional selflessness, that infant will grow into an adult who behaves unconditionally selflessly. Apply this training across all the members of that infant's group and the result is an unconditionally selflessly behaved, priority-consideration-given-to-the-maintenance-and-welfare-of-the-group, cooperative, fully integrated society. And then, with this training in unconditional selflessness occurring over many generations, the unconditionally selfless behaviour will become instinctive—a moral conscience will be established. Genes will inevitably follow and reinforce any development process—in this they are not selective. The difficulty is in getting the development of unconditional selflessness to occur in the first place, for once it is regularly occurring it will naturally become instinctive over time.

The 'trick' in this 'love-indoctrination' process lies in the fact that the traits for nurturing are encouraged, or selected for genetically, because the better infants are cared for the greater are their, and the nurturing traits', chances of survival. There is, however, an integrative side effect, in that the more infants are nurtured, the more their brains are trained in unconditional selflessness.

But for a species to develop nurturing—to develop this 'trick' for overcoming the gene-based learning system's seeming inability to develop unconditional selflessness—it required the capacity to allow its offspring to remain in the infancy stage long enough for the infant's brain to become trained or indoctrinated with unconditional selflessness or love. In most species, infancy has to be kept as brief as possible because of the infant's extreme vulnerability to predators. Zebras, for example, have to be capable of independent flight almost as soon as they are born, which gives them little opportunity to be trained in selflessness. Primates, on the other hand, were already semi-upright as a result of their tree-living, swinging-from-branch-to-branch, arboreal heritage, and so with their arms semi-freed from walking and thus available to hold a helpless infant they were especially facilitated for prolonging their offspring's infancy and thus developing love-indoctrination. And so it was

our distant ape ancestors who perfected the 'love-indoctrination' process, and that is how we acquired our unconditionally selfless, fully altruistic, instinctive self or 'soul', the 'voice' of which is our moral 'conscience'.

On this point, the exceptionally maternal, matriarchal, cooperatively behaved bonobo primate species (*Pan paniscus*) provide a living example of a species in the final stages of developing this love indoctrination process. Indeed, not only are bonobos extraordinarily loving and nurturing of their infants and the most cooperative and peaceful of all non-human primates, they are also the non-human primate that is most often seen walking upright, which, along with their peaceful cooperative nature, we can now explain. The longer infancy is delayed, the more and longer infants had to be held, and thus the greater selection for arms-freed, upright walking. When I put forward this 'love-indoctrination' explanation of humans' unconditionally selfless moral conscience and soul in 1983, I said, contrary to prevailing views, that it meant bipedalism must have developed early in this nurturing of love process, and in fact the early appearance of bipedalism in the fossil record of our ancestors is now being found. For example, it was reported that a **'4.4 million-year-old skeleton of a likely human ancestor known as *Ardipithecus ramidus*'**, discovered in Ethiopia in 1994, has features which show they **'walked upright on two legs'** ('A Long-Lost Relative', *TIME* mag. 12 Oct. 2009).

As will be briefly explained shortly in Part 3:11, and more completely in Part 8:4C, this development of unconditionally selfless behaviour in our distant forebears had the accidental side effect of liberating consciousness, and with the emergence of full consciousness came the human-condition-producing, upsetting battle between our original instinctive self and newer conscious self. (The reason I am unable to explain how we humans became conscious until Part 3:11 is because I first need to explain other related concepts, which I will do shortly.)

So nurturing is what made us human. It gave us our instinctive orientation to behaving cooperatively, which led to the emergence of our conscious mind, which in turn led to the upsetting battle of our human condition. Of course, for upset humans who have understandably been incapable of adequately nurturing their children with unconditional love while the horrific battle of the human condition raged, this nurturing explanation for human origins has been far too confronting to admit or accept—as has been said, **'people would rather admit to being an axe murderer than being a bad father or mother'** ('A Single Mum's Guide to Raising Boys', *Sun-Herald*, 7 July 2002). The nature vs nurture debate has really been about defensively trying to argue against the importance of nurturing in the lives of our children. It is *only now* that we can explain the upset state of the human condition that it becomes safe to confront and admit the critical part that nurturing has played both in the emergence of our species and in the maturation of our own individual lives.

Nurturing *was* the main influence or prime mover in human development—not tool use, or upright walking, or language, or mastery of fire, or movement from the forest to the savannah, or any one of the other evasive explanations that denial-complying biologists have been putting forward in the mountain of books that have been published on human origins. And our species' original instinctive self or soul, the 'voice' of which is our moral 'conscience', is an orientation to behaving in an utterly cooperative, harmonious, loving way—a truth that we have had to deny, and yet, as mentioned earlier, it is recognised in all our great mythologies. But both these truths, of an original cooperatively orientated,

loving instinctive self or soul within us, and the role and importance nurturing played in the maturation of our lives, have been unbearable for upset humans to admit to while we couldn't explain why we humans became corrupted. Later in Part 4, these two truths (and four others that have been equally unbearable) will be described in more detail.

As I mentioned in Part 3:1, given how guilty we have felt about our present seemingly evil divisive competitive, aggressive and selfish behaviour—behaviour we couldn't truthfully explain—we understandably had to invent excuses for the behaviour, the main excuses being that our competitive and aggressive behaviour is due to savage animal instincts within us that make us fight and compete for food, shelter, territory and a mate; and, as for our selflessly orientated moral sense, well that was explained as either a subtle form of selfishness resulting from reciprocity, or, as E.O. Wilson now falsely claims, the result of conflict between groups of early humans, neither of which account for our *psychologically* troubled human condition. But we can *now* understand that our human condition *is* a result of a psychological dilemma that arose from a conflict between our unconditionally selfless moral instincts and our newer self-adjusting conscious mind—which is consistent with the awarenesses that have been so beautifully articulated in all our mythologies of the nature of our condition, namely that we once lived in a fully cooperative, unconditionally selfless state, and then we became conscious, the result of which was the emergence of the psychologically upset state of the human condition.

To now address the second element of the question that forms this Part—namely the impact our instinctive orientation to behaving in an unconditionally selfless, fully altruistic way had on the issue of our human condition.

While in the case of Adam Stork, when *he* became upset—angry, egocentric and alienated—for defying his instincts and searching for knowledge, his instinctive orientation to a flight path wouldn't have had any particular impact on or conflict with that upset behaviour, but that certainly wasn't the case with us humans. When *we* became angry, egocentric and alienated for defying our instincts and searching for knowledge, our instinctive orientation to behaving in a loving, cooperative, honest way was extremely offended by that response. And so in *our* case, becoming upset produced further criticism from our particular instincts. When *we* set out in search of knowledge, we suffered a 'double whammy', a double condemnation: firstly for defying our instincts, and secondly for reacting in a way that was counter and offensive to our instincts. So if old Adam Stork had cause to be upset, we had double cause to be upset!

And yet the horror of our situation did not end there—it was actually even more pronounced than that, if a worse fate can be imagined! For we weren't just doubly condemned, we were triply condemned—forced, in fact, to endure a 'triple whammy'! To explain what I mean by 'triple whammy' I need to introduce another of the six historically unbearable, unconfrontable truths, which is the truth of Integrative Meaning. (As just mentioned, the six historically unconfrontable truths will be described in Part 4:4, but for reference they are, firstly, the issue of the human condition itself; secondly, Integrative Meaning, which is about to be briefly explained; thirdly, the nature of consciousness; fourthly, the truth that we humans once lived in an unconditionally selfless, all-loving state, which has been introduced; fifthly, the truth of the differences in alienation between humans; and sixthly,

that nurturing was the main influence or prime mover in the emergence of humanity and in our own lives, which has also been introduced.)

To briefly explain the historically unbearable truth of Integrative Meaning. Our world is constructed from some 94 naturally occurring elements. Under the influence of the laws of physics, in particular the law of Negative Entropy (also known as the 'Second Path of the Second Law of Thermodynamics'), these elements have come together to form stable arrangements. For example, two hydrogen atoms with their single positive charges came together with one oxygen atom with its double negative charge to form the stable relationship known as water. Over time, larger molecules and compounds developed. Eventually macro compounds formed. These eventually integrated to form virus-like organisms, which in turn came together or integrated to form single-celled organisms, which in turn integrated to form multicellular organisms, which in turn integrated to form societies of single species, which in turn integrate to form stable, ordered arrangements of different species. So everywhere we look order is developing—larger in space and more stable in time arrangements of matter are forming. It is as plain as day that is what is happening out there in our world. Everything is a hierarchy of ordered matter and what is happening overall everywhere is that matter is integrating, and yet we have denied this truth—but there is an *extremely* good reason why we have done so, which is that the truth of Integrative Meaning has, in fact, been the most confronting and condemning of all truths for the upset human race. This is because to develop and maintain the order of matter requires parts of the developing wholes to consider the welfare of the larger whole over their own. Selfishness is disintegrative while selflessness is integrative. In fact, selflessness—ideally *unconditional* selflessness or altruism—is the glue that holds wholes together and, as such, is the theme of the development of order of matter on Earth, but to acknowledge that truth left upset, selfishly-behaved humans condemned as bad, evil and worthless. Until the divisive, selfish upset state of the human condition could be explained the selfless, integrative theme and meaning of existence, which, as will be explained in Parts 4:4B and 8:1 when Integrative Meaning is more fully explained, is actually what 'God' is the personification of, had to be denied. And so the contrivance developed to support this denial of the truth of Integrative Meaning was to assert that there is no direction or meaning to existence and that change is random. Holistic science—derived as it is from the term 'holism', which acknowledges **'the tendency in nature to form wholes'** (*Concise Oxford Dict*. 5th edn, 1964), or teleological science—derived as it is from the term 'teleology', which means **'the belief that purpose and design are a part of nature'** (*Macquarie Dict*. 3rd edn, 1998)—have been avoided in favour of integrative-meaning-denying, focus-down-on-the-details-not-up-at-the-unbearable-whole-view, mechanistic, reductionist science. Again, we see what a huge part denial has played in human existence up until now. We have had to live an immensely troubled, soul-and-truth-disconnected, evasive, dishonest, fraudulent, lying-based alienated existence—a situation perfectly described in the Bible where it says, **'Today you** [Integrative Meaning/God] **are driving me from the land, and I will be hidden from your presence, I will be a restless wanderer on the earth'** (Gen. 4:14).

So, the further *extremely* upsetting dimension to our upset competitive and aggressive behaviour, what affords it the 'triple whammy' status I referred to earlier, was that it defied the cooperative, integrative ideals of life—we were, in effect, defying 'God'! This additional

guilt from seeming to be at war with the integrative ideals of existence, with 'God', means our upset has been *absolutely* extreme. Our defiance of our instincts would have made us excruciatingly guilt-ridden and thus *extremely* upset, which is exactly what happened. 'Flying off course' in our case, as necessary as it was, was an *incredibly* upsetting act of defiance—which is why we humans have been capable of absolutely extraordinary acts of brutality, barbarism and cruelty. While we have tried to restrain and conceal the anger within us, 'civilise' it, it is, in truth, volcanic—but we can now at last understand why.

When fully explained, the story of the agony of our human condition will tell a tale of diabolical anguish, but the main or primary issue in that upsetting situation was the battle that emerged between our instincts and our conscious search for knowledge—the transition from an instinct controlled state to an intellect controlled state—which the Adam Stork analogy describes. (How our instinctive orientation to behaving in an unconditionally selfless, altruistic, fully integrated way greatly compounded our upset will be more fully explained in Part 8:8.)

Part 3:5 We can now know that not only are humans good, we are the absolute heroes of the story of life on Earth

The WTM's FREEDOM poster, copies of which are freely available at <www.humancondition.com/wtm-posters>

It is not surprising then that, unable to explain ourselves and, in doing so, safely acknowledge the truth of our own instinctive orientation, and other previously unconfrontable truths, denial—and deep denial at that—has been our only means of coping with the imperfections and dilemmas of our lives.

As will be described more fully in Part 3:10, in his great work, *The Republic*, the Greek philosopher Plato (c.429-347 BC) employed the allegory of a cave to describe the human condition. This allegory—in which humans live imprisoned in a dark cave, deep underground (which the picture of the cave in our FREEDOM poster, above, depicts)—is the perfect metaphor for having to live in a state of denial or block-out or dissociation or alienation: humans have had to, as it were, hide in a cave to avoid the glaring light of the sun, which symbolises all the truth about ourselves that we haven't, until now, been able to confront. Indeed, while some of those unbearable truths have been introduced, as this presentation progresses more and more truths that we have had to live in denial of will be revealed, which will undoubtedly make the reader/viewer nervous, however, all these truths will be presented under the umbrella of the safety of the dignifying, reconciling, redeeming, rehabilitating and TRANSFORMING full truth about our less-than-ideal, imperfect, upset, hurt, damaged, compromised, corrupted, soul-destroyed lives. Explanation of the human condition brings ameliorating, healing understanding to *all* the upset, *all* the psychological suffering in human life. The word **'psychiatry'** literally means **'soul-healing'** (derived as it is from *psyche* meaning **'soul'** and *iatreia* meaning **'healing'**), but we have never been able to 'heal our soul', explain to our original instinctive self or soul that we, our fully conscious, thinking self is good and not bad and, by so doing, reconcile and heal our split selves—until now.

As the euphemisms have asserted, 'understanding is compassion', **'the truth will set you free'** (Bible, John 8:32), 'honesty is therapy' and 'in repentance lies salvation'—but we humans have never been able to 'understand' ourselves, know 'the truth' about ourselves, be 'honest' about our condition, explain why we have been upset and in so doing end our insecurity and redeem ourselves from upset with honesty. But now we can. Now that we can explain and understand that we are fundamentally good and not bad after all, the insecure, suicidally depressing state of our apparently contradictory nature—our human condition—can be reconciled and thus brought to an end. As Professor Prosen said, with understanding of the human condition found **'the psychological rehabilitation of the human race'** can finally begin.

I mentioned earlier that the Adam Stork analogy has parallels to the Biblical account presented in Genesis of the story of the Garden of Eden, in which Adam and Eve **'eat** [the **fruit**] **from the tree of the knowledge of good and evil'** (2:17) that was **'desirable for gaining wisdom'** (3:6)—go in search of understanding—and, as a result, are demonised and **'banished…from the Garden of Eden'** (3:23). In short, when *we* went in search of understanding our upset, corrupted, **'fallen'** (derived from the title of Gen. 3, **'The Fall of Man'**), supposedly 'sinful', 'guilty' state emerged. However, in *this* presentation, as in the Adam Stork analogy, Adam and Eve are not the banishment-deserving, evil, worthless, guilty villains they are portrayed as in Genesis, but immense HEROES, for they, representing, as they do, all humans, *had to* go in search of knowledge and defy ignorance. But since our instincts had no sympathy for the pursuit of knowledge and would have stopped the search if possible, defiance of those instincts and the upset that resulted was the price we *had to* pay to find understanding. It couldn't have been any other way.

We fully conscious humans *had to* set out in search for knowledge, we *had* to have the courage to bite into the proverbial 'apple', which is why 'apple', and the symbol of an apple with a bite out of it, are such inspired branding choices for the information communication and technology giant, Apple Inc. It is also why I drew a version of the apple for the logo of WTM Publishing & Communications, the organisation that now publishes all of our books and other publications.

Logo of the computer corporation Apple Inc.

Logo of WTM Publishing & Communications

DrawingbyJeremyGriffith©FedmexPtyLtd2002

So at last we humans are now able to understand that greatest of all paradoxes of how we could be good when, by all appearances, we seem to be bad, evil, guilty, sinful, defiling, undeserving, worthless creatures. In fact, we can see now that we fully conscious humans are not just good, we are the absolute heroes of the story of life on Earth for having endured so much unjust criticism for so long before we were able to prevail over that criticism and explain why it wasn't deserved.

We can *now* understand why our intellect, surely the culminating achievement of the grand experiment in nature that we call life, also appeared to be the most destructive, even evil, force to have ever appeared on Earth. Our previous inability to explain this dichotomy, to explain all the corrupting and destructive repercussions of being—supposedly—the most brilliant, fully conscious, highly intelligent, super-smart, rational animal on the planet, has meant that we humans have been extremely insecure and defensive about our supposedly brilliant intelligence. After all, what was so smart and intelligent and rational about being *so* brutal as to create a world of suffering, and *so* destructive as to nearly destroy the planet we live on? As described in Genesis, our fully conscious, self-adjusting intellect caused us to take the **'fruit' 'from the tree of…knowledge'** and become so badly behaved and destructive that we seemingly deserved to be condemned and **'banished'** as defiling, unworthy, evil beings. But now that we can understand that our intellect was simply fulfilling its great potential to be the knowing master of change (as opposed to all other forms of life that are the unknowing victims of change) and having to do so in the condemning presence of an unjustly critical instinctive self, we can at last face the truth about the role our intellect has been playing and finally appreciate why such destruction was a tragic but unavoidable by-product of that process. Our intellect's readiness to stoically endure and persevere in a situation where it has been unjustly condemned as the great evil influence on Earth, and to have endured that horrific persecution for some two million years, reveals our intellect to have been the very opposite of the villain in the story of life on Earth—it has been the absolute hero of that saga. We can see in hindsight that we were living in denial of a partial or half truth—denying that our intellect appeared to be the guilty party behind all the destruction going on in the world—

until we found the full, compassionate and redeeming truth that would explain that our intellect was not the villain but the hero. A denial that said we weren't bad was less of a lie than a partial truth that implied we were.

For two million years our intellect has been seen as the villain of the piece while our instinctive self or soul's moral conscience was held up as the epitome of goodness, but the truth, which we can now finally explain, turns out to be the exact opposite in the sense that it was our instincts' unjust criticism that caused us to become upset. This paradoxical turn of events in which our 'good side' is revealed to have been the 'bad side' is the theme of the English crime writer (and, according to the *Guinness Book of World Records*, the all time best-selling writer of books) Agatha Christie's famous play *The Mousetrap*. First performed in 1952, *The Mousetrap* is just another 'whodunnit' murder mystery and yet it is now the longest running play in history—and it's still going strong, celebrating its 60th anniversary with a global tour in 2012. All enduring myths and stories contain truths that resonate, and in the case of *The Mousetrap*, the police inspector involved in the murder investigation, who is held up as the pillar of goodness and justice throughout the play, is revealed at the very end of the play to be the culprit. It is the essential story of humanity where the apparent ideals of the soul's selfless, loving world are revealed, at the very last moment, to have been the unjustly condemning villains. As with so many aspects of the human condition, *the truth was not as it appeared*. We discover at the very end of our journey to enlightenment that conscious humans, immensely corrupt as we are, are good and not bad after all. In fact, not only are we good, we are the absolute *heroes* of the whole horrible tragedy.

In the English writer G.K. Chesterton's 1908 book *The Man Who Was Thursday*, a policeman representing the 'good' side has to infiltrate and expose the sinister members of a quintessentially corrupt organisation, but consecutively each of the apparently corrupt members are revealed to be forces for good commissioned to fight evil. Again, it is a story of the essential paradox of the human situation: that which was apparently 'bad'—humans in our competitive and divisive state—turns out to be 'good', and that which was 'good' turns out to be the cause of our 'sin'.

With understanding of the issue of the human condition now found the great, ancient, historical, debilitating burden of guilt has finally been lifted from our species' shoulders. While we fully conscious intelligent humans always intuitively believed we weren't fundamentally bad and evil, we could never explain why we weren't, but now at last we can. Unable to explain ourselves we were condemned to living life in a tortured, cave-like state of alienating denial, but the human race can now come home from that deathly dark cave-like existence it was forced to live in and stand FREE in the sunshine of dignifying, uplifting, relieving, redeeming, explaining and liberating self-knowledge. It is all over. Our banishment from THE HELL OF UNJUST CONDEMNATION HAS ENDED. WE HUMANS ARE FREE AT LAST—WE ARE FREE AT LAST—WE ARE COMING HOME.

The American lyricist Joe Darion encapsulated this great paradox of the human condition in his 1965 song, *The Impossible Dream* (which featured in the musical *The Man of La Mancha*), when he wrote that we had to be prepared **'to march into hell for a heavenly cause'**; we had to lose ourselves, suffer self-corruption, in order to find ourselves. Upset was the price of our heroic search for knowledge. And 'upset' is the right word because while we are not

'bad' we are definitely upset. 'Corrupted' and 'fallen' have been used but they have negative connotations which we can now understand are not deserved. We humans are now immensely psychologically upset—angry, egocentric and alienated—from participating in humanity's heroic search for knowledge, but we are not bad, evil beings. In fact, now that we have understanding of the great and necessary battle that humanity had to wage, the whole concept of 'good' and 'evil', of superior and inferior, disappears from the conceptualisation of ourselves.

Greek mythology described how Prometheus stole fire from his fellow Gods and gave it to humans for their use, an act which enraged the Gods, in particular Zeus who saw that it heralded an era of enlightenment for humans. As punishment, Zeus had Prometheus strapped to the top of a mountain where, every day in perpetuity, Prometheus was forced to suffer having his innards eaten out by an eagle. In light of what has been revealed thus far, we can now understand that in this story fire is the metaphor for the conscious intellect (as it is in many mythologies), and that the consequence of humans gaining a conscious mind was extremely upset behaviour, which explains why Prometheus was punished by the Gods—in their eyes he was responsible for the corruption of the human race, for our falling out with the Godly ideals.

The eighteenth century English poet and philosopher Samuel Taylor Coleridge similarly recognised the suffering that came with our conscious search for understanding, ultimately self-understanding, when he wrote of becoming a **'sadder and a wiser man** [people]**'** (*The Rhyme of the Ancient Mariner*, 1797) as a result of our journey.

But the origin of so-called 'sin' has finally been explained and it is science that has made this possible because, after centuries of discovery, science was able to reveal that while the gene-based learning system can give species orientations only the nerve-based learning system is capable of insightful reasoning, and therein lies the explanation of the human condition. One of the products the FHA/WTM has been selling since the early 1990s is a t-shirt that, on the front, poses the question, 'Ask me to explain the human condition', under which is the Adam Stork picture. Written on the back is the answer: 'Genes Can Orientate But Are Ignorant Of Nerves' Need To Understand. Result: The Human Condition.' To recap this very important point, it was science's discovery of the existence of nerves and genes and how they work that enabled the human condition to be explained.

Thus, in summary, if our fully conscious brain is nature's greatest invention and humans were in effect given the task of developing it then the condemnation, the persecution we have stoically endured for some two million years, the period of time humans have been a fully conscious species, is quite phenomenal—we *must* surely be the most heroic species to have ever existed on this planet. But it follows that to endure so much unjust condemnation we must have employed a strong mechanism to cope—and we did: as mentioned at the start of this Part, denial has been our only means of coping with the horrific injustice of being unfairly condemned as bad and evil when deep within ourselves we knew we weren't. Indeed, we have been living in such deep denial of so many truths that we are now the most alienated of species. So much so, in fact, that if advanced intelligent life does exist within the universe, Earth would undoubtedly be known as 'the planet of the alienated'. But the extent of our alienation is just a measure of how utterly courageous we have had to be in the face of so much unjust condemnation, so while our extreme alienation would be recognised by any foreign intelligent life, so would our incredible bravery.

So despite all appearances to the contrary—despite our anger, egocentricity and alienation—we humans are the most wonderful beings. In fact, if there is a word such as divine that can be applied to mortals, then we can now see that it truly does belong to us—because to withstand two million years of the injustice that we have had to endure and still be on our feet, still be able to laugh, still be able to smack each other on the back with encouragement, still be able to carry on, get out of bed each day and face life under the duress of the human condition, we must be the most magnificent of organisms.

This fact of our magnificence, that we can now understand and know is true rather than merely hope it is so, brings such intense relief to our angst-ridden cells, limbs and torsos that we will find it is like throwing off a shroud of heavy chains. This explanation, which the analogy of Adam Stork depicts, brings so much relieving understanding to the human situation that it ends all the hurt, heartache and suffering; indeed, as this presentation progresses we will see how this explanation of the human condition finally reconciles all the unresolved polarities of the human situation—of instinct and intellect, 'good' and 'evil', women and men, young and old, left-wing and right-wing, idealism and realism, socialism and capitalism, religion and science, etc, etc.

Detail from Michelangelo's *The Creation of Adam* (c.1508-1512)

This is a detail from *The Creation of Adam*, Michelangelo's famous masterpiece that adorns the ceiling of the Sistine Chapel in the Vatican City. In interpretations of the painting, God is said to be in the process of creating Adam, yet it can also be construed as God and man reaching out to each other. Since we can now afford to acknowledge that 'God' is the personification of the integrative, cooperative, selfless, harmonious ideal values of life, then with the reconciling understanding of our less-than-ideal, human-condition-afflicted state found, the 'out-stretched fingers' of God and man *have* finally touched. It turns out that for all their wild, off-the-wall, upset behaviour, the Blues Brothers really were **'on a mission from God'** (from the 1980 American film *The Blues Brothers*); indeed, the life of every human who has ever lived has been entirely meaningful.

We can now see that the story of the human race *is* the greatest, most heroic story ever told. It is the story of our species' journey from a pre-conscious state of untroubled ignorance, to conscious awakening and with it the emergence of the horror and darkness of the 'good and

evil', human-condition-afflicted state, to finally finding the redeeming understanding of that condition. It has been a truly horrendous saga. The suffering, however, has not been in vain because with this dignifying, uplifting, relieving, psychologically-healing, peace-bringing understanding humanity now begins an absolutely fabulous, TRANSFORMED existence.

William Blake's *Albion Arose* (c. 1794-96); this coloured impression of *Albion Arose* was painted by Carol Marando for the WTM in 1991

William Blake's *Cringing in Terror* (c.1794-96)

These famous pictures by the English painter and poet William Blake are reproduced on the cover of two of my books. The painting titled *Cringing in Terror* is a perfect depiction

of the terror of the human condition. In truth, the fiery hell that features in so many of our mythologies, in art and in literature, was not some deathly dark destination we were cast into *after* living an evil life, it was the horror of the burning state of unbearable condemnation that we humans experienced *during* our lifetime. Hell has been the existing state of human life. The other picture, titled *Albion Arose*, perfectly portrays the liberated state that understanding of the human condition makes possible. We can even see a bat flying out from the cave of terrible alienation from which we emerge in a sunlit, rehabilitated, TRANSFORMED state.

Genevieve's Sun poster, copies of which are freely available at <www.humancondition.com/wtm-posters>

This picture of a tiny figure standing with upraised arms in front of an immense sun as it rises over the horizon represents this fabulous moment of liberation from the human condition. Created by WORLD TRANSFORMATION MOVEMENT founding member Genevieve Salter in January 1998, this image has become the emblem of the WTM and the basis of these posters that form the backdrop of our theatre. It is the scale of the person compared with the size of the rising sun that is so wonderful because it shows just how truly magnificent the arrival of the liberating truth that drives away all the darkness from our lives is.

Part 3:6 Science is the liberator of humanity

I would like to elaborate on a very significant point I raised in the previous Part, regarding the critically important role science has played in assembling the details that made explanation of the human condition possible.

What has enabled this, the real story about humanity—the underlying saga that has dominated human life since we first became conscious beings—to at last be told is that after centuries of painstaking enquiry science finally gathered together sufficient knowledge for the human condition to be identified, explained and, by so doing, understood.

But of course this is not the full story. As this entire presentation attests, ever since humans first became conscious some two million years ago humanity as a whole has, against enormous resistance, persevered in the search for and accumulation of knowledge. Thus, it is on the shoulders of eons of human effort and sacrifice that sufficient knowledge—specifically knowledge of the difference in the way genes and nerves process information—was ultimately found to explain the human condition. Science is but the final refinement of that ancient quest for knowledge, the discipline the human race developed and entrusted with the specific task of searching for first-principle-based understanding, specifically self-understanding—understanding of the human condition no less. So while, as was explained in Part 3:4, science was an enterprise undertaken by upset insecure, human-condition-afraid humans, and as such has had to comply with the practice of denying any truths that confronted humans with the unbearable issue of the human condition—such as of Integrative Meaning and of a nurtured cooperative, loving past for humans—it was this denial-complying, whole-view-evading, mechanistic, reductionist enterprise, *supported by the efforts of the entire human race*, that enabled humanity to be liberated from two million years spent living in doubt and uncertainty about our species' fundamental goodness, worthiness, relevance and meaning.

Science, supported by humanity as a whole, has enabled us to explain that when humans became fully conscious and able to wrest management of our lives from our instincts, our instincts resisted this takeover and that it was this opposition that unavoidably led to the 'corrupted', upset angry, egocentric and alienated state of our human condition. Further, it is this ability now to understand how we became upset that allows that upset state to subside.

As mentioned earlier, the WTM has, for many years, been selling a t-shirt that features the question, 'Ask me to explain the human condition', under which is the Adam Stork picture. Written on the back of the shirt is the answer: 'Genes Can Orientate But Are Ignorant Of Nerves' Need To Understand. Result: The Human Condition.' Again, the important point I'm making here is that it was science's discovery of the existence of nerves and genes and how they function that enabled our species' consciousness-induced, human-condition-afflicted psychosis to be explained and thus healed.

Yes, what distinguishes humans from other animals is our fully conscious state, our ability to understand and thus manage the relationship between cause and effect. However, prior to becoming fully conscious and able to self-manage—consciously decide how to behave—our ape ancestors were controlled by and obedient to their instincts, as other animals still are. Aldous Huxley (1894-1963), the grandson of Darwin's staunch defender Thomas

Henry Huxley and author of such famous novels as *Brave New World*, acknowledged how other animals live, and also how our ancestors would have lived, obedient to their instincts, when he wrote, **'Non-rational creatures do not look before or after, but live in the animal eternity of a perpetual present; instinct is their animal grace and constant inspiration; and <u>they are never tempted to live otherwise than in accord with their own…immanent law</u>. Thanks to his reasoning powers and to the instrument of reason, language, man (in his merely human condition) lives nostalgically, apprehensively and hopefully in the past and future as well as in the present'** (*The Perennial Philosophy*, 1946, p.141 of 352). Part of this passage has been underlined because it raises the important question of what would happen if a species was **'tempted to live otherwise than in accord with their own'** instincts, as Huxley infers humans must have done when we became fully conscious? The story of Adam Stork describes what actually had to have happened.

At this point it should again be explained why it is being so strongly asserted that what has been presented *is* the real explanation of the human condition. It may at first seem unscientific to say unequivocally that this *is* the understanding of the human condition that humanity has so tirelessly sought. Surely, you may think that what is being put forward at this stage is no more than a hypothesis, much as Darwin's idea of natural selection was put forward only as a hypothesis. As Thomas Henry Huxley wrote, **'We wanted…to get hold of clear and definite conceptions** [as to the origin of the variety of life on Earth] **which could be brought face to face with facts and have their validity tested. The "Origin** [of Species]**" provided us with the working hypothesis we sought'** (*The Life and Letters of Thomas Henry Huxley*, Leonard Huxley, Vol.1, 1900, p.170). For a hypothesis to become accepted as true the scientific method dictates that it must first be tested and in the case of a hypothesis about the human condition the ultimate test is how accountable it is of our own lives. As has been mentioned, that greatest of all physicists, Albert Einstein, once said that **'truth is what stands the test of experience'** (*Out of My Later Years*, 1950). The Australian author Morris West similarly wrote that **'Life itself is the best of all lie-detectors'** (*A View from the Ridge*, 1996). Fantastic a claim as it may seem, what is being presented here *is* the long-sought-after, desperately needed, psychosis-addressing-and-resolving, human race-transforming explanation of the human condition and the reason you will know this is because once you understand the explanation and begin to apply it—as will be done throughout this presentation—you will discover it is *so* able to make sense of human behaviour it makes it transparent. As mentioned in Section 1:13 of *Freedom Expanded: Book 2*, a reader of my books complained about this transparency when he wrote the following to the WTM: **'Diving into a sea of truth where everything is completely transparent one can't but ask, "how will anybody cope with this; how in the world can anybody cross**

such darkness to reach light?!"' (Enrico, WTM records, 24 Feb. 2011). This transparency of ourselves and our world—for example, the exposure of all our falseness—that understanding of the human condition brings is the ultimate **'test of experience'** that confirms that the understanding being presented here *is* the long-sought explanation of the human condition. In this particular scientific study—the biological analysis of the human condition—we humans are the subjects, which means we can experience, feel and know the truthfulness or otherwise of the explanations being put forward.

Part 3:7 The depth of our anger

To summarise Part 3 thus far, we can, through using the Adam Stork analogy, understand that neither Adam Stork (as a representative of humanity) nor any of his descendants could have hoped to relieve themselves of the injustice of their condemned condition until such time as sufficient knowledge was found to explain why the upset angry, egocentric and alienated state emerged. Descriptions of Adam Stork's upset, embattled condition were not enough, the upset state had to be explained. The story of the Garden of Eden described perfectly how Adam and Eve went in search of knowledge, took the **'fruit' 'from the tree of…knowledge'**, but at the end of that story they were **'banished…from the Garden'** as evil beings. Until the difference between the gene and nerve-based learning systems was understood there was no ability to clarify the situation and explain why 'Adam and Eve', why humans, were good and not bad; to explain why they did not deserve to be banished, exiled to a state of upset.

The next image features another famous cartoon by Michael Leunig, in my view his greatest, so it is with deep reverence to Leunig that I have taken the liberty of drawing three more frames in his marvellously expressive style to complete the story. Leunig's cartoon depicts the Genesis story of Adam and Eve in the Garden of Eden, beginning with Adam and Eve taking the **'fruit'** (Gen. 3:3) **'from the tree of the knowledge of good and evil'** (2:9, 17) and being **'banished…from the Garden of Eden'** (3:23) as a result. Up to that point there is nothing unusual about the story being portrayed, however, the cartoon goes on to show Adam reaping revenge upon that hallowed Garden. Possibly Leunig meant for the retaliation to be interpreted as a straightforward joke about human behaviour—'You kicked me out, I'll get even'—but surely there is a deeper truth to the retaliation that accounts for the cartoon resonating with so many people. Hasn't Leunig got to the truth that lies at the very heart of the issue of our human condition, and summarised that truth in the most succinct way possible using the story of the Garden of Eden? Hasn't he captured the underlying feeling that we humans have of being condemned as fundamentally evil and God-disobeying when in our heart of hearts we don't believe we are; and hasn't he captured the psychotic anger that feeling of unjust condemnation has caused us?

As we can now understand, humans have been unjustly condemned since our conscious mind became fully developed and we became a self-managing species some *two million years ago*—so how deeply, deeply angry must we be inside ourselves having had to live

undefended on this planet against so much unjust condemnation for so long! I ask you, wouldn't, and shouldn't, we be as angry as Leunig has depicted us in this cartoon?

Cartoon by Michael Leunig that appeared in Melbourne's *The Age* newspaper on 31 Dec. 1988

Drawings by Jeremy Griffith, with deeply appreciative deference to Michael Leunig, Jul. 2009

Drawings by Jeremy Griffith © 2009 Fedmex Pty Ltd

To analyse the cartoon's elements more closely, in the fourth frame of this cartoon we see Adam fuming with rage for being evicted, implying that he doesn't believe it is deserved, and deciding that he has no choice but to retaliate against the injustice; he can't be expected to just sit there and take it, he has to find some way of demonstrating that he doesn't accept as true the criticism that he is fundamentally bad. And so a vengeful Adam returns with a chainsaw to raze the Garden. The guardian angel is in tears at the wanton destruction, and we can see that Eve is similarly distressed by his actions. (This lack of empathy by women for men's battle to defy the ignorance of our instinctive self, which Leunig has so honestly expressed here, will be explained in Part 7:1.) But Adam's expression and body language shows the immense relief and satisfaction his retaliation brings him. In giving the guardian angel 'the bird', he's symbolically saying, 'Stick that up your jumper for unjustly condemning me!'

BUT, above all, in the expression of extreme anger on Adam's face, Leunig has revealed just what two million years of being unjustly condemned by the *whole* world has done to us humans. And since the sun, the rain, the trees and the innocent animals are all friends of our original instinctive self, through that association they too have condemned us. While, as will be explained at length later in Part 3:11D, we have learnt to conceal how upset we are—learnt 'civility'—underneath that facade of restraint lies the level of anger Leunig has portrayed.

It really has been a case of **'Give me liberty or give me death'**, **'No retreat, no surrender'**, **'Death before dishonour'**, **'Death or glory'**, **'Do or die'**, **'Die on your feet, don't live on your knees'**, **'Never give in'**, **'I'd rather reign in hell than serve in heaven'**, **'You can stand me up at the gates of hell, but I won't back down'**, as the old sayings go. We could *never* accept that we were fundamentally bad, evil beings, for if we did we wouldn't be able to get out of bed in the morning and face the world. If we truly believed we were fundamentally evil beings, we would shoot ourselves. There had to be a greater truth that explained us and we couldn't rest until we found it. And so every day as we got out of bed we took on the world of ignorance that was condemning us. We defied the implication that we are bad, we shook our fist at the heavens; in essence, we said, 'One day, one day, we are going to prove ourselves, explain that we are not bad after all, and until that day arrives we are not going to **'back down'**, we are not going to take the criticism, we are going to fight back with all our might.' And that is what we did, and because we did we have now finally broken through and found the full truth that explains that we humans are wonderful, even divine beings, after all.

When the American clergyman and civil rights leader Martin Luther King Jr spoke so eloquently of his **'dream'** of being able to say we are **'Free at last! Free at last! Thank God Almighty, we are free at last!'** ('I Have A Dream' speech, 28 Aug. 1963), he was in truth dreaming about the arrival of the all-liberating, all-emancipating and all-reconciling understanding of the human condition that has now finally arrived.

Yes, the essential truth that has now at last been explained is that we should *never* have been 'thrown out of the Garden of Eden' in the first place—which is why I have taken the liberty of attempting to draw three additional frames to complete the story. The first frame that I have added depicts Adam and Eve beckoning to the guardian angel to return, while the second shows them explaining to the angel the biological reason why we humans aren't fundamentally evil—in fact, explaining that we are the absolute heroes of the story of life on Earth—a truth that so affects the angel that it starts to cry out of regret and sympathy. The

third and final frame shows the angel taking Adam and Eve, the human race in effect, by the hand and apologetically escorting us back to the Garden of Eden.

This cartoon encapsulates the *whole* human story now—starting as it does with the human race emerging in an unconscious, unaware, unknowing, 'knowledge-less', ignorant, upset-free, pre-human-condition-afflicted, innocent instinctive state. We then, however, developed a fully conscious thinking, self-adjusting mind and became an extremely psychologically upset, angry, retaliatory, defensive, egocentric, human-condition-afflicted species, before finally finding the redeeming and ameliorating understanding of why our 'good-and-evil'-afflicted state emerged, which in turn allows us to return to an upset-free, psychologically-untroubled, settled, relieved, peaceful, harmonious existence.

In finding the liberating understanding of the human condition, humanity has come full circle. Our round of departure *has* ended. The Nobel Prize-winning American-born, British poet T.S. Eliot wonderfully articulated our species' horrifically agonising but awesomely heroic journey from an original innocent, yet ignorant, state to a psychologically upset state, and back to an uncorrupted, but this time enlightened, state when he wrote, **'We shall not cease from exploration and the end of all our exploring will be to arrive where we started and know the place for the first time'** (*Little Gidding*, 1942).

I should explain that in the frames attached to Leunig's cartoon, I included a giraffe, a rhinoceros and a buffalo (although I mistakenly gave the buffalo Asian buffalo horns rather than African buffalo horns) to reflect Africa's heritage as our original Garden of Eden. Africa is our instinctive self or soul's home, it is where our species grew up, so the animals of that cradle of humanity represent our soul's original friends before we turned on them and their world with such a vengeance because their innocence, and that of their world, exposed, confronted and unjustly condemned us for our own loss of innocence. In the 1998 documentary *Scrapbooks From Africa and Beyond* about the exotic life of American photographer and author Peter Beard, Beard made this comment when talking about Africa that recognises how condemning it has been for us humans: **'Nature has hundreds of millions of years of messages for us—we came from that base but we want to deny it and pour cement over it.'** As evidence of the devastation upset humans have inflicted on the natural world (which Leunig illustrated so powerfully by having Adam take to the hallowed garden with a chainsaw!), in his 1963 book, the appropriately titled *The End of the Game*, which contains a collage of amazing photographs of natural Africa, Beard records how a white African hunter, ironically named J.A. Hunter, dispatched **'996 Rhinos'** from **'August 29th 1944 to October 31st 1946'** (p.137 of 280). That is the equivalent of nearly ten rhinoceroses every week for more than two years that he shot to death! In truth, hunting animals was the first expression of our anger and resentment for being unjustly condemned by our original instinctive self and its friends. As mentioned, since our original instinctive self developed alongside nature, by association nature has also criticised us. Further, since the innocence of animals contrasted with our own lack of innocence, to attack that innocence was a means of getting even with it for its implied condemnation of the upset state. As will be explained again in Part 7:1, research shows that 80 percent of the food of existing hunter-foragers, such as the Bushmen of the Kalahari, is supplied by the women's foraging (*Kalahari Hunter-Gatherers*, eds. Richard B. Lee & Irven DeVore, 1976, p.115 of 408). So what were men doing hunting all day? We can now understand that what they were doing was getting even with innocence for its unjust condemnation of their upset state.

With the explanation and defence for our corrupted self now found our former friends the animals and their world should, in effect, apologise to us humans for criticising us so unjustly for so long and welcome us back into the fold, as my third frame depicts. We can see that *only* understanding of the human condition was ever going to allow the real repair of not only ourselves but planet Earth; *only* dignifying understanding could quell our species' immensely upset and destructive nature. Incidentally, isn't that the most amazing statement? We killed **'996 Rhinos'** but they should apologise to *US* humans! Amazing as it is, this statement is true, as this presentation will continue to confirm.

Cartoon by Michael Leunig (detail) that appeared
in Melbourne's *The Age* newspaper on 31 Dec. 1988

To elaborate, this need and capacity to murder animals, and eventually one another, reveals the very deep psychosis that lies within us humans. As Leunig's cartoon predicted with his drawing of the wasteland (above) that results from Adam's retaliation, unless we found the dignifying understanding of ourselves our anger was such that we were going to destroy this planet. Hugging trees, cuddling animals, reducing our 'carbon footprint', and all the other supposed noble causes that people take up today, were never going to 'Save the World', as placards for the Green Movement proclaim—no, *only* understanding of the human condition could save the situation, avoid the destruction of our world, but paradoxically that search for liberating understanding depended on continuing the corrupting search for knowledge, *not* on 'flying back on course' and taking up feel-good causes. It is the finding of the understanding of the fundamental goodness of humans that ends the unjust criticism that has so upset us and which now allows our anger, egocentricity and alienation to subside. It is explanation that is key: understanding is the basis for compassion.

As I have already emphasised, there has been much talk of the need to love each other and to love the environment, but the *real* need and cause on Earth has been to find the means to love the dark side of ourselves, to bring understanding to that aspect of our make-up. And again, as the Swiss psychoanalyst Carl Jung frequently emphasised, **'wholeness for humans depended on the ability to own their own shadow'**—or as the pre-eminent philosopher from South Africa Sir Laurens van der Post said, **'True love is love of the difficult and unlovable'** (*Journey Into*

Russia, 1964, p.145 of 319) and **'Only by understanding how we were all a part of the same contemporary pattern** [of wars, cruelty, greed and indifference] **could we defeat those dark forces with a true understanding of their nature and origin'** (*Jung and the Story of Our Time*, 1976, p.24 of 275).

True compassion was ultimately the only means by which peace and love could come to our planet and it could only be achieved through finding the fully accountable, psychosis-ending understanding of our human condition. Drawing again from the writings of Sir Laurens: **'Compassion leaves an indelible blueprint of the recognition that life so sorely needs between one individual and another; one nation and another; one culture and another. It is also valid for the road which our spirit should be building now for crossing the historical abyss that still separates us from a truly contemporary vision of life, and the increase of life and meaning that awaits us in the future'** (ibid. p.29). Yes, only **'true understanding of the nature and origin'** of our species' 'good-and-evil'-afflicted, even 'fallen' or corrupted condition could allow us to cross **'the historical abyss'** that **'separate**[d] **us'** from a **'compassion**[ate]**'**, reconciled, ameliorated, **'meaning**[ful]**'** view of ourselves. This **'future'** that Sir Laurens anticipated, of finding understanding of our human condition, has now finally arrived. One day there had to be, to quote The Rolling Stones' lyrics from 1968, **'Sympathy for the devil'**; one day, which is today, we had to find compassionate understanding of the dark side of human nature!

So, we can now see that our divisive human nature was *not* an unchangeable or immutable state as many people came to believe, and which E.O. Wilson's theory of Eusociality deems it to be, rather it was the result of the human condition, the inability to understand ourselves, and therefore it *will* dissipate now that we have found that understanding. Importantly, this understanding of why we became upset as a species doesn't condone or sanction 'evil', rather, through bringing understanding to humans' upset behaviour, it ameliorates and thus subsides and ultimately eliminates it. 'Evil'—humans' divisive behaviour—was a result of a conflict and insecurity within us that arose from the dilemma of the human condition: resolve the dilemma and you end the conflict and insecurity. As emphasised, peace could only come to our troubled, divisive state and world through removing the underlying insecurity of our condition. With our ego or sense of self worth satisfied at the most fundamental level our anger can now subside and all our denials and resulting alienation can be dismantled. From having lived in a dark, cave-like, depressed state of condemnation and, as a result, had to repress, hide and deny our true selves, we can at last, as the 1960s rock musical *Hair* sang, **'Let the sunshine in'**—end our horrid existence of having to depend on denial to cope. The compassionate-understanding-based psychological rehabilitation of the human race—the TRANSFORMATION of all humans—can begin.

As will be explained shortly in Part 3:10, the 'Brief description of the TRANSFORMATION of the human race', while it will take a number of generations for the complete psychological rehabilitation of the human race to be achieved, *all* humans can *immediately* be effectively free of the human condition by leaving their old upset way of living behind as compassionately understood and therefore obsolete and, in its place, taking up support of the humanity-liberating understanding of the human condition, which is the TRANSFORMED LIFEFORCE WAY OF LIVING.

So, in a nutshell, the treatise that I will go on to flesh out in the upcoming Parts of this presentation is that the nerve-based learning system is a different form of information

processing system to the gene-based learning system, and within that differentiation lies the explanation of the human condition—why we humans are good and not bad after all. So you could win your football match on the weekend, or you could build the biggest money pile ever seen, or you could follow the example of Mother Teresa and try to save those who are suffering—any one of which would bring you some relief from the insecurity of your condition—but you were never going to end the horror of the human condition until you could explain it, which thank goodness we now at last can.

Again, as was mentioned in Part 2:5, the Australian journalist Richard Neville summarised our species' plight perfectly when he said, **'The world is hurtling to catastrophe: from nuclear horrors, a wrecked ecosystem, 20 million dead each year from malnutrition, 600 million chronically hungry…All these crises are man made, their causes are psychological. The cures must come from this same source; which means the planet needs psychological maturity…fast. We are locked in a race between self destruction and self discovery'** (*Good Weekend* mag. *Sydney Morning Herald*, 14 Oct. 1986). Either we found the greater dignifying understanding of ourselves or it was game over. And, as we will see later, the race went right down to the wire, right to the end game point of self-destruction in terms of terminal levels of alienation destroying the human species and the planet. Recall the photo of the housing estates in California (that were included in Part 2:5), estates that in truth are not much more than sterile slums in terms of their destructive, alienation-inducing soul-lessness. Ken Miall (an adolescent in the audience today) loves his pet animals—he has ferrets and pet sheep and horses, a veritable menagerie of animals at his home in rural New South Wales—and these are all his soul's friends, which in truth we all need. The reason we need to preserve nature is not because we might, for instance, find useful drugs in some of the rare plants, as human-condition-avoiding environmentalists have been reduced to arguing, but because the natural world is our instinctive self or soul's home and without it our soul is bereft, left tortured. Ken's pets keep him alive in a world of adults that has gone mad; a world that, to his instinctive self or soul, is so wrong.

This issue of how deeply disturbing and wrong the upset world of adults is to young adolescents raises the whole issue of 'Resignation'.

Part 3:8 The anguish of Resignation

The terms 'Infancy', 'Childhood', 'Adolescence' and 'Adulthood' are commonly used to describe phases of human maturation, however, having never before been able to explain the battle that humans have been involved in of our conscious intellect against our ignorant instincts, it has not been possible to properly interpret these stages that we as individuals have been going through—and indeed humanity as a whole has traversed—but now we can. What follows then is an explanation of these stages of maturation, in the context of the human condition being understood.

To begin, 'Infancy' is the time when consciousness first appears and we become self-aware, able to recognise our existence, become aware of 'I'. It is not possible to have a sense of self-awareness until such time as the swirling array of experiences steadies enough in our mind, makes sufficient sense to realise that we are at the centre of those changing experiences.

It is during 'infancy' that we become sufficiently able to understand the relationship between cause and effect to realise that we are at the centre of all the events we are experiencing.

So, the ability to make sense of experience, to understand change sufficiently to be aware or 'conscious' of how experiences are related, first demonstrates itself in our infancy when we become self-aware. While some other higher primates are sufficiently able to understand cause and effect to become self-aware, only humans have been able to progress beyond that point and become so able to understand the relationship between events, to make sense of change, that we are able to confidently start manipulating the world around us, which brings about the next stage in the development of conscious thought—childhood.

'Childhood' is the stage when humans develop the ability to understand the relationship between cause and effect sufficiently to experiment or 'play' with the power of conscious free will. This ability to understand cause and effect meant there was going to come a time when we became sufficiently confident in managing events to carry out experiments in managing events over a brief time and then across increasingly longer periods. Childhood is the 'Look at me Dad, I can jump puddles!' stage where we start to confidently manage our lives.

The next stage of 'Adolescence' occurs when we become sufficiently adept in our ability to understand cause and effect to want to better understand not just the relationship of events over a brief period of time but over all of time. It is when humans try to make sense of life itself, understand the meaning of all changing events, the meaning of the world we are living in so that we can adjust our lives in accordance with that meaning. Adolescence is when we become philosophical, 'philosophy' being **'the study of the truths underlying all reality'** (*Macquarie Dict*. 3rd edn, 1998).

It was during this stage of thinking deeply about the meaning of life that we historically encountered the problem of the human condition, the issue of the imperfection of human behaviour generally—and, since we were a product of all the upset that we inevitably encountered during our upbringing, we *also* tried to understand the upset, the imperfection, the lack of ideality, that was becoming increasingly apparent in our *own* behaviour.

The problem was that it didn't take much thinking about what the meaning of existence is before we realised that it is to be cooperative, loving and selfless—a realisation that confronted us with the issue of why aren't humans cooperative, loving and selfless, which is the issue of the human condition. As was outlined in Part 3:4 and will be more fully introduced in Part 4:4B, the meaning of existence is to develop the order of matter, to integrate matter into ever larger and more stable wholes. While the upset human race has learnt to live in denial of this truth of Integrative Meaning, the fact is, we are surrounded by examples of ordered matter, by arrangements of matter where the parts of the arrangement behave cooperatively. A tree's leaves, branches, trunk, roots and bark, and indeed all the cells of all those parts of the tree, exist in a state of harmonious cooperation—even behaving selflessly, such as when leaves fall (in effect, give their life) in autumn so that the tree as a whole can better survive through winter. Our body is a similar collection of cooperating parts. Almost everywhere we look we see arrangements of ordered matter and we see how well those arrangements benefit from all their parts cooperating in a selfless fashion. In fact, in the instances where there isn't such cooperation, such as where we see competition and fighting between organisms, we realise how destabilising and divisive such behaviour is. As such, we deduce very quickly

that selfishness and aggression are *not* consistent with creating order and stability. Moreover, from what we deduce from our surroundings and from what we are taught about the nature of matter at school, we also very quickly realise that there is a tendency of matter to develop *ever larger* and *more stable* arrangements of matter; for instance, atoms have come together to form molecules, and in turn molecules have come together to form compounds, which in turn have come together or integrated to form virus-like organisms, which in turn have come together to form single-celled organisms. We are able to observe that single-celled organisms have formed multicellular organisms and, in turn, multicellular organisms have come together or integrated to form societies of multicellular organisms. Clearly there is a hierarchy of ordered matter in the world around us, that ever larger and more stable arrangements of matter are being developed, and that selfless cooperation is the glue that makes those arrangements of matter stay together in a stable state. In essence, we are able to recognise that the meaning of existence is to develop order—to integrate matter into ever larger and more stable wholes. But, as mentioned in Part 3:4, the inherent problem with this obvious truth of Integrative Meaning is that it is unbearably confronting because it begs the question of why do *we* behave so divisively—so competitively, aggressively and selfishly?

So, when young adolescents realised this obvious truth of Integrative Meaning and the horrifically confronting and unbearably depressing issue it raises of the human condition they soon learnt that, unable to explain it, they had no choice but to resign themselves to living in denial of both the issue itself, and the truth of selfless-cooperation-based Integrative Meaning that confronted them with that issue.

Furthermore, not only have young adolescents been able to reason that the meaning of existence is to be cooperative, loving and selfless, we humans also have unconditionally altruistic instincts—our moral conscience—informing us that is the way we should behave. As was briefly explained in Part 3:4 and will be more fully explained in Part 4:4D, these moral instincts were acquired during a time in our species' past when our ape ancestors lived in a matriarchal, nurturing, fully cooperative, all-loving, pre-conscious, human-condition-free, upset-free, harmonious, innocent state—a time that is recognised in all our mythologies, such as in the story of the Garden of Eden.

So, from both their own power of reasoning and the 'voice' of their own conscience, young adolescents have historically been confronted by the issue of the human condition—the issue of why aren't we humans ideally behaved now—and the more they tried to think about the question without the explanation of the human condition, the more depressed they became, because the only conclusion they could come to was that humans were a flawed, unworthy, destructive, defiling, bad, awful species. In fact, trying to face down the issue of the human condition, especially the issue of the lack of ideality within yourself, eventually became so depressing—indeed, suicidally depressing—that there was, as mentioned, no option but to resign yourself to adopting a strategy of block-out or avoidance or denial of Integrative Meaning, and of your unbearably condemning cooperative, loving and selfless instinctive self or soul, and with it the whole depressing issue that is raised of your own and the human race's seemingly immensely flawed condition. Having to resign yourself to blocking out your unbearably condemning, all-sensitive and all-loving instinctive self

or soul was a truly terrible decision to have to make, and certainly one adolescents didn't make easily, because it meant becoming such a false/superficial/fake, empty, effectively dead person, but without the explanation of the human condition there was no other way—the alternative of living in a state of suicidal depression was not an option. The fact that humans have had to resign to living such a horrifically fraudulent and destitute existence is witness to the absolutely extraordinary courage that the human race has exhibited for the last two million years!

This deeper philosophical thought journey that brought humans into contact with the issue of the human condition began when we were around 10 or 11 years of age and deepened until Resignation became unavoidable at about 14 or 15 years of age. In fact, moving children from primary school to secondary school when they were around 12 years old and on the cusp of adolescence was at base a recognition that children had, at this age, undergone this fundamental change from idealistic extravert to sobered introvert.

The final stage of '<u>Adulthood</u>' occurs when humans leave the insecurity of an adolescence spent attempting to understand the meaning of existence, for having succeeded in understanding themselves and their world they are, at last, able to mature to secure adulthood. Since the human race as a whole has not, until now, been able to understand the context, meaning and worth of human life, in particular understand the dilemma of the human condition, humans haven't been able to properly enter adulthood. That's not to say that when stages of maturation aren't properly completed it doesn't mean subsequent growth stages don't take place, they do—but if a previous stage isn't properly fulfilled those subsequent stages are greatly compromised by the incomplete preceding stages. People do grow up, but in a state of arrested development. Without the explanation of the human condition humans have been insecure, they have not properly developed—in fact, they have been preoccupied with still trying to validate themselves, prove that they are good and not bad, find some relief from the insecurity of the human condition. It is only now with understanding of the human condition found that humans will be able to complete their adolescence properly and grow into secure adults, and the human race as a whole will be able to mature from insecure adolescence to secure adulthood. (Incidentally, I initially called our organisation the Foundation for Humanity's Adulthood because humanity has been stalled in insecure adolescence searching for the understanding of the human condition that matures humanity to secure adulthood, and since we are presenting that understanding we are laying the Foundation for Humanity's Adulthood.)

In summary, infancy is 'I am', childhood is 'I can', adolescence is 'but who am I?' and adulthood is 'I know who I am'.

A much more detailed description of all these stages of maturation will be given shortly in Part 3:11, however, since the Resignation that has been occurring in adolescence is such an important element in understanding our species' current behaviour it is necessary to provide the following more detailed description of it. (The full description of the process of Resignation appears in the 'Resignation' chapter of my book *A Species In Denial*, which can be accessed at <www.humancondition.com/asid-resignation>.)

Resignation to living a life of denial of the issue of the human condition and any truths that brought it into focus (which, as we will see as this whole presentation about the human condition unfolds, have been many, many, many truths) has been a feature of human life since our conscious, self-managing mind fully developed some two million years ago and we became sufferers of the agony of the human condition. Indeed, it has been the most important psychological event to occur in human life and yet it has never been explained and only very rarely acknowledged before now. This is because you could not admit to living in denial and at the same time be in denial—you can't effectively lie if you admit you are lying. To admit to the process of Resignation meant admitting that the resigned adult world was an artificial, superficial, fraudulent, virtually dead world of terrible lies, and to admit that when we couldn't understand and thus do anything about being so incredibly fake was obviously untenable. It is *only* now that we can explain—> and thus defend—> and thus leave behind—> and thus ultimately heal the extremely upset, denial-based, alienated world we have been living in that we can afford to admit and talk about all that upset and all the denial and resulting alienation from all that is true and meaningful in our lives. Clearly, an understanding of the process of Resignation is key to understanding why our lives have been so incredibly distressed, lost, empty and weird.

As has been described, the issue of the human condition was first encountered in late childhood. As I will talk more about shortly, having already resigned to living in denial of the issue of the human condition, adults have become highly adept at overlooking the utter wrongness and hypocrisy of human life and blocking out the question it raised as to their own badness/guilt or otherwise, but children in their naivety still recognised that hypocrisy. Children are both able to know (from listening to their instinctive moral conscience) and to reason that the ideal way to behave is to be cooperative, selfless and loving and, as such, are able to recognise that there is something terribly amiss with the way humans are behaving now. They ask, '*Mum, why do you and Dad argue all the time?*' and '*Why are we always worried about having enough money?*' and '*Why are we going to a big, expensive party when the family down the road is so poor?*' and '*Why is everyone so lonely, unhappy and preoccupied?*' and '*Why are people so fake; so artificial and false?*' and '*Why is it that the only thing people talk about when they meet each other is such incredibly superficial things as the weather or the football?*' and '*What is religion?*' and '*Why do people go to church?*' and '*Why do they pray?*' and '*Who is God?*' and '*Why do people make awful jokes?*' and '*why do men kill each other?*' and '*Why are there wars?*' and '*Why do we allow pictures of dead people in the paper?*' and '*Why are there pictures about sex everywhere?*' and '*Why did those people fly those planes into those buildings?*' And the truth is, these are the *real* questions about human life, as this quote by the Nobel Prize-winning biologist George Wald acknowledges: **'The great questions are those an intelligent child asks and, getting no answers, stops asking'** (Introduction by George Wald to *The Fitness of the Environment*, Lawrence J. Henderson, 1958, p.xvii). The reason children **'stopped asking'** the real questions—stopped trying to point out the all-important and immensely-obvious-if-you-are-looking-at-the-world-truthfully, yet almost totally unacknowledged proverbial 'elephant in the living room' issue of the human condition—was because they eventually realised that adults couldn't answer their questions; and, more to the point, they were made distinctly uncomfortable by them.

The truth is, the hypocrisy of human behaviour—which is the difference between what our cooperatively-orientated, all-loving, pre-human-condition-afflicted, innocent, original instinctive moral self or soul expects of human behaviour and what our present immensely upset, human-condition-afflicted, denial-committed behaviour *is* actually like—surrounds us. Two-thirds of the world's population live in poverty while the rest bathe in material security and continually seek *more* wealth and luxury. Everywhere there is extreme inequality between individuals, sexes, races and even generations. When a woman pointed out on a radio talk-back program that **'we can get a man to walk on the moon, but a woman is still not safe walking down the street at night on her own'**, she was acknowledging the absurd hypocrisy of human life. Yes, humans can be heartbroken when they lose a loved one, but are also capable of shooting one of their own family. We will dive into raging torrents to help strangers without thought of self, but are also capable of molesting children. We are so loving we will give our life for another and yet we routinely torture others. A community will pool its efforts to save a kitten stranded up a tree and yet humans will **'eat elaborately prepared dishes featuring endangered animals'** (*TIME* mag. 8 Apr. 1991). We have been sensitive enough to create the beauty of the Sistine Chapel, yet so insensitive as to pollute our planet to the point of threatening our own existence.

For a child entering adolescence, which has historically occurred around the beginning of their teenage years, this deeper philosophical questioning about the extraordinary inconsistency of human behaviour with what their reasoning and their moral instincts—their mind and their soul—expect of human behaviour leads them to thinking about the inconsistency of their *own* behaviour with the ideals. So, it was not only the issue of the human condition *without*—the lack of ideality in the world around them—that has been unbearably depressing for adolescents, it was also the issue of the human condition *within*, their own lack of ideality from the upset they encountered having to be born into and raised in an upset world.

The result of encountering the issue of the human condition both without *and within* meant that between the ages of 13 and 15 adolescents struggled to hold on to their innocent, instinctive, born-with awareness of another magic, true, all-loving, utterly cooperative and all-sensitive world free of the human condition. Trying to hold on to the last vestiges of ideality in their lives before they had to resign, young girls, if they were lucky, had their ponies, their last true friend before they died in soul from being used as sex objects, while young boys, if they were lucky, had a dog, their soul's companion before they undertook their initiation into the war zone of the world of men. (As mentioned, the immensely tragic roles of men and women under the duress of the human condition will be explained in Part 7:1.)

Eventually, however, trying to think about the issue of the human condition both without and within became overwhelming, unbearably—in fact, suicidally—depressing, at which point it became necessary for adolescents to resign themselves to a strategy of living in mental denial of their unbearably condemning instinctive self or soul and the whole depressing issue it raised of the human condition.

Adolescents didn't resign easily because it meant separating themselves from all the wonder, beauty and excitement of existence that our species' instinctive self or soul has access to. In fact, denial and the resulting alienation from our true self was a form of death—in resigning you were adopting such a false, dishonest state that you were, in effect, becoming 'dead' inside. After Resignation all access to the wonderful world of our species' soul was going

to be blocked out because it raised too many unbearably depressing questions about our current immensely upset, compromised, corrupted life and world. But, by this stage, the 'voice' of our conscience was becoming unbearable, leaving us no choice but to repress and ignore it. The English poet Alexander Pope (1688-1744) acknowledged the pain of the criticism emanating from our conscience when he wrote, **'our nature** [our primary instinctive state, which is our cooperatively orientated moral soul, the voice of which is our conscience—is]**…A sharp accuser, but a helpless friend!'** (*An Essay on Man*, Epistle II, 1733). His compatriot, the poet laureate William Wordsworth (1770-1850), was also pointing out the unbearable condemnation from our instinctive conscience when, in his great poem *Intimations of Immortality*, he wrote about our **'High instincts before which our mortal Nature / Did tremble like a guilty thing surprised.'** And the exceptionally honest French Algerian author, philosopher and Nobel Prize winner for Literature, Albert Camus (1913-1960), was similarly voicing the murderous pain of the criticism coming from our naive, ignorant, innocent instinctive self when he wrote, '[can] **innocence, the moment it begins to act…avoid committing murder** [?]' (*L'Homme Révolté*, 1951, [pub. in English as *The Rebel*, 1953]).

And so, struggling mightily to resist Resignation, adolescents typically locked themselves in their room and surrounded themselves with loud, head-banging music, just trying to lose themselves, escape the pain of what they were thinking and feeling about the wrongness of the world and of their own imperfections—and about the terrible, deadening consequences of giving in and resigning themselves to blocking out their soul and stopping themselves from thinking about anything that brought the issue into focus, which is, of course, nearly everything.

Yes, Resignation brought with it both denial of soul (soul-repression, soul-death or **'psychosis'**) and fear of thinking (the inability to think, conscious denials or **'neurosis'**). Revealingly, **'psychosis'** literally means **'soul-illness'**, derived as it is from *psyche*, which according to the *Concise Oxford Dictionary* comes from the Greek word *psukhe* meaning **'breath, life, soul'**, and which, according to *The Encyclopedic World Dictionary*, **'Homer identified with life itself'** (and **'Plato as immortal and akin to the gods'** and **'neoplatonism as the animating principle of the body'**), and *osis* which, according to *Dictionary.com*, is of Greek origin and means **'abnormal state or condition'**. **'Neurosis'** similarly means **'nerve-illness'**, derived as it is, according to the *Concise Oxford Dictionary*, from the Greek word *neuro* meaning **'neuron or nerve'**, and *osis* which, as just mentioned, means **'abnormal state or condition'**. Thus, the two elements involved in producing the upset state of the human condition of our gene-based instinctive soul and our newer nerve-based fully conscious thinking mind both suffered when humans resigned. In essence, *we died in soul and in mind*, we killed off our instinctive self or soul and we stopped using our conscious mind to think truthfully and thus effectively—what an extraordinarily high price to have to pay!

(Just to complete the description-by-definition of our soul-and-mind-destroyed upset state and the psychological healing of our upset state that understanding of the human condition finally makes possible, the word **'psychiatry'**—a discipline that can now finally be practiced in earnest—literally means **'soul-healing'**, coming as it does from *psyche*, the meaning and

source of which has already been described, and the Greek word *iatreia*, which, according to *The Encyclopedic World Dictionary*, means **'healing'**. Similarly, **'psychology'**, which literally means the **'study of the soul'**, derived as it is, according to the *Online Etymology Dictionary*, from *psyche*, meaning **'soul'**, and the Greek word *logia* meaning **'study of'**, is another field that can now, at last, be truthfully and thus properly studied. Also, while talking about these two elements of our gene-based instinctive self or soul and our newer nerve-based fully conscious thinking mind, I should point out that our instinctive self or soul did involve natural selection of nerves or neural pathways, so there was some nerve-based refinement involved in our gene-based instinctive self or soul, and similarly, our newer nerve-based fully conscious thinking mind did also develop by the gene-based process of natural selection, so our newer nerve-based fully conscious thinking mind also involved some gene-based natural selection. While I seem to talk about our gene-based instinctive self as being distinct or separate from our nerve-based conscious thinking self, there was obviously some of the two information refinement systems involved in each of the two conflicting aspects of ourselves. In a way there is some 'mind' involved in our 'soul', and some 'instincts' involved in our 'intellect'. Some definitions of 'psyche' have referred to it as 'the human soul, spirit or mind', and this acknowledgement of some 'mind' involved in our 'soul' is not inaccurate.)

Tragically, because of our soul's unbearable criticism, upset humans have been ruthlessly repressing that idealistic part of themselves and, in the process, repressing all the beauty and truth that our soul knows of and has access to—to such an extent that resigned humans have now lost almost all memory of that original, innocent, ideal, true world that our species grew up in. And without that memory humans walk in meaningless darkness. The word **'enthusiasm'** is derived from the Greek word *enthios*, which means **'God within'**. Without some knowledge of the heavenly, integrative, unconditionally loving state that our soul has already experienced, without some knowledge of 'the God within', life lost its richness and value. Resignation to a life of living in denial of the issue of the human condition came at a very high price indeed.

Since we can now understand why such extreme alienation emerged in us humans, it is worth including here the following incredibly honest collection of quotes from the great Scottish psychiatrist R.D. Laing (1927-1989), who bravely defied the tradition of denial when he wrote that **'Our alienation goes to the roots. The realization of this is the essential springboard for any serious reflection on any aspect of present inter-human life…We are born into a world where alienation awaits us. We are potentially men, but are in an alienated state** [p.12 of 156] **…the *ordinary* person is a shrivelled, desiccated fragment of what a person can be. As adults, we have forgotten most of our childhood, not only its contents but its flavour; as men of the world, we hardly know of the existence of the inner world** [p.22] **…The condition of alienation, of being asleep, of being unconscious, of being out of one's mind, is the condition of the normal man** [p.24] **…between *us* and It** [our true self or soul] **there is a veil which is more like fifty feet of solid concrete. *Deus absconditus*. Or we have absconded** [p.118] **… The outer divorced from any illumination from the inner is in a state of darkness. We are in an age of**

darkness. The state of outer darkness is a state of sin—i.e. alienation or estrangement from the inner light [p.116]**' …We are all murderers and prostitutes—no matter to what culture, society, class, nation one belongs…We are bemused and crazed creatures, strangers to our true selves, to one another, and to the spiritual and material world** [pp.11-12]**'** (*The Politics of Experience* and *The Bird of Paradise*, 1967). **'We are dead, but think we are alive. We are asleep, but think we are awake. We are dreaming, but take our dreams to be reality. We are the halt, lame, blind, deaf, the sick. But we are doubly unconscious. We are *so* ill that we no longer feel ill, as in many terminal illnesses. We are mad, but have no insight** [into the fact of our madness]**'** (*Self and Others*, 1961, p.38 of 192).

It is no wonder adolescents fought so hard to resist Resignation! Indeed, if we need any further proof of the struggles faced by resigning teenagers, consider the agonising poems that adolescents in the throes of Resignation quite often wrote as one way of expressing their great struggle to someone—if only on a piece of paper—because adults, who were already resigned to living in denial of the whole issue of the human condition, were unable to recall and empathise with what they were going through. The following is an example of such a poem. Sent to the WTM in February 2000 by Fiona Miller after she read my first book *Free: The End Of The Human Condition*, it fully expresses the torture of accepting the consequences of Resignation that Laing so honestly described, namely the death of our soul's true world and the adoption of a false, all-but-dead, deluded, alienated world. Significantly, it was accompanied by a note that also illustrates the fact that once resigned, adolescents typically (like all resigned adults before them) very quickly forget or, more specifically, block-out the whole horrific episode: **'I dug out this poem I wrote in my diary when I was about 13 or 14 years old… It has always sounded very depressing to me whenever I have read it and so I have not shown anyone since leaving school…Maybe this was the "transition point"** [a term I had used about Resignation in writings I had given Fiona] **for me when instead of trying to fight forever I just integrated very nicely!!??'**

This is Fiona's incredible Resignation poem: **'You will never have a home again / You'll forget the bonds of family and family will become just family / Smiles will never bloom from your heart again, but be fake and you will speak fake words to fake people from your fake soul / What you do today you will do tomorrow and what you do tomorrow you will do for the rest of your life / From now on pressure, stress, pain and the past can never be forgotten / You have no heart or soul and there are no good memories / Your mind and thoughts rule your body that will hold all things inside it; bottled up, now impossible to be released / You are fake, you will be fake, you will be a supreme actor of happiness but never be happy / Time, joy and freedom will hardly come your way and never last as you well know / Others' lives and the dreams of things that you can never have or be part of, will keep you alive / You**

will become like the rest of the world—a divine actor, trying to hide and suppress your fate, pretending it doesn't exist / There is only one way to escape society and the world you help build, but that is impossible, for no one can ever become a baby again / Instead you spend the rest of life trying to find the meaning of life and confused in its maze.' (Other incredibly honest poems are included in the aforementioned 'Resignation' chapter in *A Species In Denial* at <www.humancondition.com/asid-resignation>.)

Fiona was right, stopping thinking truthfully meant condemning yourself to a life **'trying to find the meaning of life and confused in its maze'**. The fact is, Resignation was a state of extremely prejudiced falseness and thus futility when it came to thinking effectively. The resigned state is not interested in the truth, it is interested only in *evading* the truth. As the German philosopher Arthur Schopenhauer (1788–1860) recognised, **'The discovery of truth is prevented most effectively…by prejudice, which…stands in the path of truth and is then like a contrary wind driving a ship away from land'** (*Essays and Aphorisms*, tr. R.J. Hollingdale, 1970, p.120 of 237). Aldous Huxley, who was introduced earlier, also courageously recognised why the resigned mind is incapable of penetrating thought when he wrote, **'We don't know because we don't want to know'** (*Ends and Means*, 1937, p.270). T.S. Eliot was also acknowledging this truth when he wrote that **'human kind cannot bear very much reality'** (*Burnt Norton*, 1936).

But while the consequences of Resignation *were* horrific, the alternative of continuing to try to think truthfully was an even worse option, as the Australian comedian Rod Quantock once said, **'Thinking can get you into terrible downwards spirals of doubt'** ('Sayings of the Week', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 5 July 1986); and Albert Camus wrote that **'Beginning to think is beginning to be undermined'** (*The Myth of Sisyphus*, 1942); and another Nobel Prize winner for literature, Bertrand Russell, similarly said, **'Many people would sooner die than think'** (Antony Flew, *Thinking About Thinking*, 1975, p.5 of 127).

So yes, going through Resignation *has* been a truly horrific experience. A friend and I were walking in bushland past a school one day when we came across a boy, who would have been about 14 years old, sitting by the track in an hunched, foetal position. When I asked him if he was okay he looked up with such deep despair in his eyes that it was clear he didn't want to be disturbed and so we left him alone. It was very apparent that he was trying to wrestle with the issue of the human condition, but without understanding of the human condition it hasn't been possible for humans to do so without becoming so hideously condemned and thus depressed that they had no choice but to eventually surrender and take up denial of the issue of the human condition as the only way to cope with it—even though doing so meant adopting a completely dishonest and superficial, effectively dead, existence.

I haven't as yet come across a photograph of an adolescent in the midst of Resignation, however, in my picture collection I do have the following haunting image of a boy who had, the previous day, lost all his classmates in a plane crash, and his expression is exactly the same deeply sobered, drained pale, all-pretences-and-facades-stripped-away, pained, tragic, stunned, human-condition-laid-bare expression I have seen on the faces of adolescents going through Resignation. We can see in this boy's face that all the artificialities of human life have been rendered meaningless and ineffectual by the horror of losing all his friends, leaving bare only the sad, painful awareness of a world devoid of any real love or truth.

'Too poor to go on school trip, boy fishes the day after classmates perish in plane crash'
Photo by Harry Benson; published in the Fall Special 1991 edition of *LIFE* magazine

As mentioned above, one of the greatest agonies for resigning adolescents was that the whole adult world, having already resigned themselves, could not acknowledge the Resignation process and only rarely recall having gone through it, which meant adolescents were essentially alone in what they were going through. Tragically there has been virtually no dialogue between resigning adolescents and resigned adults. Indeed, when adults read the 'Resignation' chapter in my book *A Species In Denial* they typically feel unnerved because in doing so they are prompted to remember being there, they are awakened to the memory of having made that

terrible transition to the resigned state. Remember, it was only on very rare occasions that adults even acknowledged the existence of the issue of the human condition, let alone having been through Resignation—which makes the following acknowledgements very special indeed.

In his 1996 book *The Moral Intelligence of Children*, the renowned child psychiatrist Robert Coles provided a rare account by an adult of a teenager in the midst of Resignation. Coles is a Pulitzer Prize-winning author, which is not surprising given the degree of honesty he managed to get up in this book about what adolescents go through—it is a fact that a little bit of truth has been lauded while a lot of truth has been loathed. In commencing his recollection, Coles wrote: **'I tell of the loneliness many young people feel, even if they have a good number of friends…It's a loneliness that has to do with a self-imposed judgment of sorts: I am pushed and pulled by an array of urges, yearnings, worries, fears, that I can't share with anyone, really.'** As emphasised, it has been difficult enough for adolescents to look at the human condition *without*, namely the imperfection of the world around them, but it is when they looked at the human condition *within* themselves that they became overwhelmed with depression. The fact is, no child has received the amount of nurturing all children received before the upset state of the human condition emerged, and when this upset within adolescents became apparent it did result in a **'self-imposed judgment'**. Coles went on to describe his encounter with the teenager and the effect of this judgment of self that adolescents typically experienced: **'This sense of utter difference…makes for a certain moodiness well known among adolescents, who are, after all, constantly trying to figure out exactly how they ought to and might live…I remember…a young man of fifteen who engaged in light banter, only to shut down, shake his head, refuse to talk at all when his own life and troubles became the subject at hand. He had stopped going to school, begun using large amounts of pot; he sat in his room for hours listening to rock music, the door closed. To myself I called him a host of psychiatric names: withdrawn, depressed, possibly psychotic; finally I asked him about his head-shaking behavior: I wondered whom he was thereby addressing. He replied: "No one." I hesitated, gulped a bit as I took a chance: "Not yourself?" He looked right at me now in a sustained stare, for the first time. "Why do you say that?"** [he asked]**…I decided not to answer the question in the manner that I was trained** [as a denial-complying psychiatrist] **to reply…an account of what I had surmised about him, what I thought was happening inside him…Instead, with some unease…I heard myself saying this: "I've been there; I remember being there—remember when I felt I couldn't say a word to anyone"…I can still remember those words, still remember feeling that I ought not to have spoken them: it was a breach in "technique". The young man kept staring at me, didn't speak, at least with his mouth. When he took out his handkerchief and wiped his eyes, I realized they had begun to fill'** (pp.143-144 of 218).

The boy was in tears because Coles had reached him with some recognition and acknowledgement of what he was wrestling with. Coles had shown some honesty about what the boy could see and was struggling with, namely the horror of the utter hypocrisy of human behaviour—which all those who had already resigned to living in denial of the human condition had determinedly committed their minds to avoiding. It has been very hard to grow up in a world that is so full of bullshit/denial/dishonesty, most especially its silence about the truth of the human condition.

The words Coles used in his admission that he too had once grappled with the issue of the human condition, **'I've been there'**, are exactly those used by one of Australia's greatest poets, Henry Lawson, in his exceptionally honest poem about the human condition, about

the unbearable depression that has resulted from trying to confront the question of why human behaviour is so at odds with the cooperative, loving Godly ideals of life. In his 1897 poem *The Voice from Over Yonder* Lawson wrote: **'"Say it! think it, if you dare! / Have you ever thought or wondered / Why the Man and God were sundered** [torn apart]**? / Do you think the Maker blundered?"** [Do you think humans are evil and a mistake?] / **And the voice in mocking accents, answered only: "I've been there."'** The unsaid words in the final phrase, **'I've been there'**, are 'and I'm not going *there* again!'—the **'there'** and the **'over yonder'** of the title being the state of deepest, darkest depression.

Goya's *The sleep of reason brings forth monsters* (1796-97)

Interestingly, in his best-selling 2003 book *Goya*, about the great Spanish artist Francisco Goya, the Australian Robert Hughes, who for many years was *TIME* magazine's art critic, described how he **'had been thinking about Goya…**[since] **I was a high school student in Australia…** [with] **the first work of art I ever bought…**[being] **a poor second state of Capricho 43…*The sleep of reason brings forth monsters*…** [Goya's most famous etching reproduced above] **of the intellectual beset with doubts and night terrors, slumped on his desk with owls gyring around his poor perplexed head…And I** [then] **got to know him a little better, through reproductions in books…all those decades ago…**[when I was] **fourteen.'** Hughes then commented that, **'glimpsing *The sleep of reason brings forth monsters* was**

a fluke' (pp.3, 4). A little further on, Hughes wrote of this experience that **'At fifteen, to find this voice** [of Goya's]**—so finely wrought** [in *The sleep of reason brings forth monsters*] **and yet so raw, public and yet strangely private—speaking to me with such insistence and urgency…was no small thing. It had the feeling of a message transmitted with terrible urgency, mouth to ear: this is the *truth*, you *must know* this, I have *been through* it'** (p.5). Again, while the process of Resignation is such a horrific experience that adolescents determined never to revisit it, or even recall it, Hughes' attraction to *The sleep of reason brings forth monsters* was not the **'fluke'** he thought it was. The person slumped at the table with owls and bats gyrating around his head perfectly depicts the bottomless depression that occurs in humans just prior to resigning to a life of denial of the issue of the human condition, and someone in that situation would have recognised that meaning instantly, almost wilfully drawing such a perfect representation of their state out of the world around them. Even the title is accurate: **'The sleep of reason'**—namely reasoning at a very deep level—does **'bring forth monsters'**; what did the comedian Rod Quantock say? **'Thinking can get you into terrible downwards spirals of doubt'**! While Hughes hasn't recognised that what he was negotiating **'At fifteen'** was Resignation, he has accurately recalled how strong his recognition was of what was being portrayed in the etching: **'It had the feeling of a message transmitted with terrible urgency, mouth to ear: this is the *truth*, you *must know* this, I have *been through* it.'** Hughes' words, **'I have *been through* it'**, are almost identical to Coles and Lawson's words **'I've been there.'**

Carl Jung gave this deadly accurate description of the human condition: **'When it** [our **shadow**] **appears…it is quite within the bounds of possibility for a man to recognize the relative evil of his nature, but it is a rare and shattering experience for him to gaze into the face of absolute evil'** (*Aion: Researches into the Phenomenology of the Self*, 1959, tr. R.F.C. Hull; in *The Collected Works of C.G. Jung*, Vol. 9/2, p.10). Yes, it was **'a rare and shattering experience'** for resigned adults to allow their minds to confront the question of why their behaviour is so diabolically at odds with what soulful, cooperative ideal behaviour would be like—despite it being the stark staring obvious question that had to be addressed and explained if we humans were to ever understand ourselves.

In Part 2:3 I also included Olive Schreiner's extraordinarily honest recollection, on her death bed, of having grappled with the issue of the human condition as a child—when in her **'darkest hour'** she **'tried to wear no blinkers…tried to look nakedly in the face those facts which make most against all hope'**. Those **'facts'** being the ones that caused her to exclaim, **'All the world seemed wrong to me…Why did everyone press on everyone and try to make them do what they wanted? Why did the strong always crush the weak? Why did we hate and kill and torture? Why was it all as it was? Why had the world ever been made?'**

These *are* rare acknowledgements by adults of Resignation, because on the whole the resigned adult world has been incapable of speaking the truth to resigning adolescents. If I was to give this talk to young people aged between 12 and 14 years of age they would hear what I had to say clearly because they have not yet resigned to a life of denial of truth. Older adolescents who have already resigned just talk bullshit—saying such things as, 'You've got to go out and buy yourself the latest gear, get yourself lost at parties, just escape, rave on and rage'; just get distracted because 'There are no answers to those questions you are wrestling with, so give up trying to think about them.' (Note, it is a measure of the extent of the denial in the world that there is no everyday word for all the denial that resigned humans practice, except for the swear words 'bullshit' or 'crap'.)

For their part, parents did the best they could from their resigned position. Mothers gave their troubled adolescent a hug and uttered such empty reassurances as 'Sweetheart, you'll be alright, you know the world is just the way it is', while fathers typically turned their backs because being so egocentric men especially didn't want to be reminded of a lost innocent state and the issue it raised of the human condition. So, locked in their room playing loud, head-banging music to try to stop the pain in their brain and with nobody to talk to truthfully, the adolescent was dying inside—their desire to think and their true self or soul was dying.

The response from the larger world in general to the honest questioning of children and to the agony of young adolescents struggling with the horrific imperfection of human life was to say something in keeping with the tradition of denial, like, 'It's just our animal instincts to be brutally aggressive, mean and selfish, it's not a perfect world, you'll get over it.' But adolescents, who hadn't yet adopted all the lies, knew full well that the way humans behave now is *not* the way humans should or once did behave—*they* did not buy the false excuses sprouted by mechanistic science. Their truthful mind and truthful instinctive moral soul was still alive inside of them and the way humans behave now simply terrorised them. For those who are already resigned and living in denial it is self-evident why everyone is lying and being so silent about the incredible wrongness of human behaviour, but to unresigned innocents it has been an extraordinary and inexplicable mystery.

From the young adolescent's point of view, adults have been 'full of shit'; full of denial; using all manner of false excuses and not even admitting that there is a very real and serious problem with human behaviour. Resigned adults certainly didn't admit that humans once lived in an upset-free, innocent state because by not admitting that they were eliminating the possibility in their mind of there being any basis for any question that needed to be asked about present human behaviour. And it is only adults who have resigned to living in denial of the issue of the human condition who advance the argument that our current aggressive nature is due to savage animal instincts in us and, as such, that there is no fundamental dilemma or underlying psychosis and neurosis involved in human behaviour—that there is no issue of the human condition to have to be explained. Resigned adults also denied there was any integrative, cooperative meaning and purpose to existence, maintaining instead that change is random. The resigned adult world has been 'God-fearing' not 'God-confronting', but those who are unresigned know these excuses are completely false.

So how then have resigned adults rationalised the agonies that adolescents have been going through during Resignation? Unable to talk about the Resignation that has taken place in the lives of humans when *they* were teenagers, resigned, denial-complying, mechanistic, reductionist scientists simply blamed the well known struggles of adolescence on the hormonal upheaval that accompanies puberty, the so-called 'puberty blues'—even terming glandular fever, a debilitating illness which often occurs in mid-adolescence, a puberty-related 'kissing disease'. These terms, 'puberty blues' and 'kissing disease', are dishonest, denial-complying, evasive excuses because it wasn't the onset of puberty that was causing the depressing 'blues' or glandular fever, but the trauma of Resignation, of having to accept the death of your true self or soul. For glandular fever to occur a person's immune system must be extremely rundown, and yet during puberty the body is physically at its peak in terms of growth and vitality—so for an adolescent to succumb to the illness they must be under

extraordinary psychological pressure, experiencing stresses much greater than those that could possibly be associated with the physical adjustments to puberty, an adjustment that, after all, has been going on since animals first became sexual. The depression and glandular fever experienced by young adolescents are a direct result of the trauma of having to resign to never again revisiting the subject of the human condition.

Of course, when adolescents encountered the extreme depression that thinking about the human condition could cause, they very quickly appreciated why adults were using all this bullshit, all these denials to cope, because they too certainly never wanted to experience that suicidal depression ever again. Once people resigned it was almost impossible to get them to think about the issue of the human condition again, which is why people go 'deaf' reading my books. This 'deaf effect', where people find it difficult absorbing discussion about the human condition, is a very real phenomenon. Resignation, when adolescents take up the strategy of living in denial of the human condition, has been a watershed moment in people's lives and yet it has never been discussed because to admit that you have taken up lying would make that strategy of lying unbearable and untenable.

Before finishing this long but necessary description of Resignation, I need to describe an adolescent's transition from the pre-resigned situation, where they expect behaviour to be cooperative and loving, to the post-resigned state, where they embrace an extremely competitive, aggressive and selfish existence. It is an absolutely astonishing shift in behaviour, but if we follow closely what happens in the mind of resigning adolescents we can appreciate why and how such a transition takes place.

As has now been explained, what upset humans did when they unsuccessfully attempted to confront the issue of the human condition—that is, when they unsuccessfully attempted to understand why humans aren't behaving 'properly' (which is in the way that our moral instincts expect human behaviour to be like)—was that they resigned themselves to blocking out the whole issue. But having given up on trying to understand the human condition they were then left needing to find some way of feeling good about themselves. At this point the post-resigned mind set about seeking any reinforcement it could find; it became focused on seeking ways to at least relieve the insecurity it was having to live with, the feeling that it wasn't ideal, good. The post-resigned human became focused on seeking all manner of power, fame, fortune and glory as their only means of relieving themselves of the agony of the human condition. In short, they became extremely egocentric, their minds became focused or 'centred' on making their ego, which the dictionary defines as **'the conscious thinking self'**, feel good and not bad—'Okay, I can't explain why I am not and the world is not ideally behaved, so I'll give up on that, but that leaves me feeling bad about myself, feeling that I'm not a good person, so how am I going to live with that? I know, I'll go out and get as much power, fame, fortune and glory as I can and then I will at least feel a little bit better about myself.' And that is what happened—pre-resigned humans are idealistic and truthful, while post-resigned humans are materialistic, evasive, dishonest, superficial, self-centred, ego-centric power-fame-fortune-and-glory-seekers. And with each resigned person seeking to achieve as much power, fame, fortune and glory as they could, every opportunity to achieve power, fame, fortune and glory became highly contested, the result being that resigned adults became extremely competitive. <u>It can be seen that this competition has nothing to do with the sort of</u>

competition instinct-controlled animals practice with their incessant rivalry over food, shelter, space and a mate, even though that has been the excuse used to explain away our extremely competitive natures. Our competitive natures arise from the insecurity we suffer from of the human condition, it is *psychologically* derived.

To draw on the Adam Stork analogy, when Adam set out in search of knowledge and encountered the undeserved criticism from his instinctive self of that search, in order to cope he had no choice but to resign himself to living a life of attacking the criticism, of trying to relieve himself of the criticism by winning as much power, fame, fortune and glory as he could find, and to blocking out the criticism. He became angry, egocentric and alienated—in a word, upset. Adam Stork then had a son or daughter who had to grow up in an upset world, which meant Adam Stork Junior was going to be a product of both the upset from his or her own searching for knowledge and also the effect upon him or her of the upset accumulated by the previous generation. We can see that resigning to a life of anger, of competitive egocentricity, and of alienation began when the search for knowledge began, however, as upset accumulated and increased over generations so too did the degree of condemnation for being increasingly non-ideally behaved, and thus the depth of depression prior to Resignation became worse and worse, and thus the commitment after Resignation to never again revisiting the issue of the human condition became greater and greater—to the point we are at today, where upset is extreme, Resignation is a terrifying experience and the commitment to not engaging the subject of the human condition is immense; which again is why it is initially very difficult for people today to absorb or take in or 'hear' discussion of the human condition. Even the word 'human condition' leaves humans today in deep shock—despite recent attempts by scientists like E.O. Wilson to nullify the term's profundity (as will be discussed in detail in Part 4:12I).

A further stage that occurred after resigning to a life of seeking relief from the insecurity caused by the human condition through winning power, fame, fortune and glory was to become, as we say, 'born-again' to the soul's ideal world. After living a false, seemingly meaningless and destructive existence for many years, resigned adults could become so disenchanted with their life that they could decide to abandon that way of living and take up support of some form of idealism. They could become 'born-again' to religion, to supporting left-wing politics, to being dedicated environmentalists, feminists, activists for the rights of indigenous people, or animal liberationists. These were pseudo forms of idealism because *real* idealism depended on defying and ultimately defeating, through understanding, the unjustly condemning idealism of the world of the soul, not on caving-in to it. To use the Adam Stork analogy, at any time Adam could quit the upsetting battle to find knowledge and fly back on course, give in to his instincts, but in doing so he would no longer be participating in the heroic search for knowledge.

It is true that the battle to defy and defeat ignorance was corrupting and when people became overly corrupt they had to give up fighting ignorance and try and bring some soul and its world of truth and soundness back into their lives. For those who had become overly corrupted, excessively angry and destructive, the adoption of a born-again, pseudo-idealistic strategy was a responsible reaction. The problem was, however, that unable to explain and thus confront and admit their extremely corrupted and alienated state, they were using the

born-again-to-'idealism' lifestyle to delude themselves that what they were doing was actually right, that it was ideal. They deluded themselves that they held the 'moral high ground' when the opposite was true. They even used their born-again lifestyle to delude themselves that they were uncorrupted people. There was an extremely deluded, selfish aspect to their behaviour—a desire to, as their critics said, 'feel-good' about themselves. The truth is the born-again state was the most dishonest and alienated state humans could adopt. Much more will be said about the immense danger of the delusion involved in pseudo idealism in Part 3:11E, and also in Part 3:11H, 'The final 200 years when pseudo idealism took humanity to a death-by-dogma, end play state of terminal alienation—the time when we needed to, as the Bible warned, "beware of false prophets", the merchants of delusion and denial, for they are "the abomination that causes desolation".'

As will be explained more fully in Part 3:11G, the great value of religions, compared to other forms of pseudo idealism, was that they involved a high degree of honesty, a significant acknowledgment of the alienated state. This honesty was contained in the sound life and words of the prophet around whom the religion was founded, because through acknowledging the prophet and his denial-free life and thoughts, a person's *own* lack of honesty and soundness was also being acknowledged, albeit indirectly. And yet, the problem with religions, and why in recent times they have waned in popularity, was precisely this honesty, for the more alienated people became, the less confronting honesty they could bear. Born-again'ers needed more guilt-free forms of idealism to support, as this quote, which has been mentioned previously, acknowledges: **'The environment became the last best cause, the ultimate guilt-free issue.'**

So while resigned people who were not born-again to 'idealism' were living a false existence, they were at least still participating in humanity's heroic battle to defy the soul's ignorance as to the true goodness or worthiness of humans. They *were* 'bullshitting', living dishonestly, but those who had effectively quit the all-important battle—and who had not only quit it but were now effectively subverting it—whilst pretending to be ideal were 'double bullshitters', doubly dishonest. With understanding of the human condition it is not hard to understand what has been referred to as 'right-wing prejudice' against 'idealism'. At a certain point the lies became suffocating, unbearable—especially the lie that humans' lack of ideality meant they were evil, inferior and worthless, but most specifically the lie that people practicing born-again 'idealism' were themselves ideal.

Overall, we can see that only the finding of understanding of the human condition could unravel this terrible mess, in particular end the need for the relief of power, fame fortune and glory and all the destructive materialistic greed, egocentricity and competition that resulted from it, and end the immensely dishonest and extremely dangerous practice of pseudo idealism.

And, most wonderfully, with understanding of the human condition now found we can at last tell young adolescents the truth about the extremely upset world we live in, we can explain the incredible imperfection of human life. We can end the great and terrible ('terrible' from an innocent's point of view) silence/denial/lie about the upset, immensely corrupted and alienated human condition. And we can tell the more innocent races, like the Bushman of the Kalahari, the Australian Aborigines and the Amazonian Indians, what has actually been

going on—that people in the 'developed' world are not the seemingly secure and confident people they portray themselves as, but in fact sad, alienated lost souls. Imagine how much that honesty is going to help the unresigned and the relatively innocent. Imagine their enormous relief when finally told the compassionate truth about the extraordinarily corrupted human condition and the good reason why humans have been that way. It means children will no longer have to resign themselves to a life of mental denial of their soul's true world and adopt all the escapist ego-centric, materialistic, self-centred, selfish preoccupations of resigned adults today. And it means those more innocent amongst us will no longer be intimidated, seduced and overwhelmed by the deluded arrogance and pretence of the extremely alienated world. To properly help relatively innocent races like the Australian Aborigines we had to stop talking pseudo idealistic drivel to them, telling them in condescending tones that they were good at finding 'bush tucker' and how important 'country' is to them and how 'sorry' we are for taking their country, and start telling them the truth about how corrupted we are and how relatively uncorrupted they are. Typically, it was the most corrupted who went on with the most drivel because taking up the cause of Aborigines made them feel good about themselves—it made them feel as though they weren't corrupted. In other words, they were using the 'plight' of the Aborigines as a way to avoid being honest about their own plight, their own condition, when it was precisely that dishonesty that they were adding to with their pseudo idealistic behaviour that was so destructive of Aborigines in the first place! Instead of being selfless and considerate of others, as they maintained they were being, they were being selfish; they were using Aborigines to artificially relieve themselves of their own corrupted condition, *not* help Aborigines as they claimed. They were actually doing the complete opposite of helping the Aborigines because, again, it was precisely their lying (which they were adding to by the minute with what they were doing) that was so destructive of the Aborigines' relative innocence. As mentioned, much more will be said about the horror and danger of pseudo idealism shortly in Parts 3:11E and 3:11H.

In short, what destroyed the innocent was not so much what was done to them, destructive as that often was, but the lying to them about ourselves, about our own upset human condition. So the truth not only sets upset humans free, it also liberates the more innocent looking on. I consider Sir Laurens van der Post to be the pre-eminent philosopher of the twentieth century, so I would like to include here his thoughts on the immensely destructive codependent (which means **'reliant on another to the extent that independent action is no longer possible'** (*Macquarie Dict*. 3rd edn, 1998)) effect that the lies of the resigned world have had on those still relatively innocent: **'Nor should we forget that there were races in the world which vanished not because of the wars we waged against them but simply because contact with us was more than their simple natural spirit could endure'** (*The Dark Eye in Africa*, 1955, p.101 of 159), and, **'mere contact with twentieth-century life seemed lethal to the Bushman. He was essentially so innocent and natural a person that he had only to come near us for a sort of radioactive fall-out from our unnatural**

world to produce a fatal leukaemia in his spirit' (*The Heart of the Hunter*, 1961, p.111 of 233), and, **'Only the irrepressible gaiety of the Bushman of old was missing in him. Knowing what contact with Europeans has done to aboriginal laughter in Africa, I had no right to be surprised. Indeed I have lived with primitive people so much that I have an inkling now of the almost paralytic effect our mere presence can have on their natural spirit. It is as if, when they first encounter us, the independence of our minds from instinct** [namely our alienation] **and our immense power in the physical world, which to them is not composed of inanimate matter but is another manifestation of master spirits, trap them into the belief that we are gods of a sort…If only we were humble enough to realize that just by what we are we play the devil with the natural spirit of man'** (ibid. p. 56). And at last the human race can afford to be **'humble enough'** to stop **'play**[ing] **the devil with the natural spirit of man'**—and before long this ability to be honest about our lives will allow generations of humans to appear who won't have experienced an upset childhood, out of which will eventually emerge a human race that is entirely free of the human condition.

Another aspect of human behaviour post-Resignation is that those who were resigned tended to assume it was self-evident to everyone else why they were behaving so outrageously arrogantly, deludedly and dishonestly, but, again, if resigned adults wouldn't admit why they were behaving in a way that was so different to what our innocent instinctive self or soul expected, then the unresigned or relatively innocent could have no possible way of knowing why they were behaving so extraordinarily. One of Carl Jung's most gifted students, the Austrian psychiatrist Wilhelm Reich (1897-1957), was another who wrote honestly about the codependent effect that the lies of the resigned world have had upon cooperative, loving, trusting, soul-infused innocence when he described how **'The living** [those relatively free of upset]**…is naively kindly…It assumes that the fellow human also follows the laws of the living and is kindly, helpful and giving. As long as there is the emotional plague** [the flood of extreme upset in the world]**, this natural basic attitude, that of the healthy child or the primitive…**[is subject to] **the greatest danger…For the plague individual also ascribes to his fellow beings the characteristics of his own thinking and acting. The kindly individual believes that all people are kindly and act accordingly. The plague individual believes that all people lie, swindle, steal and crave power. Clearly, then, the living is at a disadvantage and in danger'** (*Listen, Little Man!*, 1948, p.8 of 109).

In concluding this Part, it needs to be emphasised that although the resigned adult lived a soul-destroyed, materialistic, evasive, dishonest, superficial, self-centred, arrogant, ego-centric power-fame-fortune-and-glory-seeking life, that horrible **'plague'** existence has, until now, been an unavoidable, in fact absolutely necessary, way of living. The alternative of facing the human condition, without understanding of it, was impossible. The situation has been that if upset humans were to carry on and continue their heroic search for knowledge, ultimately for the liberating understanding of the human condition, then they had to resign themselves to living under the horrible duress of that condition. The courage of the human race, which is the subject of the next Part, has been absolutely incredible.

Yes, having to resign and live in a state of extreme dishonesty was immensely heroic, but thank goodness Resignation no longer has to occur. That classic of American literature, J.D. Salinger's 1951 novel *The Catcher in the Rye*, is all about a 16-year-old boy struggling against having to resign. The boy, Holden Caulfield, felt **'surrounded by phonies'** (p.12 of 192), in a world **'full of phonies'** (pp.118 & 151) and **'morons'** who **'never want to discuss anything'** (p.39), of living on the **'opposite sides of the pole'** (p.13) to most people, and in a situation where he absolutely **'hate**[d]**' 'school'** (p.117), a time when he **'just didn't like anything that was happening'** (p.152), to wanting to escape to **'somewhere with a brook…**[where] **I could chop all our own wood in the winter time and all'** (p.119). The 16-year-old knows he is supposed to resign—he talks about being told that **'Life being a game…you should play it according to the rules'** (p.7), to feeling **'so damn lonesome'** (pp.42 & 134) and **'depressed'** (multiple references) he even felt like **'committing suicide'** (p.94). As a result of all this disenchantment with the world he keeps **'failing'** (p.9) all his subjects at school and as a result had to leave four schools for **'making absolutely no effort at all'** (p.167). He says about his behaviour, **'I swear to God I'm a madman'** (p.121) and **'I know. I'm very hard to talk to'** (p.168). Finally he finds some empathy from an adult who says **'This fall I think you're riding for—it's a special kind of fall, a horrible kind…**[where you] **just keep falling and falling** [utter depression]**'** (p.169). The adult then spoke of men who **'at some time or other in their lives, were looking for something their own environment couldn't supply them with…So they gave up looking** [resigned]**…**[adding] **you'll find that you're not the first person who was ever confused and frightened and even sickened by human behavior'** (pp.169-170). Summarising the horror of having to resign the 16-year-old says: **'I keep picturing all these little kids playing some game in this big field of rye and all. Thousands of little kids, and nobody's around—nobody big, I mean—except me. And I'm standing on the edge of some crazy cliff. What I have to do, I have to catch everybody if they start to go over the cliff—I mean if they're running and they don't look where they're going I have to come out from somewhere and *catch* them. That's all I do all day. I'd just be the catcher in the rye and all. I know it's crazy, but that's the only thing I'd really like to be'** (p.156). Yes, finally the reconciling understanding of the human condition has arrived that provides **'the catcher in the rye'**, the means to **'catch everybody'** before **'they start to go over the cliff'** that Holden Caulfield so yearned for! *The Catcher in the Rye* has rightly been considered a masterpiece, and with understanding of the process of Resignation and how adults have lived in denial of it, it becomes even more impressive, if that were possible! (The Scottish author, J.M. Barrie's 1902 story of *Peter Pan* who has a never-ending childhood is also a story of the dream of not having to become a tragic, resigned, effectively dead adult. Yes, it is going to be a world full of Peter Pan's now, a world of unresigned, soul-alive adults.)

(As I mentioned, a more complete description of Resignation is given in the 'Resignation' chapter of my book *A Species In Denial*, which can be accessed at <www.humancondition.com/asid-resignation>.)

The following drawings summarise the agonising journey through Resignation.

Drawing by Jeremy Griffith © 1996 Fedmex Pty Ltd

A young person (or relatively innocent race) trying to understand the upset, immensely dishonest and deluded, human-condition-afflicted world around them.

Drawing by Jeremy Griffith © 1996 Fedmex Pty Ltd

An adolescent grappling with the suicidally depressing agony of the human condition within themselves.

Drawing by Jeremy Griffith © 1990 Fedmex Pty Ltd

The moment of Resignation when the adolescent gave up trying to understand why the world and they were not ideally behaved and committed their mind to blocking out the unbearably confronting truth of the existence of our species' original instinctive self or soul's ideal-behaviour-demanding moral world, and of the existence of Integrative Meaning, and instead took up a life of seeking as much relieving power, fame, fortune and glory as they could find.

Drawing by Jeremy Griffith © 1996 Fedmex Pty Ltd

Having resigned, the adolescent became another deluded, artificial, superficial, immensely egocentric and selfish, power-fame-fortune-and-glory seeking resigned adult.

Drawing by Jeremy Griffith © 1996 Fedmex

The end-play, terminal alienation, 'abomination that causes desolation', doubly-deluded, human-journey-subverting, pseudo-idealistic resigned adult.

Part 3:9 The awesome courage of the human race

Earlier I mentioned Joe Darion's song *The Impossible Dream*, the lyrics of which describe so well the extraordinary paradox of our human situation of having **'to march into hell for a heavenly cause'**. More of that song should now be included because it provides such a wonderful description of humanity's heroic journey to find liberating understanding. It begins: **'To dream the impossible dream, to fight the unbeatable foe / To bear the unbearable sorrow, to run where the brave dare not go / To right the unrightable wrong, to love pure and chaste from**

afar.' Achieving freedom from the human condition *has*, until now, been an **'impossible dream'** because *only* the arrival of understanding of the human condition could deliver that freedom, and finding that understanding required the work of many, many generations. Indeed, every generation since the conscious, self-managing state fully emerged some two million years ago has had to 'die in the trenches'—continue the immensely upsetting/corrupting but heroic search for knowledge, without ever being able to liberate themselves from the pain of the human condition. For all those generations liberation from the human condition *was* an **'impossible dream'**; every generation up until now *has had* **'to fight the unbeatable foe'**, **'To bear the unbearable sorrow'** of this horrific state of upset/corruption, and be prepared **'to run where the brave dare not go'**, be braver than even the bravest. We have had **'To right the unrightable wrong'**—try to achieve some form of validation of ourselves without being able to explain in first principle terms why we are good and not bad. We have had **'to love pure and chaste from afar'**—accept that we are corrupted but still be in love with, have faith in, aspire to the dream that humanity would one day return to the ideal, all-loving, upset-free state. We had to carry on the journey to find knowledge, ultimately the self-knowledge that would liberate us from our human condition. As Darion concluded, we had **'To try when your arms are too weary, to reach the unreachable star / This is my quest, to follow that star / No matter how hopeless, no matter how far / To fight for the right without question or pause / To be willing to march into hell for a heavenly cause / And I know if I will only be true, to this glorious quest / That my heart will lie peaceful and calm, when I'm laid to my rest / And the world will be better for this, that one man scorned and covered with scars / Still strove with his last ounce of courage, to reach the unreachable star.'**

There is a very famous parable or story that I understand originated with the Hottentot people of southern Africa that also beautifully describes the incredibly difficult, heroic journey humanity has been undergoing. Sir Laurens van der Post has written about it—in fact, his 1994 anthology *Feather Fall* is named after the parable. It starts with a hunter seeing in a pool of water the reflection of a great white bird, which is described as 'the white bird of truth', which we can now understand is the liberating truth about the human condition. After seeing this wondrous image of the white bird of truth the hunter sets out on a heroic journey to find it, leaving behind his friends and village—in effect, leaving behind his innocent childhood—to begin his ascent of this great mountain, at the top of which lives the great white bird of truth. As the hunter begins his lonely climb he can still hear in the distance the happy, joyous laughter of those he has had to leave behind—implying that as a result of his journey he has to suffer becoming corrupted and alienated from his original happy, gregarious, social innocent true self and world. As he ascends, gremlins begin to appear amongst the rocks, taunting him by saying, 'You have become such an egocentric, angry evil person, why don't you give up?', or words to that effect. His doubts grow but still he struggles on. Eventually, as the mountainside becomes steeper, the hunter starts finding steps that have been carved in the rock face by others who have gone before him. He makes use of these steps but when they

eventually run out he still doesn't give up. Instead, he carves further steps, but as the years go by his energy wanes. Eventually in his old age he can go no farther and lies down to die, but just as he is about to die a white feather flutters down and comes to rest on his forehead, symbolising that the hunter has found some truth and added to the accumulation of knowledge that would one day lead to the finding of the full truth about the human condition, which is the great white bird of truth that resides at the summit of all human endeavour and which has now, after all the efforts of all the humans who have ever lived, at last been found.

It's a story that crops up in the mythologies of many cultures—for instance, it is reminiscent of the Greek myth Jason and the Argonauts, in which the hero, Jason, sets out on a great adventure to find the 'Golden Fleece', which again is symbolic of the liberating understanding of the human condition. The myth of King Arthur's Knights of the Round Table and their quest for the 'Holy Grail' is another expression of the same story of humanity's search for liberating understanding of the human condition. These are fabulous mythologies that reveal very clearly the ordeal that humans have had to endure growing up in a world without understanding of the human condition and where all they could do was try and help find that all-important insecurity-of-self-ending understanding—and, thankfully, those efforts have been rewarded for the 'Golden Fleece', 'The Holy Grail' and the 'White Bird of Truth' *have all finally been found*.

Part 3:10 Brief description of the TRANSFORMATION of the human race

Graphic by J. Griffith, M. Rowell and G. Salter © 2009 Fedmex Pty Ltd

The word 'science' comes from the Latin word *scientia*, meaning **'knowledge'** (*Encyclopedia World Dictionary*), and 'biology' is, of course, the branch of that search for knowledge that studies the **'life…of animals and plants'** (*The Concise Oxford Dictionary*)—animals and plants being the forms that living organisms have taken. Since its inception, the great outstanding question in biology

has been to understand the behaviour of us human animals, and the central issue that we needed to understand about ourselves was our good-and-evil-afflicted state or condition—our particular *human condition*.

Charles Darwin achieved a great breakthrough in this field when, through his explanation of the process of natural selection, he was able to explain the origins of life, but the *ultimate* goal of biology was to explain ourselves, our human condition. That has been the goal of the whole Darwinian revolution. Indeed, even E.O. Wilson once conceded that **'The human condition is the most important frontier of the natural sciences'** (*Consilience*, 1998, p.298 of 374)—despite nullifying this **'most important frontier'** with his own human-condition-avoiding 'explanation' of it. Yes, finding understanding of the human condition has been the objective of *all* human endeavour—the objective that every human who has ever lived has worked tirelessly towards, because *only* by understanding our seemingly imperfect, 'corrupted', 'fallen' condition could we humans hope to end the psychological insecurity, the upsetting sense of guilt, that we experienced from being non-ideally behaved and, by so doing, relieve and heal our immensely distressed human condition.

As fully conscious beings we have been in search of knowledge, specifically the liberating, ameliorating, TRANSFORMING understanding of our good-and-evil afflicted human condition, and it is that goal of goals that has finally been achieved.

That the search for understanding of the human condition has been the central quest in our human journey of conscious thought and enquiry is apparent in the fact that all our great mythologies and religions are centred around finding that liberating understanding. As just mentioned, the mythologies of King Arthur's Knights' search for the 'Holy Grail', Jason and the Argonauts' search for the 'Golden Fleece', and the Hottentot hunter's search for the 'white bird of truth', were expressions of the search for this key, all-important liberating understanding of ourselves. Religious mythology reveals further examples—for instance, Genesis in the Bible states that after **'eat**[ing the **fruit**] **from the tree of the knowledge of good and evil'** (2:17) that was **'desirable for gaining wisdom'** (3:6) and having to suffer being **'banished…from the Garden of Eden'** (3:23), we **'will be like God, knowing good and evil'** (3:5); we will be like secure, sound Gods, because we will have finally understood and reconciled our good-and-evil afflicted upset lives. Buddha similarly looked forward to the time when **'In the future they will every one be Buddhas** [in the future everyone will be free of psychosis and neurosis] / **And will reach Perfect Enlightenment / In domains in all directions / Each will have the same title / Simultaneously on wisdom-thrones / They will prove the Supreme Wisdom'** (Buddha [Siddartha Gautama] c.560–480 BC, *The Lotus Sutra*, ch.9; tr. W.E. Soothill, 1987, p.148 of 275). Buddha was anticipating the time when understanding of the human condition would be found and everyone would be able to share understanding of the human condition and, as a result, become secure and sound. Since our different personalities are largely a result of our different states of upset and alienation resulting from the insecurity of the human condition, when reconciling understanding of the human condition arrives, as it now has, our different personalities will largely disappear. As Buddha foresaw, we **'Each will have the same title.'**

(On this note, I should briefly address a comment some people have made when told about our various states of alienation disappearing and everyone having similar personalities in the future, which is 'Well, that will be boring, because all the interesting "colour" of human life

will go.' This comment is what I call 'black speak', blindness preaching blindness, because the alienated state is such a numb, seared and exhausted state that to argue that we should stay alienated is effectively arguing that we should stay dead! As will become increasingly clear as this presentation unfolds, if a bucket of water represents the depth of sensitivity humans are capable of then our alienated state is equivalent to living life on the thin surface meniscus of that water. So to argue that we should remain in an empty, insecure, immensely unhappy and deeply, deeply distressed, effectively dead state that can hardly feel or know anything when we can finally, at last, savour the magnificence of our world is simply alienation trying to build a positive out of a negative. It is an understandable defensive reaction that people have had in order to make themselves feel better about their human-condition-afflicted, empty lives, but clearly it is an absurd betrayal of all that the human race has worked towards. While our world will lose some of its superficial variety or 'colour' when the different states of alienation disappear and everyone has similar personalities, the incredible sensitivity and happiness that will come to humans from being able to access the world of our soul again will mean our lives have a depth and potential that we have hardly dared to dream of. For example, each person will be able to immerse themselves in whatever aspect of sensitivity they choose, with the number of different aspects of sensitivity available in our world to savour being innumerable. Some people might spend a whole lifetime perfecting, and sharing with others, what it's like to feel what a certain mood feels like, or what a certain animal or plant feels like, or what a certain time of the day truly feels like. There are awarenesses and feelings and knowledge and thoughts and imaginings that we haven't even begun to tap into in our human-condition-preoccupied, virtually dead state. Once people allow themselves to appreciate what life will be like free of the human condition they will never make such sad, blind, defensive comments as suggesting the future will be 'boring'.)

Like biology and theology, the study of philosophy, which is **'the study of the truths underlying all reality'** (*Macquarie Dict*. 3rd edn, 1998), has in fact *also* been focused on the all-important need to find understanding of the human condition, because the most elusive and necessary of all **'truths underlying all reality'** has been the truth about the human condition. And within this great biological, theological and philosophical quest to find understanding of the human condition all the evidence suggests that the person who went the furthest in both describing the actual problem of the human condition and in anticipating what would happen when it was eventually resolved was that incomparable philosopher of the Golden Age of Greece, Plato.

Of Plato's writings, his most celebrated is *The Republic*, the centrepiece of which is the allegory of the cave. Despite being written so long ago in approximately 360 BC, this allegory contains what is undoubtedly the most honest and penetrating account ever given of the problem and resolution of the human condition prior to it being able to be scientifically explained. As evidence of Plato's stature as an exceptionally honest and thus effective and thus penetrating philosopher, Alfred North Whitehead, one of the most highly regarded philosophers of the twentieth century, described the history of philosophy as merely **'a series of footnotes to Plato'** (*Process and Reality [Gifford Lectures Delivered in the University of Edinburgh During the Session 1927-28]*, 1979, p.39 of 413). Thus, if Plato is regarded as being the most accomplished thinker about **'the truths underlying all reality'**, and his most celebrated work is *The Republic*, the centrepiece of which is the allegory of the cave, then his cave allegory must be all significant—and it is.

In *The Republic*, Plato described humans as having to live imprisoned in a dark cave-like state of denial, unable to face the glare of confrontation with the depressing issue of our unbearably imperfect, less-than-ideally-behaved lives. What is so significant about Plato's description of humans incarcerated in a cave-like state of denial of the issue of the human condition is his admission of, and focus upon, that denial. The great impediment to solving the human condition has been our species' great fear and resulting denial of the subject, so to home in on that denial was extraordinarily honest. As I explained earlier, you can't admit to being in denial if you are in denial, so for Plato to have done so means he was obviously an exceptionally innocent individual who was sufficiently free of the insecurity of the human condition to have avoided having to resign to a life lived in denial of it; he was clearly an exceptionally honest, denial-free thinker, or what has historically been referred to as a prophet. So while the mythologies of King Arthur's Knights and Jason and the Argonauts could only allude to our search for understanding of the human condition using metaphors of a 'Holy Grail' and a 'Golden Fleece', Plato actually spoke directly and specifically about the human condition, about our denial of it, and about how we had to overcome that great denial to solve the human condition. Later in Part 4 we will see how even Charles Darwin, like virtually every other biologist in recorded history, went out of his way to avoid the issue of the human condition (although in his defence, he did not do so dishonestly—he intuitively knew he was not secure enough in self to take that next step and confront the human condition and, as such, chose not to attempt to do so, unlike other biologists who sidestepped that responsible precedent to go on to manufacture a whole industry of denial-laden and thus fraudulent biological thinking). In Darwin's case, in his seminal work, *The Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection*, apart from referring to the way humans select pigeons and manipulate animals through breeding, Darwin made no attempt to explain human behaviour—despite the fact his book was actually called *The Origin of Species* and should, by inference, also account for the origins of our species' behaviour. As the description of the process of Resignation has made *very* clear, trying to confront the human condition has been a suicidally dangerous enterprise for virtually all humans. Plato was indeed an incomparable philosopher.

Returning then to his work, in *The Republic* Plato both described humans as having to live imprisoned in a dark cave-like state of denial and foresaw that liberation from the 'cave' of protective but at the same time deadening, alienated darkness could only come when the reconciling understanding of the origins of our species' less-than-ideal behaviour would lift the siege of criticism of our non-ideal behaviour that caused us to have to live shamefully in a cave-like state of denial—and, most importantly, heal or ameliorate, and by so doing end, the non-ideal behaviour itself, thus TRANSFORMING the human race. Beginning with what must be one of the earliest mentions of the term 'human condition', Plato wrote: **'I want you to go on to picture the enlightenment or ignorance of our human conditions somewhat as follows. Imagine an underground chamber, like a cave with an entrance open to the daylight and running a long way underground. In this chamber are men who have been prisoners there'** (*Plato The Republic*, tr. H.D.P. Lee, 1955, p.278 of 405). A more complete presentation of what Plato wrote in *The Republic* about the human condition and its resolution will be included later in Part 6:2, however, in summary he described how the cave's exit is blocked by a fire such that if one of the prisoners were **'to stand up and turn his head and look and walk towards the fire; all these actions would be painful…**

he would [have to] **turn back and take refuge'** in the cave of **'shadows'**, which are only an **'illusion'** of the real world outside the cave (ibid. pp.279-280). The allegory makes clear that while **'the light of the fire in the cave prison corresponds to the power of the sun'** (p.282), with **'the sun…making things we see visible'** (p.273) such that without it we can only **'see dimly and appear to be almost blind'** (p.272), having to hide in the **'cave'** of **'illusion'** and endure **'almost blind'** alienation was infinitely preferable to facing the **'painful'** light of the **'fire'/'sun'** that would make **'visible'** the unbearably depressing issue of **'the imperfections of human life'** (p.282). The main thrust of Plato's cave allegory was that while living in a cave-like state of denial has tragically been absolutely necessary it was ultimately only by being **'illuminated by truth and reality'** (p.273) that **'the enlightenment…of our human conditions'** could be achieved and the cave prisoners be **'released from their bonds and cured of their delusions'** (p.279).

We can see from this condensation of what Plato wrote in *The Republic* how truthful and accurate his description of the human condition and of its eventual resolution was. Plato certainly was one of the soundest men in recorded history. Later, in Part 10:1, I will argue that Plato, along with the other two very great denial-free thinking prophets in history of Moses and Christ, made the most important contributions to humanity's great journey to enlightenment. I will argue that with his Ten Commandments Moses gave humanity the most effective form of Imposed Discipline for containing the ever increasing levels of upset in the human race, that Christ gave humanity the soundest and thus most effective corruption-and-denial-countering Religion, and that Plato gave philosophy—the actual business of studying **'the truths underlying all reality'**, in particular studying and finding the all-important understanding of the human condition—the best possible orientation and assistance. So, we could say that 'the beauty and taste of roses, rice and potato saved the human race'!! And I probably should add a 'leg of lamb'—the prophet Abraham—to that feast because Abraham contributed the precious foundations of real, effective religion with his emphasis on the need to revere the truth of there being one God, namely Integrative Meaning.

Finding the **'enlightenment'** of our **'imperfect' 'human condition'** that enables us to be **'released from'** the **'bonds'** of our **'cave'-'like' 'prison'** of **'almost blind'** alienated denial and, as a result, **'cured of'** our **'illusion'** and **'delusions'** is the dreamed of breakthrough that brings about the complete TRANSFORMATION—in fact, transfiguration—of the whole human race. The word transfiguration means **'a change that glorifies or exalts'**, **'a marked change in form or appearance; a metamorphosis'** (Dictionary.com), so it is a perfect description for what happens to humans when, with dignifying, uplifting, relieving, ameliorating, reconciling, redeeming, healing and curing understanding, we are finally able to not only end our old egocentric, must-prove-that-we-are-not-bad, insecure, human-condition-afflicted existence, but enter an incredibly exciting 'out-of-cave', 'world-in-sunshine' state of glorious FREEDOM, optimism and psychologically liberated, empowered capability—as the detail from the computer graphic of our WTM FREEDOM poster at the beginning of this Part 3:10 portrays.

Importantly, as I mentioned earlier, this TRANSFORMATION—in fact, TRANSFIGURATION—from a human-condition-afflicted existence to an almost unbelievably wonderful exhilarated and empowered lifeforce existence is not achieved artificially through transcending our embattled conscious thinking egoic self, as 'spiritual gurus' in the 'New Age' or, more recently, 'A New Earth', 'alternative' movements advocate—nor is it achieved through deep, meditative

extinction of our human-condition-distressed thinking mind as some religious practices teach. It is not achieved by dogmatically imposing a deconstructed, good-and-evil-differentiation-free, politically-correct-but-human-reality-dishonest, ideal world as the postmodern movement and, before it, the socialist and communist movements tried to do. And nor does it involve escaping the real issue before us as a species of our deeply troubled selves by adopting a focus-away-from-yourself, guilt-free, feel-good, pseudo idealistic cause like Environmentalism. Rather, the TRANSFORMATION is achieved through what is ultimately the only real and lasting way it could be: through satisfying our conscious thinking human mind with first-principle-based, biological understanding of *why* we humans are wholly worthwhile and meaningful beings.

There *had* to be a biological explanation for our species' non-ideal divisive, competitive, aggressive, angry, even-brutal-and-mean, selfish, self-obsessed, indifferent-to-others'-needs, arrogant, egocentric, deluded, defensive, escapist, superficial, artificial, alienated **'imperfections'**, and our responsibility as conscious beings was to find that **'enlightenment'** of our **'human condition'**. The British science historian Jacob Bronowski emphasised this fundamental responsibility we humans had in the concluding statement to his 1973 television series and book of the same name, *The Ascent of Man*: **'I am infinitely saddened to find myself suddenly surrounded in the west by a sense of terrible loss of nerve, a retreat from knowledge into—into what? Into…falsely profound questions about, Are we not really just animals at bottom; into extra-sensory perception and mystery. They do not lie along the line of what we are now able to know if we devote ourselves to it: an understanding of man himself. We are nature's unique experiment to make the rational intelligence prove itself sounder than the reflex** [instinct]**. Knowledge is our destiny. Self-knowledge, at last bringing together the experience of the arts and the explanations of science, waits ahead of us'** (p.437 of 448).

Yes, there has been a litany of false starts to a TRANSFORMED, human-condition-FREE new world for humans, but for the conscious thinking human mind to find true peace it needed *answers*. Transcendence of the issue of self, thought repression, enforced dogma and escapism could not provide that. De-braining ourselves or **'retreat**[ing] **from knowledge'** was never going to work. Ultimately we needed brain food not brain anaesthetic, knowledge—specifically the dignifying, uplifting, healing, ameliorating, relieving, peace-bringing, **'cave'**-liberating, **'prison'**-**'released'**, **'imperfections'**-no-longer-**'painful'**, **'blind**[ness]**'**-ending, **'delusions'**-**'cured'**, **'sun'**/truth-**'illuminated' 'enlightenment'** of **'our human-condition'**-afflicted lives. Anything else was an abrogation of the responsibility that came with our greatest capacity and nature's greatest invention: our species' fully conscious, thinking, self-managing, self-adjusting *mind*. And, thankfully, that fabulous destiny and potential to progress from mere abstract, artistic *description* of the agonising, good-and-evil-afflicted dilemma of our human situation to reconciling, first-principle-based, biological, scientific *understanding* of that dilemma and resulting amelioration, integration and unification of ourselves and our species has now, at last, finally arrived.

What has been described so far in Part 3:10 is the overview of how understanding of the human condition liberates the human race from the insecurity of that condition and by so doing enables, as Professor Prosen said, **'the psychological rehabilitation of the human race'**. As Plato said, **'enlightenment'** of our **'imperfect' 'human condition'** enables us to be **'released from'** the

'bonds' of our **'cave'-'like' 'prison'** of **'almost blind'** alienated denial and, as a result, be **'cured of'** our **'illusion'** and **'delusions'**.

Importantly, while this **'psychological rehabilitation of the human race'**, this therapy of all our upsets, is now possible, the problem is for it to take place in our lifetime would require a great deal of time and supportive counselling—time and counselling that isn't available and which the world cannot afford at the moment. In fact, it will naturally take a number of generations for all the upset inside humans to be ameliorated or healed through the dissemination and absorption of the understanding of the human condition that is now available. The crucial question this raises is, 'Does this mean the human race is going to have to wait a personally agonising and possibly world-destroying (because all our immense upsets will obliterate the world if we don't change soon) number of generations to be TRANSFORMED from a life of living with the human condition?'

The answer to this question is that in all but the most extreme cases such psychological rehabilitating therapy *is not necessary*. This is because, with understanding of the human condition found, we can *immediately* leave behind our upset way of living even though it hasn't been ameliorated or healed. The fact is, with the upset state of the human condition now explained and defended *we no longer have to live those upsets out. What we can do straight away is leave all our upsets behind as dealt with, the effect of which will be to be immediately free of the upset state of the human condition*. All humans can now immediately be TRANSFORMED from living in the upset state of the human condition.

To elaborate, now that upset is explained and defended at the most fundamental level—now that the *source* of all the upset in the human race has at last been compassionately understood—it follows that *all* the upset in humans is also now explained and defended. This means that *all* the ways we have been employing to try to cope with the upset within us and around us are now obsolete, rendered unnecessary and meaningless. No longer do we have to try to prove our worth because our worth has been established at the most fundamental level. No longer do we have to deny any confronting truths about our immensely upset/corrupted condition because no longer are there any truths about our upset/corrupted state that condemn us. And no longer do we have to retaliate against criticism of our upset state because our upset state has been defended with truthful, compassionate understanding at the most profound level. Our upset lives are explained and defended now, which means we no longer have to be preoccupied compensating for that upset by finding forms of self-aggrandisement, by seeking self-distraction, or by chasing relief through materialistic forms of compensation for all the hurt we experienced growing up in an immensely human-condition-afflicted world. In other words, we no longer need to seek power, fame, fortune and glory to make ourselves feel good about ourselves because our goodness has now been established at the deepest, most profound, fundamental level.

Instead, we can simply leave our whole 'must-prove-our-worth, attack-and-deny-any-criticism' way of living behind as obsolete and redirect our mind and all our energies to supporting and disseminating these human-race-saving understandings, and to repairing the world from all the damage our upset has caused—for with the human condition solved it is at last possible to *properly* repair our environment, because all the upset that caused, and was continuing to cause, the destruction of the planet now ends. You can, as it were, put the issue

of all your upsets/corruptions in a suitcase, attach a label to it saying, 'Everything in here is now explained and defended' and simply leave that suitcase behind at the entrance to what we in the WTM call the Sunshine Highway as you set out free and unencumbered into the new, human-condition-free world.

All our egocentric, embattled posturing to get a win out of life, all our strategising every minute of every day to try to find a way to compensate for feeling inadequate or imperfect or bad about ourselves, suddenly ends. We leave the dark **'cave'** of **'blind'** denial and **'delusion'** where we have been hiding to escape the **'painful'** glare of the truth about our seemingly **'imperfect' 'human condition'**. Excitement and meaning—based on **'enlighten**[ing]**'**, liberating, truthful, honest understanding of ourselves and our world—is what sustains us now.

This will be more fully explained in Part 9, but I cannot stress enough that having the human condition explained and defended means that everyone can now immediately leave their old human-condition-embattled way of living behind forever. While it will take a number of generations to eliminate the upset state of the human condition from within humans, everyone can *immediately* be effectively free of the human condition by redirecting their efforts from being preoccupied with and living out their upsets to living in support of these understandings and to repairing the world. In essence, the excitement of being effectively free of the human condition—the joy and happiness of being liberated from the burden of your insecurities and self-preoccupations; the awesome meaning and power of finally being aligned with the truth and participating in the magic true world; the wonderful empathy and equality of goodness and fellowship that understanding of the human condition now allows you to feel for your fellow humans; the freedom now to effectively focus on repairing the world; and, above all, the radiant aliveness from the optimism that comes with knowing our march through hell has finally ended—IS GOING TO TRANSFORM THE WORLD.

There will naturally be a brief initial period of shock and procrastination, because understanding of the human condition inevitably brings with it exposure of, and thus confrontation with, our immensely upset condition. We can't very well have the truth about humans and not have that truth apply to *ourselves*. If we return to the Adam Stork analogy, if Adam could have explained why he had to carry out his search for knowledge when he was first criticised for doing so he would never have become upset—he would never have become defensively angry, egocentric and alienated. Or if he had found the explanation for why he had to search for knowledge after only a few days of carrying out that search he would have accumulated very little anger, egocentricity and alienation to have to heal with understanding. But humans' conscious, self-managing state fully emerged some *two million years ago* and we have only now found the understanding of why we became upset, which means there is now an absolute mountain of accumulated anger, unsatisfied ego, and denial in us humans to have to heal with this understanding. Certainly, we have learnt to restrain and conceal a great deal of that upset; we have learnt to, as we say, 'civilise it', not let it show—for instance, we don't normally attack someone now the moment we become angry. Adult humans now exhibit a great deal of self-control, but underneath our manufactured facade of restrained civility, even manufactured happiness, lies volcanic anger and immense frustrated egocentricity, which shows itself in all the ferocious atrocities and vengeful bloodshed we humans commit, and—to a lesser degree—in our smaller, everyday disputes.

So while we do at last have the compassionate understanding to heal all our psychoses, there is an immense amount of upset in us that we have to suddenly face and rehabilitate, and, as emphasised, the reality is it will take a number of generations to heal all the upset/hurt that exists in the human race. Alvin Toffler's famous 1970 book *Future Shock* was actually an intuitive anticipation of this time when understanding of the human condition would emerge and humans would suddenly be faced with, as Toffler wrote, **'the shattering stress and disorientation that we induce in individuals by subjecting them to too much change in too short a time'** (p.4 of 505). But it couldn't be any other way: when understanding of our fundamental goodness was finally found *after two million years* there *was* going to be an incalculable amount of anger, egocentricity and denial/falseness/dishonesty/alienation that would suddenly be revealed. The truth about ourselves unavoidably and necessarily exposes the extent of our angry, egocentric and alienated condition; it destroys the lies, our denials, our pretences, our **'illusion**[s]**'** and **'delusions'**, as it must, otherwise it wouldn't be the truth. We have been living in near total denial of our corrupted condition as our only means of coping with it, so the arrival of the truth about our corrupted state suddenly exposes and destroys all that denial.

Unavoidably and necessarily, when understanding of the human condition arrives the extent of our upset state *is* suddenly revealed. Truth day *is* honesty day, exposure day, transparency day, revelation day—in fact, it is the long-feared so-called **'judgment day'** referred to in the Bible (Matt. 10:15, 11:22, 24, 12:36; Mark 6:11; 2 Pet. 2:9, 3:7; 1 John 4:17). Although **'judgment day'** is actually a day of compassionate understanding, not a day of condemnation—as a Turkish poet once said, judgment day is **'Not the day of judgment but the day of understanding'** (Merle Severy, 'The World of Süleyman the Magnificent', *National Geographic*, Nov. 1987)—it *is*, nevertheless, a day when we face fearful exposure of the extent of our species' by now *extremely* upset condition. This paradox of being wonderfully liberated but at the same time agonisingly exposed was captured by the prophet Isaiah when he said that the liberation that **'gives you relief from suffering and turmoil and cruel bondage…will come with vengeance; with divine retribution…to save you. Then will the eyes of the blind be opened and the ears of the deaf unstopped…Your nakedness will be exposed'** (Bible, 14:3; 35:4, 5; 47:3). Also referring to **'the Day of Reckoning'** (*The Koran*, ch.56) and **'the Last Judgement'** (ibid. ch.69), the prophet Muhammad provided a very similar description of the paradox of being simultaneously liberated and fearfully exposed when he said, **'when the Trumpet is blown with a single blast and the earth and the mountains are lifted up and crushed with a single blow, Then, on that day, the Terror shall come to pass, and heaven shall be split…On that day you shall be exposed, not one secret of yours concealed'** (ibid. ch.69). The **'apocalypse'**, which is the Greek name for the Book of Revelation in the Bible, is another anticipation of the time, which has now arrived, when the liberating truth about our species' now heroically exhausted condition is revealed—indeed **'apocalypse'** is **'Ancient Greek meaning "un-covering", translated literally from Greek, is a disclosure of knowledge, hidden from humanity in an era dominated by falsehood and misconception, i.e., a lifting of the veil or revelation'** (accessed Apr. 2013 at: <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Apocalypse>), and **'a cataclysm in which the forces of good triumph over the forces of evil'** (accessed Apr. 2013 at: <https://www.thefreedictionary.com/apocalpyse>). And, with regard to the difference in alienation between individual humans being exposed, immediately after describing how the arrival of the all-exposing, shocking truth about humans will come **'like the lightning, which flashes and lights up the sky from one end to the other'**, Christ described how **'two people will be in one bed; one will be taken** [revealed as

sound, non-alienated] **and the other left** [revealed as being alienated]**. Two women will be grinding corn together; one will be taken and the other left'** (Bible, Luke 17:24, 34, 35; see also Matt. 24:27, 40). Again, it has to be stressed that **'judgment day'** is not a time when some will be judged as deserving of being **'taken'** to heaven and others **'left'** rejected, but a time of compassionate understanding of everyone. Yes, the way **'the forces of good triumph over the forces of evil'** is through 'evil' finally being compassionately, lovingly understood as a heroic consequence of humanity's upsetting battle to defeat ignorance—which was the point Sir Laurens van der Post was making when he said, **'True love is love of the difficult and** [historically] **unlovable'** (*Journey Into Russia*, 1964, p.145 of 319).

Given how extremely confronting and exposing of all our upsets the arrival of understanding of the human condition is, some people will naturally, at least initially, want to resist that **'cataclysm'** of terrifying exposure, maintain all their denials, remain hidden in the **'cave'** of denial—a resistance that was even anticipated by Plato in his cave allegory, which is not surprising given how incredibly honest and thus penetrating his thinking was.

Yes, having described humans as existing in a **'cave'-'like' 'prison'** of **'almost blind'** alienated **'illusion'** and **'delusion'** from living in denial of the issue of the **'human condition'**, Plato went on to describe what would happen when understanding of the human condition was found. To quote from a summary of the cave allegory that appears in *Encarta Encyclopedia*'s entry for 'Plato': **'Breaking free, one of the individuals escapes from the cave into the light of day. With the aid of the sun** [assisted by the understanding of the differences in the way genes and nerves process information that science has at last found, and necessarily living free of denial of the foundation truths of Integrative Meaning, of the existence of cooperative loving instincts in humans and of the issue they raise of the human condition]**, that person sees for the first time the real world and returns to the cave with the message that the only things they have seen heretofore are shadows and appearances and that the real world awaits them if they are willing to struggle free of their bonds. The shadowy environment of the cave symbolizes for Plato the physical world of appearances. Escape into the sun-filled setting outside the cave symbolizes the transition to the real world, the world of full and perfect being, the world of Forms, which is the proper object of knowledge'** (written by Prof. Robert M. Baird, accessed 11 Jul. 2008: see <www.wtmsources.com/101>). To return to *The Republic* and Plato's own words: **'if he** [the cave prisoner] **were made to look directly at the light of the fire** [again the fire represents the unconfrontable issue of the human condition]**, it would hurt his eyes and he would turn back and take refuge in the things which he could see** [take refuge in all the denials and dishonest explanations and arguments that he has become accustomed to]**, which he would think really far clearer than the things being shown him. And if he were forcibly dragged up the steep and rocky ascent** [out of the cave of denial by the person who has broken free of the cave] **and not let go till he had been dragged out into the sunlight** [shown the truthful all-liberating—but at the same time all-exposing and confronting—explanation of the human condition]**, the process would be a painful one, to which he would much object, and when he emerged into the light his eyes would be so overwhelmed by the brightness of it that he wouldn't be able to see a single one of the things he was now told were real** [this inability to absorb discussion of the human condition is what I have referred to as the 'deaf effect']**'** (p.280). Plato continued, **'they would say that his** [the person who tries to deliver understanding of the human condition] **visit to the upper world had ruined his sight** [they would treat him as if he was mad, which is how I have been treated for many years, as is documented on our website where the 30 years of persecution that I and this project have been subjected to is recorded]**, and** [they would say] **that the ascent** [out of the cave] **was not worth even attempting** [as is

documented on our website, such assertions have been regularly made against our work, such as one of the architects of the public campaign of persecution against myself and the WTM saying **'You know you are encroaching on the personal unspeakable inside people and you won't succeed'**]**. And if anyone tried to release them and lead them up, they would kill him if they could lay hands on him'** (p.281). In fact, my persecutors have done everything they can, short of physical attack, to **'kill'** me!

Again, the answer to this problem of exposure of the immense amount of upset that exists in humans is that, while this information *is* unavoidably and necessarily extremely confronting and exposing, all it means is that we shouldn't, *and in fact don't have to*, overly confront and study it. All we *need* to do is study the understanding sufficiently to verify to our own satisfaction that it has explained the human condition and then avoid studying it more deeply. Instead, as described, we can leave all our upsets behind as dealt with and redirect our efforts to living in support of these understandings and to repairing the world.

Once you have investigated these understandings sufficiently to know that they have explained the human condition you don't need to know more than that. You don't need to know the full extent of the truth it reveals about the upset state of human existence, or how it reveals and explains everything about your own particular upset life. In fact, if you study this information beyond what your particular level of soundness and security of self can cope with you risk becoming overly self-confronted and exposed and depressed. As emphasised, the human race has coped this far by maintaining extreme levels of denial of many, many truths, so obviously the human race can't hope to confront and dismantle all those denials overnight. That process will take generations, but that doesn't mean we can't support the truth while this digestion and healing takes place—*as long as we don't overly confront the truth during this absorption process*. According to each person's level of upset there will be a limit to how much truth each person can cope with—there will be a limit to how much they can listen to, read about and study these human-condition-confronting understandings—but that doesn't mean all people can't immediately live in support of the truth.

So while we each should investigate these understandings of the human condition sufficiently to verify to our own satisfaction that they are the liberating understandings of the human condition that the whole human race has been searching for, we shouldn't risk investigating them to the extent that we start to become overly exposed and confronted by the truths they are revealing. If you *do* become overly confronted by what is being presented, your natural reaction will be to try to attack and deny it in order to protect yourself—in effect, you will try to put all your denials back in place. You will become defensive and angry and retaliatory toward the information, and the consequence of such a response will be to sabotage the efforts of all the humans who have ever lived to bring the human race to this dreamed of moment of its liberation. As mentioned, we in the WTM have endured years and years of this furiously angry, defensive reaction towards this information, attacks that were ultimately fruitless because this information is true and it won't be intimidated or oppressed: it is too precious to allow that. In short, the effect of overly studying this information, studying it more than your degree of security of self can cope with, can be both dangerous to you and dangerous to the human race, and no one should want, nor risk, either of those outcomes.

I should also point out here that any meritorious new idea in science has typically gone through stages of resistance and even persecution before becoming accepted. With the subject of the human condition being both novel and extremely confronting that resistance was always going to exceptional, but the same journey to acceptance occurs. On this journey we in the WTM believe that after having successfully fought, in the law courts, a terrible public campaign of persecution against us that the initial stage of outright hate and persecution is over and that we can now move on to the next stage in the journey to acceptance where we will certainly face scepticism, but not ferocious persecution. The *Persecution of the WTM* section on our website (<www.humancondition.com/persecution>) documents these years of persecution and our final vindication.

With regard to not overly studying these understandings, having lived without any real understanding of the world it is natural to want to keep studying these explanations that finally make sense of the world around you, but, again, this can lead to becoming overly confronted by the extent of your own corrupted state. The more intelligent and/or more educated in the old human-condition-avoiding, denial-based, mechanistic, reductionist world, who pride themselves on being able to think and study new ideas, will initially be especially tempted to study these understandings beyond what their varying levels of security of self can cope with, but it won't be long before everyone learns that such an approach is, as stressed above, psychologically dangerous on a personal level, and irresponsible in terms of the human race.

When Christ spoke of a time when **'the meek…inherit the earth'** (Matt. 5:5), and when **'many who are first will be last, and many who are last will be first'** (Matt. 19:30, 20:16; Mark 10:31; Luke 13:30), he was anticipating this time when understanding of the human condition would arrive and instead of the more intelligent and intellectual leading the way, as has been the case in almost every human situation, the more innocent and sound, the more soulful and instinctual, the less upset or corrupted will do so. As the story of Adam Stork reveals, throughout the two million year battle to find understanding our instinctive self or soul was repressed because of its unjust condemnation of our intellect, but when understanding of the human condition is finally found this process is reversed, soul becomes sought-after. Our innocent, upset-free, original instinctive self or soul—soundness—has to lead us back home to soundness. It makes sense. Again, Christ gave the perfect description of this new situation when he said, **'The stone the builders rejected has become the capstone'** (Ps. 118:22; Matt. 21:42; Mark 12:10; Luke 20:17; Acts 4:11; 1 Pet. 2:7). That pre-eminent philosopher of the twentieth century, Sir Laurens van der Post, referred to this biblical analogy when he too anticipated this new situation: **'It is part of the great secret which Christ tried to pass on to us when He spoke of the "stone which the builders rejected" becoming the cornerstone of the building to come. The cornerstone of this new building of a war-less, non-racial world, too, I believe, must be…those** [more innocent, instinctual] **aspects of life which we have despised and rejected for so long'** (*The Dark Eye in Africa*, 1955, p.155 of 159).

So while it will be initially difficult accepting this advice to only investigate the truth to the degree each person is sound enough to do so, with honesty it can be appreciated as a reasonably understood and accepted proposition. It makes sense that the more secure in self, the least alienated, have to develop these understandings of the human condition. In the old

human-condition-avoiding, denial-based world, academia limited those who could be involved in the pursuit of knowledge to the more intelligent, those with a high IQ (intelligence quotient). For instance, to enter university you had to pass entrance exams that basically tested your IQ. Obviously, to have the most appropriate people studying complex subjects like higher mathematics and physics you needed people with the highest IQ. If you didn't have an adequate IQ you would make little progress in studying such subjects. In the new human-condition-resolved, human-condition-confronting world we similarly need the most appropriate people to study its information, which are those with a high SQ, soul or soundness quotient. If you don't have an adequate SQ you simply won't be able to make any progress with the information involved. With the explanation of the human condition we can now understand that everyone is necessarily variously upset/unsound but that upset/unsoundness is not something bad, just as in the old denial-based world those who lacked IQ weren't considered bad people, just not as able to think as effectively about complex subjects. Upset is a heroic, good state, not a bad, evil, sinful state, because it is a product of humanity's heroic search for knowledge.

As such, everyone has to measure and limit how much they can study these human-condition-confronting understandings against how much self-confrontation they can cope with. But thankfully, and most importantly, no one *has to* overly confront their old upset self—everyone *can* leave that behind as dealt with and simply live for the new world and all its potential. And *that* is the main thing to remember: once you know that this information has explained the human condition then you know all the upset in the world and all the upset within you is also now explained and defended—which means you can, as described earlier, put the issue of all your upsets or corruptions in a 'suitcase', attach a label to it saying 'Everything in here is now explained and defended', and simply leave it behind as dealt with as you set out free and unencumbered into the new, human-condition-free world. You *can* join the Sunshine Army on the Sunshine Highway to the World In Sunshine.

Once you know this information is true, that the upset state of the human condition is defended at the fundamental level, you can leave the issue of your own and the world's corruption behind as effectively dealt with and preoccupy yourself with disseminating this information throughout the world and to a fresh generation, and preoccupy yourself with supporting all the projects that must be undertaken now to free and rehabilitate the world from the destructive effects of two million years of living under the duress of the human condition. In fact, it shouldn't even be necessary to talk about the whole issue of the human condition any more than what appears in these presentations on our website. Humanity moves on to an entirely new existence now. We get the truth up, and we move on.

Yes, now that we have the truth up all that truly matters is that it is kept alive and that it is disseminated to the world's population, because it alone can heal the human race and save the world. All everyone must do now is support the truth about the human condition and it will achieve everything everyone has ever dreamt of. If we look after this information it in turn will look after the world. That is the mantra of the new world that understanding of the human condition brings about.

And the relief of being able to leave the issue of our upset state behind as dealt with, and the excitement of knowing a human-condition-free new world is coming and that we can all fully participate in bringing that about, is so absolutely incredibly relieving and exciting it will TRANSFORM all humans. From being a human-condition oppressed and depressed alienated person all humans can, and will now be, TRANSFORMED into Redeemed, Liberated from the Human Condition, Exhilarated, Ecstatic, Enthralled-with-Existence, Transfigured, Empowered, World-Transforming LIFEFORCES. This Exhilarated, Ecstatic, Enthralled-with-Existence aspect is the 'Life' in 'Lifeforce'; and the Empowered, World-Transforming aspect is the 'force' in 'Lifeforce', so LIFEFORCE covers both the personal benefit and the benefit to the world in one word.

(Note, how humans can and will cope with the problem of exposure will be more fully explained later in Part 9.)

Part 3:11 Stages of humanity's journey to enlightenment

Before beginning this description of the stages that humanity has journeyed through to reach enlightenment, I should mention that while these stages are very briefly discussed towards the *end* of the 2009 Introductory Video, I have chosen to include that description here, which is relatively *early* in the transcript of that 2009 Introductory Video. The reason for this re-positioning is that in this written presentation I have now been able to introduce all the concepts necessary to explain the stages, and since the stages are so significant in terms of helping us to better understand ourselves they should be included as soon as possible.

Thus, in having explained the origins of our upset human condition (in Part 3:2), how nurturing led to the development of an unconditionally selfless, altruistic, cooperative, loving existence and moral instinctive self or soul in our ape ancestors (in Part 3:4), what the stages of Infancy, Childhood, Adolescence and Adulthood truly mean (in Part 3:8), and how ending the insecure, human-condition-afflicted Adolescent stage enables the human race to mature to secure, human-condition-free, TRANSFORMED Adulthood, we are now in a position to summarise the whole of our species' conscious journey from innocent ignorance to enlightenment of our true worth and meaning. We can now explain the *psychological* journey that the human race has been involved in, and since the psychological journey is the *real* journey we fully conscious, human-condition-afflicted humans have been involved in, and since it has never before been able to be explained, the following pictures and text provide the first ever true summary of our species' origins and development. While there have been mountains of books written about human origins, this is the first denial-free, truthful description of our species' emergence from our ape ancestors. What follows then is the most amazing and epic journey of any species to have existed on Earth—and it's our own story, the story of the human race.

Australopithecus afarensis	*Australopithecus africanus*	*Australopithecus boisei*	*Homo habilis*	*Homo erectus*	*Homo sapiens*	*Homo sapiens sapiens*
Fossil evidence from 3.9 to 3 million years ago	3.3 to 2.1 m y a	2.3 to 1.2 m y a	2.4 to 1.4 m y a	1.9 to 0.1 m y a	0.5 to 0.1 m y a	0.2 m y a to now
Brain Volume 400 cc average	450 cc	530 cc	650 cc	900-1100 cc	1350 cc	1400 cc
Early Happy Childman	Middle Demonstrative Childman	Late Naughty Childman	Distressed Adolescentman	Adventurous Adolescentman	Angry Adolescentman	Pseudo idealistic and Hollow Adolescentman

Human Condition Fully Emerges Here

The above sequence of fossil hominid skulls, which date back to our ape ancestors, appeared in the November 1985 edition of *National Geographic* magazine. While anthropologists have since discovered more varieties of *Australopithecus* and *Homo* than those depicted here, these remain representative of the main varieties.

In examining this sequence we can see that a sudden increase in the size of the brain case, and by inference the brain's volume, occurred around two million years ago. A larger brain case was needed to house a larger **'association cortex'**. As explained in Part 3:3, the ability to **'associate'** information is what made it possible to reason how experiences are related, learn to understand and become conscious of, or aware of, or intelligent about, the relationship between events that occur through time. It follows that the development of a *larger* association cortex meant that a greatly increased need for understanding had emerged, which, as will be explained shortly, was a result of the emergence of the dilemma of the human condition. The inference we can take from this evidence then is that the human condition became a full blown problem some two million years ago.

To explain the descriptions of the psychological stages that appear under each of the fossil skulls I need to briefly describe the evolutionary journey we humans have been on since the time of our ape ancestors.

Our early pre-Australopithecine and pre-*Homo* ape ancestors lived in male-dominated, patriarchal societies in which males aggressively competed for mating opportunities. Then, as outlined in Part 3:4 and as will be fully explained in Part 8:4, through the females' nurturing of their infants our ape ancestors were able to grow up trained to behave in an unconditionally selfless way, curtailing aggressive male behaviour and producing female-dominated, matriarchal, fully cooperative societies—a process the bonobos are presently in the final stages of developing.

I mentioned in Part 3:4 that this development of unconditionally selfless behaviour had the accidental side effect of liberating consciousness, but at that point in the presentation I wasn't able to go beyond that to even briefly explain *how* this occurred, because I hadn't yet

explained Integrative Meaning or the process of Resignation—both of which were necessary to understand how the development of selflessness liberated consciousness. But having now provided those prerequisite explanations, I now can.

Towards the end of Part 3:4, I described how the meaning of existence is to develop the order of matter, and that the 'glue' that holds integrated wholes together is selflessness—and that selflessness is cooperative and integrative, while selfishness is divisive and disintegrative. Selflessness is the very theme of existence, so if you can't acknowledge that central truth you are not in a position to think truthfully and therefore effectively. As was pointed out when Resignation was explained in Part 3:8, having to live in denial of both Integrative Meaning and the all-important theme of integrative behaviour of selflessness, as resigned adults have had to do, meant adopting a dishonest and thus ineffective way of thinking. You can't build the truth from lies. As Arthur Schopenhauer said, **'The discovery of truth is prevented most effectively…by prejudice, which…stands in the path of truth and is then like a contrary wind driving a ship away from land.'** Similarly, in her aforementioned Resignation poem Fiona Miller wrote that **'you** [will] **spend the rest of life trying to find the meaning of life and confused in its maze.'** The alienated state that adolescents adopted when they resigned came at the loss of the ability to think truthfully and thus effectively. But how, you may be asking, does Resignation and the loss of our ability to think effectively relate to our ape ancestors who had become orientated to living selflessly? As was also explained in Part 3:4, the limitation of genetics is that it can't normally develop unconditional selflessness, because such traits tend to self-eliminate. This means that if a species *did* begin to think truthfully and recognise that selflessness is meaningful and, as a result of this realisation, did begin to behave selflessly, the gene based learning system of natural selection would actively resist such selfless behaviour—it would not allow it to develop, essentially blocking the emergence of truthful, effective thinking and thus consciousness. However, once our ape ancestors were able to develop selflessness through nurturing this impasse was suddenly breached and truthful, selflessness-acknowledging, effective thinking and thus consciousness began to emerge—and sure enough bonobos, which are well on their way to developing the selflessness-dependent, fully integrated state, are fast developing consciousness; they are the most intelligent of all non-human primates. So it can be said that our human brain has been alienated from truthful, effective thinking twice in its history: once when we were like other animals living a competitive, aggressive and selfish existence, and more recently when we lived in fear and thus denial of Integrative Meaning and of the real importance of love and selflessness. (As was pointed out when describing the horrific alienating consequences of Resignation in Part 3:8, resigning to a life of denial of any truths that brought the issue of the human condition into focus meant that we died in soul and in mind: we killed off our instinctive self or soul and *we stopped using our conscious mind to think truthfully and thus effectively*.) This is an *extremely* abbreviated account of how we humans became conscious—a longer summary will be given in Part 8:4C, while the complete description will be provided in Part 8:7B.

The descriptions given below the picture of the various fossil hominid skulls document the stages humanity progressed through as this liberated consciousness developed. The names I've ascribed to each stage indicate parallels with our own human life-stages. This parallel

occurs because the stages that we, as conscious individuals, progress through are the same stages our human ancestors progressed through—'ontogeny recapitulates phylogeny': our individual consciousness necessarily charts the same course that our species' consciousness has taken as a whole. Eugene Marais recognised this when he wrote that **'The phyletic history of the primate soul can clearly be traced in the mental evolution of the human child'** (*The Soul of the Ape*, written between 1916-1936 and published posthumously in 1969, p.78 of 170). Wherever consciousness emerges it will first become self-aware, then it will start to experiment with its power to effectively understand and thus manage change, then it will seek to understand the meaning behind all change, and from there it will obviously try to comply with that meaning. In the case of consciousness developing in us individually and in our ancestors, that journey was disrupted by our necessary search for the understanding of why we did not comply with the integrative, cooperative meaning of existence. As described at the beginning of Part 3:8, adolescence is the stage in the development of consciousness where the search for identity takes place, where the search for understanding of the meaning behind change, and the conscious organism's relationship to that meaning, occurs. In the case of our lives individually, and that of our species, the identity we needed to find understanding of was why we were behaving divisively when the meaning of existence was to behave cooperatively and lovingly. Until we could answer that question we, individually and collectively, were stuck in adolescence—we were stalled searching for our identity, for understanding of ourselves. Our individual and species' development has been waylaid, or, as psychologists say, 'arrested' in adolescence by our inability to understand why we had become divisively behaved. Only with understanding of why we were less-than-ideally behaved could we individually and collectively mature from insecure adolescence to secure adulthood.

To go over this important point again (it was initially raised at the beginning of Part 3:8), since the human race as a whole has not—until now—been able to understand the dilemma of the human condition, humans haven't been able to properly enter adulthood. When stages of maturation aren't properly completed it doesn't mean subsequent growth stages don't take place, they do, but if a previous stage isn't properly fulfilled those subsequent stages are greatly compromised by the incomplete preceding stages. People do grow up, but in a state of arrested development. Without the explanation of the human condition humans have been insecure, not properly developed—in fact, preoccupied with still trying to validate themselves, prove that they are good and not bad, find some relief from the insecurity of the human condition. It is only now with understanding of the human condition found that humans will be able to complete their adolescence properly and grow into secure adults, and the human race as a whole will be able to mature from insecure adolescence to secure adulthood.

In this journey through the stages involved in the development of consciousness that our species progressed, 'Infantman' was the ape ancestor who first developed the nurturing training in selflessness that produced the fully cooperative state and, in doing so, liberated consciousness. The various stages of 'Childman', who developed from 'Infantman', were, as summarised under the picture of the skulls above, the australopithecines who began to

experiment with the power of conscious free will: 'Early Happy Childman' (*Australopithecus afarensis*), who evolved into 'Middle Demonstrative Childman' (*Australopithecus africanus*), who then developed into 'Late Naughty Childman' (*Australopithecus boisei*). At each stage greater experimentation in conscious self-management was taking place—from demonstrating the power of free will in mid-childhood, to beginning to challenge the instincts for the right to manage events in late childhood.

When the conscious mind broke free of the influence of the instincts and took over management of events, the instincts began to, in effect, resist that takeover, a tension that resulted in the distressing, sobering upset state of the human condition. Indeed, in recognition of a significant change that took place around two million years ago, anthropologists actually changed the name of the genus at that point from *Australopithecus* to *Homo*; 'Childman', the australopithecines, changed to 'Adolescentman', *Homo*. As stated, adolescence is the stage when the search for identity takes place, and the identity that 'Adolescentman', *Homo*, particularly sought to understand was their lack of ideality—the reason why they were not ideally behaved. Once the march of upset began, its progression could *only* be brought to an end by finding sufficient knowledge to explain why the instincts' 'criticism' was undeserved. Thus, there was an ever increasing need for mental cleverness to explain ourselves—in particular to find the liberating understanding of the human condition—hence the rapid increase in brain volume from two million years onwards.

After our species entered Adolescence, we necessarily went through the early sobered adolescentman stage (early *Homo habilis*), to the depressed adolescentman stage (late *Homo habilis*), through to the adventurous adolescentman stage (*Homo erectus*, who first left Africa), then to the embattled angry adolescentman stage (*Homo sapiens*), through to the pseudo idealistic adolescentman stage (*Homo sapiens sapiens*), through to the hollow adolescentman stage, and now finally, with the finding of understanding of why we have been divisively behaved, humans individually, and humanity collectively, can mature from insecure Adolescence to secure Adulthood: 'Adolescentman' becomes TRANSFORMED 'Adultman'. (Note, 'man' is an abbreviation for 'human' or 'humanity', however, the use of 'man' also denotes a recognition that while humanity's Infancy and Childhood was matriarchal or female-role-led, because that was when nurturing of infants was all-important, humanity's Adolescence became patriarchal with the emergence of the egocentric, male-role-led need to defy the instincts, search for knowledge and defiantly prove we humans are good and not bad—a transition that will be more fully explained in this presentation. Since humanity's adulthood will be neither female or male led—because our species' maturation is complete—'Adultman' should more properly be described as 'Adulthuman'. By the same logic, since Adolescence was originally female role-led, the description should have been Adolescentwoman not Adolescentman, but this is all getting too novel and complicated, so we will leave it all as 'man'.)

We will now examine these various stages—from the perspective of both the individual and humanity—more closely.

Part 3:11A Infancy and Childhood

Infancy

As explained in Part 3:4, it was through the process of love-indoctrination, the nurturing of infants, that our ape ancestor was able to develop unconditionally selfless, fully altruistic, cooperative, moral, integrative behaviour—a process the bonobos are currently perfecting, as illustrated by the following photo of the bonobo Matata hugging her adopted son, Kanzi. Nurturing is what made us human, a truth that the image of the Madonna and child has been the archetypal representation of. And, as has just been briefly explained, with the development of selflessness consciousness was able to emerge, and with consciousness came all the stages of maturation that consciousness itself had to progress through—namely Infancy, Childhood, Adolescence, and Adulthood.

The first stage of Infancy is when humans become sufficiently conscious, sufficiently aware of cause and effect to realise that 'I exist', that we are at the centre of constantly changing experiences. As mentioned in Part 3:4, the nurturing bonobos, who are in the final stages of this 'infancy, emerging-consciousness, self-aware' stage, are the most intelligent of all non-human primates, and some of that intelligence is apparent in Matata's expression.

The species: our ape ancestor—20 to 5 million years ago
The individual: 0 to 3 years old

=

Drawing by Jeremy Griffith © 2006 Fedmex Pty Ltd and photograph of Matata by Manny Rubio

Childhood

Childhood is when consciousness begins to experiment in self-adjustment and manage events to its own chosen ends. It comprises three stages: Early Happy, Innocent Childhood; Middle Demonstrative Childhood; and Late Naughty Childhood.

The species: the australopithecines—5 to 1 million years ago
The individual: 4 to 11 years old

Drawing by Jeremy Griffith © 1996 Fedmex Pty Ltd

Early Happy, Innocent Childhood

This is the time when the intellect becomes sufficiently able to understand the relationship between cause and effect to begin actively experimenting—'playing'—with the conscious power to self-manage and self-adjust.

The species: the early australopithecines including *Australopithecus afarensis*—5 to 3 million years ago
The individual: 4, 5 and 6 years old

Drawing by Jeremy Griffith © 2006-2013 Fedmex Pty Ltd

The 'look-at-me-daddy-I-can-jump-puddles',
early, happy, prime-of-innocence stage of Childhood

While infancy is all about receiving unconditionally selfless treatment or 'love', early happy, innocent childhood is predominantly about beginning to outwardly express the emerging intellectual ability to experiment in self-management. It's when the power of free will is innocently tested or played with; it's when we start to experiment with the awesome

ability that consciousness provides of managing events to bring about the conscious mind's own desired outcome. Indeed, we call it 'play' in recognition of the naive unawareness children have at this stage of the problems associated with having free will, particularly their unawareness of the conflict it inevitably leads to with our instincts. We are still, as it were, holding onto our mother's apron strings, our instinctive orientations, with one hand, while carrying out short experiments in conscious self-management with the other. We are still depending on our established instinctive responses, namely our nurtured orientation to love, for the overall management of our life, but we are also beginning to actively experiment in managing our life from a basis of understanding. The first demonstrative displays of the emerging ability to consciously manage cause and effect appear during this stage. In the case of humans today, it is the 'Look at me, Daddy, I can jump puddles' stage where reinforcing admiration from parents of the emerging conscious ability to manage events is so important.

Middle Demonstrative Childhood

In the Middle Demonstrative Childman stage, the intellect becomes demonstrative of the power of free will and experiences its first encounter with the frustrations of a conflict with the instincts, which is the human condition.

The species: *Australopithecus africanus*—3 to 2 million years ago
The individual: 7 and 8 years old

Drawing by Jeremy Griffith © 1991 Fedmex Pty Ltd

The middle demonstrative stage of Childhood

By mid-childhood consciousness is sufficiently able to make enough sense of experience to successfully manage and thus plan activities for not just minutes ahead, but for hours and even days—a development that empowers the individual to be both outwardly marvelling at, and demonstrative of, its intellectual power. It is at this stage of active self-management that the results of some experiments in self-adjustment also begin to attract criticism from the instinctive self. 'There are some apples; why shouldn't I take them all for myself?'—an innocuous mistake by a mind trying to reason how to behave, but the instinctive self, orientated to behaving unconditionally selflessly, makes the intellect aware that this is not the right way to behave. The emerging intellect has, in effect, been disobedient, but the conscious self doesn't know why it has 'disobeyed' the instincts; it isn't able to understand and explain that it has become a conscious being. Also, the conscious self can't stop 'disobeying' the instincts; now that it is

capable of thought it can't stop thinking. While the conscious self can't explain its actions it does know that what it is doing is not something it should stop doing, it is not something bad, it is not something deserving of this feeling of opposition coming from within itself. In fact, the intellect is quite proud of its achievements in self-management. Out of frustration, the precursors of the defensive, retaliatory reactions of anger, egocentricity and alienation start to appear. Some aggressive 'nastiness' creeps into the conscious self's behaviour. Furthermore, in this situation of feeling unfairly criticised, any positive feedback reinforcement begins to be deliberately sought after, which is the beginning of egocentricity—the conscious thinking self or ego's preoccupation with trying to defend its worth, assert that it is good and not bad. At this point, the intellect also begins experimenting in evading the unwarranted criticism. These early experiments in denial take the form of blatant lying. Lying is an art and initially we have little skill in it, simply blurting out, 'But Mum, Billy told me to do it.' From demonstrating the power of free will, the child has started to feel the first real aggravations from the horror of the injustice of the human condition. Of course, for children growing up during humanity's australopithecine childhood, love would still have very much been the dominant influence in life overall and these defensive expressions of frustration would have been restricted to feelings and actions rather than expressed in words. In fact, language wasn't developed by our forebears until the early adolescent stage when alienation appeared and the need to somehow explain our extremely unnatural behaviour and needs arose. Anthropologist Richard Leakey's study of brain cases in fossil skulls for the imprint of Broca's area, the word-organising centre of the brain, evidences this development: **'*Homo* had a greater need than the australopithecines for a rudimentary language'** (*Origins*, 1977, p.205 of 264). Prior to the emergence of alienation we were all instinctively aware of and in sync with each other. Apart from contact calls there was little need to talk.

Late Naughty Childhood

The Late Naughty Childman stage represents the time when the intellect naively lashes out at the increasing unjust criticism it is encountering as a result of its first tentative experiments in self-adjustment.

The species: The robust australopithecines (*A. robustus* and *A. boisei*)—2.5 to 1 million years ago
The individual: 9, 10 and 11 years old

Our moral conscience

'Why shouldn't I push Johnny over in the playground?' –the frustrated, naughty, bullying final stage of childhood.

Drawing by Jeremy Griffith © 1991-2011 Fedmex Pty Ltd

The late naughty stage of Childhood

Since school teachers become very aware of the changing behaviour of children under their care, I asked a teacher to describe what she and her colleagues knew of the stages children and early adolescents go through. These are the main points from the response she collected: **'Six and seven-year-olds are considered to be very compliant, but by eight children are starting to test the waters and challenge the world a little.'** She continued, **'the eight-year-olds can be annoying and a little naughty'**, while **'nine and ten-year-olds can be hard to handle as they seem to hit a phase of recklessness'** and **'are considered naughty'**. She noted that **'Teachers love teaching 11 and 12-year-olds because it is during this stage that children become civilised'** but that **'Teachers consider years nine and ten, when students are 14, 15 and 16 years old, the most difficult to teach. The adolescents seem to be at complete odds with what is expected of them. Most teachers are terrified of these extremely uncooperative mid-teenage ages'** (personal communication, 1997). These insights evidence the explanations being given of the stages of maturation of consciousness through childhood—and confirm the agonising stage of Resignation that occurs in early adolescence.

Of course, as the human condition developed children were going to be increasingly influenced by the upset world in which they were raised, and it would become harder to differentiate what upset in them was a result of those circumstances or from their own experiments in understanding. However, by eight years of age we can expect that even in the original situation, where there was little or no upset in the world, the child would justifiably be feeling resentful towards the 'criticism' emanating from their instinctive self of their tentative efforts to self-manage their life using understanding. And, unable to adequately cope with this 'criticism' with understanding of it, we can expect that the child would begin to retaliate against the criticism as the only form of defence available to them. The problem then, however, would be that these early, relatively mild experiments in retaliation—of anger, selfishness and dishonest excuse-making in mid-childhood—would have the alarming effect of greatly compounding the 'criticism' from the child's perfectly integratively orientated, moral instinctive self. From being mildly insecure we can expect the child to now feel guilty and that this drastic escalation in criticism and thus frustration would be a contributing factor to the turbulent, boisterous **'naughty nines'** that parents and teachers have labelled this stage. By the end of childhood, at the ages of 10 and 11, we can expect the resentment and frustration to be such that it would express itself in the form of taunting and bullying. The child would be belligerently lashing out at the unjust world: 'Why shouldn't I feel resentful and retaliate?', 'Why shouldn't I shove you around if I can, especially since I'm bigger and stronger?', and 'What's wrong with being selfish and aggressive anyway?'

In the situation that exists today, where the external upset is almost overwhelming, we can expect that almost all of the child's upset will have resulted from their encounter with external upset. The increasingly thoughtful child can see the whole horribly upset world and would be understandably totally bewildered and deeply troubled by it. Eight-year-olds will only be beginning to be consciously aware of the horror of the state of the world they have been born into, but by nine they will have become aware of that horror and be needing a lot of reassurance that 'Everything is going to be alright.' In fact, nine-year-olds can be so troubled by the imperfection of the world that they go through a process of trying not to accept that it is true. By 10, this despair about the state of the world reaches desperation levels with nightmares of distress for children. It is a very unhappy, lonely, needing-of-love time

for them. So at 11 they enter the 'Peter Pan' stage where they decide they don't want to grow up; they decide they want to stay a child forever, surrounded by all the things they love, and not ever become part of the horror world they have discovered. It is no wonder **'Teachers love teaching 11 and 12-year-olds'** who have **'become civilised'**—they're essentially tame compared to the **'reckless'**, **'naughty' 'nine and ten-year-olds'**.

There is evidence in the fossil record of the description that has been given of these stages of Childman. The early *Australopithecus afarensis*, who have been described as occupying the early happy, prime of innocence stage, and the subsequent *Australopithecus africanus*, who have been described as being in the middle demonstrative childhood stage, are both finely built compared to the much more robustly built *Australopithecus boisei* and associated *Australopithecus robustus*, both of whom have been described here as being in the Late Naughty Childman stage. Anthropologists have even placed the more robust late australopithecines on a separate, dead-end branch to *Homo*, but that has to be impossible because for branching to occur there has to be deflecting influences, such as when Darwin's finches gradually became adapted to different food niches on the Galápagos Islands, and in our case there was only one major development going on and that was the *psychological* one. In a situation where there is only one all-dominant influence causing change there is no opportunity for divergence to develop. From our species' infancy, humans have been under the all-dominant influence of what was occurring in our heads, namely the development of consciousness and its psychological consequences. Any other influence was so secondary as to be ineffectual in causing our path to branch. But if the robust australopithecines weren't a separate branch, why was there such a big difference between them and the much more gracile or fine featured preceding *A. afarensis* and *A. africanus*, and the variety of early humans they gave rise to, the also much more gracile *Homo habilis?* The answer has to lie in the psychological differences between the much quieter, love-immersed *A. afarensis* and *A. africanus*, the extroverted, boisterous bullying *A. boisei* and *A. robustus*, and the introverted, sobered, quiet early adolescent *H. habilis*, who will be described shortly.

Late Naughty Childman, *A. robustus* and *A. boisei*, had comparatively big frames and skulls that were especially heavily built with very pronounced cranial and facial bone structures. Anthropologists recognise that these skull modifications came about to support the much stronger facial muscles that were required to work the heavy jaw and huge grinding teeth that characterise these late australopithecines. We know from such evidence as the wear patterns on their teeth that the australopithecines were vegetarian, but why did the later australopithecines need bigger grinding teeth? What dietary change occurred, and why? Being extroverted, increasingly naughty and roughly behaved, the late australopithecines were like older children today who would rather be out playing than eating, but such an extremely physically assertive and energetic lifestyle required fuel. Not being sufficiently conscious to attempt self-management, all other animal species exert only enough energy to secure their necessary food, space, shelter and a mate—they are conservative energy users—but, with their rough, energetic play, late childhood humans became the first non-conservative energy users on Earth. In order to 'eat and run' Late Naughty Childman would have needed a readily available food source that they could eat quickly and, being vegetarian, they would have needed a lot of it because vegetables do not convert into as much energy as meat for instance,

which was not to appear on humanity's dining table until upset developed. (While the australopithecines, in their naughtiness, would have been capable of being rough and possibly even cruel at times to animals, they were not yet upset with innocence and thus killing innocent animals regularly, which, as will be explained shortly, is what so called 'hunting' was really all about for upset humans and what finally led to meat-eating.) As such, we can imagine certain edible varieties of nuts, hard-shelled fruits, fibrous roots and tubers would have provided a ready fuel supply, which explains the need for massive grinding teeth and the necessary facial structure. In contrast, however, to these late australopithecines, *H. habilis* was an entirely different individual. Introspective, deeply thoughtful and sobered, *H. habilis* was no longer interested in physically intimidating the world, and therefore did not need great quantities of energy and thus food.

Another feature of the fossil record of early humans is the evidence it provides of the overlap between the different varieties. For example, in what is the biggest overlap by far, australopithecines were possibly still in existence up to 1.5 million years after *H. habilis* appeared. Again, this evidence has been used to argue that the late australopithecines branched away from the *Homo* line, but now that we can take into account what was happening psychologically, the overlap becomes understandable. Just as there are very early models of cars still around today, long after they have been superseded, so groups of early, less intelligent varieties of humans carried on long after they had been superseded. Of course, the best example of such overlapping in the anthropological record is the existence today of remnants of our infant ape ancestors, specifically the non-human primates of today, such as chimpanzees and gorillas. Apes are not a branched development from the human line at all—they are on exactly the same development path, but at a much, much earlier stage.

Part 3:11B Sobered and Depressed Adolescentman

Before describing the first, Early Sobered Adolescent Stage of Humanity's Adolescence, adolescence itself should be briefly explained again.

Adolescence

Adolescence is the stage when we fully conscious humans search for our identity, for understanding of who we are, specifically for why we have not been ideally behaved. Unable to understand the corrupted state of our human condition, the only alternative to suicidal depression for humans once they became extremely upset was to resign themselves to living in denial of the whole depressing issue of the human condition. The result of this psychological estrangement from our true situation and true selves has been the horrifically deadening state of alienation that became the main characteristic of human life during the final stage of humanity's two-million-year journey through adolescence.

Detail of Francis Bacon's deadly accurate painting of the psychologically-imprisoned-arms-pinned-behind-the-back-twisted-smudged-face-alienated human condition. This painting will be studied in more detail in Part 7:5.

Drawing by Jeremy Griffith © 1996 Fedmex Pty Ltd

Early Sobered Adolescentman

The Early Sobered Adolescent Stage of Adolescent Humanity

The Early Sobered Adolescentman stage signals the end of Childhood and encompasses the time when we encounter, in earnest, the sobering imperfections of life under the duress of the human condition.

The species: the first half of *Homo habilis'* reign—2 to 1.5 million years ago
The individual: 12 and 13 years old

Drawing by Jeremy Griffith © 1991-2011 Fedmex Pty Ltd

The early sobered stage of Adolescence

By the end of childhood we realise that lashing out in exasperation at the 'injustice of the world' doesn't change anything and that the only possible way to solve that frustration is to find the reconciling understanding of why the criticism we are experiencing is not deserved.

At this point, the child matures from a frustrated, extroverted protestor into a sobered, deeply thoughtful, introverted adolescent. While the main stages of maturation in non-human species are generally described as infancy, then adolescence when individuals are on the threshold of sexual maturity, and finally the sexual maturity of adulthood, in the case of fully conscious humans our stages of maturation involve a *psychological* journey, so our stages of maturation (from infancy to childhood, adolescence and adulthood) are fundamentally different to the infancy, adolescence and adulthood stages of other species. Indeed, as mentioned, the very significant psychological change in our psychological journey from the relatively human-condition-free state to the human-condition-aware state is recognised in the fact that we separate those stages into Childhood and Adolescence. As mentioned earlier, even our schooling system marks this very significant change that occurs at 12 to 13 years of age—when we humans shift from frustrated protestor to deep thinker about the imperfections of life under the duress of the human condition—by having children graduate from what is generally called primary school into secondary school. As also mentioned earlier, this critical junction in our species' development was actually recognised by anthropologists when they changed the name of the genus from *Australopithecus* to *Homo*; 'Childman', the australopithecines, became 'Adolescentman', *Homo*.

Since the agonising psychological journey that adolescents have gone through as they engaged the agonising subject of the human condition (which for the extremely upset led to Resignation) has just been described in Part 3:8, it is not necessary to repeat it again here, or in the next stage.

Depressed Adolescentman

The Depressed Adolescent Stage of Adolescent Humanity

The Depressed Adolescentman stage represents the time when adolescents struggled with the depression that engaging the issue of the human condition caused both 'without' and 'within'. When the human race as a whole became excessively upset the depression that resulted from confronting the issue of the human condition became so severe for most individuals in this adolescent stage that they had no choice other than to resign to living in denial of the issue and any thinking that brought that issue into focus, which was almost all thinking—a process that resulted in the psychotic (psyche/soul repressed) and neurotic (neuron/mind repressed) alienated state.

The species: the second half of *Homo habilis'* reign—2 to 1.5 million years ago
The individual: 14 to 21 years old

Our moral conscience

Approaching Resignation

The moment of Resignation

The selfish, egocentric, power-fame-fortune-and-glory seeking resigned adult

Drawings by Jeremy Griffith © 1991-2011 Fedmex Pty

In the case of humanity's journey, Resignation would not have become the key feature it now is in most adult lives during the time of *H. habilis*, or the *H. erectus* representatives of the next adventurous early adulthood stage of adolescent humanity, or even the subsequent *H. sapiens* representatives of the angry adulthood stage. This is because it is the upset from the lack of nurturing in infancy and early childhood that makes self-confrontation during the thoughtful early adolescent stage overwhelmingly depressing, and this lack of nurturing was not a feature of human life until the latter stages of humanity's increasingly upsetting adolescence. The upset from a developing mind's own efforts to self-adjust, while distressing and even depressing, was not sufficient to cause the mind to have to block out the truth of cooperative ideality. This is evidenced by the fact that even amongst *H. sapiens sapiens*, the 40-year-old-plus equivalent variety of humans living today, there have been adults who didn't resign, such as the prophets Abraham, Moses and Christ. Also, quite a number of adults from relatively innocent representative races of *H. sapiens sapiens*, such as the Bushmen of the Kalahari, must not be resigned to be as happy and full of the zest and enthusiasm for life and as generous, selfless and free in spirit as numbers of them are, or at least were when they were still living as hunter-foragers. The English explorer and philosopher Bruce Chatwin acknowledged the soundness of Christ and also of innocent races when he wrote these extraordinarily honest words: **'There is no contradiction between the Theory of Evolution and belief in God** [Integrative Meaning] **and His Son** [the uncorrupted expression of our original instinctive self or soul's orientation to Integrative Meaning] **on earth. If Christ were the perfect instinctual specimen—and we have every reason to believe He was—He must be the Son of God. By the same token, the First Man was also Christ'** (*What Am I Doing Here*, 1989, p.65 of 367). More will be said in Part 5:2 about the soundness of Christ and so-called 'primitive' races.

Similarly, ancient Greece must have been home to quite a number of unresigned, denial-free, truthful, effective thinking so-called 'prophets' for that empire to have been so extraordinarily innovative, establishing as it did in that golden era so many of the foundation ideas for the western world, across politics, philosophy, science, psychology, astronomy, architecture and art. Certainly, the early Athenians Socrates and Plato were unresigned, denial-free thinking prophets; indeed, very early Athenian society must especially have been populated by relatively innocent people, because they were sufficiently ego-free to both seek out relatively uncorrupted, innocent shepherds to run Athens and, in turn, tolerate their authority. Indeed, the prophet Muhammad observed **'that every prophet was a shepherd in his youth'** (*Eastern Definitions*, Edward Rice, 1978, p.260 of 433). It is the unnatural world of city living that is especially distressing to, and thus corrupting of, our original instinctive self or soul. Sir Laurens van der Post noted that during the turbulent period of Plato's time, Pericles, a close friend of Plato's stepfather, **'urged the Athenians therefore to go back to their ancient rule of choosing men who lived on and off the land and were reluctant to spend their lives in towns, and prepared to serve them purely out of sense of public duty and not like their present rulers who did so uniquely for personal power and advancement'** (Foreword to *Progress Without Loss of Soul*, by Theodor Abt, 1983, p.xii of 389).

The human race is not so instinctively adapted to upset now that humans are no longer capable of being innocent enough to avoid Resignation. With sufficient nurturing and shelter from upset behaviour humans can still be sufficiently innocent to avoid Resignation. The reality is there has to be a great deal of upset in humans for that upset to become so unbearable that they have no choice but to pay the extremely high price of blocking out all access to their soulful true self. In the poem by Fiona Miller that was included in Part 3:8, in which she wrote that **'Smiles will never bloom from your heart again, but be fake and you will speak fake words to fake people from your fake soul…From now on pressure, stress, pain and the past can never be forgotten / You have no heart or soul and there are no good memories'**, etc, the terrible consequences of resigning to living in denial of the issue of the human condition and any truths that brought that issue into focus are palpable. The behaviour of a resigned person is essentially a form of autism; indeed, it matches perfectly the description a former president of the British Psychoanalytical Society, psychoanalyst D.W. Winnicott (1896-1971), gave for behaviour associated with autism: **'Autism is a highly sophisticated defence organization. What we see is *invulnerability*…The child carries round *the (lost) memory of unthinkable anxiety*, and the illness is a complex mental structure insuring against recurrence of the conditions of the unthinkable anxiety'** (*Thinking About Children*, 1996, pp.220, 221 of 343). Later in this description of the stages that the human race has progressed through under the duress of the human condition we will see that when upset became even more extreme how an even more dishonest, alienating, autism-equivalent psychological strategy than Resignation was invented to cope with the human condition, which was to take up born-again, pseudo idealism.

Since it requires a great deal of upset for Resignation to become necessary, we can expect that it has only become an *almost* universal phenomenon amongst adult humans from about 11,000 years ago, when the advent of agriculture and the domestication of animals allowed humans to live in close proximity, the effect of which, as will be talked about shortly, was to rapidly spread and compound upset behaviour. The Biblical account of Noah's Ark is actually a metaphorical description of this time when Resignation 'flooded' the world and our soul and all its truths went under, 'drowned'—when our soul was pushed into our subconscious, out of conscious awareness, and the highly competitive egocentric way of living became all-dominant. The only creatures to escape the horror of Resignation, to survive this 'drowning' of our soul, were the animals and the very few unresigned prophets, as symbolised in this story by Noah and his floating zoo. As it says in Genesis, **'Noah was a righteous man, blameless among the people of his time, and he walked with God** [he did not have to deny Integrative Meaning]**… God saw how corrupt the earth had become, for all the people on earth had corrupted their ways. So God said to Noah, "…make yourself an ark…I am going to bring floodwaters on the earth…Everything on earth will perish** [the soul and all the denial-free truths will perish when people resign to a life of denial]**. But I will establish my covenant with you** [but from here on prophets will have to preserve the truth of Integrative Meaning and all the other great truths that relate to it]**, and you will enter the ark… Go into the ark** [don't resign]**, you and your whole family, because I have found you righteous in this**

generation'" (6:9,12,14,17,18; 7:1). And to think people have actually searched for the remains of Noah's Ark, and tested ice cores from glaciers and sea beds in the Black Sea for evidence of a great flood event in the past, as if the story of Noah's Ark was an actual event rather than the metaphor it really is! Understandably, however, and this will be elaborated upon shortly, the more upset and thus insecure humans became, the less they could afford to confront the truths contained in religious scriptures and the more they needed to interpret their contents in literal and fundamentalist ways—'God is actually a person sitting in the clouds somewhere', 'Christ was actually physically resurrected from death', 'Christ's mother was actually a virgin', 'Abraham actually considered murdering his son', 'Judgment day actually heralds an afterlife in which some unlucky souls will be judged as evil and burnt in a fiery pit', etc, etc. But with the upset state of the human condition now defended, all religious metaphorical descriptions, parables and symbols—in fact, all mythology—can be safely explained and demystified, as will be shown throughout this presentation.

In this instance, 'Noah' symbolised the rare few individuals who, in recent millennia, didn't have to resign to a life of almost total dishonesty. Some of the Bushmen people of southern Africa have, in the past, also used a revealing analogical term to describe prophets in their society, which Sir Laurens van der Post wrote about in his 1958 book, *The Lost World of the Kalahari*. Sir Laurens described meeting a Bushman **'prophet and healer'** named **'Samutchoso'**, which he was told meant **'He who was left after the reaping'** (1958, pp.159, 129 of 253). Christ has similarly been referred to as **'the firstborn from among the dead'** (Col. 1:18). The reference by these Bushmen to one of them being called **'He who was left after the reaping'** suggests that the majority of them must have been resigned/**'reap**[ed]**'**, which is contrary to what I said earlier about quite a number of the natural living Bushmen *not* being resigned. However, **'Samutchoso'** was a remnant of an almost vanished race of River Bushmen who, as Sir Laurens described it, **'had all come together in the swamps** [of the Okavango Delta] **not by choice but when escaping destruction by the Matabele** [Bantu/negro/black Africans who had migrated down from the north] **in the time of Africa's great troubles in the past'**, and who were **'withheld and profoundly reserved. Their faces too, were strangely uneven as if each one belonged to a different race from which he had been torn by a violent fate'** (*The Lost World of the Kalahari*, p.127). So while **'Samutchoso'** was a now rare unresigned individual amongst the devastated River Bushmen, the existence of unresigned individuals amongst unmolested, natural living Bushmen might not in fact be a rare phenomenon—indeed, the happy, excited dispositions of so many suggests it's not.

We now need to look at what happened in the years immediately *following* Resignation, as well as what happened in those same years, from 15 to 21 years of age, for humans who *didn't have to resign*, such as our forebears who were alive during the second half of *H. habilis*' reign and during the time of *H. erectus* and *H. sapiens*.

Firstly, in looking at the post-resigned situation of those who *did* resign to living a life of denial of the issue of the human condition and of any truths that brought the issue into focus, after resigning at about the age of 15 it normally took another six years of procrastination to make sufficient mental adjustments to embrace the new, extremely dishonest resigned way of living.

To best describe the situation presented by this sobered and then depressed period leading up to Resignation, and then the six-year period of procrastination over having to take up a dishonest, soul-dead resigned life, imagine sitting on a ridge between two valleys. Behind us lies the valley of humanity's enchanted childhood, the 'Garden of Eden' where everyone lived happily and extremely sensitively in a non-upset, cooperative, all-loving state. Before us, however, is a hell of smouldering wasteland of devastation and destruction, the wilderness of terrible upset and alienation. Of course, we didn't *want* to go forward into that wasteland, but retreat was not an option. To leave all that happiness, laughter and togetherness behind was heartbreaking, but we had no choice but to turn our back on it; we couldn't throw away our conscious mind, we couldn't stop thinking, and while we practiced thinking upset was an inescapable by-product that could only be ameliorated by finding understanding of our corrupted state—understanding that lay at the other side of that terrible wilderness of devastation, aloneness and alienation.

Again, it is worth including more of Fiona Miller's poem to illustrate the horrific consequences of Resignation: **'Smiles will never bloom from your heart again, but be fake and you will speak fake words to fake people from your fake soul…From now on pressure, stress, pain and the past can never be forgotten / You have no heart or soul and there are no good memories…You are fake, you will be fake, you will be a supreme actor of happiness but never be happy…You will become like the rest of the world—a divine actor, trying to hide and suppress your fate, pretending it doesn't exist / There is only one way to escape society and the world you help build, but that is impossible, for no one can ever become a baby again / Instead you spend the rest of life trying to find the meaning of life and confused in its maze.'**

In Part 3:9, Joe Darion's song *The Impossible Dream* was also used to illustrate just how awesomely courageous humans have been, for we, and all those who came before us, had to set out on our species' corrupting search for knowledge, during which time we had **'To dream the impossible dream, to fight the unbeatable foe / To bear the unbearable sorrow, to run where the brave dare not go / To right the unrightable wrong, to love pure and chaste from afar / To try when your arms are too weary, to reach the unreachable star / This is my quest, to follow that star / No matter how hopeless, no matter how far / To fight for the right without question or pause / To be willing to march into hell for a heavenly cause / And I know if I will only be true, to this glorious quest / That my heart will lie peaceful and calm, when I'm laid to my rest / And the world will be better for this, that one man scorned and covered with scars / Still strove with his last ounce of courage, to reach the unreachable star.'** Also

included in Part 3:9 as evidence of the immense courage of the human race was the famous parable of the Hottentot hunter who had to leave behind his happy village life to ascend, on his own, a great mountain in an attempt to reach the 'White Bird of Truth' that lived at its summit. Reference was also made to Jason and the Argonauts' heroic search for the 'Golden Fleece', and King Arthur's knights' courageous quest for the 'Holy Grail'.

There was no retreat for the resigned adolescent; like all the fully conscious humans who had gone before them, they *had to* find the courage to continue humanity's heroic search for knowledge. Procrastination got them nowhere, and so, more typically in recent times, after a few years' spent consuming lots of drugs and alcohol and partying long into the night to help them accept their fate, the adolescent had to 'get on with it' and take up the challenge of adulthood in a world where understanding of the human condition was yet to be found. In fact, it normally wasn't until they reached 21 that resigned adolescents finally managed to orientate themselves to their extremely compromised resigned life. This orientation involved making two main adjustments: firstly, they had to block out the negative reality that living so falsely and thus so dead in soul and intellect would eventually end in the disaster of a completely corrupted life; and secondly, they had to train their mind to block out all memory of their innocent childhood and focus on whatever meagre positives they could find in the journey ahead. I describe these positives as 'meagre' because the degree of happiness they provided was, in truth, no comparison to the happiness the human race enjoyed while living in the magic state of our soul's true world.

The first tiny positive was the prospect of the <u>adventure</u> involved in trying to avoid, for as long as possible, the inevitable disaster of complete self-corruption. We may have been about to 'go under'—become totally corrupted—but at least we could hope to make a good fight of it. In fact, as will be described in the next 21-year-old-plus stage, by the age of 21 young resigned adult men in particular could have so blocked out the truth of another ideal, soulful, integrative true world, and so adopted belief in a selfishness-justifying, competitive, survival-of-the-fittest meaning to life, that they deluded themselves that winning power, fame, fortune and glory would *genuinely* bring them validation, prove that they actually were good and not bad—when in fact, winning power, fame, fortune and glory could, at best, only bring them some superficial relief from the insecurity of the human condition, whereas it would certainly lead to them becoming even more unbearably upset, corrupted and insecure.

The second, in truth tiny, positive in the resigned existence was <u>romance</u>, the hope of 'falling in love', which can be now understood as the hope of escaping reality through the dream of ideality that could be inspired by the neotenous image of innocence in women. (This concept of neoteny and the 'neotenous image of innocence in women' will be explained when the next Adventurous stage is described, but to summarise quickly, men could dream that women were actually innocent and that they could share in that innocent state, and that, for their part, women could use the fact that men were inspired by their image of innocence to delude themselves that they were actually innocent rather than just the embodiment of innocence.)

Although these two positives were only tiny, resigned adolescents gradually built them up in their mind to the extent that they became everything. They had to mentally posture themselves and their resigned environment in such a way as to be able to leave that ridge and take up humanity's journey to find liberating understanding of our species' upset, corrupted condition.

We now need to look at the journey into adulthood, and beyond, of those individuals who didn't resign, including, as mentioned, our forebears who were alive during the second half of *H. habilis*' reign, and during the time of *H. erectus* and *H. sapiens*.

Even for those who hadn't become so upset that they had to resign to a life of living in denial of the issue of the human condition, their lives still followed a parallel path to that of resigned humans, who were living with the delusion that by winning power, fame, fortune and glory they could genuinely validate themselves, prove that they were actually good and not bad. The reality of this path, however, was that the resigned were inevitably going to discover that power, fame, fortune and glory didn't bring them any real validation, but merely resulted in them becoming *more* upset, and thus *more* insecure about their meaning and worth, and thus *more* dissatisfied. While the unresigned were not living with the delusion that they could prove that they were champions and heroes of a competitive, survival-of-the-fittest, 'red-in-tooth-and-claw' world, they were living with the naive illusion, the optimistic hope, that all the wrongness in the world could be righted, that they could make the world a better, more ideal place. The reality for the unresigned person was that the situation all around them, and even in themselves, only got worse as the upsetting search for knowledge continued. Everywhere humans were becoming more upset and thus more destructive and mean spirited. So while their disappointments and frustrations were coming off vastly different bases, both the resigned and the unresigned faced overwhelmingly difficult paths.

In the situation, however, where most people were resigned, the overwhelming problem for the unresigned person was that the resigned state of complete dishonesty and desperate competitiveness was a total mystery to them—because those who *were* resigned to living a life of extreme dishonesty and deluded competitiveness never admitted so. It was the 'silence' of the resigned state that was the most destructive of innocence, be that in children or unresigned adults. In effect, the resigned imagined that everyone else was also resigned and that it was therefore self-evident as to why they behaved so dishonestly and fraudulently, but their behaviour was, in fact, a complete mystery to the unresigned. The idealistic innocence of the unresigned mind was so trusting and thus codependent to the resigned state that they were brutalised to the point where, almost invariably, their innocence was destroyed by the extreme dishonesty and defensiveness of the resigned state. As mentioned in Part 3:8, the Austrian psychiatrist Wilhelm Reich wrote honestly about the effects of upset on innocence when he described how **'The living** [those relatively free of upset]**…is naively kindly…It assumes that the fellow human also follows the laws of the living and is kindly, helpful and giving. As long as there**

is the emotional plague [the flood of upset in the world]**, this natural basic attitude, that of the healthy child or the primitive…**[or the unresigned adult, is subject to] **the greatest danger…For the plague individual also ascribes to his fellow beings the characteristics of his own thinking and acting. The kindly individual believes that all people are kindly and act accordingly. The plague individual believes that all people lie, swindle, steal and crave power. Clearly, then, the living is at a disadvantage and in danger.'** As was also mentioned in Part 3:8, Sir Laurens van der Post described how the relatively innocent Bushman race struggled to cope with upset when he wrote that **'mere contact with twentieth-century life seemed lethal to the Bushman. He was essentially so innocent and natural a person that he had only to come near us for a sort of radioactive fall-out from our unnatural world to produce a fatal leukaemia in his spirit.'**

The problem for the unresigned was that no matter how much idealism, no matter how much selfless behaviour they threw at a problem, the bottom line truth was that only understanding of the human condition could stop the resigned from behaving the way they were behaving—simply because the resigned had no other way of coping in the meantime. We will see shortly how various mechanisms, like religion, were developed to try to contain the dishonesty and devastation of the resigned way of living, but ultimately such measures were limited in their effectiveness.

So, in the final 15-to-21-year-old stage of adolescence, while the resigned person procrastinated over having to take up such a dishonest, soul-less life, the unresigned person (or, in humanity's case, the unresigned amongst *H. habilis*, *H. erectus* and *H. sapiens*) had to adjust to the prospect of having their idealism disappointed, resisted and frustrated at every turn. For the unresigned, facing that valley of devastation was just as difficult as it was for the resigned, but, like the resigned, they had no choice but to accept that fate. Just as the resigned used those years between 15 and 21 to condition themselves to taking up the challenge of 'marching into hell for a heavenly cause', so did the unresigned. The 'adventure' for the unresigned was to see how much they could resist the corruption in the world, and if not change it then at least contain it. And the unresigned also used romance to inspire their horrifically difficult and lonely undertaking. And so, after an initial period of mental adjustment, both the resigned and the unresigned began their 20s determined to make a difference, even if they were bound to become overwhelmed by the horror of life under the duress of the human condition.

Tragically, all the deadening effects of living with the human condition meant that the human race faced the very real prospect of eventually becoming completely estranged/alienated from our soul's happy, loving and all-sensitive world. And that very nearly happened—humans came perilously close to an eternity spent wandering like waifs in the terrible wilderness of the darkness of denial and its resulting alienation, as it is so accurately described in the Bible: **'Today you** [Integrative Meaning/God] **are driving me from the land, and I will be hidden from your presence, I will be a restless wanderer on the earth'** (Gen. 4:14).

As was emphasised in Part 3:9, and reiterated here, the courage of all humans who lived during humanity's heroic two million years in adolescence, in which time they had to face the inevitability of total self-corruption by the end of their lives, has been so immense it is, and possibly will be for all time, out of reach of true appreciation.

Part 3:11C Adventurous Adolescentman

The Adventurous Early Adulthood Stage of Adolescent Humanity

The Adventurous Adolescentman stage is the time we took up the battle to overthrow our idealistic instinctive self or soul's ignorance as to the fact of our conscious self's fundamental goodness.

The species: *Homo erectus*—1.5 to 0.5 million years ago
The individual: 21 to 30 year old

Drawing by Jeremy Griffith © 1991-2011 Fedmex Pty Ltd

By 21 years of age, after about six years of blocking out the negatives and focusing only on the tiny positives available to them, resigned humans finally adjusted to life in Resignation. In fact, by 21 both resigned and unresigned young adults were able to arm themselves sufficiently well with a positive attitude to commit themselves to the battle that humanity as a whole was involved in of gradually, step by step, generation by generation, working towards one day accumulating sufficient knowledge to be able to explain and liberate the human race from the human condition. Indeed, by 21 young adults had made sufficient adjustments to be raring to go, with men in particular having become *so* focused on the positive of the adventure of attempting to make a good fight of the battle to validate themselves through winning power, fame, fortune and glory that they were cavalier and swashbuckling. Naive about just how quickly overwhelming the battle was going to become, both resigned and unresigned males had plenty of strength and resilience—plenty of 'rock-n-roll'. For their part, 21-year-old women had also become firmly focused on the few positives they had of the reinforcements they could receive from men for their physical beauty and of the satisfaction of being able to support men and nurture another generation of brave humans to carry on humanity's heroic struggle. Hence the significance of the long-held tradition in Western societies to hold a so-called 'coming of age' party for offspring when they reached this milestone, at which they were typically given a 'key' symbolising that they were at last ready to leave home and 'face the world', and so with a big kiss from Mum and a slap on the back from Dad the young adult set off 'to see what life held for them'. Interestingly, the fact that young adults were considered sufficiently adapted to life under the duress of the human condition to be considered independent at 21 rather than at the round figure of 20 is an indication of how precisely all these stages with ages occurred, and also how uniform and powerful the effects of the human condition have been.

Basically our 20s, during humanity's adolescence, was the period when we began refining all the techniques we needed to cope with living with the horror of the human condition. In our teens we agonisingly adjusted to having accepted a life of living with upset, and in our 20s we took up the challenge of living out that life. The forebear who lived in humanity's adventurous early adulthood stage was Adventurous Adolescentman, *H. erectus*, who existed between 1.5 million and 0.5 million years ago. Consistent with the description that has been given for this stage, fossil evidence has revealed that it was *H. erectus* who first adventured out from our ancestral home in Africa around 1.25 million years ago and migrated throughout the world.

It was during the one million year reign of Adventurous Adolescentman that humanity perfected the many techniques for coping with the human condition, techniques that have been part of human life for so long now we tend to think of them as having always been part of our species' make-up, but all the methods of coping with life under the duress of the human condition had to be invented. We describe these ways of coping now as simply 'human nature', but in truth an immense and an amazing transition took place in our behaviour—especially amongst those who had resigned, who changed from living cooperatively, selflessly, lovingly and gently, to living competitively, aggressively and selfishly.

As mentioned, while humanity's infancy and childhood was matriarchal or female-role led (because the nurturing of infants was the all-important activity during those stages), when the upsetting battle to defy our ignorant instincts and find understanding emerged during humanity's adolescence our society became patriarchal or male-role led. As will be explained more fully when men and women are explained in Part 7:1, this change occurred because, with women preoccupied nurturing infants, it was men who had to take up the now all-important role of championing the conscious thinking self or ego over our instincts; it was men who were particularly charged with the extremely upsetting task of trying to defeat the ignorance of our instincts and prove that we humans are good and not bad—which is why men became so egocentric, combative and angry.

It is important to note, however, that while men have been so upset, they are far from being evil blights on Earth—indeed, they are the heroes of the story of life on Earth because they had to, and did, succeed in championing the conscious thinking mind over the ignorance of the instinctive state. One of the main reasons men are such heroes is because they had to endure being so misunderstood and misrepresented for so long, for the truth was not as it appeared. There was great meaning in the sparse, tightly written prose that the great American novelist Ernest Hemingway (1899-1961) used to describe the stoic lives of men in his books; just consider these titles alone of some of his books: *Death in the Afternoon*, *For Whom the Bell Tolls*, *Winner Take Nothing*, *To Have and Have Not*, *The Old Man and the Sea* and *Islands in the Stream*. So Ernest, I write these few words of appreciation for you.

As briefly mentioned in Part 3:7, one of the first adaptions to living in the resigned embattled angry, egocentric and alienated state was that we changed from being a relatively peaceful vegetarian species to ruthless hunters of animals. <u>The hunting and killing of animals was the first great expression of men's upset anger and egocentricity</u>. It has always been claimed that the hunting in the 'hunter-forager' lifestyle that characterised virtually the entire two million year period of humanity's adolescence was primarily driven by the need for protein-rich food—a denial-complying belief that has so far protected upset humans from the

condemning truth of the extreme aggression involved in hunting. But, in fact, research shows that 80 percent of the food consumed by existing hunter-foragers, such as the Bushmen of the Kalahari, is supplied by the women's foraging (see *Kalahari Hunter-Gatherers*, eds. Richard B. Lee & Irven DeVore, 1976, p.115 of 408). So if providing food was not the reason, why did men hunt? The honest, unevasive answer is that hunting was men's earliest ego outlet. Men attacked animals because their innocence, albeit unwittingly, unfairly criticised men's *lack of innocence*; it condemned their upset aggressive lives. Also, by attacking, killing and dominating animals, men were demonstrating their power, which was a perverse way of demonstrating their worth. If men could not rebut the accusation that they were bad, they could at least find some relief from that guilt by demonstrating their superiority over their accusers. The exhibition of power was a substitute for explanation. This 'sport' of attacking animals, which were once our species' closest friends, was, as just mentioned, one of the earliest expressions of our upset. One of the definitions given for 'sport' in the *Encylopedic World Dictionary* is **'the pastime of hunting, shooting, or fishing with reference to the pleasure achieved: "we had good sport today"'** (1971). The **'pleasure'** of hunting was of the perverse, sick kind, of attacking animals for their innocence and its implied criticism of us.

Photo on the front page of the 27 Oct. 2011 edition of *The Australian* newspaper of a shooter posing with a scimitar-horned oryx, which he shot at a game ranch in the Northern Territory of Australia. The species is officially listed as extinct in the wild.

Anthropological evidence supports the notion that hunting is an aspect of fully conscious, upset Adolescentman, because it was during the time of *H. erectus* that the first signs of hunting appeared in the fossil record. All the anthropological evidence indicates Childman was a vegetarian, but with big game hunting came meat eating, an adaption that would have revolted our original instinctive self or soul since it involved *eating* our soul's friends—even today, the act of killing animals, or just *seeing* animals get slaughtered, produces feelings of deep revulsion within us. But we weren't to be put off and in time, as our increasingly upset and driven (to find ego relief) lifestyle developed, we became somewhat physically dependent

on the high energy value of meat. (Again, as to whether the lifestyle of Adolescentman should be described as hunter-forager or forager-hunter, since the priority was the heroic search for knowledge and hunting provided men with some retaliatory relief from the criticism of the innocent world they had to live in, it should be described as hunter-forager.)

As upset increased, so too did men's insecurity about being corrupted, as did, it follows, the need to combat that insecurity with whatever form of relieving reinforcement they could find. And since it was men who had to especially take on the responsibility of championing the conscious-thinking self or ego over the ignorance of our original instinctive self, it was men who particularly came to need reinforcement of their worth. In the case of resigned men, they particularly needed to seek out power, fame, fortune and glory. In the soundtrack to the 1986 African musical *Ipi Tombi*, the female narrator says, **'The women had to do all the work because the men were so busy being big, strong and brave'** (Narration: Sesiya Hamba, *Drinking Song*, lyrics by Thandi Lephelile). This quote acknowledges just how preoccupied men eventually became in trying to prove their worth, in defeating the implication that they weren't worthy. Men became so insecure/ego-embattled that in the end it was a case of **'Give me liberty or give me death'**, **'No retreat, no surrender'**, **'Death before dishonour'**, **'Death or glory'**—they just stood there refusing to do anything except receive glorification and adulation, which meant someone else (that is, women) had to do all the practical work if it was going to get done. The following two pictures, from Richard Borshay Lee and Irven DeVore's *Kalahari Hunter-Gatherers* (1976), of the relatively innocent Bushman members of the present *H. sapiens sapiens* variety of humans, perfectly illustrate the situation. In the first picture women are shown gathering the aforementioned 80 percent of the food, in addition to nurturing the children—basically doing all the practical work—while the other photograph, titled *Telling the Hunt*, shows the men sitting around together with their backs contemptuously shunning innocent nature's condemning presence as they boldly tell each other about their heroic conquests over innocent animals.

Women with infants digging roots

Telling the Hunt

This destruction of innocence, such as the killing of animals, has been going on at all levels. In resigning, humans also destroyed the innocent soul in themselves by repressing it. And having turned on and attacked their innocent animal friends, men *then* turned on the relative innocence of their partners in life, women, and attacked that.

As will also be explained in Part 7:1, men perverted the act of procreation, inventing sex as in 'fucking' or violating or destroying or ruining or degrading or sullying the relative innocence of women. Prior to the perversion of 'sex', women weren't viewed as sex objects and so nudity had none of the problems of attracting lust and so there was no need to conceal our nakedness with clothes. To quote the Bible, when Adam and Eve took the fruit from the tree of knowledge—set out in search of understanding—**'the eyes of both of them were opened, and they realized that they were naked; so they sewed fig leaves together and made coverings for themselves'** (Gen. 3:7). Clothing was not originally designed to protect the body from cold as children have been evasively taught at school, but to restrain lust, to the extent that once we became extremely upset even the mere sight of a women's ankle or face became dangerously exciting to men, which is why some societies demand that women be completely draped. The convention of marriage was invented as one way of containing this spread of upset. By confining sex to one life-long, monogamous relationship, the souls of the couple could gradually make contact and coexist, in spite of the sexual destruction involved in their relationship. As stated in the Bible, in marriage **'a man will leave his father and mother and be united to his wife, and the two will become one flesh. So they are no longer two, but one'** (Mark 10:7, 8.). Brief relationships kept souls repressed and spread soul repression—however, the more upset, corrupted, insecure and alienated humans became, the more they needed sexual distraction and reinforcement through sexual conquest (in the case of men) and sex-object attention (in the case of women), and thus the more difficult it became for both sexes to remain content in a monogamous relationship. The saying **'the first cut** [the first falling out of love] **is the deepest'** is an acknowledgment of the deep and total commitment humans make to their first love. It reveals that the original, relatively innocent relationship between a man and a woman was

monogamous. Since sex killed innocence, ideally (although impractical for the majority of the human race, who had to ensure the continuation of the species) if we wanted to free our soul from the soul-destroying hurt sex caused it we needed to be celibate; as Christ explained it, some priests **'renounce marriage** [for] **the kingdom of heaven'** (Matt. 19:12).

But, while sex *was* an attack on innocence, an act of aggression, it was also one of the greatest distractions and releases of frustration and, on a higher level, an expression of sympathy, compassion and support—an act of love. The emotions involved in sexual relationships were also part of romance, part of the dream that the image of innocence in women could inspire of living ideally, of living free of the human condition. As mentioned earlier, men could dream that women were actually innocent and that, through that partnership, they could share in that innocent state, while for their part, women could use the fact that men were inspired by their image of innocence to delude themselves that they actually *were* innocent. Men and women could 'fall in love', let go of reality and dream of an ideal world. The beautiful lyrics of the song *Somewhere*, written by Stephen Sondheim for the blockbuster 1956 musical (and later film) *West Side Story*, perfectly describe the dream of the heavenly state of true togetherness that humans allow themselves to be transported to when they fall in love: **'Somewhere / We'll find a new way of living / We'll find a way of forgiving / Somewhere // There's a place for us / A time and place for us / Hold my hand and we're halfway there / Hold my hand and I'll take you there / Somehow / Some day / Somewhere!'** Cole Porter's 1928 song *Let's Fall In Love* also contains lyrics that reveal how falling in love is about allowing yourself to dream of the ideal state, of 'paradise': **'Let's fall in love / Why shouldn't we fall in love? / Our hearts are made of it / Let's take a chance / Why be afraid of it / Let's close our eyes and make our own paradise.'**

The effect of the 'attraction' of innocence—which has been the preserve of youth because the young hadn't yet been exposed to all the upset in the world—for both dreaming through and for sexual destruction was that through the course of the two million year journey through our species' adolescence our physical features became increasingly youthful looking or neotenous, as the increasingly child-like features of the skulls of the varieties of our *Homo* ancestors pictured in Part 3:11 evidence. The dramatic increase in neoteny from *H. habilis* to *H. erectus* reflects the dramatic increase in upset that took place once humanity set out on its search of understanding at the age-equivalent of 21, and the dramatic increase in neoteny from *H. erectus* to *H. sapiens sapiens* reflects the dramatic increase in upset that occurred when humanity entered the rapidly dis-integrating stage in the progression of upset in the last quarter of the exponential growth of upset's development. Women were especially selected

for their more innocent looking, neotenous, youthful, childlike features of a domed forehead, large eyes, snub nose and hairless body. Just how adapted women have now become to being sex objects can be seen in women's magazines, which are almost entirely dedicated to showing women how to be 'attractive', which really means just better able to imitate the *image* of innocence. Women are now habituated and codependent to the reinforcement that men, for over two million years, have given their object self rather than their real self—for instance, they love to adorn themselves with beautiful objects, use make-up on their faces to increase their neotenous appearance, and wear high-heel shoes to give themselves the leggy, youthful, almost pubescent, ultra-innocent look.

The German supermodel Claudia Schiffer,
Australian *Elle* magazine Aug. 1992

In summary, since all forms of innocence unfairly criticised humans, all forms of innocence were attacked by upset humans, who not only attacked animals, but attacked nature

in the broader sense because all of nature was a friend and 'ally' of our instinctive soul and therefore an 'enemy' of our apparently 'bad' conscious mind. There was even satisfaction in chopping down trees and setting fire to vegetation. The wearing of dark glasses ostensibly as sunshades was often an effort to alienate ourselves from the natural world that was alienating us—it was a rejection of, an attack on, the innocence of the daytime, of sunshine. The attacking and murdering of each other, and eventually outright, organised warfare, represented a dramatic escalation in our upset with the condemning innocence of the ideal world of our soul. But, as will be explained during the 40-year-old equivalent stage, this extremely destructive behaviour didn't emerge until the latter period of our two million years in adolescence.

Of course, the more upset we became the more we needed ways to escape and relieve the trauma of our condition. We sought the material rewards of luxury and comfort to compensate for the high price we were having to pay of becoming corrupted. Later, when upset became extreme, materialism became one of the main driving forces or motivations in life. Glittering dresses, sparkling diamonds, bubbling Champagne, huge chandeliers, silver tea sets, big houses, swimming pools and shiny, pretentious cars gave us the fanfare and glory we knew was due us, but which the world in its ignorance would not give us. From being bold, challenging and confrontationist, the heroic 21-year-old eventually became embattled, cynical and exhausted, greatly in need of escapism and relief and thus an increasingly superficial and artificial person. We abandoned any idealistic hope of winning the battle to overthrow ignorance as to the fact of our true goodness and became realists, concerned only with finding relief and bestowing glory upon ourselves.

As mentioned earlier, while innocent Childmen were instinctively coordinated and connected, once upset, especially alienation, developed, language became a necessity. With alienation differing from one person to another there became a need to try to explain ourselves, to explain why we were behaving differently, in such a seemingly non-ideal manner. In fact, talking became the key vehicle for justifying ourselves, both in our minds and to others. But since we couldn't speak directly about the human condition, or about other people's particular states of alienation without overly confronting and condemning them, stories became a way of passing on knowledge, or what we call wisdom, about the subtleties of living under the duress of the human condition. Much later, with the development of the written word about 6,000 years ago, the fundamental quest for self-justification became greatly assisted because the wisdom acquired during each generation could be more accurately recorded, which meant that quite suddenly the accumulation of knowledge gained real impetus. And throughout the journey through humanity's adolescence the need to somehow explain and justify ourselves with words, both oral and written, became increasingly sophisticated with the invention of all kinds of excuses and lies. The industry of denial became one of the main features of our behaviour; indeed, the extreme denials that have taken place in science about our species' innocent, upset-free, psychologically secure and happy past bear stark witness to just how sophisticated the art of denial became.

At this point in our journey, other forms of self-expression, such as art and music, became particularly useful because, unlike language and stories, their message wasn't as clear and therefore as potentially confronting. Each person could derive as much meaning from the art or the music or even the dance and other cultural rituals as they could personally cope with. On the whole, culture essentially encompassed the various ways people passed on, from one generation to the next, the knowledge they had learnt about living under the duress of the human condition. More will be said about cultural traditions shortly.

Although the oldest known cave paintings are just 35,000 years old, archaeologists working in Zambia announced in 2000 that they had found pigments and paint grinding equipment believed to be between 350,000 and 400,000 years old. At the time of the discovery it was reported that the find showed that **'Stone Age man's first forays into art were taking place at the same time as the development of more efficient hunting equipment, including tools that combined both wooden handles and stone implements…**[and that it was evidence of] **the development of new technology, art and rituals'** (*BBC World News*, 2 May 2000). The British archaeologist Lawrence Barham, a member of the team in Zambia, described the find as the **'earliest evidence of an aesthetic sense'** and that **'It also implies the use of language'** (ibid). As explained, language would have emerged with alienation because people would have then needed some way to account for their unnatural behaviour to each other, and, since we can expect alienation to have begun soon after the emergence of *Homo*, we can assume that at least a rudimentary language would have been practiced by *H. habilis*. The oldest musical instruments found so far, phalange (bone) whistles, show that Neanderthals, the early variety of *H. sapiens sapiens*, were making music around 80–100,000 years ago, while a Neanderthal burial site at the Shanidar Cave in Iraq, estimated to be around 50,000 years old, contains traces of pollen grains, indicating that bouquets of flowers were buried with the corpses. The creative and aesthetic sense of our ancestors of nearly half a million years ago, as indicated by the pigments and paint grinding equipment, suggests that the creative and spiritual sensitivities demonstrated by the Neanderthals were in existence long before their time.

I find the extreme sensitivity that is particularly apparent in the rock paintings of the Bushman of southern Africa and Australian Aborigines, and in the cave paintings of early humans in Europe, especially revealing of how much innocence the human race has lost in relatively recent times. In order to draw the little pictures that have been included throughout this written presentation, I learnt long ago that I have to disconnect my conscious mind and just let my instinctive sensitivity express itself, and that if I don't do that I simply can't draw at all. For example, the drawing of the three childmen happily embracing that I used to illustrate humanity's Childhood stage earlier was done so quickly I shocked myself because I could hardly believe that such an empathetic drawing could be produced from an almost instant scribble. At that moment I saw just how much sensitivity we once had, and how much alienation now exists within us two-million-years-embattled humans. The extraordinary empathy and accuracy of the paintings of animals in the rock and cave paintings I referred

to above are similarly incredibly revealing of the amount of sensitivity we humans once had and have since lost. We are *such* an embattled species now, so worn out, so brutalised, so toughened. How extremely sensitive must early humans have been! Sir Laurens van der Post wasn't exaggerating when he wrote that **'He** [the Bushman] **and his needs were committed to the nature of Africa and the swing of its wide seasons as a fish to the sea. He and they all participated so deeply of one another's being that the experience could almost be called mystical. For instance, he seemed to *know* what it actually felt like to be an elephant, a lion, an antelope, a steenbuck, a lizard, a striped mouse, mantis, baobab tree'** (*The Lost World of the Kalahari*, 1958, p.21 of 253).

The Chauvet Cave in southern France contains a wealth of Neolithic cave drawings that, as one reviewer of them described it, are **'miraculous'**, **'overwhelming in density, humbling in sophistication, and awe-inspiring in sheer beauty'** (*The Goddess Bites*, accessed 14 Oct. 2011 at: <https://daedala.wordpress.com/>). The drawings, some of which are reproduced here (see next images), are made of charcoal and, in some cases, red ochre. Carbon dating shows that the earliest of the paintings are around 32,000 years old. Only discovered in 1991, the cave was sealed by a rockslide some 28,000 years ago, so its contents are pristine. What struck me most when watching the German filmmaker Werner Herzog's wonderful 2010 3D film *Cave of Forgotten Dreams*, on the Chauvet Cave drawings, was the extraordinary empathy the artists exhibited towards the bison, mammoth, horses, rhinoceroses, lions, bears and other animals that they so effortlessly drew in the cave—some of the drawings even appear to be animated, such as the rhinoceros depicted throwing his horn forward. When our mind becomes preoccupied with upset, with psychosis and neurosis, it loses the ability to take an interest in anything else. The pain in our brain stops us feeling or seeing or engaging in our surroundings; recall Plato's depiction of our human-condition-afflicted state of alienation or estrangement from the true world that our original instinctive self or soul has complete access to—he described it as living in a dark cave where we can only **'see dimly and appear to be almost blind'** (see Part 3:10). Our brain is distracted from everything else that is happening in the world. The more upset that our mind is preoccupied with, either trying to understand or, if the upset is extreme, constantly trying to block out, the less we can access all the other events and experiences going on around us. So, as the human race became more and more upset, so its ability to feel and savour the world around it shrank. For example, later in Part 6:4 I describe how power addicts—adults who as children had to stand up to tyrannical parents, especially tyrannical fathers, and, as a result, became psychologically exceptionally preoccupied trying to prove they are good and not bad—are typically described as **'lacking any ability to empathise with others'**. So although the humans responsible for the drawings in the Chauvet Cave were not anything like as upset-free/

innocent as humans were two million years ago when upset first began to develop in earnest, their ability to draw the animals around them so vividly indicates they were much, much more innocent than humans today. Clearly alienation has increased at an extremely rapid rate in the final stages of humanity's two-million-year journey through adolescence.

When all the upset in humans heals, as it now will with understanding of the human condition now found, the world is going to open up for us. We are going to be able to feel everything around us. We are going to have so much kindness and love and empathy for each other and our fellow creatures because we will, once again, be able to feel everything they are experiencing, including just how embattled the lives of other animals are. While, through the nurturing, love-indoctrination process that was explained in Part 3:4, *our* ape ancestors were able to break free from the tyranny of genes having to ensure their own reproduction, other animals are stuck having to continually compete for food, shelter, space and a mate; unlike humans, they can't develop full unconditionally selfless cooperative instincts. And so, in these amazing drawings of animals, above all else, it is this empathy with, this feeling for, the relatively short, brutish, forever-having-to-fight-for-your-chance-to-reproduce lives of animals that those who made these drawings have so sensitively expressed. To use Sir Laurens' words, they **'seemed to *know* what it actually felt like to be'** a bison, rhinoceros or horse. You can sense the whole internal struggle of the animals' lives in these drawings. Their huge chests heave with their brutal and tough battle to survive—they are struggling so much to endure their lot that it is as if they have asthma! One day, when we humans get over the terrible agony of our 'human condition', we will again be able to empathise with the terrible agony of the 'animal condition'. It's not very nice to have to belt the living daylights out of others to ensure your genes reproduce, let alone other members of your own species—in fact, your cousins, uncles and even your own father! No, it is not at all easy being a non-human animal, and that is an extreme understatement, just as it has not been at all easy being a human, which is, of course, another extreme understatement! In those who made these drawings there is not the alienation that now exists in us humans that separates us from having an awareness of what it's like to be one of these animals. In his commentary in his film, Werner wonders whether the paintings **'somehow** [show] **the beginning of the modern human soul'**, but in truth they show the *last* remnants of our all-sensitive human soul. At least Werner gets it right at the very end of the documentary when, in showing footage of mutant albino crocodiles who live in a tropical biosphere that has been created by the surplus warm water from a nuclear power plant that has been built some 20 miles from the cave, he asks, **'Are we today possibly the crocodiles who look back into an abyss of time when we see the paintings of Chauvet cave?'** Yes, these paintings certainly reveal how alienated we are now.

As I mentioned, while the Paleolithic artists clearly weren't as alienated as we humans are today, they still had to be much, much more alienated than humans *originally* were. I think this is revealed by the fact that these cave artists almost completely avoided depicting humans. In the entire Chauvet Cave complex there is only one representation of a human, and even that is limited to a drawing of only the bottom half of a woman's torso. On the few occasions when these cave artists tried to draw humans they almost invariably ended up drawing stick figures. The human face, in particular, which you would think would be the most interesting and relevant of subjects for these artists to depict, seems to have been totally beyond their ability. It seems clear that the facial expressions of humans were by then so alienated, so devoid of the innocence that they must have once exhibited, that our instinctive self or soul couldn't relate to it; it couldn't draw us. The artist Francis Bacon revealed just how visibly corrupted we *really* are in his deadly honest painting of the psychologically-twisted-smudged-face alienated human condition that was included at the beginning of Part 3:11B. Also included in that Part was Sir Laurens van der Post's honest description of the physical effects of alienation, when he described the psychologically devastated River Bushmen as having **'faces…**[that] **were strangely uneven as if each one belonged to a different race from which he had been torn by a violent fate'**.

But it's not just these River Bushmen who have been **'torn by a violent fate'** from their soulful moorings—that is the reality of the entire human race. When looking at some Aboriginal rock paintings, thought to be some 2,000 years old, at Ubirr in the Kakadu National Park in the Northern Territory of Australia, I asked the guide, who was accompanying a tour group, whether she thought the reason the paintings of wildlife were so accurate while the paintings of the humans were so pathetic was because we are now too alienated for our soul to be able to empathise with us. I remember the guide, and everyone else, reacting with a real shudder and audible choking noise—what I had said was just too close to the truth.

The author at Ubirr, Kakadu, 2010

© 2010 Fedmex Pty Ltd

Author's photo of fish, spear thrower and tortoise at Ubirr

A 27,000 year old Bushmen rock painting of an eland hunt, Kamberg, Drakensberg Mountains, South Africa

A 17,300 year old cave painting of a wounded bison, a dead man with a broken spear beside him, a bird and what appears to be a rhinoceros in Lascaux, France. While there are many extraordinarily empathetic paintings of animals in the Lascaux caverns there is only this one crude image of a man.

In light of my comment above, about the River Bushmen being 'psychologically devastated', I should context comments that I made earlier when I spoke of the relative innocence of the Bushmen race that still exists today. The Bushmen's ability to paint eland with the empathetic sensitivity that is so evident in the painting (see previous image, bottom left) is another indicator, like the happiness and zest for life of the unmolested, natural living Bushmen I mentioned earlier, that the Bushmen *are* a relatively innocent, relatively non-upset, relatively soul-preserved race. However, for their souls not to be able to relate to and thus draw themselves indicates that they are far more 'psychologically devastated' or upset than original, fully soulful, innocent humans were. The fact that the life of the Bushmen is so focused on hunting shows that they are indeed very upset, even if they are not as far along the exhaustion curve as other races today. After all, the Bushmen are, like the artists who drew the animals in the Chauvet and Lascaux caves, and on the Ubirr rocks, modern humans, members of the extremely upset genus, *Homo sapiens sapiens*.

It is truly an insight into how sensitive and loving we humans once were that our instinctive self or soul can't relate to the way we humans are now. Consider the tenderness in the expression on the face of the Madonna in the drawing of the Madonna and child that was included at the beginning of the Infancy stage in Part 3:11A. My soul drew that—I, my conscious self, had nothing to do with it. Truly, as William Wordsworth wrote, **'trailing clouds of glory do we come, From God** [the integrated, loving, all-sensitive state]**, who is our home'** (*Intimations of Immortality from Recollections of Early Childhood*, 1807). And people say we humans have brutish, aggressive instincts! It's the world we humans *currently* live in that is mad. It is just so traumatised with upset that it hasn't been able to deal with the fact that it is deeply, deeply dishonest, horrifically alienated. What did the great Spanish artist Pablo Picasso (1881-1973), one of the modern world's most accomplished artists, famously say about his ability to paint: **'It's taken me a lifetime to learn to paint like a child.'** And what did R.D. Laing say, **'between *us* and It** [our true self or soul] **there is a veil which is more like fifty feet of solid concrete'**. Turn on the television and find a wildlife documentary and I bet it will show pictures of crocodiles on the Mara River tearing wildebeest apart, or white sharks devouring seals, or snakes striking

at the camera lens. All the beauty in nature has been reduced to representations of butchery and horror because we humans have become so upset all we can cope with are pictures of animals 'being' as aggressive as we are, everything else in nature is far too confronting. I have been to natural Africa and seen its spectacle, and the sheer magic of it all surpasses all imaginings; it is just achingly beautiful, the most sacred realm on Earth—'spiritual amnesia' are the only words I can think of to describe it and they don't even make sense. My partner Annie and I have sat hidden amongst the trees on the banks of the Tiva sand river in Tsavo National Park in Kenya and seen dust rise above the tree line in the shimmering midday heat and then watched as a vast herd of black Cape buffalo, led by an old crooked horn cow, quietly materialised from the bush, cautiously coming down to drink at pools in the river bed. I really felt like a spy in heaven. It was all just unbelievable. The Earth at its primal, spiritual, authentic, soulful, magical very best. I think God was there beside us sitting on his heels like a little Bushman smiling at all that he had created. With our sophisticated communication technology, why oh why don't we have documentaries sensitively immersing us in all of that. It is *so* sad. We haven't been able to cope with any truth. Our world has shrunk to the size of a pea. All the beauty and magic that is out there escapes us, we don't see it; worse, *we don't want to see it*. No wonder our soul can't relate to us and just draws stick figures with weird blobs for faces.

My partner Annie and I in Samburu National Park in Kenya in 1992. Those giraffes behind us are just walking around as free as a daisy. In Africa, animals like giraffes and elephants and rhinoceroses aren't in cages; there are no fences over there. Animals—and the place is teeming with them, all sorts of weird shapes and sizes—just walk all around the place. It's amazing. They can go wherever they want. They can stop here for a while and then go over the hill if they want to. They just mooch about everywhere; walk around a bush and there is another one, this time with great spiral horns coming out of the top of its head, big eyes looking at you as if to say, 'So, who are you, what's your problem?' '*My* problem! Have you had a look at what's coming out the top of your head!?' It takes some getting used to. I don't know who made them all, and was he just having fun making them all in such weird and different shapes—and, more to the point, who let them all out!

Similar to what happens when I draw, in my writing I have also learnt to, as I describe it, 'think like a stone', or 'think like a child'—say the simplest, most elementary thought—because I learnt that such a thought will be the most truthful and accurate and accountable and explanatory. Absolutely every time I encounter a problem I have to solve in my thinking about the human condition I go into a routine where I say to myself, 'Just go into yourself and think like a stone, just let the truth come out that's within and you will have the answer.' Basically, I learnt to trust in and take guidance from my truthful instinctive self or soul. I learnt to think honestly, free of alienated, intellectual bullshit, and all the answers, all the insights that I have found, and there are many hundreds of them, were found this way. I have so perfected the art of thinking truthfully and thus effectively that you can put any problem or question in front of me to do with human behaviour and I can get to the bottom of it, answer and solve it. It has been astonishing to me to watch my mind work, the freedom it has and where it is capable of going in its thinking. It wears me out keeping up with it. This wearing out problem is especially so because there is so much suffering in the world that simply has to be brought a stop to. Yes, I know that every sentence I write is truth-laden, in complete contrast to the billions of sentences being churned out every second everywhere else on Earth. It is the innocent instinctive child in us that knows the truth. Christ, as usual, put it perfectly when he said, **'you have hidden these things from the wise and learned, and revealed them to little children'** (Matt. 11:25). Albert Einstein also recognised the mental integrity of the young when he famously said that **'every child is born a genius'**; the American architect and philosopher Richard Buckminster Fuller similarly said, **'There is no such thing as genius, some children are just less damaged than others'** (NASA Speech, 1966), and **'All children are born geniuses. 9999 out of every 10,000 are swiftly, inadvertently de-geniused by grown-ups'** (*Education for Human Development: Understanding Montessori*, by Mario M. Montessori Jr., Paula Polk Lillard & Buckminster Fuller, 1987, Foreword); while R.D. Laing noted that **'Each child is a new beginning, a potential prophet** [denial-free, honest, truthful, effective thinker]**'** (*The Politics of Experience* and *The Bird of Paradise*, 1967, p.26 of 156). Laing also pointed out that **'Children are not yet fools, but** [by our treatment of them] **we shall turn them into imbeciles like ourselves, with high I.Q.'s if possible'** (ibid. p.49). Sigmund Freud was another who recognised the problem of the alienated adult/modern human mind, writing, **'What a distressing contrast there is between the radiant intelligence of the child and the feeble mentality of the average adult'** (*The Freud Reader*, ed. P. Gay, 1995, p.715). Many exceptionally creative people have made statements to the effect that genius is the ability to think like a child. As just mentioned, one of the most accomplished artists of all time, Pablo Picasso, famously said (about his struggle to paint well) that **'It's taken me a lifetime to learn to paint like a**

child.' Truly, our species' original instinctive self or soul, which the innocence of children still has access to, is wonderfully orientated to the cooperative, integrative, 'Godly', loving, ideal, truthful state. We do indeed come **'trailing clouds of glory…From God, who is our home'**.

Interestingly, a comment that was included earlier, by the biographer George Seaver on the theologian, missionary and physician Albert Schweitzer, reiterates what I have just said about natural thinking: **'Naturalness. That is the keynote of Schweitzer's thought, life, and personality. The ultimate thought, the thought which holds the clue to the riddle of life's meaning and mystery, must be the simplest thought conceivable, the most natural, the most elemental, and therefore also the most profound'** (*Albert Schweitzer The Man and His Mind*, 1947, p.311).

It was bad enough to have acquired a fully conscious brain, the marvellous computer we have on our heads, and not be given the program for it and instead be left to wander this Earth searching for that program/understanding in a terrifying darkness of confusion and bewilderment, most especially about our worthiness or otherwise as a species, but to then have to be disconnected from access to the ideal, 'Godly', cooperatively orientated, integrative, all-loving and all-sensitive, truthful world of our original instinctive self or soul—having to block it out because it unjustly condemned us—meant we have been enduring an *extraordinarily* lonely, sad existence! It follows that it became a matter of great urgency for the increasingly upset human race to find ways to cope with the utter devastation and loneliness of our situation.

Having repressed our soul because it condemned us, a counter need developed to reconnect with it, to find our way back to purity and sanity, and one way we managed to do so was by creating one of the earliest forms of religion, namely animism or nature worship—religion being the strategy of putting our faith in, deferring to, and looking for comfort, reassurance and guidance from something other than our overly upset and overly soul-estranged conscious thinking egoic self. Unlike our upset soul-destroyed self, the natural world remained in an innocent state, and since nature was also associated with our original instinctive self because our species grew up with nature, it could also reconnect us to the innocent, true world of our soul. So, despite our upset state's often violent repudiation of nature's condemning innocence, nature *could* still link us back to repressed 'spiritual', soul-infused sensitivities, feelings and awarenesses within us that we had lost access to.

Another way that developed to counter the loneliness of our situation, and this was also one of the earliest forms of religion, was ancestor worship. Having managed to survive our mind's loneliness and our soul's estrangement, our ancestors were a source of great

reassurance and comfort. In our uncertainty and distress, we could look to them for the hope that we too might survive the horror of life under the duress of the human condition. We could look to them for 'spiritual' guidance, for inspiration for our troubled minds. If we tried to imagine how they coped and what they would have done in situations that we now faced, we could be inspired to reach potentials within ourselves that our troubled minds might not otherwise have allowed us access to. By revering them and cultivating their memories, our ancestors could remain a presence in our lives to look after and guide us. Prior to developing writing and with it the ability to very effectively pass on and accumulate knowledge, especially knowledge about how to cope with being a human, we had to depend on the oral communication of knowledge through stories that were easily recalled, and on the memories of our ancestors who embodied that accumulated knowledge.

Rituals involving pantomimes and the use of visual totems and objects like masks also helped build a cultural tradition that could reassure and guide us from one generation to the next. It follows that since masks are representations of the human face they should be extremely revealing of our species' whole psychological condition, which they are.

As has been described at length, there are two fundamental aspects to the human condition: the tragic repression of our original all-loving and all-sensitive instinctive self or soul, and the extremely angry state of the unjustly condemned conscious thinking egoic intellect. In the day to day lives of humans living under the duress of the human condition the truth of the extent to which our soul has been brutally repressed has been hidden from view. Similarly, the depth of the anger of our conscious mind has also been mostly restrained and contained and thus also not often revealed. We learnt to be, as we say, civilised; we tried not to let the true extent of our corrupted, upset state show. So, for the most part, we went about in a state of extremely artificial and superficial pretence that we were sound, secure, well-adjusted, sane and happy people. We went to great lengths to conceal our extremely tortured, disfigured, soul-dead, furiously angry real condition. While this denial of the truth of our condition saved the upset human race from unbearable self-confrontation, the extreme dishonesty, artificiality and superficiality of living that way could also become unbearable—psychologically and then physically sickening in fact, at which point some purging, cathartic, exorcising honesty was needed. The wearing of masks that revealed the true depth of how either soul-dead or ferociously angry we upset humans had become was a powerfully effective way of bringing some relieving, therapeutic honesty to our lives. It comes as little surprise then that masks have, in fact, been used in the ceremonies of almost all cultures.

The Greeks call masks **'ekstasis'**, a word which means **'to stand outside oneself'**. It follows that when we stood outside our self we were, in turn, looking into our self and seeing the real devastation that R.D. Laing spoke of when he referred to the **'fifty feet of solid concrete'** that now exists between us and our original soulful true self. The term 'mask' is actually derived from the term *msk*, which was used in the middle Egyptian period to denote **'second skin'**. That **'second skin'** that the mask sought to exorcise was our soul-corrupted, immensely upset, human-condition-afflicted real state. Masks allowed the wearer to momentarily relieve themselves of their extremely dishonest everyday masquerade of being a secure, sound, well-adjusted, happy person, and let the truth out, which could be *very* therapeutic for both the wearer and the observer.

By far the most common variety of masks are those that reveal the true extent of the, in truth, volcanic, demonic anger inside of humans. The following are some examples.

Bhairav Mask, Nepal,
Amogh Siddhi Shakya, Nepal

Maori Koruru (gable mask), New Zealand, c.1880,
Peabody Essex Museum, Gift of the Dominion
Museum, Wellington, NZ, 1956

"Mudman", Asaro Valley, Papua New Guinea,
photo by David Austin; published in
The National Geographic Society 100 Years of Adventure and Discovery, 1987

'Day of the Dead' Skull Mask, Mexico,
National Museum of Anthropology,
Mexico City

Masks that focused on revealing and exorcising the other aspect in the duality of the human condition, of the extent of the devastation of our cooperative, integrative, 'Godly', all-loving and all-sensitive original instinctive self or soul, were always going to be rarer than masks that revealed the extent of our intellect's anger. This is because the more upset humans became, the more we replaced any sensitive, inward-focusing, introspective awareness and concern about our loss of soulful innocence with an increasing need to get even with the world for its unjust condemnation, at which point outward-focusing, egocentric ferocious anger became the dominant concern and orientation of life—which is why masks that exorcise ferocious anger predominate. Put simply, the more upset we humans became, the less we wanted to be reminded of how soul-dead we had become, which means that any masks that *did* reveal how estranged from our soul we humans have become were going to be few and far between, if not non-existent. In fact, in my research I have not yet found any masks that seem to me to have the specific intention of revealing and exorcising the truth of how soul-dead we humans really are—however, what I *have* found are masks that were made for another purpose but which *happen* to reveal how soul-destroyed we are.

The pictures that follow are of a selection of these truly extraordinary masks that were made by a few central African Bantu/black/negro tribes who practiced ancestor worship. These examples were chosen from many, in some cases hundreds, of very similar masks from each of what appear to be the main tribes who crafted these particular ancestor masks. For example, the website of the Royal Museum for Central Africa in Belgium (<https://www.africamuseum.be/>) displays some 800 of these masks that were collected between the late 1800s and the early 1900s from tribes living in or around the Congo River basin, and if you glance through them you will see that the samples I have chosen are not at all unique, but, in fact, typical of all the masks.

To explain the meaning behind these masks, I first need to present a brief description of the tribes that made them.

The Fang tribe are warrior-like people who spread over a large area encompassing the forests of Equatorial Guinea and Gabon along the Atlantic Coast. Fang masks **'typically are large elongated covered with** [white] **kaolin** [clay] **and featuring a face that was usually heart-shaped with a long fine nose. Apparently it has been linked with the dead since white is their color…**[**Skull fragments, or sometimes complete skulls,** of **ancestors**] **would be consulted when the village was to change location, or when a new crop was planted…or before going hunting, fishing, or to war…**[Representations of the ancestors] **also served for therapeutic rituals and, above all, for the initiation of young males'** (Rebirth African Art Gallery, accessed Aug. 2011 at: <https://www.rebirth.co.za/fang_mask_history.htm>).

The Lega are another war-like tribe who, in the sixteenth century, migrated down from modern Uganda to their present location in the virgin forests of eastern Congo, near Burundi. In their society **'both men and women aspire to moral authority by gaining high rank in the *bwami* association…**[who] **regulate the social, religious and political life of the Lega…Circumcision** [initiation] **was an indispensable process that allowed entrance into the *bwami*** (African Art Museum, accessed Aug. 2011 at: <http://www.zyama.com/lega/>). **'The highest rank of Bwami…is directly associated with the skulls of the ancestors, which are placed in a hut at the center of the village…**[and] **are not exposed to public eye'** (Art & Life in Africa, accessed Aug. 2011 at: <https://africa.uima.uiowa.edu/peoples/show/Lega>). **'Masks with heart-shaped, concave faces painted with white pigment are owned, in some areas, by every male member of the** [most advanced levels] **of the bwami association'** (African Art Museum, accessed Aug. 2011 at: <http://www.zyama.com/lega/C552lega.htm>).

Fang mask, Gabon, Africa, c. 19th century, the Pavillon des Sessions in Louvre Museum

Lega Bwami masks, Congo, Africa, c.1915-1945, collection of David Norden, Belgium

Ivory Lega Mask,
Royal Museum for Central Africa, Belgium,
acquired: 1939; collected: Maniema, Congo

Wooden Chokwe mask,
Royal Museum for Central Africa, Belgium,
acquired: 1954; collected: Kwilu, Congo

Wooden Pende Mask,
Royal Museum for Central Africa, Belgium,
acquired: 1959; collected: Kwilu, Congo

Wooden Woyo mask,
Royal Museum for Central Africa, Belgium,
acquired: 1919; collected: Bas-Congo, Congo

The Chokwe tribe were once one of the twelve clans of the great Lunda Empire of seventeenth and eighteenth century Angola. They have since spread over a wide area of eastern Angola, southern Congo and Zambia. **'They are vigorous and courageous hunters and agriculturalists, who used formerly to engage in the slave trade…Masks are used during investiture ceremonies of a chief and sacrifices to the ancestors…**[and] **play a role in male initiation…training** [which] **lasts from one to two years. Boys between the ages of eight and twelve are secluded in a camp in the wilderness, away from the village. There they are circumcised and spend several months in a special lodge where they are instructed in their anticipated roles as men. As part of their instruction, the boys are taught the history and traditions of the group and the secrets associated with the wearing and making of masks…The eyes closed to narrow slits** [of masks] **evoke those of a deceased person'** (African Art Museum, accessed Aug. 2011 at: <http://www.zyama.com/chokwe/>).

Originally from Angola, the Pende people relocated to southern Congo in the beginning of the seventeenth century. The Pende **'ancestors are placated through various rituals and offerings. The family head is responsible for taking care of the shrines and appeasing the spirits…when ancestors are neglected they cause bad things to happen…Pende masks…appear in ceremonies such as millet-planting celebration or circumcision and initiation ritual, and the ritual of enthronement of a chief. There are two styles: the western one of the Kwilu with its *mbuya* mask characterized by a somber, gloomy expression; and the Kasai style that is more geometric and colorful. The Kwilu Pende are especially well known for their masks that were originally used for circumcision ceremonies'** (African Art Museum, accessed Aug. 2011 at: <http://www.zyama.com/pende/>).

The Woyo tribe of Africa, who left the Congo River cataracts area sometime prior to the fifteenth century, live along the Atlantic coast in Congo and Angola near the mouth of the Congo River. **'Masks are used during initiations, funerals of important individuals or may have social control functions or are used by diviners and healers…The subtle relief carving of the face with the down turned mouth with teeth was painted a dots color applied by fingertips to further set it off from the face painted a startling white to indicate understanding and knowledge. This use of color reflects the complex symbolism of color…such as red for bravery, male potency or black for darkness and white to illustrate illumination and knowledge or femininity, fertility and social harmony. White also makes reference to female ancestral spirits'** (Africa Direct, accessed Aug. 2011: see <www.wtmsources.com/192>).

I have included these details because while I, and those helping with this research, have found only one suggestion in the literature to indicate that these extraordinary masks *are* meant to represent the white skulls of deceased ancestors, I think it's clear from these descriptions that that is, in fact, what they are. Such sacred importance is placed on the skulls of ancestors that for the Lega **'the skulls of the ancestors, which are placed in a hut at the center of the village…are not exposed to public eye'**, with **'Masks with heart-shaped, concave faces painted with white pigment…owned…by every male member of the'** elite. The description of the Fang mask mentioned that the **'color' 'white'** is **'linked with the dead'**. The Chokwe quote also mentioned that **'The eyes closed to narrow slits** [in their masks] **evoke those of a deceased person.'**

Interestingly, the most distinctive feature of a human skull is its large eye sockets, which clearly the **'heart-shaped, concave faces'** of almost all the masks I have seen from these tribes capture, but the problem for an artist is that if they don't put eyes in the concave sockets the face has no feeling or emotional presence, which is needed if a connection is to be forged with the ancestor they represent. On the other hand, if the artist places round eyes into the

concave socket to give it presence the mask takes on the appearance of a living person, not a dead ancestor; this 'awake' effect is apparent in two of the masks in the photo of the Lega collection above. It seems clear that the answer to this problem was to make the eyes slits, so that the mask still represented the skull of a deceased person, but was not vacant and devoid of presence—which is why **'eyes closed to narrow slits evoke those of a deceased person'**.

As such, I think these masks are clearly representations of the skulls of ancestors that were used in the very important ritual of ancestor worship. But while the veneration of ancestors has been practiced by many, if not most, tribal peoples around the world, these ancestor skull masks, from these few tribes from the Congo River region of Africa, are the only ones I have found. The question this raises is why haven't other tribes around the world made ceremonial mask representations of the skulls of their ancestors? I think the very good reason is because, as mentioned earlier, the more upset people became the more unbearable it became to confront the truth of how soul-dead they were, *and these skull masks of deceased ancestors are far too evocative of the death of our soul*. So while these masks were clearly made to represent the skulls of deceased ancestors, their accidental effect was to reveal the hidden truth of how soul-destroyed we immensely upset humans really are. The sadness, the emptiness, the grief-stricken bereavement in the expressions of these African masks is overwhelming. It is like the face of a human stripped of all facades—the human condition rendered bare. If we compare the Fang mask, for example, with the face of the boy who, the day before, had lost all his classmates in a plane crash (pictured in Part 3:8), what we see are two identical expressions—the same deeply sobered, drained-pale, long-faced, hollowed-out-cheeks, gaunt and empty, all-pretences-and-facades-stripped-away, pained-tragic-human-condition-laid-bare countenance.

Given their long agricultural history and war-like, opportunistic nature, the Bantu Africans who made these masks were obviously not as innocent as the Bushmen, but, nevertheless, they must have been *relatively* innocent to tolerate the making of masks that evoke such incredibly confronting honesty about the death of our soul. I can't imagine extremely upset races coping with such honesty in their everyday lives, even if that honesty wasn't intentional. But not only did these Bantu people tolerate the confronting honesty of these masks in their midst, they cultivated it, encouraged it, ultimately developing it into an extremely sophisticated, stylised art form. Of course, having been able to tolerate the inadvertent honesty of these masks, these tribes would have also benefited from the exorcism of the truth of the loss of soul that the masks then facilitated. These masks are absolutely extraordinarily revealing and thus exorcising of the tragic, lonely, sad demise of our true, all-loving original instinctive self or soul. It has been suggested that the long face of some of these masks symbolises **'the soberness of one's duty that comes with power'** (<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mask>, accessed Dec. 2010), but I suspect that what happened is that once these obviously extremely soul-guided and thus talented artists recognised the accidental therapeutic value of their art they deliberately developed it—some of their creations are just too powerfully honest for there to be any other interpretation.

Another illustration of the relative innocence of these Bantu Africans is that not one of the many hundreds of their masks that I have seen appears to exorcise anger. Amongst the collection held at the Royal Museum for Central Africa, I did find some masks that showed ferocious aggression, but when looking at their origins it turned out they were either from Mexico or from the Iroquois Indians of North America. Another interesting observation I made when looking at the RMCA collection and that of other museums was that the masks

that were made by Bantu tribes from further north in Africa, such as Nigeria, Liberia and Côte d'Ivoire (Ivory Coast), all seemed to be missing the authentic connection to reality and truth that the masks from the Congo region exhibited. The sensitive presence so apparent in the Congo masks was gone, replaced by superficial, bland, inane expressions, even silly looking smiles and, often as not, by completely mad, demonic grimaces. But at a certain point in the development of upset that is what happened—people's psychological situations became so messed up they lost all moorings to anything real. Perhaps the Arab slave traders who had been coming down on raids from the north of Africa for centuries, and the Europeans who followed them, corrupted the Bantu in these central northern areas at a faster rate than those who were situated further south. Of course, the Bantu down in the Congo region *were* also horrifically brutalised for forty years, from 1880 to 1920, by Belgian colonisers who not only employed such horrific tactics as chopping off villagers' hands to intimidate the rest of the village into gathering ivory and rubber from the forests, but also exposed them to the outside world and the trauma of having their numbers decimated by diseases that they had never before been exposed to and therefore had not built up any resistance to, such as smallpox—but, despite such incursions, perhaps their prolonged isolation from exploitation and disease allowed the Congolese to remain more innocent than their northern relatives.

Overall, as is talked about later in Part 7:4, upset has been overrunning, oppressing and often replacing innocence since upset first appeared. As Sir Laurens van der Post mentioned earlier, the Bushmen of the Kalahari were, in turn, decimated by the Bantu who were, as just mentioned, brutalised by the Arabs and the Europeans. The Biblical story of Cain and Abel perfectly summarises what has been happening: **'Abel kept flocks,** [he lived the nomadic life of a shepherd, staying close to nature and innocence] **and Cain worked the soil** [he cultivated crops and domesticated animals and as a result was able to become settled and through greater interaction with other humans and being more removed from innocent nature became increasingly upset]**…Cain was** [became] **very angry, and his face was downcast** [he became depressed about his upset state and]**…Cain attacked his** [relatively innocent and thus unwittingly exposing, confronting and condemning] **brother Abel and killed him'** (Gen. 4:2, 5, 8). *Only* the finding of understanding of the human condition was going to stop the march to ever greater levels of upset. And absolutely thank goodness it has finally arrived.

To return, however, to discussing these incredible masks from around the Congo River basin, the truth of the loss of our soul that these masks helped to reveal must have been especially relieving for the adolescents amongst these tribes who were undergoing the initiation into adulthood, namely negotiating Resignation—for as the description for each of the tribes mentions, these masks were also used in initiation/Resignation rituals. Recall in Part 3:8 how much it helped the art critic Robert Hughes to find that etching of Goya's *The sleep of reason brings forth monsters* when he was negotiating Resignation. Well, I doubt that an adolescent who was going through Resignation could find anywhere in the world an expression that captured the agony they were going through more accurately than the ivory Lega mask; I have never seen such a pure representation of inner suffering.

This further quote about the use of these masks in initiation ceremonies is interesting, especially its reference to the **'energy'** of resigning adolescents being **'dangerous and destabilizing to society'**. Adults have always been unable to cope with the agony and distress that adolescents went through when negotiating Resignation, and have, as a result, sought to assist, if not force, the adolescent through to resigned adulthood as directly as possible; as mentioned, the

Chokwe even started this **'danger'**-avoiding process when their children were **'eight'** years old: **'As people change physically, especially at adolescence** [actually, as has been explained, it was the psychological not the physical change that was painful for adolescents]**, old age, and death, masking rituals are performed to mark the transition and make it safe. Adolescent energy, for example, can be dangerous and destabilizing to society. To insure a safe transition, groups of young boys, for example, may be gathered and kept away from their village for long periods of time while they are taught the ways of masculine adulthood'** (*Masks – The Functions of Masking*, accessed Aug. 2011 at: <https://science.jrank.org/pages/10098/Masks-Functions-Masking.html>).

Interestingly, many of the masks feature tears—as seen in two of the masks I have included here. I have not found any explanation for these tears, but I know that the secret to being a good healer is the ability to empathise with those who are suffering, and there can probably be no greater empathetic connection for someone suffering than for their healer to be crying for them. I think I would find an ancestor who was crying for me much more therapeutic than one who wasn't, so this might be the reason for the tears. Indeed, in addition to ceremonial and initiation rituals, these ancestor skull masks were actually used for healing—the Pende mask I've included was described in the literature accompanying it as a **'sickness mask'**—which makes sense since the masks are so therapeutic.

Although it was not their primary intention, a measure of just how extraordinarily suggestive these masks are of the true extent of the inner devastation, loneliness, emptiness and sadness of our lives under the duress of the human condition can be gained by how deeply they effect us when we look at them. We are such miserable wrecks of what a human could and should be, so it is relieving for our true self to see such honesty. Indeed, the extraordinary therapeutic, exorcising power of these masks from the Congo region of Africa has led to them being considered amongst the finest creations in the art world. For instance, a Fang mask very similar to the one shown sold for around $US7 million in 2006 (Lot 193, Vérité auction, Paris, Jun. 2006).

It is no wonder some of the world's greatest artists have been influenced by these African masks. A 2010 documentary, titled *Paris The Luminous Years*, describes how **'The walls of his** [Pablo Picasso's] **studio were hung with African masks and African musical instruments. There was severe competition in those days** [the very early 1900s] **between** [the great artists] **Picasso,** [André] **Derain,** [Henri] **Matisse and** [Georges] **Braque, as to who could discover the most beautiful African heads.** [As Braque said] **Negro masks open new horizons to me. They put me in touch with things instinctive'** (Thirteen production). And indeed, Picasso himself said he experienced a **'revelation'** (*Picasso*, Rubin & Fluegel, 1980, p.87) while viewing African art at a Paris museum and his painting *Les Demoiselles d'Avignon* (see next image) was the first work to result from that inspiration. The two faces on the right were especially inspired by the African masks Picasso saw in the museum, which were **'similar in style'** to the **'Fang sculpture'** that I have included in the selection above (Accessed 3 Feb. 2011 at: <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Picasso's_African_Period>). Picasso also perfectly understood the healing value of masks, saying, **'The** [African] **masks were not simply sculptures like any other. Not at all. They were magic objects…They were weapons. To help people stop being ruled by spirits, to free themselves. Tools. <u>If we give a form to these spirits, we become free</u>…I understood why I became a painter…*Les Demoiselles d'Avignon* must have come to me that very day** [when I visited the museum and saw the African masks]**, but not at all because of the forms; because it was my first exorcism painting'** (In a conversation with André Malraux in 1937; André Breton, *Oeuvres Completes*, ed. M. Bonnet, 1988). Yes, as Christ

said, **'the truth will set you free'** (Bible, John 8:32). I might add that in Picasso's representation the eyes are open, not closed like they are in the masks, and as a result his depictions are not nearly as effective in revealing the extent of our alienation. Later in Part 7:5 we will see how the artist Francis Bacon got the eyes-closed, twisted-face representation of our alienated human condition right, just as the African artists did way before modern art was invented. Indeed, it could be said that the honesty imbued in these African masks cracked the denial being practiced by humans today and laid the way for modern art. Such is the power of innocence.

Les Demoiselles d'Avignon by Pablo Picasso, 1907

To return now to the more abridged description of our species' journey through its adolescence, throughout which technology was also growing in its sophistication. For instance, sharpened stones, choppers, hand axes and scrapers, cudgels, spears, harpoons and bone needles appear in the archaeological record from 3 million years onwards, while other evidence shows that *H. erectus* made refined tear-drop shaped flint axe heads and that even the earliest of this species were using fire, as indicated by the remnants of hearths at Koobi Fora in Kenya. However, it is only in the final 14,000 of those two million years that the most dramatic improvements have occurred—it was then that the bow and arrow, fish basket traps and crude boats first appeared, while the practice of agriculture and the domestication of animals, which both began around 11,000 years ago, prompted the associated production of earthenware pottery, looms, hoes, ploughs and reaping-hooks. Around 7,000 years ago the Stone Age was replaced by the so-called Bronze Age, which in turn was replaced around 3,100 years ago by the Iron Age.

It needs to be emphasised that throughout these epochs of time the whole development of upset was being driven by increasing intelligence. The more intelligent we were, the more we searched for understanding and the more upset we became—and with each new level of upset a new psychological and accompanying physical existence and state emerged, including increased alienation.

The following two graphs chart the psychological journey that humanity has been on, with the top graph charting the development over time of mental cleverness, as indicated by brain volume, and the bottom graph charting the development of cooperativeness or integration.

Fig. 2: The Development of Mental Cleverness
(Brain volume is used as a guide to mental cleverness)

Fig. 3: The Development of Integration

We can see that while the brain size of Childman (the australopithecines) was not much bigger than Infantman (such as common chimpanzees and bonobos), a sudden increase in brain size occurred with the emergence of the first Adolescentman, *H. habilis*, when the need to think and understand began in earnest as a result of the emergence of the dilemma of the human condition. This dramatic growth continued through Adventurous Adolescentman (*H. erectus*) and Angry Adolescentman (*H. sapiens*) before finally plateauing with Pseudo Idealistic Adolescentman (*H. sapiens sapiens*). Anthropologists have long wondered why this growth stopped. The reason is that in Pseudo Idealistic Adolescentman a balance was struck between the need for cleverness and the need for soundness; between knowledge-finding yet corrupting mental cleverness and conscience-obedient yet non-knowledge-finding lack of mental cleverness, with the average IQ today representing that relatively safe conscience-subordinate compromise. The bottom graph shows that by five million years ago nurturing had enabled our ancestors to live in an utterly cooperative state. However, with conscious self-management, and with it the upsetting battle of the human condition, becoming fully developed some two million years ago, we see that the graph charts a rapid increase in upset from that time to the present, where, as will be described, we faced the prospect of terminal levels of alienation and social disintegration.

Part 3:11D Angry Adolescentman

The Angry Adulthood Stage of Adolescent Humanity

The Angry Adolescentman stage was when we encountered the reality, frustration and anger of trying but failing to defeat the ignorance of our idealistic instinctive self or soul and had to learn to Self Discipline to contain or civilise our now overly upset state.

The species: *Homo sapiens*—0.5 million (500,000) to 0.05 million (50,000) years ago
The individual: 30 to 40 years old

Drawing by J. Griffith © 1993-2022 Fedmex Pty Ltd

Throughout our 20s we individually, or, in the case of humanity, *H. erectus*, settled into the long, corrupting journey to find understanding, ultimately understanding of why we became corrupted in the first place. But, tragically, the more we searched for knowledge

the more upset we became, and the more upset the human race as a whole became, and the more new generations had to contend with that ever-accumulating upset. It was an extremely upset-compounding situation. As the graph charting humanity's increase in upset over the last two million years shows, for the first three-quarters of the journey (basically to the end of Adventurous Adolescentman, *H. erectus'* reign), the rate of increase in upset was not great. However, in the last quarter of that time period (during the reign of Angry Adolescentman, *H. sapiens*) the graph descended markedly, and then, in the final 50,000 years (during the reign of Pseudo Idealistic Adolescentman, *H. sapiens sapiens*), it entered into free fall—upset began to compound at an extremely rapid rate, a rate that only ends with the rise of human-condition-understood-and-ameliorated TRANSFORMED, Adultman or Triumphantman or Godman.

A contributing factor to the speeding up of this progression in upset was the hardship and confinement of life throughout the four great ice ages that occurred during the Pleistocene epoch, the period from 1.8 million years to 10,000 years ago. These ice ages greatly contributed to the increase in upset because, in forcing close habitation between people of varying degrees of upset, they dramatically accentuated the difficulties encountered by humans coexisting under the strain of the human condition, to the point where life today, towards the bottom of the graph, has become so difficult that even coupling has proved untenable for many, with marriage breakdown a common occurrence.

The closer humans lived during humanity's adolescence and/or the more difficult the living conditions, the greater the occurrence and spread and thus increase in upset. Innocence doesn't last long in New York's Times Square or Sydney's Kings Cross where drug pushers, prostitutes, muggers and beggars work the streets. And as those from cold climates will attest, winters *are* particularly confining and testing, and so each great ice age did, in effect, represent one *very* long, trying winter. It is not surprising then that out of the hardship of each of the great ice ages came the next more upset/soul-exhausted/embattled/alienated stage of humans. From the rigours of the first great ice age, called the Günz Ice Age, came the flowering of *H. erectus*. *H. sapiens* emerged after the second ice age, the Mindel Ice Age, while Neanderthal man, a precursor of *H. sapiens sapiens*, appeared after the third ice age, the Riss Ice Age. *H. sapiens sapiens* emerged after the Würm Ice Age, the fourth ice age. Each ice age also contributed significantly to the culling of the human race in terms of humans' ability to adapt to life under the duress of the human condition—because as upset increased throughout humanity's adolescence many individuals must have, in effect, quit the great battle humanity was waging against the ignorance of our instinctive self or soul through not being able to survive the degree of compromise to their soul that was increasingly being demanded of them, leaving only the most courageous and enduring. But just how toughened the human race became is now hidden under layer upon layer of self-restraint, or what we call 'civility'. This restraining, civilising process will be explained shortly, but the point being made here is that beneath our facade of restraint and manufactured positiveness, which was so necessary to cope with the horror of the human condition, lies a highly genetically toughened individual.

But to return once more to humanity's journey through its adolescence, by the age of 30 in the case of the individual, or by some half a million years ago in the case of humanity, the exponential increase in upset meant that the levels of upset had exceeded the graph of upset's inflection point and had entered the stage where upset increased *rapidly*. Upset, namely

anger, egocentricity and alienation, increased dramatically from that time on and while all the adjustments that were made during the Adventurous 20s had served us well—both as individuals and, in the case of humanity, as members of *H. erectus*—there was now an urgent need to take more specific measures to manage the new extreme levels of upset.

If we consider what happened to the 21-year-old more closely we can see why management of upset had become such a serious matter, for despite their bravery and sheer optimism, it wasn't long before the reality of, in the case of the resigned, trying to win the battle of proving you were good and not bad—or, in the case of the unresigned, trying to reform upset behaviour—started to sour. Gradually he or she came to experience and appreciate just how truly difficult it was to self-manage and contain upset without the ameliorating understanding of upset.

The problem for those who were resigned was the harder you fought to validate yourself, the more criticism you attracted from your idealistic soul, and thus the more upset you became. Also, throughout your 20s, you were increasingly encountering the upsetting difficulty of trying to survive and compete alongside *other* embattled humans who were *also* trying to prove their worth. The resulting compounding of upset meant that by the time you were 30 you were becoming very frustrated and angry, and by the time you reached your mid-30s you were becoming a seriously upset, embattled person. While 20-year-olds were naive about the difficulties of living under the duress of the human condition, 30-year-olds had become realists about such an existence. The song *I Was Only Joking*, which was written by Gary Grainger and Rod Stewart and released by Stewart in 1977, contains lyrics that vividly describe the reality check of reaching 30: **'Me and the boys thought we had it sussed. Valentinos all of us…running free, Waging war with society…But nothing ever changed…What kind of fool was I. I could never win…Illusions of that grand first prize, are slowly wearing thin… I guess it had to end.'**

Our previous inability to defend our corruption has meant that it hasn't been possible to admit it, however, the following Japanese proverb does, at least, acknowledge the stages of its development: **'At 10 man is an animal, at 20 a lunatic, at 30 a failure, at 40 a fraud and at 50 a criminal.'** But with understanding of the human condition now found we can finally explain these stages. Ten-year-olds were **'animals'** in the sense that their instinctive selves were unrepressed. Twenty-year-olds—and young men in particular—were **'lunatics'** in the sense that they were swashbuckling cavaliers who deludedly believed they could take on and overthrow the ignorant world. Thirty-year-olds (and again, men in particular) were **'failures'** in the sense that, although they were still determinedly trying to defy the inevitable, they were being forced to accept that the corrupting life of seeking power, fame, fortune and glory was not going to be a genuinely meaningful and thus satisfying way of living. As will be described shortly when the 40-year-old stage is explained, at this age men in particular were **'frauds'** in the sense that they had become so corrupted and disenchanted with their efforts to 'conquer the world' that they suffered a 'mid-life crisis'—a crisis of confidence that resulted in their decision to take up support of some form of 'idealism' in order to make themselves feel better about their corrupted state. Having had enough of the critically important, yet horribly corrupting, battle to champion the ego over soul, they effectively changed sides to become 'born-again' supporters of the soul's 'idealistic' world. This 'born-again' conversion to taking up support of some form of idealism made them **'frauds'** because they were deluding themselves that they

were at last on the side of good when, in truth, they were working *against* good, in the sense that good depended on defying and defeating—not supporting—the ignorant 'idealistic' world of the soul. They were being *pseudo* idealistic, not *genuinely* idealistic. As will be described when the 50-year-old stage is explained, at this age men in particular were **'criminals'** in the sense that they had become so disillusioned with the extreme dishonesty of the born-again state that they had returned to the battle of championing the ego over ignorance, but were, by this stage of their personal journey, *so* deeply upset that they were extremely angry and cynical about life—basically, they knew they were beaten on every front and *had* become bitter and vengeful **'criminals'**.

Thus, we can see that the 30-year-old stage or, in the case of humanity, the life of *H. sapiens*, was characterised by extreme frustration and anger. Thirty-year-olds/*H. sapiens* had entered the rapidly deteriorating stage in the development of upset where they were brought into contact with the destructive and depressing horror of being either excessively upset in the case of the resigned, or having had their innocence destroyed and thus also become overly upset if they were unresigned. Upset was becoming overwhelming *everywhere*.

It was at this point that the radical measures alluded to earlier had to be implemented to contain the upset in the world, with the first solution to practice <u>self discipline</u> of the upset.

Fully aware that upset was not desirable we had been trying to, with varying success, practice self-restraint of our upset ever since it first appeared in our childhood. But what happened during our 30s when upset started to become seriously destructive of the fabric of our society was that self discipline became a *critical* part of our behaviour, something that everyone *had to* make sure they practiced. And so we learnt to manufacture a calm, controlled, even compassionate and considerate exterior, and to conceal the real extent of our, by now, inner savage fury from being so unjustly condemned by the Godly ideals of life. We, as we say, *civilised* our upset, brought it under control. Since this self discipline, and its civilising effect, has been the primary way of managing our extremely upset state and has been practiced since time immemorial, it has become, to a large degree, an automatic, instinctive element of human behaviour, so much so that we now hardly notice we are practicing it—to the extent that we are barely aware of just how upset we really are underneath our restrained exterior. As emphasised at the beginning of this Part, the truth is there is volcanic upset within us as a species from living for so long with the injustice of being condemned as evil, bad and worthless when we intuitively knew we weren't but couldn't explain why we weren't. The Australian writer Morris West offered a rare honest insight into the extent of the upset that exists in *all* humans today when he wrote that **'The disease of evil** [now able to be understood as upset] **is pandemic; it spares no individual, no society, because all are predisposed to it…I know that, given the circumstances and the provocation, I could commit any crime in the calendar'** (*A View from the Ridge: The Testimony of a Pilgrim*, 1996, p.78 of 143).

Through civility we not only concealed the extent of our anger and egocentricity, we also concealed the extent of our alienation—the extent of our estrangement from our original, upset-free, happy, innocent true selves. We manufactured smiles and politely greeted acquaintances with 'Good morning' and asked 'How are you?' and talked about totally non-confronting subjects, such as the weather. In order not to be overcome by the true negativity of life under the duress of the human condition we have had to, as it's said,

'put on a brave face', 'keep our chin up', 'stay positive', and 'keep up appearances'. But while such civility and positivity made living together possible, it was an extreme form of pretence—of being what we were not. But, in turn, while this falseness was highly corrosive of any young innocents looking on, it was far less destructive than allowing our real upset to express itself and has therefore been a very necessary and effective tool. However, after millennia of use, our civility now hides the extent to which we have blocked out the truth of our upset, corrupted, alienated condition. So when, for instance, we donned scary masks we were, in effect, exorcising our *real* upset self—we were being honest about ourselves; we were admitting that '*This* is what I am *really* like, this is who I've become.' R.D. Laing spoke the truth about just how corrupted our species has become when he said, **'The condition of alienation…is the condition of the normal man…between *us* and It** [our true self or soul] **there is a veil which is more like fifty feet of solid concrete.'** It needs to be emphasised that adopting self discipline did not mean we had stopped the corrupting search for knowledge, we had just decided to try not to allow any expression or manifestation of our corruption to show. When the 40-year-old stage is explained in more detail shortly we will see that when upset developed even further, some individuals were forced to abandon, and even side against, the corrupting search for knowledge in a far more drastic attempt to slow the increase in their upset by becoming 'born again' to pseudo idealistically supporting some form of idealism. (This is, of course, the **'fraud'** stage that featured in the aforementioned Japanese proverb.)

So while civility did have its place, it invariably meant bottling-up our frustrations and angers, which produced another problem of how then to relieve that pent-up state. And so, unable to be honest about our internal upset, we had to learn to valve off and relieve ourselves in ways that weren't destructive. The origin of humour, for example, has never been able to be properly explained, but once it is understood how false humans became the source of humour becomes very clear. For the most part, adults maintain a carefully constructed facade of denial, but every now and then a mistake is made, we 'slip-up', and the truth of our real situation is revealed, providing the basis for humour. Occasionally situations occurred where the extreme denial, self-deception, delusion, artificiality, alienation became apparent and transparent, and in those moments the truth of that immense falseness was exposed for what it really was—so farcical it *was* funny; in fact, a 'joke'. When someone tripped or fell over, for instance, it *was* humorous because suddenly their carefully constructed, civilised image of togetherness disintegrated. We take humour for granted now as being a natural part of our make-up, but there was a time when there was no humour because prior to becoming false there was nothing very comic or silly or funny or absurd about humans to laugh about or make fun of.

Swearing has been another way of tearing down and breaking free from the extreme dishonesty of our condition—because in what is a stark measure of just how dishonest humans have been, we don't even have an everyday word for all the evasions and dishonest denials and delusions we practice every minute of the day, except for the swear word 'bullshit', or 'BS' or 'bull' or 'crap'. To understand why 'fuck' is such a powerful swear word we only have to acknowledge the truth of what sex really is. As explained, while sex at its noblest level was something that marvellously complemented the human journey and as such

has truly been an act of love, it has, nevertheless, at base been about attacking innocence (which women represent) for innocence's unjust condemnation of humans' (especially men's) lack of innocence. 'Fuck' means destroy or ruin, and what is being destroyed or ruined or sullied or degraded or violated is innocence or purity. Sex has been such a preoccupation of humans and yet everyone lives in denial of the truth that it is, at base, an attack on innocence. This makes sex one of the biggest lies and thus jokes of all, which is why using the word 'fuck' is such a powerful attack on the world of lies, and thus such a powerful swear word.

As emphasised, however, civilising our upset didn't stop its development, it only concealed and helped contain it. It was inevitable then, that as the corrupting search for knowledge continued, levels of upset were only going to escalate until eventually, by our late 30s, we/*H. sapiens* were embroiled in a rage of hate and anger. Because of the compounding effect of upset we became immensely embattled, 'punch-drunk' in fact, which made us absolutely desperate about our situation. On reaching this state of extreme anger and destructiveness we began to hate even ourselves. Life had become both personally and socially unbearable, an untenable position that produced a crisis, the well-known 'mid-life crisis' of the early 40-year-old, or, in the case of humanity, the emergence some 50,000 years ago of *H. sapiens sapiens*.

Part 3:11E Pseudo Idealistic Adolescentman

The Born-Again, Pseudo Idealistic Late Adulthood Stage of Adolescent Humanity

The Pseudo Idealistic Adolescentman stage encompasses the time of the 'mid-life crisis' and the adoption of Pseudo Idealism—the 'born-again in support of cooperative idealism' lifestyle.

The species: *Homo sapiens sapiens*—0.05 million (50,000) years ago to the present day
The individual: 40 to 50 years old

Drawing by Jeremy Griffith © 1991-2011 Fedmex Pty Ltd

In this 40-year-old stage, upset was compounding at such a rapid rate that the graph charting its intensity did go into free fall, with social disintegration an imminent prospect. But with upset compounding throughout humanity's adolescence, we always knew that if we didn't find the relieving understanding of the human condition in time then eventually the human race *would* enter a final end play stage where the levels of upset anger, egocentricity and alienation *would* threaten to destroy humanity. And this fear did play out: the two million year race our species has been involved in between self-destruction and self-discovery *did* finally enter this crisis stage some 50,000 years ago and the variety of humans involved was *H. sapiens sapiens*—us, anatomically modern humans who emerged from *H. sapiens* at about that time. In the case of the individual growing up during humanity's human-condition-afflicted, insecure adolescence, this was when, at about 40 years of age, we entered our so-called 'mid-life crisis'.

At this point in our journey, our upset had become so great that, on one hand, we were hating the condemnation from the cooperative idealistic world of our soul with such fervour that we were beginning to become murderously behaved, while on the other we were despising ourselves for being so upset and destructive of the world. Although we had, through the measures taken through our 30s, developed a great deal of instinctive capacity to restrain and conceal—civilise—our upset, it was becoming so great that it all too readily broke out, revealing the extremely angry person we had become. So despite all our efforts to 'conquer the world' if we were resigned, or 'fix the world' if we were unresigned, all we had to now show for ourselves was an overly upset individual—in truth, a wreck of a person. In the words of *The Man of La Mancha*, we had finally **'marched into hell…**[and became] **scorned and covered with scars'**—that was the price we had to pay for pursuing the **'heavenly cause'** of trying to prove that the human race is fundamentally good and not bad.

But what could we do? The so-called 'mid-life crisis' long associated with becoming 40 years old had arrived. The essential problem for us personally was that we were loathing and depressed about what we and our world had become—a crisis that has parallels with the situation that we faced in our early adolescence when we first started thinking philosophically about the corruption both in the world and in ourselves. The journalist Ali Gripper acknowledged this parallel in an article titled 'Turning 40 and Frantic, Mid life crisis', writing that **'Mid life is undoubtedly a recycling of adolescent issues. It is as if the psyche goes back and picks up the threads of what we were dealing with as teenagers'** (*Sydney Morning Herald*, 29 Mar. 1996). As with the situation that occurred in early adolescence, when resigning individuals were faced with extreme states of despair and depression about their circumstances, or unresigned individuals were faced with the ever-increasing wrongness of the world around them, so 40-year-olds were faced with variously extreme states of desperation about their situation. And like the adolescent struggling with their extreme despair and depression, the 40-year-old's mind similarly searched frantically for a way to solve the problem of their now untenable situation. And just as the unbearably upset and psychologically desperate adolescent came up with a desperate solution to put aside the reality of their circumstances completely by resigning themself to living in denial of cooperative ideality and thus the depressing issue of the human condition, so too did the, by now, extremely corrupted 40-year-old—BUT this time the evasion was achieved through focusing on the positive, guilt-relieving effect or feeling that came from

being civilised. The angry 30-year-old had learnt to restrain/civilise their upset, but what the desperate 40-year-old realised in their frantic search to find a solution to their problem was that being civilised or 'well-behaved' or 'good' produced a guilt-relieving positive feeling and that this was the one positive in their life that they could derive some reinforcement from.

When humans are psychologically cornered they typically 'scan the horizon' for any positive, no matter how small it is, and make a huge deal out of it, and this situation was no different. Frantically scanning for any positive that could be employed to escape condemnation and depression, it was the *side effect* of feeling good when we behaved in a civilised way that the 40-year-old latched onto to develop. Indeed, in the case of the more extremely upset 40-year-old, *so* desperate were they for relief from the horror and guilt of their situation that their mind decided to focus so completely on the positive that they were good when they behaved in a cooperative, civilised, ideal, loving way that they deluded themselves that they actually weren't corrupted, that they weren't massively upset human-condition-afflicted people. They convinced themselves that the mask or facade of civility was not actually a mask or facade at all, but the representation of their real self, their *true* state—'I am behaving in a cooperative, loving way, therefore I *am* an upset-free, guilt-free, human-condition-eliminated, thoroughly good, cooperative, loving, sound human.' It was an *extraordinarily* false/dishonest/deluded interpretation, but the depression from feeling guilty/bad/worthless about being *so* upset was *so* great that their mind was well and truly capable of making such a grand delusion. The situation was similar to the resigned person being so overwhelmed by the depression caused by their predicament that they were capable of making the extremely false interpretation that instead of having integrative, 'Godly', unconditionally selfless, moral instincts, we actually live in a non-integrative world of random, directionless change, and have selfish, competitive, survival-of-the-fittest animal instincts that make us competitive and aggressive, and therefore there is no psychological dilemma of the human condition to have to explain.

This 40-year-old 'do good in order to delude yourself that you are actually good, that you are actually free of corruption and thus the dilemma of the human condition', extremely deluded strategy of coping with the problem of the now massively corrupted human-condition-afflicted state has been so seductive that it developed into an industry so huge and so influential that the dishonesty involved threatened to destroy humanity.

To elaborate, while being civilised—that is, using self discipline to restrain and contain your upset so it didn't show—did help contain destructive behaviour and provide relief from doing so, what happened during the 40-year-old stage, for both humanity and humans individually, was that this relieving, 'feel good', 'warm inner glow', 'blissed out' positive of having restrained your upset and behaved in a 'good'/ideal/cooperative way became the *entire* focus of existence. In the end, as we will see, when humans became extremely upset—saturated with the problem of the corrupted state of the human condition—their whole mental preoccupation became one of searching for situations and opportunities where, through doing 'good', they could derive 'the rush' of relief from the condemning issue and truth of their corrupted state. So again, while the 30-year-old used civilising self discipline to restrain and conceal their upset, unlike the 40-year-old they *weren't* using it to delude themselves that they were ideally behaved, upset-free, guilt-free, human-condition-eliminated, sound people.

The immense danger of this preoccupation with relief-hunting through 'doing good' was that it could become so consuming, so addictive and thus selfishly indulged that it could stop the all-important search for knowledge, because if there was too much preoccupation with 'doing good' it could result in insufficient tolerance of the corruption that unavoidably resulted from pursuing humanity's heroic search for knowledge—ultimately self-knowledge, the liberating understanding of the human condition. If there was too much emphasis on cooperative idealism humanity would never find the liberating understanding of the human condition, and if it didn't find that liberating understanding humanity would be condemned to the eventual emergence of terminal levels of upset—in particular, unbearable levels of the psychosis and neurosis of alienation from having to adopt excessive amounts of psychological denial and delusion. In short, the *dogma* of doing good could oppress and even stop the all-important search for knowledge by denying the *freedom* to be, to a degree, corrupted. As we will see, this extremely dangerous situation did arise; humanity *did* face a death by dogma, a fate that only the finding of the liberating understanding of the human condition—that science has made possible and which is being presented here—saves humanity from.

The danger of excessive oppression of freedom was particularly great because of the massively seductive effects of relief-hunting. If we return to the Adam Stork analogy for describing the human condition, at any time Adam could surrender to his criticising instinctive self and fly back on course, obey his instinctive orientation, and by so doing stop and thus relieve the criticism emanating from his instinctive self, but that meant abandoning the all-important search for knowledge. And in the case of humans, when *we* 'flew off course' and became angry, egocentric and alienated the sense of guilt from defying our cooperatively orientated, all-loving, 'Godly', moral instincts was immense, so for us 'flying back on course' was an *extremely* guilt-relieving, and thus an *extremely* tempting, option.

There was, however, a further, very significant dimension to the problem of 'flying back on course'—being, as we revealingly say, 'born again' to supporting instead of resisting the cooperative ideals our instinctive self dogmatically demanded—which was that since our instinctive self was orientated to behaving cooperatively, when we abandoned the search for knowledge by taking up support of cooperative idealism we were not only abandoning the battle to champion our ego or conscious thinking self over our idealistic instinctive self or soul, *we were also* siding against those fighting the battle. We weren't just 'taking a rest' to recuperate, we had actually switched camps/allegiances to side with the enemy. It was completely subversive, mad behaviour—in fact, an act of cowardice and treachery—because in switching sides the individual was basically saying, 'I don't care about humanity anymore, I only care about making myself feel good and relieving my own guilt.' They were being totally selfish, the complete opposite of the selfless and ideal person they were deluding themselves they were. And since the lie they were maintaining was so great, in order to maintain it they had to work very hard at convincing both themselves and others of it, which meant they were typically a strident, extremely intolerant, even fanatical, advocate of their position.

Yes, in choosing to be 'born again' you had to work *very* hard at maintaining the conviction that what you were doing was right because, while we haven't been able to explain, confront or talk about it, the truth is all humans who have lived during humanity's adolescence have intuitively been aware of the battle of having to overthrow the ignorant

idealism of our soul—when we shook our fist at the heavens we were saying, 'One day, one day we are going to prove that we humans are good and not bad.' We *knew* that to give up the battle against our idealistic soul, and not just give it up but side with the enemy and against those trying to win the battle, was a crime against all those still fighting for understanding, and against humanity as a whole. So despite how tempting an option it was, in reality the revulsion of siding against humanity and those fighting the battle meant that it took a great deal of despair and fear of depression about being overly corrupt to give up the battle and change sides.

We intuitively knew that changing sides and being born-again to living in support of the cooperative ideal world of our soul, while immensely relieving, was also immensely loathsome. The delusion, dishonesty and betrayal involved *was* immense, but for ever-increasing numbers of people the need for relief from feeling guilty/bad about themselves became so great it could not be resisted.

Again, the great danger was that, since upset was the price of searching for knowledge, if everyone became addicted to selfishly indulging the relief of 'doing good to feel good' there would be no tolerance of non-ideal upset behaviour, and humanity's all-important search for knowledge, ultimately liberating self-knowledge, would be shut down, condemning humanity to eventual terminal levels of alienation and thus extinction. So while Resignation to living in denial of the issue of the human condition and taking up a competitive, egocentric, selfish power-fame-fortune-and-glory-seeking lifestyle was, in itself, extremely desperate and mad behaviour, at least you were still participating in humanity's great battle to overthrow ignorance. As irresistible as it became for ever-increasing numbers of people, the 'do-good-to-feel-good-and-pretend-you're-sound-and-pretend-there's-no-need-for-any-freedom-from-idealism lifestyle' was far more desperate and far madder and far more dangerous behaviour, because you were not just abandoning humanity's great battle to liberate itself from ignorance, you were siding against it.

Certainly, the upset behaviour that resulted from participating in humanity's heroic search for knowledge was increasingly causing immense human suffering and environmental devastation, but if we didn't continue the search for knowledge then there was no hope. To put it in political terms, the harsh, brutal reality associated with what became known as 'right-wing' politics *was* bringing about immense human inequality, hardship and suffering, and it *was* destroying the planet, but it was the search-for-knowledge-oppressing so-called 'left-wing' politics that posed the real threat to the survival of the human race—because *only* the search for knowledge could lead to the finding of understanding of the human condition and the liberation of humans from that totally unbearable, crippling, soul-sickening, black-dog-depressing, real-person-extinguishing, deadening, human-life-denying condition! While, as the journalist Geoffrey Wheatcroft recognised, **'the great twin political problems of the age are the brutality of the right, and the dishonesty of the left'** (*Australian Financial Review*, 29 Jan. 1999), and, as the scientist philosopher Carl von Weizsäcker also recognised, **'The sin of modern capitalism is cynicism (about human nature), and the sin of socialism is lying'** (mentioned in a speech by Prof. Charles Birch that was reproduced in the Geelong Grammar School mag. *The Corian*, Sept-Oct. 1980), it was NOT the **'cynicism'** and **'the brutality of the right'**, BUT THE **'lying'**, **'dishonesty of the left'** that stood like a colossal ogre over the human race, threatening to destroy it!

To return to the Adam Stork analogy once more, Adam knew from the outset that he had to continue with the upsetting search for knowledge, that he could never afford to stop until the liberating understanding of his corrupted condition was found. That was his fundamental reality, *and it has remained our fundamental reality*. The Statue of Liberty is as good a symbol as any of the fundamental responsibility we humans have had to maintain *freedom*, which we can now understand means freedom from the cooperative ideals in order to continue the upsetting search for the knowledge that would allow humanity's *ultimate* freedom. Paradoxically, *real* idealism, the real path to an ideal world, depended on continuing the corrupting search for knowledge until we found the human-race-liberating understanding of the human condition. The strategy of hunting for guilt-relieving, feel-good causes was in truth pseudo or false idealism, because it meant abandoning, and, worse still, oppressing, and—even worse still—actively opposing, that all-important search for knowledge.

In summary, with so much upset in human life and in the world, humans have had to counter its effects with a degree of idealistic, concern-for-others-and-concern-for-the-world behaviour, and in truth becoming civilised did involve a degree of abandonment of the upsetting battle in favour of being idealistic and showing concern for others and the world, but, as has been explained, what happened is the feel good aspect of behaving 'ideally' evolved into an extremely dangerous industry. Again, if there was too much pseudo idealistic obedience to the 'good', cooperative ideals through too many people becoming seduced by this 'do good to feel good' preoccupation there would not be sufficient freedom from those condemning ideals to carry on the all-important corrupting search for knowledge. At any time Adam Stork could fly back on course and feel immensely relieved of the criticism emanating from his instinctive self, but he would be abandoning the heroic search for knowledge. Siding with the cooperative ideals was always going to become all but irresistible as upset from searching for knowledge became overwhelming, but we *had to* resist, *not* lose our nerve. Given it has been *so* hard to explain and argue why not being ideally behaved is good, and *so* easy to argue that being ideally behaved can't be anything but good, 'the left' has had a field day mocking 'the right' as selfish, immoral and evil, so this quote by the great German philosopher Friedrich Nietzsche (1844-1900) stands out as a brave and rare pronouncement on the need to hold our nerve and continue our great heroic battle to champion the ego over the ignorance of our instincts: **'There have always been many sickly people among those who invent fables and long for God** [ideality]**: they have a raging hate for the enlightened man and for that youngest of virtues which is called honesty…Purer and more honest of speech is the healthy body, perfect and square-built: and it speaks of the meaning of the earth** [to face truth and one day find understanding of the human condition]**…You are not yet free, you still *search* for freedom. Your search has fatigued you…But, by my love and hope I entreat you: do not reject the hero in your soul! Keep holy your highest hope!… War and courage have done more great things than charity. Not your pity but your bravery has saved the unfortunate up to now…What warrior wants to be spared? I do not spare you, I love you from the very heart, my brothers in war!'** (*Thus Spoke Zarathustra: A Book for Everyone and No One*, 1892; tr. R.J. Hollingdale, 1961, pp.61-75 of 343). The English author and journalist George Orwell (1903-1950) was another who bravely recognised the very real danger of humanity losing its nerve when he famously predicted that **'If you want a picture of the future, imagine a boot stamping on a human face** [freedom] **forever'** (*Nineteen Eighty-Four*, 1949). In fact, as mentioned and as will soon be documented, this end

play, death-by-dogma fate for the human race had all but descended upon us and is only being avoided by the eleventh-hour arrival of this understanding of the human condition.

As pointed out, all humans have been intuitively aware that when they took up the born-again, pseudo idealistic way of coping with the human condition they were siding against humanity, siding with the enemy, and that doing so was a loathsome act of cowardice and treachery. So while the desperately upset, mid-life crisis of the 40-year-old stage made taking up the born-again, pseudo idealistic way of coping a tempting option that was worth trying, the revulsion of living so treacherously caused many to change sides yet again and return to the upsetting battle of searching for knowledge. However, when they returned to the upsetting battle they could only expect to become even more upset, angry, egocentric and alienated, which introduces the final stage that living under the duress of the human condition could result in—the extremely tragic Hollow Adolescentman stage.

Part 3:11F Hollow Adolescentman

The Hollow Final Adulthood Stage of Adolescent Humanity

The Hollow Adolescentman stage represents the time when many post-40-year-olds became disillusioned with the treacherous, extremely dishonest and deluded born-again existence and returned to the upsetting battle to champion the ego over the condemning instincts. As a result, however, of this desperate turnaround was that they became even *more* upset and embattled—in fact, horrifically punch-drunk and soul-destroyed—hollow 50-year-old-plus people.

The species: the Born-again and Hollowman stages are both characteristic of *Homo sapiens sapiens'* reign—0.05 million (50,000) years ago to the present day
The individual: 50 plus years old

Drawing by Jeremy Griffith © 2011 Fedmex Pty Ltd

The soul-destroyed 50-year-old-plus human

Having succumbed to the born-again, pseudo idealistic, completely selfish, 'do good to feel good' way of coping with the, by now, extremely upset human condition, many in the 50-year-old-plus camp became so disillusioned with the extreme delusion, dishonesty and treachery of that way of coping that they returned to the upsetting battle of championing the ego over our ignorant instincts. But doing so could only mean becoming even *more* upset—that is, angry, egocentric and alienated—than they were when they were initially driven, through being so extremely upset, to adopt the pseudo idealistic way of living in the first place. In the context of that extraordinarily honest Japanese proverb included earlier, which described the stages of maturation under the duress of the human condition—**'At 10 man is an animal, at 20 a lunatic, at 30 a failure, at 40 a fraud and at 50 a criminal'**—this was the 50-year-old **'criminal'** stage where men in particular had become so angry, so punch-drunk, so bitter and vengeful that they brutally and completely repressed the condemning voice of their ideal-behaviour-demanding, cooperatively orientated soul and were now adrift in an empty, hollow, soul-less wilderness.

This 'grumpy old man', vengeful, burnt-out, empty, sad existence that men typically inhabited when they reached 50 and beyond was perfectly described by T.S. Eliot in his 1925 poem *The Hollow Men*: **'We are the hollow men / We are the stuffed men / Leaning together / Headpiece filled with straw. Alas! / Our dried voices, when / We whisper together / Are quiet and meaningless / As wind in dry grass / Or rats' feet over broken glass / In our dry cellar // Shape without form, shade without colour / Paralysed force, gesture without motion //…This is the dead land / This is cactus land / Here the stone images / Are raised, here they receive / The supplication of a dead man's hand / Under the twinkle of a fading star // Is it like this / In death's other kingdom / Waking alone / At the hour when we are / Trembling with tenderness / Lips that would kiss / Form prayers to broken stone // The eyes are not here / There are no eyes here / In this valley of dying stars / In this hollow valley / This broken jaw of our lost kingdoms // In this last of meeting places / We grope together / And avoid speech / Gathered on this beach of the tumid river //…Between the desire / And the spasm / Between the potency / And the existence / Between the essence / And the descent / Falls the Shadow /…This is the way the world ends / Not with a bang but a whimper'** (*T.S. Eliot Selected Poems*, 1954, pp.77-80 of 127).

For women, ageing during humanity's adolescence was, in its own way, similarly horrific because it meant the loss of the image of innocence that they depended on for reinforcement, the loss of their sex-object 'attractiveness', and with it, the loss of their meaning in the world—a source of meaningfulness that all women's magazines that focus entirely on how to be 'attractive' are testament to. When women are young their beauty is generally so empowering it is as if they own the world, but when they become older and their beauty/ 'attractiveness'/innocence fades they discover that they have become invisible; when they walk down the street they are no longer noticed. This quote from the French beauty therapist Diane Delaheve describes how devastating it can be for women to lose their sex appeal: **'Her eyes, the mirror of her soul, speak nothing but despair. Her face may have kept its beauty, but it has become a picture of affliction. For some women, the prospect of age is sheer tragedy, worse than death, which might be seen as an escape'** (*Sydney Morning Herald*, 4 Sept. 1988). So, while men become 'hollow', women become 'invisible'; when observing older couples walking together in the park you can see how united they are by their comparable afflictions. (Again, the roles of men and women under the duress of the human condition will be fully explained later in Part 7:1.)

An added dimension to the situation faced by older women is that in not being as responsible for the main battle of having to champion the ego over ignorance as men were, women found that their role of living in support of the battle was limited. It has been observed that a woman's life progressed from **'bimbo, breeder, babysitter to burden'**. Men, on the other hand, were directly participating in the battle of championing the ego and therefore didn't face the prospect of one day feeling they were a **'burden'** to the extent that women did. In his 1993 book *The Fisher King & The Handless Maiden*, the American Jungian analyst Robert A. Johnson relates the myth of the Handless Maiden, which tells of a miller who makes a deal with the devil in order to complete more work with less effort. The devil demands the miller's daughter as payment: **'The miller is desolate but unwilling to give up his much expanded mill, so he gives his daughter to the devil. The devil chops off her hands and carries them away'** (p.59 of 103). Waited on by her newly prosperous family, the handless maiden is content for a time, until her growing sense of desperation sends her out to the forest alone. Johnson explains that the cry of women, like that of the handless maiden, is **'What can I *do?* I feel so useless or second-rate and inferior in this world that puts its women on the rubbish heap when they are through with courtship and childbearing!'** (p.56).

Later in Part 7:2 the following drawing by British cartoonist and caricaturist Ralph Steadman will be discussed in some detail because it depicts with such incredible honesty the horror of the human condition—indeed, I have used the main dragon in this cartoon as the inspiration for my drawing above of the 50-year-old-plus stage; his eyes show the hollowness that T.S. Eliot spoke of: **'This is the dead land / This is cactus land.'** The desperately tragic, sickly state of older women is also apparent in this cartoon.

Ralph Steadman's *The Lizard Lounge* 1971

Part 3:11G The last 11,000 years

The last 11,000 years and the rise of Imposed Discipline, Religion and other forms of Pseudo Idealism

Clearly, when the level of upset in the human race as a whole reached this final Hollowman stage humanity was at end play or end game in the race between self-discovery and self-destruction. The levels of upset had become stupendous. But what could we do about it? We were stuck between two increasingly flawed options: adopting, or in some cases returning to, the extremely treacherous and fraudulent and thus dangerous born-again, pseudo idealistic, 'do good to feel good' way of living, or persevering with the ever more brutal and destructive power-fame-fortune-and-glory-seeking, egocentric, knowledge-finding, resigned competitive existence. In fact, our lives, both individually and collectively as societies for all of the last 11,000 years—when the domestication of plants and animals first began, the significance of which will be explained shortly—have been marked by the oscillation between these two extremely flawed ways of coping with the human condition. We tried living by the born-again strategy until it became unbearably irresponsible, dishonest and dangerous, and then we tried living by the resigned competitive strategy until it became too corrupting and destructive, and so on, back and forth. As has been mentioned, these two strategies were eventually refined into what we now term the 'left-wing' and 'right-wing' in politics.

We now need to examine what happened with these two strategies when, following the advent of agriculture and the domestication of animals some 11,000 years ago, upset reached a crescendo. Of the two strategies, we'll firstly look at the increasingly brutal and destructive power-fame-fortune-and-glory-seeking, egocentric, knowledge-finding, resigned competitive strategy—the approach that became known as 'right-wing'.

The significance of the domestication of plants and animals was that it led to such a rapid increase in upset that, on the graph charting the intensification of our upset, humanity was fast approaching rock-bottom—we were racing towards the bitter and vengeful, burnt-out, out-of-control, all-restraints-thrown-to-the-wind, rampaging, warring level of upset. This was because the domestication of plants and animals enabled people to live a more sedentary, less nomadic existence, in closer proximity and in greater numbers, the effect of which was to greatly increase the spread and growth of upset in humans. As explained earlier when describing the effect the ice ages had on our species, living closely under the strain of the human condition dramatically accentuated the difficulties encountered by humans who were living with upset. So it follows that the closer humans lived during humanity's adolescence and/or the more difficult the living conditions, the greater the spread of and increase in upset, and that isolation from such encounters with the battle of the human condition served to minimise the spread of upset or soul-exhaustion. In short, if we were each left alone with our personal level of exhaustion, we would not be criticised by fresher souls or corrupted by the more battle-worn. The French philosopher Jean-Paul Sartre succinctly summed up just how difficult it is for upset, alienated people to coexist when he said, **'Hell is other people'** (*Closed Doors*, 1944). As mentioned earlier, we need only look at the extreme situation to see the principle in action—innocence isn't going to survive long in New York's Times Square or

Sydney's Kings Cross where drug pushers, prostitutes, muggers and beggars work the streets. Of course, while living closer together in more organised societies did greatly increase the spread and accumulation of upset, it also assisted the spread and accumulation of knowledge. In terms then of the race between self-discovery and self-destruction, there was at this time a speeding up in the development of *both* aspects.

This explanation of how the advent of agriculture and the domestication of animals led to a rapid increase in upset allows us to better understand why, in the aforementioned Biblical story, Cain became more upset than his brother, Abel: **'Abel kept flocks** [he lived the nomadic life of a shepherd, staying close to nature and innocence]**, and Cain worked the soil** [he cultivated crops and domesticated animals and as a result was able to become settled and through greater interaction with other humans became increasingly upset]**…Cain was** [became] **very angry, and his face was downcast** [he became depressed about his upset state and]**…Cain attacked his** [relatively innocent and thus unwittingly exposing, confronting and condemning] **brother Abel and killed him'** (Gen. 4:2, 5, 8).

By some 4,000 years ago (2,000 BC) the development of villages, the movement by people into specialised occupations, the beginnings of trade and industry, and the close personal interaction that each development inevitably brought, resulted in humans becoming so upset that some could no longer contain their upset and had to live that upset out, as the story of Cain and Abel describes—they had to allow some expression of their upset if they were to find any relief from the pressure of being so upset. Men especially began to feel the periodic need to go on a rampage of raping and pillaging. Tragic examples abound, but the thirteenth century Mongol conqueror Genghis Khan was certainly someone who lived out his upset to the full, every day satisfying his anger with bloodletting, his egocentricity through the domination of others, and his mind or spirit by blocking out any feelings of guilt or remorse coming from the moral instincts within himself. As Genghis Khan is reputed to have said, **'Happiness lies in conquering one's enemies, in driving them in front of oneself, in taking their property, in savouring their despair, in outraging their wives and daughters.'**

The periodic need to go on the rampage and express, indeed purge, unbearable levels of upset resulted in endless rounds of payback warfare where warriors from one tribe or village would raid another tribe for their material goods and maidens, which in turn would provoke a counter raid, and so it went on. Clearly at this point, where the upset in humans had become so great that the warfare and killing and raping was being carried out incessantly, in wave after wave of ever-increasing ferocity and brutality, a new way to restrain upset simply had to be invented. For the truth is, despite Genghis Khan obtaining some momentary relief from feeling so upset by rampaging across the world, there would have been no inner peace in his own life, or, more significantly, any peace in his blood-soaked world.

Such extreme upset meant that Self Discipline could no longer contain or civilise the escalating levels of upset in society and so another form of restraint for those participating in the upsetting heroic search for knowledge had to be developed. The solution that emerged was Imposed Discipline—an agreed upon set of rules and laws that enforced social (integrative) behaviour through threat of punishment. Once developed, this new form of restraint proved significantly effective. For example, by the time Europeans arrived in North America a grand union of American Indian tribes, known as the Iroquois Confederacy, had been established by

two unresigned, denial-free thinkers or prophets who had emerged from within their ranks. Recognised and described by their people as **'prophets'**, these two American Indians, named Hiawatha and 'The Great Peacemaker', with all their soulful sensitive feeling and denial-free clarity of thought, were able to realise that the endless rounds of payback warfare between and within the tribes could only be prevented by everyone agreeing to certain restraining rules that were enforced through punishment. The resulting discipline proved highly effective, as this quote illustrates: **'The Iroquois Confederacy was established before European contact, complete with a constitution known as the…"Great Law of Peace"…The two prophets, Ayonwentah** [Hiawatha]**… and Dekanawidah, The Great Peacemaker, brought a message of peace to squabbling tribes…Once they ceased infighting, they rapidly became one of the strongest forces in seventeenth and eighteenth century north eastern North America'** (*The Iroquois Confederacy and the Founding Fathers*, accessed Sept. 2009; see <www.wtmsources.com/113>).

Exactly the same scenario had played out some 3,000 years prior when, in approximately 1,500 BC, the very great denial-free thinker or prophet Moses brought order to the Israelite Nation through the Ten Commandments that he had etched on stone tablets. The moral code contained in those Ten Commandments became the basis of the constitutions, laws and rules that continue to govern much of modern society and proved vital in helping rein in the kinds of upset unleashed by the likes of Genghis Khan, namely Hollow Adolescentman.

We now need to consider how the last 11,000 years affected the other strategy for coping with the human condition, which involved searching for an idealistic cause to support to make yourself feel better about your, by now, immensely upset state—the approach that later became known as 'left-wing'.

Just as the resigned competitive practitioners invented a new strategy for coping with their problem of excessive upset, which was Imposed Discipline, so born-again, pseudo idealistic practitioners came up with a new strategy for coping with the problems associated with *their* excessive upset of siding against humanity's great battle and of being excessively dishonest, which was Religion. To understand the benefit of religion we need to look further into the very serious problems associated with the born-again, pseudo idealistic strategy.

As has already been described, a serious problem with the born-again, pseudo idealistic, 'do good to feel good' strategy was that it involved siding against humanity's great battle to champion the ego over the ignorance of our instinctive self. The other very serious problem with this strategy was that because you were *behaving* in a supposedly good, ideal way you were effectively saying that you *actually were* a good, selfless, cooperative, gentle, loving, guilt-and-human-condition-free, ideal person. This was unlike the resigned competitive strategy where, firstly, you were still participating in humanity's heroic battle to find knowledge, and secondly, while you were using denial and lies to defend your upset state (asserting that there was no integrative purpose to existence, only random change, and that you were aggressive and selfish because humans had selfish instincts, and therefore there was no psychological dilemma of the human condition to have to explain), you were *not* deluding yourself you were a cooperative, loving, selfless, gentle, thoroughly good person free of upset. The born-again, pseudo idealist both abandoned the battle *and* took lying and delusion to a whole new level.

To go over this again, while the resigned competitive person continued with the heroic search for knowledge and used dishonest excuses for being upset, the born-again pseudo idealist both abandoned humanity's heroic search for knowledge *and* took the business of lying about upset to the extreme of denying even being upset in the first place. It is worth mentioning that maintaining such extreme delusion was greatly helped along by the fact that we had *already* been practicing total denial of the issue of our corrupted, human-condition-afflicted state since resigning in our early adolescent years. So, in adopting a born-again, pseudo idealist strategy, all its advocates were doing was adding another layer of delusion to one that was already well entrenched. As mentioned in Part 3:11B, while Resignation was a form of autism, of block-out/detachment/denial, pseudo idealism was an even more extreme form of it, **'autism'** being, as former president of the British Psychoanalytical Society, the psychoanalyst D.W. Winnicott explained, **'a highly sophisticated defence organization. What we see is *invulnerability*…The child carries round *the (lost) memory of unthinkable anxiety*, and the illness is a complex mental structure insuring against recurrence of the conditions of the unthinkable anxiety.'**

So, in essence, there were three states of denial. Firstly, there was the unresigned, denial-free position held by unevasive thinkers/prophets who didn't deny that humanity was involved in a great battle, and didn't deny the Godly, Integrative Meaning of existence, nor the moral soul in humans, nor the corrupted state of humanity. Secondly, there was the resigned competitive person who didn't behave as if there was no great battle that humanity was involved in and didn't deny their competitive, aggressive and selfish upset nature, but who did use dishonest excuses to cope with that upset state. And thirdly, there was the born-again pseudo idealist who denied that humanity was involved in a great battle *and* deluded themselves they were free of the upset state of the human condition—which basically meant they denied *all* the fundamental truths about our human-condition-afflicted state. The born-again, pseudo idealist took the practice of lying to the absolute extreme.

The born-again, pseudo idealistic strategy was both treacherous and extremely dishonest, traits that totally undermined the search for knowledge, because in campaigning against the battle to find knowledge you were leading humanity towards an extreme state of denial/alienation/separation from the truth/knowledge, when, in fact, humanity had to continue the battle to try to get closer to and ultimately reach the truth/knowledge/understanding of the human condition. And, as we will see, when the born-again, pseudo idealistic state became fully developed in the form of 'postmodernism' even the existence of truth itself was denied! The fundamental objective of the human journey was to find the truth about ourselves, so adopting extreme denial of the truth, especially extreme denial of the truth about the human condition, was leading humanity *away* from its objective, misguiding humanity onto the path to oblivion, to total darkness in terms of enlightening ourselves about ourselves—which is why, as will shortly be further explained, pseudo idealism came to be described as **'the abomination that causes desolation'**.

We can see that since dishonesty was so dangerous, and pseudo idealism was the most dishonest strategy ever developed for coping with the human condition, there was a very great need to find a form of pseudo idealism that minimised this extreme dishonesty—and eventually a great counter to this extreme dishonesty was found in Religion.

Religion did, of course, involve being 'born again' to the cooperative ideal state, it *was* a form of pseudo idealism, because instead of living through yourself with all the associated overly upset angers, egocentricities and denials, you deferred to someone exceptionally free of upset—namely one of the unresigned, denial-free-thinking, integrative-ideals-or-God-acknowledging, soulful, sound, innocent prophets around whom the great religions have been founded. Because you had become overly upset you decided to end your participation in humanity's heroic yet upsetting battle to find knowledge and instead put your faith in and live through supporting the soundness and truth of a prophet's life and words. Rather than adhering to what your now overly upset self wanted to do and say, you adhered to the soundness and truth of the prophet's life and words. But, the immense benefit of deferring to religion was that while it allowed you to be born-again to a form of idealism and thus contain your upset and feel good about yourself, you were minimising the dishonesty normally involved in the born-again, pseudo idealistic strategy, because you were acknowledging the soundness of the prophet and, by inference, your lack of soundness. By recognising, indeed worshipping, the integrity of the prophet, and his representation of another true, denial-free, integrative, soulful, sound state, you were indirectly admitting your own extreme lack of soundness—your separation from the integrative, true, soulful state; you were indirectly being honest about your immensely corrupted state.

Religions even countered the degree of dishonesty involved in the other strategy for coping—the resigned, competitive way of living—because most religions acknowledged the existence of a God who, as has been explained, is the personification of Integrative Meaning. Also, by acknowledging the soulful soundness of the prophet, you were recognising the existence of a cooperative, unconditionally selfless, moral soul in humans.

Another very important benefit of religion was that, on an individual level, it also helped assuage the guilt felt by pseudo idealists who were struggling with the fact that they were siding against humanity in its great battle. This is because in supporting your religion you were also indirectly supporting humanity's heroic search for knowledge, because the truthful words of the prophet that were recorded in your religion's scriptures, which you were showing reverence for and deferring to, were the very font of knowledge; in fact, they were the most denial-free expression of knowledge the human race had ever known. Indeed, now that we are able to explain the human condition we can demystify—explain and understand—the metaphysical content of religious texts (such as the explanation already given of the story of Noah's Ark in the Bible, and of prophets, and of 'God') and what is revealed is that religious texts contain an extraordinary amount of knowledge/truth/understanding/insight into our human situation. Indeed, as it turns out, the *whole* story of the human condition, bar its scientific explanation, is perfectly described in religious texts, albeit in the abstract, metaphysical and often metaphorical terms that denial-free truthful and thus effective thinking prophets were limited to in those early pre-science times when the great religions were established. The psychoanalyst Carl Jung recognised how aligning to the truth and thus supportive of our search for knowledge Christianity, for example, has been when he wrote that '[in Christianity] **the voice of God** [truth] **can still be heard'** (*Jung and Christianity*, W.B. Clift, 1982) and that **'The Christian symbol is a living thing that carries in itself the seeds of further development'** (*The Undiscovered Self*, C.G Jung, 1957, p.63).

In summary, religions offered humans a way to abandon living out their upsets and be born-again to ideality, but in the least dangerously dishonest and most human-journey-responsible way. They enabled humans to indirectly continue to participate in humanity's heroic yet upsetting search for knowledge, and they provided a way for humans to significantly avoid being dishonest, because by deferring to a prophet you were able to indirectly admit the truth of your own corrupted state and the existence of another integrative, true, sound, soulful state. Religions provided a way for humans to be (to a degree) honest about their corrupted, false condition without having to openly admit and therefore nakedly confront it. In doing so, they helped minimise the truth-destroying levels of delusion and denial involved in the born-again, pseudo idealistic lifestyle. Thus, religion was a pseudo idealistic, 'do good in order to feel you are good', 'give up your overly upset life and be born again to a cooperative ideal life' way of living that allowed you to live in safe denial of your corrupted condition, but at the same time be honest about it—albeit indirectly. In the case of Christianity, it actually referred to being **'born again'** (John 3:3), to having **'crossed over from death to life'** (John 5:24). As Christ authoritatively said, **'I am the resurrection and the life** [through me, your ideal, soulful true self can live again]**'** (John 11:25).

The criticism that could be levelled at someone extremely upset, like Genghis Khan or Adolf Hitler, was that they didn't take up religion—or, if they did claim to be religious, they weren't being *genuinely* religious. Indeed, for the exceptionally upset, the aspect of religion that made it so superior to the strategy of Imposed Discipline, which the Ten Commandments represented, was precisely that it allowed you to delude yourself that you were being **'born again'**, **'resurrect**[ed]**'** from your corrupted state. Rather than having good behaviour forced upon you through fear of punishment, as was the case with Imposed Discipline, religion allowed you to feel that not only were you actively participating in goodness, you had actually *become* a good, selfless, loving, ideal person—that you were 'righteous'—which provided immense relief from the guilt of being overly upset. Possibly the best sales pitch for born-again religious life was that given by the apostle St Paul when he wrote, **'Now if the ministry that brought death, which was engraved in letters on stone** [Moses' Ten Commandments that were enforced by the threat of punishment]**, came with glory** [because they brought society back from the brink of destruction]**…fading though it was** [there was no sustaining positive in having discipline imposed on you]**, will not the ministry of the Spirit be even more glorious? If the ministry that condemns men is glorious, how much more glorious is the ministry that brings righteousness! For what was glorious has no glory now in comparison with the surpassing glory. And if what was fading away came with glory, how much greater is the glory of that which lasts!'** (2 Cor. 3:7–11).

Thus, in coping with the now raging levels of upset in humans, the first **'glorious'** improvement on destructively living out that ferocious upset was Imposed Discipline, which was enforced through fear and punishment. But since discipline provided little in the way of joy for the mind or spirit it was hard to maintain, it didn't **'last'**, it was **'fading'**, especially in comparison to the immensely guilt-relieving, **'righteous'**, 'do good in order to make yourself feel good' way of living offered by the next **'surpassing glory'**, religion.

We can clearly see then that the 'do good in order to delude yourself that you actually are a kind, loving, selfless, good person and not horrifically corrupted' aspect of religion was very important, which means that only being *indirectly* honest about being extremely

corrupted when you became religious was crucial to the effectiveness of religion—because if you had to be *directly* honest about being horribly corrupted you couldn't delude yourself you were actually a kind, loving, selfless, good, not-horribly-corrupted person. This ability to not just *feel* good (because you were now behaving in a good way and not in the incredibly destructive way you had been), but to use this fact to delude yourself you were actually a loving, kind, selfless, good, upset-free, ideal, guilt-free, human-condition-solved, **'righteous'** person depended on this aspect of only *indirectly* acknowledging your corrupted state. So although in taking up religion you were being indirectly honest about being corrupted, you were still relying on being able to delude yourself that you weren't corrupted. In short, religions allowed people to both admit to being horribly corrupted and yet not suffer the confronting consequences of such an admission. So just as humans could not directly acknowledge their corrupted state (because without the explanation of the human condition they couldn't defend and thus cope with that truth), religions similarly depended on not directly acknowledging/recognising the soundness of the prophet around whom the religion was founded, even though acknowledging/recognising his soundness was an intrinsic part of the honesty that made religions so special and effective. Religions depended on not recognising—at least consciously, explicitly recognising—that prophets were simply a sound variety of ordinary people, because that truth would directly confront their followers with the unbearable truth of their own lack of soundness. Instead, at least at the surface level of their conscious awareness, religious adherents viewed their prophets as being supernatural, divine, heavenly, from-another-world beings, because that way they could avoid any comparison with themselves. In fact, the more upset and insecure the religious person, the more fundamentalist/literal/superficial they had to be in their interpretations of religious scripture and the prophet himself—because being too truthful was impossibly confronting.

As such, religion involved a very delicate balance of honesty and delusion, for while it offered a way of only being *indirectly* honest about the corrupted state, its very existence depended on its adherents making at least a subconsciously relieving, honest acknowledgement of their own corrupted state, and on others making at least, on a similarly subconscious level, a relieving, truthful recognition of that corruption. On the surface of conscious awareness, however, each individual adherent also depended on being able to maintain their facade and delusions about being an upset-free, **'righteous'** person, which meant there was still a great deal of dishonesty involved in religion.

The cartoon series *The Simpsons* provides a wonderful illustration of the subtleties involved in religion. In the series, 'Ned Flanders' is the born-again religious character who is typically portrayed as having a self-satisfied, 'I-occupy-the-moral-high-ground' attitude over the still-human-condition-embroiled 'Homer Simpson'. Ned's posturing drives Homer crazy with frustration because he intuitively knows Ned is deluding himself in thinking his Christianity gives him the moral high ground—that he is the more together, sound person and is on the right track—but Homer can't explain why Ned is so extremely deluded and totally dishonest in his view of self. Homer can't explain and thus reveal the truth that real idealism and the truly on track, moral high ground lay with continuing the upsetting battle to find knowledge, and that Ned had become so upset, so unsound, that he had to abandon that all-important battle and leave it to others to continue to fight, including Homer. Worse,

in abandoning the battle, Ned has effectively sided against those still trying to win the battle, adding substantially to the opposition they had to overcome. But even Ned is intuitively aware that he is practicing delusion and so has to work hard at maintaining it. As explained earlier, maintaining a delusion meant constantly persuading yourself, and others, that you are right. Stridency and fanaticism characterised the behaviour of those maintaining a delusion, especially when, in becoming religious for instance, you were practically admitting that you were being deluded about being a sound, together, on track person yourself by having had to defer to a sound prophet.

In summary, the benefit of Imposed Discipline for the resigned, competitive way of living over the born-again, pseudo idealistic way of living was that it did not undermine a person's participation in humanity's great battle—it simply provided a means to manage the upset associated with that battle. However, since the religious born-again strategy both minimised the irresponsibility of abandoning the battle, and (despite the degree of delusion it still allowed) minimised the extreme denial involved in becoming born-again, religion provided a marvellous way of coping with the by now extremely destructive and unbearable levels of upset and associated guilt that affected nearly the entire human race, which Imposed Discipline could no longer contain. In fact, because of its degree of honesty and indirect support of the search for knowledge, religion was by far the most special, the most wonderful form of pseudo idealism to ever be developed. Indeed, it was religion that saved humanity from destruction through the most difficult final stages of its journey.

However, while religion did save the human race, at the very end of our species' journey through ignorance other forms of pseudo idealism evolved that very nearly destroyed humanity. This final development will now be described and explained.

Part 3:11H The final 200 years

The final 200 years when pseudo idealism took humanity to a death-by-dogma, end play state of terminal alienation—the time when we needed to, as the Bible warned, 'beware of false prophets', the merchants of delusion and denial, for they are 'the abomination that causes desolation'.

We now need to consider the situation faced by humanity in the final 200 years of its now plummeting path to self-destruction through excessive upset, because it was during this final stage in the march of upset that the great benefit of religion, which was its honesty, became too confronting, forcing the development and adoption of other forms of pseudo idealism that were *so* dishonest that humanity was taken to the brink of terminal alienation and extinction.

What happened around 200 years ago to dramatically increase the levels of upset in society were further serious elaborations on the factors that caused the sudden increase in upset 11,000 years ago. Firstly, due to improvements in medicine and sanitation, the world's population increased so rapidly that in many parts of the world people found themselves virtually living on top of each other; villages became towns, which in turn became cities and even mega-city metropolises. Cities represented the most extreme congestion of people and this factor, along with their nature-eliminated, un-natural environment, which was so

destructive of our innocent instinctive soul, greatly compounded the spread and increase of upset. Of course, once we humans became alienated, cities did provide a refuge from the criticising innocence of the natural world—they were a marvellous hide-out for alienation—but for the souls of the next generations who had to grow up in such soul-*less* environments cities were devastatingly alien, unnatural places; as the Australian historian Manning Clark said, **'The bush** [wilderness] **is our source of innocence; the town is where the devil prowls around'** (*Sydney Morning Herald*, 18 Feb. 1985), or as the English poet Percy Bysshe Shelley wrote, **'Away, away, from men and towns, to the wild wood and the downs—to the silent wilderness, where the soul need not repress its music'** (*To Jane: The Invitation*, c.1820). No wonder Christ looked forward to the time when understanding of the human condition would be found and alienating cities could gradually be dismantled (as they now will be), saying, **'Do you see all these great buildings?…Not one stone here will be left on another; everyone will be thrown down'** (Matt. 24:2; Mark 13:2; Luke 19:44, 21:6).

The second immense influence on the spread and growth of upset and thus alienation in the world was the development of communication technology of such sophistication that, in terms of one human's access to another, it basically shrunk the world down to one giant city—worse, one immense household. Initially, there was the delivery of letters through a sophisticated postal system, and then mass printing of documents and newspapers, and then typewriters, and then the telephone, and then television, and then credit cards, computers and faxes, and then emails and mobile phones, and then the world wide web and the likes of Facebook and Twitter. From birth, modern humans have been both immersed in an ocean of upset behaviour, especially alienated behaviour, and overwhelmed by anxiety and stress.

The overall effect of extremely congested living and of the increase in the efficiency of communication technology was that it led to upset—especially alienation from our all-loving true self—reaching a crescendo, as these quotes illustrate: **'today's children are probably the least loved generation of all'** (Robert de Grauw, Letter to the Editor, *TIME* mag. 3 Apr. 2006); **'96 percent of American families are now dysfunctional'** (popular US therapist and author John Bradshaw quoting recovery movement statistics on dysfunctional families in America, in *The Australian*, 8 May 1993); **'The 1990 US Census stated there will be more stepfamilies than original families by the year 2000, and that 66 percent of those stepfamilies break up when children are involved'** (Stepfamily Foundation, <http://www.stepfamily.org/stepfamily-statistics.html>); **'one in two US children will live in a single-parent family at some point in childhood'** (US Census Bureau of Household and Family Statistics, 2000); **'63 percent of the 18.5 million US children under 5 years of age were in some type of regular child care arrangement'** (US Census Bureau, 2005); **'the electronic age has ushered in electronic parenting. Kids spend far more time sitting passively before a device such as a computer or television than they do playing or speaking with their families'** (*The Commercial Appeal*, 26 Aug. 2001); **'the sexualisation of Western culture** [has meant] **that sex has been robbed of its emotional depth…For young men and women, it's increasingly a physical activity, with no real pleasure and no meaning at all…one hears of lipstick parties, where teenage girls wearing different coloured lipstick line up to give oral sex to boys with the aim of giving them a candy-striped penis'** (Clive Hamilton, co-author of the report 'Youth and Pornography in Australia', *The Australian*, 24 June 2006); **'someone born since 1945 is likely to be up to 3 times more depressed than their parents and 10 times more than their grandparents'** (psychologist Michael Yapko in his 1999 book *Hand-Me-Down Blues*); **'Depression is now the leading cause of disability in the US'** (Andrew Solomon in his 2001 book *The Noonday Demon*); **'Truly alarming evidence from pharmaceutical prescriptions for Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD) drugs shows that in 2005 one in 25 children in many poorer areas of**

Australia suffer from ADHD' (*The Daily Telegraph*, 13 June 2006); and **'According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), about 1 in 166 American children born today will fall somewhere on the autistic spectrum. That's double the rate of 10 years ago and 10 times the estimated incidence a generation ago'** (*TIME* mag. 15 May 2006). The psychological invulnerability that the reality-detached ADHD and autistic mind adopted to cope with the unbearable levels of upset in the world will be looked at in some detail in Part 6:5.

Australia is one of the most sheltered and isolated and thus innocent countries left in the world, and yet its society is about to unravel with psychological suffering, as this 2011 report on the front page of the *Sydney Morning Herald* indicates: **'The well-being of Australia's children and young people has declined alarmingly in the past decade—and plunging marriage rates are partly to blame, a major study has found. Growing rates of child abuse and neglect, of children being placed in foster care, and of teenage mental health problems, including a rise in hospital admissions for self-harm, are rooted in the rise of one-parent families and de facto couples, violent and unstable relationships, and divorce, the report says'** ('Decline in marriage blamed for neglect', 6 Sept. 2011). Humans are now so alienated, so divorced from their true self, they can hardly live with themselves, let alone anyone else. The real reason for the breakdown in relationships is alienation. Revealingly, recent generations have been labelled the 'X generation', the 'Y generation', and now the 'Z generation' which, according to Wikipedia, comprises **'people born between the mid-1990s and late 2000s'**. The Canadian writer Douglas Coupland defined a Generation X'er as one who **'lives an X sort of life—cerebral, alienated, seriously concerned with cool'** (*Sydney Morning Herald*, 22 Aug. 1994). These are all qualities associated with having had to adjust to an extremely soul-exhausted world. The adolescent psychologist Michael Carr-Gregg was reported as saying that **'Generation Y is being ravaged by depression, anxiety disorders and stress disorders'** ('Face it, we are all narcissists now', Miranda Devine, *Sydney Morning Herald*, 3 Sept. 2009). What exactly did we mean when we said the X, Y, Z generations? The end game state of alienation, terminal alienation. After all, what comes after Z?

And the proof of this end game state of alienation is, as mentioned at the start of this presentation, indisputable. As a result of the emergence of overwhelming levels of upset in the last 200 years humanity has endured two massive world wars and countless other insurgencies, as well as the inglorious honour of inventing weapons of such ferocity that they could wipe out entire cities.

The repercussion of upset reaching this crescendo on our strategies for coping with the human condition was that people could no longer cope with the honesty of religion—it became too confronting, guilt-inducing and unbearably depressing. Yes, the great benefit of religion—of the honesty imbued in the prophet or prophets (in the case of Hinduism) the religion was founded around—actually became a liability, because by retaining a presence of a prophet's soundness and truth, religions reminded humans of their own corrupted state and their alienation from truth, which in turn accentuated their sense of guilt; as the author Mary McCarthy once wrote about religion, **'Only people who are very good can afford to become religious; with all the others it makes them worse'** (*Memories of a Catholic Girlhood*, 1957). It was at this point when the honesty of religion became too confronting that much less confronting and less guilt-emphasising forms of pseudo idealism had to be found, with the *extremely* dangerous and negative effect being the loss of the precious honesty contained in religion.

When the truthful lives and thoughts of religions' founding prophets became unbearably confronting and condemning, Guilt-Free Expressions of Idealism to support and find 'feel good' relief from became highly sought after. These expressions took two forms. Firstly, you could defer to Less Guilt Emphasising Forms of Religion where, say within Christianity, rather than following a denomination that focused on the study and acknowledgment of the integrity of the words and life of Christ, you selected one that emphasised worship, adoration and ceremony, such as Catholicism, or the more euphoric, charismatic Evangelical varieties of Christianity that have recently gained in popularity. Or you could associate yourself with religious groups that focused on simple dogmatic obedience to the teachings of one of the religions, becoming a more fundamentalist and literalist interpreter and practitioner of a faith. Or you could find a religion like Buddhism that avoided any acknowledgement of your corrupted condition and instead focused on extinguishing the mental trauma of your upset state through meditation. As one convert said of Buddhism, it's **'non-judgemental, there's no notion of sin, there's no notion of good and evil, you don't embrace negativity'** (from *Light at Edge of the World: Science of the Mind of Buddhism*, National Geographic Channel, 2006). The problem with focusing on ways, such as meditation, to extinguish the mental trauma of the upset, human-condition-afflicted state was that, once again, they undermined the fundamental responsibility of being a conscious being, which is to think and understand, ultimately to find understanding of the human condition—as the great Russian philosopher Nikolai Berdyaev (1874-1948) wrote: **'Man sought to escape from that terror** [of the truth of **'man's…exile from paradise'**] **by extinguishing consciousness and returning to the realm of the unconscious. But this is not the way to regain lost paradise'** (*The Destiny of Man*, 1931, tr. N. Duddington, 1960, p.41 of 310). The point being made is that as upset increased, more and more escapist strategies for coping with the human condition simply *had* to be adopted, despite how irresponsible and destructive that trend was of humanity's heroic struggle to find knowledge.

The second form of more guilt-free expressions of idealism to support and live through were non-religious and in some cases atheistic, God/Integrative Meaning-denying Pseudo Idealistic Causes like communism or socialism, environmentalism, feminism, multiculturalism, aboriginalism, politically correct postmodernism, etc, etc—basically any idealistic cause you could find that allowed you to avoid having to think about and deal with the real issue behind all the destruction and imperfection in the world, namely your own and everyone else's corrupted condition. *TIME* magazine editor Richard Stengel perfectly captured this trend when he wrote that **'The environment became the last best cause, the ultimate guilt-free issue'** (*TIME* mag. 31 Dec. 1990).

Since humanity was, as we will see, trending towards ever more guilt-free but dishonest forms of pseudo idealism to cope with the exponentially increasing levels of upset in the world, there was clearly going to come a time—unless understanding of the human condition was found—when excessive dishonesty would herald the end of the all-important search for liberating understanding of the human condition and lead to terminal levels of alienation in humans. As Richard Neville summarised: **'We are locked in a race between self destruction and self discovery'**—either we found understanding of ourselves or we faced self-destruction. If we gave up the search for knowledge, ultimately understanding of ourselves, there was no hope, and, as will now be described, the virtual abandonment of that search by taking up ever more

dishonest/truthless forms of pseudo idealism *did* take humanity to the brink of hopelessness. By denying any confronting truth—that is, by taking the practice of guilt-stripping to the extreme—and simply dogmatically demanding we be ideal, pseudo idealism was only adding to alienation, burying humanity deeper in Plato's cave of denial of any truth, making it harder and harder to reach liberating understanding of ourselves.

In fact, as will become increasingly apparent as this presentation progresses, to find understanding of the human condition a veritable mountain of accumulated dishonesty, especially from pseudo idealists, had to be defied and corrected. AND, if that weren't enough, the advocates of extreme dishonesty then all but destroyed our efforts at the WORLD TRANSFORMATION MOVEMENT to bring the humanity-saving understanding of the human condition to the world! The whole journey of getting all the truth up from its almost totally buried state and then bringing the humanity-liberating understanding of the human condition that that truth made possible to the world has been *so* difficult that, in hindsight, it seems all but a miracle that it has almost been achieved. The *Persecution of the WTM* section on our website (<www.humancondition.com/persecution>) documents the horrific persecution the WTM has had to endure and our final wonderful and heroic vindication in the law courts—however, until substantial support builds for these all-precious, liberating understandings their survival remains in the balance.

To now drill down into the progression of the increasingly guilt-stripped and thus ever more dishonest and thus ever more dangerous forms of pseudo idealism that humanity developed and adopted when Religion became too confronting—commencing with Socialism and Communism. These movements denied the notion of a perfecting God and avoided the depressing recognition of a prophet's world of soundness. Instead, they simply dogmatically demanded an idealistic social or communal world and, in doing so, denied and oppressed the whole reality of the knowledge-finding, creative, egocentric, corrupting, unavoidably-variously-upset, individualistic, competitive, combative, materialism-compensation-needing, self-distraction-necessary, human-condition-afflicted world. Karl Marx, the political philosopher whose mid-nineteenth century theories gave rise to socialism and communism, argued that **'The philosophers have only interpreted the world in various ways; the point is** [not to understand the world but] **to change it'** (*Theses on Feuerbach*, written in German in 1845). By **'change it'** he meant just make it cooperative or social or communal. Marx was wrong—the whole **'point'** and responsibility of being a conscious being *is* to understand our world and place in it, ultimately to find understanding of the human condition. The attraction—and inherent lie—of socialism/communism was that you could support and live the ideals without acknowledging the reality of the human condition and its struggle.

The limitation of these philosophies was that while there was no confronting prophet involved, there was an obvious focus on the condemning cooperative, social ideals. And so in time, as levels of upset and thus insecurity increased, the need again arose for the invention of an even more guilt-free form of idealism to live through, hence the development of The New Age Movement (the forerunners of which were the Age of Aquarius and Peace Movements). In this movement all the realities and negatives of our corrupted condition were transcended in favour of taking up a completely escapist, think-positive, human-potential-stressing, self-

affirming, motivational, feel-good approach. So in truth, the new age movement was never going to transport humanity to an Aquarian new age of peaceful freedom from upset, it was only ever going to lead to an even greater state of deluded, dishonest alienation than that espoused by socialism/communism. As the philosopher Thomas Nagel recognised, **'The capacity for transcendence brings with it a liability to alienation, and the wish to escape this condition… can lead to even greater absurdity'** (*The View From Nowhere*, 1986).

The limitation of the new age movement, in terms of being an effective means of escaping the horror of the human condition, was that while it did not stress the cooperative ideals like socialism and communism did, in seeking to transcend humans' upset state it still offered up a constant reminder of the issue of our variously upset, embattled, troubled, estranged, alienated condition—a problem the *next* level of delusion sought to dispense with by simply denying its existence; yes, the Feminist Movement maintained there was no real difference between people, *especially* not between men and women. In particular, it denied the legitimacy of the exceptionally egocentric, combative male dimension to life that, as will be explained in Part 7:1, had taken on the heroic frontline role in fighting the ignorance of our instinctive self. Based on extreme dogma, the feminist movement could not and has not produced any real reconciliation between men and women, rather, as this quote points out, **'What happened was that the so-called Battle of the Sexes became a contest in which only one side turned up. Men listened, in many cases sympathetically but, by the millions, were turned off'** (Don Peterson, *Courier Mail*, June 1994). *Only* by winning the battle to champion the ego—that is, explain the human condition and establish that our egocentric conscious thinking self is good and not bad—could the polarities of life of so-called 'good' and 'evil', that women and men are in truth an expression of, be reconciled.

Again, as far as offering an effective way to transcend the realities of the human condition, feminism's flaw was that while it superficially dispensed with the problem of humans' divisive reality, we still remained the focus of attention and that was confronting. The solution that emerged to counter this limitation was the Environmental or Green Movement, which removed all need to confront and think about the human state because all focus was diverted from self onto the environment. Of course, the truth is that by not addressing the cause of the destruction of the natural world, namely the issue of our human condition's massively upset angry, egocentric and alienated state, there has been no real let up in the pace of our world's devastation, as these quotes emphasise: **'The trees aren't the problem. The problem is us'** (*Simply Living* mag. Sept. 1989), and **'We need to do something about the environmental damage in our heads'** (*TIME* mag. 24 May 1993). The guilt-stripping dishonesty of the environmental movement was recognised by the Australian businessman Ray Evans when he wrote that **'Environmentalism has largely superseded Christianity as the religion of the upper classes in Europe and to a lesser extent in the United States. It is a form of religious belief which fosters a sense of moral superiority in the believer, but which places no importance on telling the truth** [about the real issue of our corrupted human condition]**'** (*Nine Facts About Climate Change*, 2006, p.2 of 27).

So for all its guilt-relieving benefits, the environmental movement still contained a condemning moral component: if we were not responsible with the environment, 'good', we were behaving immorally, 'bad'. Moreover, nature in its purity exists in stark contrast to humans' corrupted condition.

At this stage in the march of upset yet another form of pure pseudo idealism had to be manufactured in which confrontation with the by now extremely confronting and depressing truth of the dilemma of the human condition could be totally sidestepped. What was required was a completely guilt-stripped dogma that was devoid of any need to confront and wrestle with the issue of soundness and Godliness; with whether you are a cooperative, social person; with the issue of your troubled self; with the morality issue of men and women's treatment of each other; and with the issue of whether or not you are being kind to the environment. Upset had become so great that the need was to simply be ideal without question. This demand for a totally non-confronting form of relief from feeling 'bad' resulted in the establishment of the Politically Correct Movement, which has had no other focus or requirement beyond simply choosing, from the two simplistic, fundamental, 'political' options in life—of being either 'good' or 'bad'—to be 'good'.

The politically correct culture was a pure form of freedom-denying dogma that fabricated, demanded and imposed ideality or 'correctness', specifically that of an undifferentiated world, which was in complete denial of the reality of the underlying issue of the existence of and reasons for humans' variously embattled and upset states, and beyond that of the deeper question raised by those 'non-ideal' states of the issue of the human condition. For instance, the politically correct argue that the children's nursery rhyme *Baa Baa Black Sheep* is racist and must instead be recited as **'Baa baa rainbow sheep'** (London's *Daily Telegraph*, 18 Feb. 1997).

Within the politically correct culture the need for relief from guilt was all-pervasive; the mind was constantly on the hunt for opportunities and 'good causes' through which to be 'idealistic' and achieve that rush of psychological relief of feeling that at last you are a 'good' rather than a 'bad' person. Wherever there was a victim of humanity's battle, there was an opportunity to take up their cause and access that all-important relief. Shortly, we will see that Christ described this development in much harsher terms when he said, **'Wherever there is a carcass** [the extremely upset]**, there the vultures** [the **false prophets**, the merchants of delusion and escapism] **will gather.'** With the levels of upset in the world becoming extreme, relief-hunting became a huge industry, to the extent that we became, as the sociologist Frank Furedi recognised, **'a society that celebrates victimhood rather than heroism'** (*The Culture of Fear*, 1997).

Again, while there was an ever increasing need for more dishonest, guilt-free forms of idealism to live through, for humanity to arrive at this desperately insecure state where people were *only* concerned with finding relief from their own guilt through supporting the cause of those who were suffering or less fortunate was an extremely dangerous development because it meant the human race had, in effect, abandoned the battle to find the all-important liberating understanding of ourselves. This is not to say that in a critical battle, such as the one humanity has been involved in, showing care and compassion towards those who were suffering from the effects of the battle was not important. It was very important, because although we have all been involved in an upsetting battle, selflessness is still, as has been explained, what binds wholes together; it is the glue within humanity's army. However, while caring for those struggling to keep up was important, it was obviously critical to support those on the frontline who were still carrying on the battle, otherwise the whole war would surely be lost. In this light it can be seen how very dangerous and irresponsible the politically correct movement's focus and insistence on caring only for the victims of the battle was.

In fact, while care and compassion for those suffering from the battle was ('was', because the battle is now over) certainly something a healthy society had to practice, caring for them in order to delude yourself you are an upset-free, ideal person seriously discredited the whole practice of consideration and kindness itself. Indeed, using idealism to delude yourself that you were good gave idealism such a bad name that no relatively sound, secure person wanted to be part of the left-wing political movement where relief-hunting had become endemic. In the end, there was no longer any authentic, trustable, credible, healthy, meaningful idealistic movement in society to counteract any excessively selfish and destructive right-wing behaviour—there was only moderate factions within the right-wing that the sane and rationally-behaved could join and support.

The whole democratic process that our society depended on for there to be effective progress and functionality was being destroyed by mad desperados—by a group of people who were misusing democracy for their own selfish need to make themselves feel good, rather than for what democracy was designed to be: a tool to decide the right or wrong way to manage any particular course of action. How could you possibly have an effective discussion about how best to handle a certain situation if participants in that discussion were not interested in whether the action was right or not, only in whether their participation would make them feel good and/or whether the course of action itself would ultimately make them feel good? The answer is you couldn't. It was a derailed, ineffective, dysfunctional, highly imperfect, pointless—in fact, defunct—debate. It was like being in mid-ocean on a life-boat, desperately trying to find your way to the safety of land, when someone on board decides to hijack and destroy the mission by capsizing the boat because they had become obsessed with wanting to cool off in the water. As has already been carefully explained, it was totally irresponsible, selfish—in fact, mad—behaviour. The human race was trying to save itself from destruction by finding knowledge, ultimately understanding of the human condition, but the extreme practitioners of pseudo idealism were only interested in making themselves feel good. Contrary to what their banners said, pseudo idealists no longer cared about the future of the world. Theirs was completely selfish behaviour and not at all the idealistic behaviour they made it out to be and deluded themselves it was. Thank goodness the arrival of understanding of the human condition stops this madness, because it was only while it wasn't possible to explain humanity's great heroic battle that it was possible to get away with such mad behaviour—'Can't you see we are being idealistic, we are making a better world.' What rubbish—such behaviour is nothing more than a selfish attempt to gain relief from the agony of the human condition!

Idealism was being misused—in fact, extremely, horribly misused. A particularly dysfunctional aspect of the misuse was the arrogant *extent* of pseudo idealists' delusion that they were actually ideal, that they held the moral high ground. In the situation that has existed, where the reality of the upsetting battle to find knowledge couldn't be explained, idealism—albeit the bastardised form of 'victim-hunting-to-make-yourself-feel-good, politically correct', *pseudo* idealism—had a field day mocking realism as evil. In the vacuum where the reason for humans' upset, corrupted state was not able to be explained, the **'intellectuals'/ 'liberal elites'/ 'chattering classes'/ 'left-wing trendy café society'/ 'chardonnay socialists'/ 'radical chic'/ 'Hollywood Left'/ 'CBS-*New York Times*, BBC-*Guardian*, ABC-*Sydney Morning Herald*, *Time* and *National Geographic***

'left-wing rags', etc, etc axis'/ 'high-minded do-gooders'/ 'rainbow extremists'/ 'strident bleeding hearts'/ 'feel good, warm inner glow, blissed out compassion junkies', as the relief-hunting, pseudo idealistic left-wing are variously referred to, conceitedly promenaded about with a holier-than-thou attitude, while the right-wing advocates of freedom (from the oppression of idealism in order to participate in the corrupting search for knowledge) were arrogantly and disdainfully treated as morally bankrupt and contemptible. For example, the right-wing so-called 'Tea Party' that recently emerged in American politics was derided by the left-wing Democrats for being devoid of any sound arguments for their cause—they were accused of being nothing more than promoters of **'fear, xenophobia, cryptofascism, creationism, inequality and ignorance'** (from a cartoon by Turner in *The Irish Times* that was re-printed in *The Australian*, 3 Nov. 2010). It is no wonder politics became so polarised—to the point where the two sides, rather than providing humanity with a healthy equilibrium, existed in totally opposed and different continents, and may as well have lived completely apart on separate planets. The deluded arrogance of the extremely dangerous dishonesty of the left became insufferable, unbearable, overwhelming, terrifying, sickening.

Again, the problem at base was the inability to explain the human condition. While it was easy to argue the case for the idealism of the left-wing, it was almost impossible to argue the case for the realism of the right-wing. How could you justify any selfishness or inequality; how could you defend behaviour that appeared in every way to be inhumane; how could you argue that not being ideally behaved was good? The answer is that until we could explain the paradox of the human condition we couldn't, well not sufficiently. Writers like the Russian-American Ayn Rand (1905-1982) did well to mount some sort of a case for right-wing free enterprise, but countering such efforts were the **'Capitalists are Pigs'** placards used in protests at G8 summits, and left-wing advocates like Michael Moore, the American film maker and activist who, at the conclusion of his 2009 documentary, *Capitalism: A Love Story*, smugly announced that **'Capitalism is evil.'** The truth is, it was capitalism that kept the human race going, not communism. Without the relief, reward and distraction of materialism/material goods that the exchange of money or capital facilitated humans would not have been able to cope with and carry on their upsetting, idealism-defying, heroic search for knowledge. With understanding of the human condition we can now explain that socialism/communism, the pseudo idealistic dogmatic insistence that everyone be social and communal—live for society and the communal good rather than seek a degree of material relief and reward for yourself—ignored the reality of the upsetting battle that humans have had to wage to find understanding of themselves, of their less-than-ideal human condition. With understanding of the human condition finally found what is revealed is that it was, in fact, the left-wing that was morally bankrupt, *not* the right! The truth was not as it appeared. In the Adam Stork analogy, upset angry, egocentric and alienated Adam is the hero of the story not the villain; it was his condemning, ridiculing, upsetting idealistic opponent, which the extreme pseudo idealist came to represent, who was actually the villain and not the hero he deluded himself to be and would have others believe he was.

At this point we need to return to the progression of the development of even more guilt/truth stripped forms of idealism to live through and look at what emerged after the development of the politically correct movement. While being interested only in those who were suffering was so extremely dishonest and dangerous, from the perspective of the do-

good, feel-good politically correct supporter, relief from guilt/self-confrontation/depression/ the agony of the human condition was all that mattered—when the truth is killing you, you have no qualms about escaping it. So to help ensure no subversive questioning could creep in and undermine this strategy, a philosophical justification for truthlessness was bolted on to the political correct culture. This was Postmodern Deconstructionism, **'a bewilderingly complex school of continental philosophy, or pseudo-philosophy'** of **'intellectual assumptions—truth is a matter of opinion, there is no real world outside of language and hence no facts independent of our descriptions of them'** (Luke Slattery, *The Australian*, 23 July 2005).

We saw how the politically correct culture considered the children's nursery rhyme *Baa Baa Black Sheep* racist and insisted it be recited as **'Baa baa rainbow sheep.'** The 1994 postmodernist teaching guide *From Picture Book To Literary Theory* similarly argued that school children shouldn't be read stories about witches on broomsticks because they were sexist for **'narrowly defining women's roles'**, or the *Three Little Pigs* fairy tale because of its elitist promotion of **'the virtues of property ownership and the safety of the private domain which are key elements of capitalist ideology'**. In his 2001 book *The Liar's Tale: A History of Falsehood*, Jeremy Campbell described **'postmodern theory'** as having elevated **'lying to the status of an art and neutralised untruth'**. It **'neutralised untruth'** because by denying the existence of the whole issue of humans' variously embattled and upset states it made any discussion of such differences—any pursuit of insight into the human condition—impossible.

With levels of upset in people becoming extreme and the associated levels of guilt becoming unbearable, pseudo idealistic, politically correct, postmodern relief-hunters—empowered by their own self-righteousness and the right's inability to defend itself—took over almost everywhere. Drawn together by their shared overwhelming need to find causes through which to feel 'good' they captured such major institutions as the national broadcasters in the UK and Australia. As a former British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC) correspondent, Robin Aitken, said, '[I] **could not raise a cricket team of Tories** [conservatives] **among BBC staff'** (*The Australian*, 10 Oct. 2005). The British journalist Melanie Phillips similarly observed that **'With a few honourable exceptions, the BBC views every issue through the prism of left-wing, secular, anti-Western thinking'** (*Daily Mail*, 16 May 2005). As government-owned bodies, national broadcasters like the BBC in Britain and the ABC in Australia (who, unsurprisingly, did everything they could to destroy the honest, human-condition-confronting work of the WTM) are supposed to represent all the people, not one extreme faction. A blogger who called himself 'Marcellus' (because, he said, **'In 44BC the tribune Gaius Marcellus tried to prevent Julius Caesar overturning the Roman Republic and becoming a tyrant…he failed at that time'**) posted this alarm: **'The broadcasters particularly in the BBC are…acting like the militant wing of the Labour Party. They have completely lost all restraint and integrity. They are completely out of order…**[it's] **a national outrage…**[that they] **are allowed to control the most influential power centre in the history of mankind. The BBC is run by an extreme, unrepresentative and unelected cult. The Left have finally ruined the BBC…The BBC is now irreparably infiltrated and broken…All responses to the Tories are to give the impression that whatever the Tories say, do or propose is immoral or incompetent, or imply that selfish, self-serving or somehow bad motives are the real reason for them—that they are not proposed altruistically for the genuine benefit of the country and therefore cannot be a credible alternative to what is being done by Labour, who are altruistic'** ('How the Left have corrupted broadcast news', 1 Feb. 2010; see <www.wtmsources.com/124>). As

mentioned, the pseudo idealistic left-wing sanctimoniously strutted around as if they held the moral high ground while the right-wing was treated as morally bankrupt and contemptible when, in truth, it was the left-wing that was morally bankrupt and contemptible.

The problem of pseudo idealism in the media was not confined to the national broadcasters. A 2005 UCLA-led study into the political leanings of media in the US revealed that **'almost all major media outlets tilt to the left…there is quantifiable and significant bias'** ('Media Bias Is Real, Finds UCLA Political Scientist', *UCLA News*, 14 Dec. 2005). While 'Marcellus', like the original Gaius Marcellus, was unable to prevent the **'ruin**[ing]**'** of the BBC, there was at least some active resistance to what was happening to the media in the US—in a 2010 campaign run by the Media Research Center, a watchdog group that analyses the media for liberal bias in America, **'Four billboard trucks bearing the message "Stop the Liberal Bias, Tell the Truth!" began circling the Manhattan headquarters of ABC, CBS, NBC and the *New York Times*'** for **'four weeks'** ('Trucks Encircle ABC, CBS, NBC, Challenge 'Liberal' Media to 'Tell The Truth', by Michael W. Chapman, 4 Oct. 2010, CNSnews.com).

Much of academia, the supposed home of higher learning, has similarly been hijacked by overly upset, guilt-escaping, truth-hating relief-hunters. A **'comprehensive'** survey undertaken in 2005 by political science professors at the University of Toronto revealed that **'87 percent'** of the teaching faculty **'at the most elite' 'American universities'** were **'left-wing' 'liberal'**. A co-author of the study, Professor Robert Lichter, commented that **'What's most striking is how few conservatives there are in any field** [of study in US universities]**…It's a very homogenous environment'** ('College Faculties A Most Liberal Lot, Study Finds', *Washington Post*, 29 Mar. 2005). That **'87 percent'** of teachers in the major American centres of learning held a distinct bias of thought was certainly a **'most striking'**—indeed truly frightening—statistic. The literary scholar Harold Bloom recognised the danger of this hijacking of academia by truth-hating relief-hunters in his 1994 book *The Western Canon*, which, as a *TIME* magazine review summarised, asserted that a **'rebellion in U.S. schools against Dead White European Male authors'** (or **'D.W.E.Ms'**) would lead to **'the end of civilization'** through a **'triumph of the forces of darkness'** (*TIME* mag. 10 Oct. 1994). In *The Western Canon*, Bloom lamented that **'*Batman* comics…will replace Chaucer, Shakespeare, Milton, Wordsworth'** (p.485 of 560). A 2006 article in *The Australian* newspaper reported that Australia's then Prime Minister, John Howard, **'believes the postmodern literature being taught in schools is "rubbish"…accusing state education authorities of "dumbing down" the English syllabus and succumbing to political correctness.** [He said] **"I feel very, very strongly about** [this situation where]**… traditional texts, are treated no differently from pop cultural commentary"'** (21 Apr. 2006). In the article, Howard, Australia's greatest ever Prime Minister (in my view), also referred to postmodern discourse as meaningless **'gobbledegook'**. In his insightfully titled 1987 book *The Closing of the American Mind*, the political scientist Allan Bloom also wrote of the devastating effects of postmodern so-called 'deconstructionist' teaching in American universities, contending that **'we are producing a race of moral illiterates, who have never asked the great questions of good and evil, or truth and beauty, who have indeed no idea that such questions even could be asked…deprived of literary guidance they** [students] **no longer have any image of a perfect soul, and hence do not long to have one. They do not even imagine that there is such a thing…If the classics are studied at all in the universities they are studied as curiosities in the humanities departments, not as vital centres of the liberal tradition, and not as texts offering profound insight into the human condition'** (*The Australian*, 25 July 1987).

Not so long ago, HRH The Prince of Wales (whose mentor or main influence in his philosophical life was, like mine, Sir Laurens van der Post, and who also attended Geelong Grammar School where, like me, he benefited from the influence of Sir James Darling's soul-rather-than-intellect-emphasising, Platonic education system) wrote a letter of deep concern to the Lord Chancellor of Great Britain, questioning the extreme bias that is now also apparent in legal thinking, stating that **'The Human Rights Act is only about the rights of individuals. I am unable to find a list of social responsibilities attached to it and this betrays a fundamental distortion in social and legal thinking'** (*The Australian*, 27 Sept. 2002).

Dr William Anderson, the Assistant Professor of Economics at Frostburg State University in the US, similarly observed that **'Justice pretty much is dead in the United States…Like so many other trends, this one has its intellectual underpinnings in that academic refuse pile we call Post-Modernism…a line of thinking that denies any possibility of Truth, and is the dominant "guiding light"—darkness?—in academe these days…right now, the post-modernists are winning battle after battle. It is one thing when post-modern nonsense dominates a history or English class; it is quite another when it becomes the bedrock of modern law'** ('Post-Modern Prosecutions', 25 Nov. 2006; Accessed 31 Jan. 2011: see <www.wtmsources.com/115>).

The American lawyer Gary Saalman also wrote that **'In recent years…postmodernism has risen to the forefront of legal theory. Postmodern theorists…claim the law cannot have any foundation because there is no foundation for objective knowledge of any kind…Principles of law could never reflect universal truths, they argue…According to these scholars, it is senseless to talk about whether a law is right or wrong or moral or amoral…most observers agree that postmodern theories of law are exerting a huge influence today in the courtroom and the legislature…Remember, these are not a lunatic fringe at the margins of legal practice. They include department heads, and leading professors of law schools…practicing lawyers and legal authorities'** ('Postmodernism and You: Law', Gary Saalman, 1996; Accessed 31 Jan. 2011: see <www.wtmsources.com/109>).

And, in his 2006 book *Understanding the Times: The Collision of Today's Competing Worldviews*, the American religious leader Dr David Noebel had this to say about the dangers of Postmodernism: **'Harold J. Berman, former professor of law at Harvard Law School…explains that today…foundational beliefs are rapidly disappearing, not only from the minds of philosophers, but from "the minds of lawmakers, judges, lawyers, law teachers…the historical soil of the Western legal tradition is being washed away in the twentieth century, and the tradition itself is threatened to collapse"…Postmodernists are intent on eliminating religious roots and transcendent qualities from Western law. They desire more fragmentation and subjectivity, and less objective morality than the Judeo-Christian tradition demands. In the end, they are intent on creating and using their own brand of social justice merely for left-wing political purposes'** ('Postmodern Law'; Accessed 31 Jan. 2011 at <https://www.allaboutworldview.org/postmodern-law.htm>).

The media, our centres of education and learning, the judiciary—these are all pillars of society that were being destroyed. The world was in danger of being hijacked by those who were no longer concerned with humanity's heroic journey to enlightenment and who only wanted to escape the depressing effects of the human condition. Total self-preoccupation, selfishness disguised as selflessness, had arrived. Terminal levels of alienation were upon us.

So, with understanding of the human condition finally explained, the truth that is revealed is that the underlying, *real* progression in all the great, so-called, 'social reforms' of the

last 200 years was not to a more ideal world but to greater upset and its associated need for ever more guilt-stripped forms of pseudo idealism through which to live. From Religion, the original, thousands-of-years-old, relatively honest, alienation-free form of pseudo idealism, developed Socialism and Communism, then the New Age Movement, then the Feminist Movement, then the Environment or Green Movement, then the Politically Correct Movement, and finally totally dishonest, completely alienated, extremely autistic Postmodern Deconstructionism—**'autism'** being **'a complex mental structure insuring against recurrence of… unthinkable anxiety'**; in this case, **'anxiety'** about being extremely corrupted/upset/hurt/soul-damaged in your infancy and childhood.

The American psychologist Arthur Janov developed the technique of 'primal therapy' in which adults are helped to work their way back in their minds to memories of the original (primal) hurt to their soul that occurred in their infancy and early childhood as a result of growing up in the extremely human-condition-embattled, insecure, have-to-somehow-establish-your-worth world of today. In the following extracts (which come from as well as serve as a condensation of his famous 1970 book *The Primal Scream*), Janov describes very clearly how the more upset humans became, the more they needed to find a way to escape their **'personal horror'**, summarising that **'Some of us prefer the neurotic never-never land where nothing can be absolutely true** [the postmodernist philosophy] **because it can lead us away from other personal truths which hurt so much. The neurotic has a personal stake in the denial of truth.'** Janov wrote: **'Anger is often sown by parents who see their children as a denial of their own** [human-condition-embattled] **lives. Marrying early and having to sacrifice themselves for years to demanding infants and young children are not readily accepted by those parents who never really had a chance to be free and happy** [p.327 of 446] **…neurotic parents are antifeeling, and how much of themselves they have had to cancel out in order to survive is a good index of how much they will attempt to cancel out in their children** [p.77] **…<u>there is unspeakable tragedy in the world</u>…<u>each of us being in a mad scramble away from our personal horror</u>. That is why neurotic parents cannot see the horror of what they are doing to their children, why they cannot comprehend that they are slowly killing a human being** [p.389] **…A young child cannot understand that it is his parents who are troubled…He does not know that it is not his job to make them stop fighting, to be happy, free or whatever…If he is ridiculed almost from birth, he must come to believe that something is wrong with him** [p.60] **…Neurosis begins as a means of appeasing neurotic parents by denying or covering certain feelings in hopes that "they" will finally love him** [p.65] **…a child shuts himself off in his earliest months and years because he usually has no other choice** [p.59] **… When patients** [in primal therapy] **finally get down to the early catastrophic feeling** [the 'primal scream'] **of knowing they were unloved, hated, or never to be understood—that epiphanic feeling of ultimate aloneness—they understand perfectly why they shut off** [p.97] **…<u>Some of us prefer the neurotic never-never land where nothing can be absolutely true</u>** [the postmodernist philosophy] **<u>because it can lead us away from other personal truths which hurt so much. The neurotic has a personal stake in the denial of truth</u>** [p.395]**.'** What has been said here makes it very clear that Postmodern Deconstructionism *was* extremely autistic behaviour; **'a complex mental structure insuring against recurrence of… unthinkable anxiety'**.

So, what is finally revealed about these claimed great, progressive, enlightened social reforms is that instead of those involved being more ideal people, behaving in a more ideal way and bringing about a more ideal world, as they trumpeted themselves to the world as being

and doing, they were actually more corrupted/upset/hurt/soul-damaged people, behaving in a less ideal way and bringing about a more alienated, devastated world. The truth was the complete opposite of what the pseudo-idealists, especially the latter day, more-advanced-in-denial pseudo idealists, were claiming. What was being presented to the world was a totally fraudulent, dishonest sham—and, as emphasised, the great danger of the ever-increasing levels of dishonesty was that humanity was being taken to the brink of terminal alienation.

We humans had to do what we had to do—create a guilt-free yet truthless environment in order to stay alive—but the situation got way out of hand, taking humanity perilously close to the perpetual darkness of terminal alienation. Humanity *was* facing a death by dogma, **'The Closing of the…**[human] **Mind'**, as Allan Bloom so accurately described it, and **'the end of civilization'** through a **'triumph of the forces of darkness'**, as Harold Bloom predicted. As necessary and tempting as it could become, to indulge dishonesty to the point of actually shutting down thought was the greatest weakness and failing possible on a planet where the fully conscious thinking mind is its culminating achievement. Preventing the search for knowledge represented a failure of all the effort and sacrifice made thus far by life on Earth. It represented a complete loss of nerve—as Jacob Bronowski was recorded earlier as saying: **'I am infinitely saddened to find myself suddenly surrounded in the west by a sense of terrible loss of nerve, a retreat from knowledge…**[which doesn't] **lie along the line of what we are now able to know if we devote ourselves to it: an understanding of man himself…Knowledge is our** [proper] **destiny. Self-knowledge.'**

While the danger for humanity's journey to enlightenment came from the increased levels of delusion and denial that we humans had to employ in order to cope with our increasingly insecure condition, to be truly free we *had to* confront and understand our condition, *not* escape it by adding more and more layers of denial. Denial blocked access to the truth, that being its purpose, but we *had to* find the truth, especially the truth about ourselves. As the great Greek philosopher Socrates (c.469-399 BC) famously said, **'the only good is knowledge and the only evil is ignorance'** (Diogenes Laertius, *Lives of Eminent Philosophers*, c.225 AD), and **'the unexamined life is not worth living'** (Plato's dialogue *Apology*, c.380 BC, tr. Benjamin Jowett)—but in the end a preference for ignorance and the associated need to oppress any examination of our lives, oppress any freedom to think truthfully, question and pursue knowledge, threatened to become the dominant attitude throughout the world. George Orwell's bleak prediction that **'If you want a picture of the future, imagine a boot stamping on a human face** [freedom] **– for ever'** was about to be realised—as was Aldous Huxley's fear (which he wrote about in his famous 1932 novel, *Brave New World*) that we would become a trivial culture where **'the truth would be drowned in a sea of irrelevance'**.

While the greed of capitalism was causing immense suffering and devastation, it was not greed that was taking the world to the brink of destruction, as everyone was being told—no, our society was being taken over by a desperate and madly behaved faction. It was a very, very serious matter that was made doubly so by the fact that almost no one was raising the alarm. Pseudo idealism had almost everyone intimidated, bluffed or seduced. Warnings about the real danger facing the world were only being voiced by a rare few, like those just mentioned—Socrates, Orwell, Nietzsche and Allan Bloom. As Geoffrey Wheatcroft recognised, while **'the great twin political problems of the age are the brutality of the right, and the dishonesty of the left'**, it was the dishonesty of the left that had the potential to—and was poised to—destroy the world.

I should explain that in the picture of the fossil skulls of our ancestors right through to modern man, I described the last stage of Adolescence as 'Pseudo Idealistic Adolescentman'. The reason for this demarcation was that although extremely angry Hollowman was also an element of this last stage, it was the pseudo idealism involved in this final stage that posed the most danger and was thus its most significant feature. Of the three aspects of upset of anger, egocentricity and alienation, alienation was the really dangerous one. Interestingly, anthropologists—in their defensive, mechanistic, denial-complying, dishonest mindset—named the final two varieties of humans in the series *Homo sapiens* and *Homo sapiens sapiens*, which literally translates as 'wise man' and 'wise wise man', as 'sapiens' is Latin for 'wise' and 'homo' is Latin for 'man'. Certainly, humans were gaining wisdom or knowledge, but the more truthful description of what we were really like, is 'False or Alienated Man', and 'False False or Alienated Alienated Man'.

Nietzsche's warning of the danger of the **'many sickly people'** who **'have a raging hate for the enlightened man and for that youngest of virtues which is called honesty'** can't be emphasised enough. To repeat what he wrote: **'Purer and more honest of speech is the healthy body, perfect and square-built: and it speaks of the meaning of the earth** [to face truth and one day find understanding of the human condition]**…You are not yet free, you still *search* for freedom. Your search has fatigued you…But, by my love and hope I entreat you: do not reject the hero in your soul! Keep holy your highest hope!'** Yes, yes, we could not afford to lose our nerve, but everyone nearly did.

Sir Laurens van der Post—who I regard to be, as I've mentioned already, the most exceptional denial-free thinking prophet and philosopher of the twentieth century; indeed, in his full-page obituary in the *London Times* he was described as **'a prophet out of Africa'** (20 Dec. 1996) (view Sir Laurens' obituary that was reproduced in *The Australian* at <www.humancondition.com/vanderpost-obituary>)—was another who was **'pure'** and **'honest'** and **'square-built'** enough to speak out strongly against the extreme danger of pseudo idealism, writing that **'the so-called liberal socialist elements in modern society are profoundly decadent today because they are not honest with themselves…They give people an ideological and not a real idea of what life should be about, and this is immoral…They feel good by being highly moral about other people's lives, and this is immoral…They have parted company with reality in the name of idealism…there is this enormous trend which accompanies industrialized societies, which is to produce a kind of collective man who becomes indifferent to the individual values: real societies depend for their renewal and creation on individuals…There is, in fact, a very disturbing, pathological element—something totally non-rational—in the criticism of the** [UK] **Prime Minister** [Margaret Thatcher]**. It amazes me how no one recognizes how shrill, hysterical and out of control a phenomenon it is…I think socialism, which has a nineteenth-century inspiration and was valid really only in a nineteenth-century context when the working classes had no vote, has long since been out of date and been like a rotting corpse whose smell in our midst has tainted the political atmosphere far too long'** (*A Walk with a White Bushman*, 1986, pp.90-93 of 326).

Two of the Bible's denial-free thinking, exceptionally sound, **'pure'** and **'honest'**, **'square-built'** prophets—Daniel and Christ—also warned of the extreme danger of pseudo idealism when they spoke of **'the abomination that causes desolation'** taking over the world. The Bible has, without a doubt, been the most influential book in history because it contains extraordinary honesty; indeed, it has been the most denial-free book humans have had for guidance. As Daniel said of his own contribution to the Bible, **'I will tell you what is written in the Book of**

Truth' (10:21)—and his ability to think in a denial-free, truthful and therefore effective way meant Daniel *was* in a position to **'explain to you what will happen to you people in the future'** (10:14). However, since there was no science in his day to evidence his argument, all Daniel could do was draw upon analogies to describe what he could see so clearly happening in the future. In one analogy he described **'The king of the South'** (which we can understand is the freedom-upholding, answer-searching but immensely upsetting and corrupting right-wing) constantly at war with **'the king of the North'** (the freedom-oppressing, dogma-based, pseudo idealistic, dishonest left-wing). He described how, for a long time, power would switch between these kings (as it did in democratic politics), until the complete polarisation of the two kingdoms, the two political states, came about (which has occurred), at which point **'the abomination that causes desolation'** of pseudo idealism would finally threaten to take over the world. After describing many changes of power, Daniel said: **'the king of the North will muster another army larger than the first…The forces of the South will be powerless to resist; even their best troops will not have the strength to stand** [pseudo idealism becomes increasingly seductive and powerful as people become increasingly upset]**. The invader will do as he pleases; no-one will be able to stand against him…**[but eventually 'he'/pseudo idealism] **will make an alliance with the king of the South…**[some bipartisanship between the left and right wing will occur, but then the left-wing] **will stumble and fall…** [however, in time] **He will be succeeded by a contemptible person** [even more dishonest forms of left-wing pseudo idealism will emerge] **who will not be given the honour of royalty** [they will lack religion's honesty]**. He will invade the kingdom** [the religious kingdom of honesty]**…and he will seize it through intrigue** [through the dishonesty of extreme forms of pseudo idealism masquerading as real idealism]**. Then an overwhelming army** [from the South] **will be swept away before him; both it and a prince of the covenant** [religion] **will be destroyed…when the richest provinces feel secure, he will invade them and will achieve what neither his father nor his forefathers did** [no force has been able to overthrow religion before]**…His armed forces will rise up to desecrate the temple fortress and will abolish the daily sacrifice. Then they will set up the abomination that causes desolation** [pseudo idealistic causes and fundamentalist misinterpretations of religious teaching will take over the world and lead humanity to terminal alienation]**. With flattery** [the truth-and-guilt-avoiding, do-good, feel-good self-affirmation that pseudo idealism feeds off] **he will corrupt those who have violated the covenant** [pseudo idealism will seduce the more upset away from religion's infinitely more honest way of coping with the human condition]**, but the people who know their God will firmly resist him** [the more secure, less dishonest will not be deceived and *must* strongly resist the seductive tide]**…The** [left-wing pseudo idealistic] **king will do as he pleases. He will exalt and magnify himself above every god and will say unheard-of-things against the God of gods** [such as Richard Dawkins, Oxford University's Professor of Public Understanding of Science, would you believe, who has said that **'"faith is one of the world's great evils, comparable to the smallpox virus, but harder to eradicate. The whole subject of God is a bore"…those who teach religion to small children are guilty of "child abuse"'** (quoted by Garth Wood, *The Spectator*, 20 Feb. 1999)]**. He will be successful until the time of wrath** [until the all-exposing truth of understanding of the human condition arrives to save the world, as it is doing in what you are reading right here]**…He will invade many countries and sweep through them like a flood…he will set out in a great rage** [the stridency that I and Sir Laurens van der Post talked about of those trying to persuade themselves and others that their pseudo idealistic causes represent real idealism] **to destroy and annihilate many…Yet he will come to his end, and no-one will help him…**[when understanding of the human condition arrives pseudo idealism will

be totally exposed and brought to an end. However, while 'he'/pseudo idealism reigns] **There will be a time of distress such as has not happened from the beginning of nations until then'** (from Dan. ch.11&12).

In another analogy that describes the same progression, but which in some ways is even more explicit, mentioning as it does how **'truth was thrown to the ground'**, Daniel, appropriately enough, used the symbols of a (determined) ram for the right-wing and a (stupid) goat for the left-wing. He said that initially **'No animal could stand against him** [the ram]**, and none could rescue from his power. He did as he pleased and became great…**[greed and indifference to others was so great that even children, for instance, were put to work in coalmines, but then the] **goat…charged at him in great rage…**[the left-wing emerged and] **The ram was powerless to stand against him; the goat knocked him to the ground and trampled on him, and none could rescue the ram from his power. The goat became very great…It set itself up to be as great as the Prince of the host** [it set itself up to be more important than religion]**; it took away the daily sacrifice from him, and the place of his sanctuary was brought low…It prospered in everything it did, and truth was thrown to the ground…"How long will it take for the vision to be fulfilled—the vision concerning the daily sacrifice, the rebellion that causes desolation, and the surrender of the sanctuary and of the host that will be trampled underfoot** [the rebellion against religion's honesty]**… It will take** [a long time]**…understand that the vision concerns the time of the end."…**[when humans] **have become completely wicked** [and]**, a stern-faced king** [the extremely upset]**, a master of intrigue, will arise** [the left-wing pseudo idealistic, false prophet merchants of escapist denial and delusion will arise]**…He will cause astounding devastation and will succeed in whatever he does. He will destroy the mighty men and the holy people** [even the strong will begin to succumb to the intimidating tide of pseudo idealism]**. He will cause deceit** [the misrepresentation of pseudo idealism as being real idealism] **to prosper, and he will consider himself superior** [the extreme delusion that left-wing pseudo idealism is based on will spread everywhere]**…"The vision…concerns the distant future** [that finally arrived]**'"** (Dan. ch.8).

In the New Testament, Christ gave exactly the same warning as Daniel, even referring to Daniel's description of pseudo idealism as **'the abomination that causes desolation'**—but Christ went further, truthfully and courageously advising people to head for the hills, **'flee to the mountains'**, when pseudo idealism and strident fundamentalist misinterpretations of religious teachings threatened to destroy humanity. Referring to **'the sign…of the end of the age'**, Christ said that **'At that time many will turn away from the faith and will betray and hate each other** [a great deal of upset will develop]**, and many false prophets** [pseudo idealists claiming to be leading the way to peace and a new age of goodness and happiness for humans] **will appear and deceive many people… even the elect** [even those less alienated, still relatively sound and strong in soul, will begin to be seduced by pseudo idealism]**—if that were possible. See, I have told you ahead of time…Wherever there is a carcass** [the extremely upset]**, there the vultures** [false prophet promoters of delusion and denial to artificially make the extremely upset feel good] **will gather. Because of the increase of wickedness** [upset]**, the love of most will grow cold. So when you see the "abomination that causes desolation," spoken of through the prophet Daniel, standing where it does not belong** [throwing out religion and falsely claiming to be presenting the way to the human-condition-free, good-versus-evil-deconstructed, post-human-condition, better world]**—let the reader understand—then let those who are in Judea flee to the mountains. Let no-one on the roof of his house go down to take anything out of the house. Let no-one in the field go back to get his cloak. How dreadful it will be in those days for pregnant women and**

nursing mothers! Pray that your flight will not take place in winter because those will be days of great distress [mindless dogma and its consequences] **unequalled from the beginning of the world until now—and never to be equalled again. If those days had not been cut short** [by the arrival of the liberating understanding of the human condition]**, no-one would survive'** (extracts from Matt. 24 & Mark 13 combined). In summary, when Christ said to **'Beware of false prophets. They come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly they are ferocious wolves'** (Matt. 7:15), he was saying we had to be on guard for those who hid their extreme upset behind pseudo idealistic causes in order to delude themselves that they were sound and ideally behaved people leading others to a sound and ideal world. True prophets *confronted* the issue of the human condition while false prophets were merchants of delusion, advocates of *escapism* from the issue of the human condition.

The most common criticism the WTM receives about our video presentations and their transcripts is the denunciation of pseudo idealistic causes such as environmentalism, but that is a measure of just how seduced almost everyone was by pseudo idealism. As Daniel foresaw, in the end **'even their best troops will not have the strength to stand'** against the seductive tide of pseudo idealism. He said **'no-one will be able to stand against'** it and it will **'invade many countries and sweep through them like a flood'** and **'cause deceit to prosper'**. Christ similarly warned that **'false prophets will appear and deceive many people…even the elect—if that were possible. See, I have told you ahead of time.'**

For such exceptionally sound, **'pure'** and **'honest'**, **'square-built'** prophets throughout history who weren't living in denial and thus **'who know their God'**—from Daniel to Christ to Nietzsche to van der Post—to so **'firmly resist'** and warn of the great danger of the **'dreadful' 'abomination'** that causes **'astounding devastation' 'unequalled from the beginning of the world until now'** of those who have such a **'raging hate** [of]**…honesty'** that they have created a pseudo idealistic **'rotting corpse whose smell in our midst has tainted the political atmosphere far too long'** where **'truth was thrown to the ground'** and **'trampled underfoot'**, emphasises just how extremely serious the threat of **'the end of civilization'** through a **'triumph of the forces of darkness'** of pseudo idealism and fundamentalist misinterpretations of religious teachings became. Their influence and hold became so great that any remaining political opposition would soon, as Daniel predicted, have been **'powerless to stand against'** it. The West defied and fought with all its might the spread of oppressive dogma in the form of communism in the former USSR and South East Asia, but it was proving incapable of resisting the takeover of its own culture by the oppressive dogma of pseudo idealism. Humanity had reached the precipice of self-destruction, so this understanding of the human condition arrived only just in time to **'cut short'** that tragic end.

Humanity's two million year journey to find understanding of the human condition finally came down to a so-called **'cultural war'** between the philosophy of the political left-wing and the philosophy of the political right-wing. Both sides were determined they were right, but with the human condition now explained what is revealed is that, in terms of a future for the human race, the philosophy of the left-wing was completely wrong and the philosophy of the right-wing was completely right. What is now revealed is that the left-wing was all about dogma, delusion and escapism, while the right-wing was comparatively all about realism, honesty and responsibility.

Interestingly, there is one final irony to the saga of humanity's great journey through ignorance, which is that the ideal world that the left-wing was dogmatically demanding is actually achieved by the right-wing winning its reality-defending, freedom-from-idealism, corrupting-search-for-knowledge battle against the freedom-oppressing pseudo idealism of the left-wing. As was explained in Part 3:10, with the freedom-from-dogma right-wing's search for understanding of the human condition completed, the justification for the egocentric power, fame, fortune and glory life of the right-wing ends and the ideal-behaviour-obeying attitude that the left-wing sought takes over. In a sense, when the right-wing wins we all become left-wing; through the success of the philosophy of the right-wing we all adopt the philosophy of the left-wing—but, most significantly, this time we are not abandoning the battle, we are leaving it won.

In reality of course, finding understanding of the human condition ends the inability to explain what humanity's journey has been about, the result being that the different philosophical positions of the left-wing and right-wing are completely obsoleted. Now that it can be explained that humanity has been involved in a corrupting search for knowledge, corruption is explained, which in turn exposes the unrealistic position of the left-wing's dogmatic insistence on idealism and in so doing brings it to an end. Similarly, for its part, the right-wing's corrupting search for knowledge is also brought to a close with the finding of the key knowledge it was searching for, that being understanding of the human condition. Of course, the search for knowledge continues, but it is no longer the priority. The priority for the immediate future, as was explained in Part 3:10, is to take up the TRANSFORMED LIFEFORCE WAY OF LIVING. Thus, with the arrival of understanding of the human condition, the concept of 'politics' comes to an end, which will undoubtedly be of great relief to everyone.

Finally, it should be reiterated that in the greater context of the human-condition-understood view that we now have, upset is a heroic state, with the most upset being the most heroic individuals of all because they have necessarily been involved in the battle that humanity has been waging longer and/or more intensely than any others. While the stark descriptions that have been given of the extremely upset as being **'wicked'**, **'stern-faced'**, **'cold'**, **'sickly' 'carcasses'**, **'vultures'** and **'ferocious wolves'** involved in creating a **'rotting corpse'** of **'abomination'** were necessary to match the no-holds-barred, totally brutal assault on the truth that was being **'thrown to the ground'** and left **'trampled underfoot'** by pseudo idealists, in the human-condition-understanding new world such rhetoric is entirely wrong and redundant.

In fact, it shouldn't even be necessary to talk about the old struggle between the left and right wing philosophies any more than what has now been done in this presentation. As was explained in Part 3:10, humanity now moves on to an entirely new existence. Thankfully, there will be many subjects that no longer have to be discussed now that humanity is able to move on to another existence. We get the truth up and we move on. We leave our suitcase of experiences that took place in the old ignorant, human-condition-afflicted, power-fame-fortune-and-glory-

seeking-and-pseudo-idealistic-coping world behind and move on to an entirely new, instinct-and-intellect-reconciled, human-condition-liberated, TRANSFORMED world.

The insecure, artificial-reinforcement-filled Old World

The soul and intellect reconciled New World

Drawing by Jeremy Griffith © 1991-2011 Fedmex Pty Ltd

The TRANSFORMED LIFEFORCE STATE

Drawing by Jeremy Griffith © 1996-2011 Fedmex Pty Ltd

The following drawing should be included again to summarise humanity's overall journey from our species' original innocent Childhood through an insecure, human-condition-afflicted, immensely upset Adolescence, to a secure, human-condition-reconciled, mature Adulthood.

Drawing by Jeremy Griffith © 1996 Fedmex Pty Ltd

So that's it—the greatest of all stories, our story, the story of humanity's incredibly, unbelievably heroic journey from ignorance to enlightenment told for the first time!

Part 3:12 Anticipations of the arrival of our species' liberation from the horror of the human condition and resulting TRANSFORMATION of the human race

The ability to at last explain the human condition means everything we humans have ever dreamed of is now possible. As has been emphasised in Part 3:10, and as will be explained in some detail in Part 9, the arrival of understanding of the human condition allows everyone to *immediately* be free of the human condition and as a result be TRANSFORMED into a state of extraordinary joyful excitement.

To illustrate the magnificence of this breakthrough in **'enlightenment'** or understanding and resulting **'cave-prison'-'released'** transfiguration of the human race that Plato talked about and in truth every human who has ever lived has worked tirelessly towards, all that is required is the inclusion of a few of the anticipations of this wondrous moment of FREEDOM from the human condition and resulting TRANSFORMATION of the human race that can be found in all ancient as well as contemporary forms of human expression.

It is relevant to note the phenomenal consistency of description and imagery in all these accounts, in particular of being imprisoned and of the rising sun representing the arrival of the dreamed of liberating knowledge about our troubled condition. While the anticipation of our species' FREEDOM was clearly something we, for the most part, had to block out of our mind because it made living with the terrible emptiness of our existing lives too unbearable, it was, nevertheless, a fabulously exciting hope and dream that we have all carried just below the surface of our conscious awareness. As such we couldn't access it by simply deciding to try to think about it—usually it had to bubble up from underneath our much-reinforced protective, defensive, denial-dependent, superficial, everyday state of awareness. Poetry and song were marvellous vehicles for allowing this to occur because in their creation we allowed our mind to, as it were, semi-disconnect from its protective **'cave prison'** state of **'almost blind'** denial and simply let rhyme express thoughts and emotions it otherwise wouldn't.

Before going on to describe these honest expressions of hope and excitement, it should also be mentioned that while the anticipation of our species' liberation from the human condition exists in everyone just below the surface of their conscious awareness, on the occasion/s that it did bubble up and break through to the surface it usually wasn't long before that awareness was once again repressed; it had to be, because, as I said, it made living with the terrible emptiness of our existing lives too unbearable. The result of this limited access to the truth of another human-condition-free state is that some of the composers of the songs that will be mentioned here have, in later life, denied the suggestion that there was any prophetic element to words that were written in their inspired youth and/or in an inspired state. Bob Dylan has said something to that effect about his earlier songs, while in his 2008 memoir, *Thirteen Tonne Theory: Life Inside Hunters and Collectors*, the Australian singer-songwriter Mark Seymour spoke about **'kook'** responses to his (soon-to-be-described) amazingly prophetic 1993 song, *The Holy Grail*—citing one of my own references to the lyrics of that song as an example. Seymour dismissively said I was suggesting his lyrics were **'somehow…connected with the dawning of a new consciousness'** (p.343 of 388). Again, the problem with any acknowledgment of another wonderful, human-condition-free world was that it made living with the terrible emptiness of our existing lives too unbearable. So while we *do* all carry an awareness of the

potential for this fabulous other world just below the surface of our consciousness, it was only in rare, inspired moments that we could actually afford to allow that awareness to bubble to the surface before having to block out once more the real significance, context and meaning of what we revealed. Of course, what has been said here doesn't just apply to songwriters, it applies across all forms of human expression: literature, art, poetry, etc.

Obviously some individuals are more capable than others of accessing the truths that the human race, as a whole, has had to repress, live in denial of. As is about to be described, John Lennon, Bob Dylan, Jim Morrison and Bono were and are four exceptionally truth-revealing, prophetic songwriters. But well before their time we, of course, had the earliest recorded anticipations of the arrival of our species' liberation from the horror of the human condition—those contained in religious scripture.

As already mentioned, the eternal hope, faith and trust we have all held onto of the eventual arrival of 'peace on Earth' is expressed in every religion, such as in the Bible in *The Lord's Prayer* where it says, **'Your** [cooperative, loving, harmonious, peaceful] **Kingdom come, your will be done on earth as it is in heaven'** (Matt. 6:10 & Luke 11:2), and in Genesis where it says that we **'will be like God, knowing** [understanding] **good and evil'** (3:5), and in Buddhist scripture where Buddha says, **'every one' 'In domains in all directions'** will be living **'on wisdom-thrones'** (*The Lotus Sutra*, ch.9; tr. W.E. Soothill, 1987, p.148 of 275).

Returning, however, to contemporary mythology, when Jim Morrison of the rock band The Doors wrote and sang of wanting to **'break on through to the other side'** (from *Break on Through*, written in 1966, first released on The Doors' 1967 album *The Doors*), he too was anticipating a time when humans could break through from living a human-condition-afflicted state to a TRANSFORMED human-condition-free state. And when he sang that **'At first flash of Eden, we race down to the sea. Standing there on freedom's shore, waiting, waiting, waiting for the sun'** (from *Waiting for the Sun*, written in 1968, first released on The Doors' 1970 album *Morrison Hotel*), what he was **'waiting'** for was the liberating light of the redeeming and rehabilitating understanding of the human condition to dawn across the world and take the human race back to a Garden-of-**'Eden'**-like state of upset-free innocence. Similarly also, the **'yellow brick road'** that Dorothy had to follow to reach the **'Emerald City'** in *The Wizard Of Oz* (first published as the book *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz*, by L. Frank Baum in 1900) was really an intuitive anticipation of the Sunshine Highway that the whole human race is now able to take to a peaceful, **'Emerald'**, Garden-of-Eden-like world bathed in the warm, healing sunshine of dignifying, uplifting, liberating and relieving *self-knowledge*. It is, as already mentioned, the anticipation in Martin Luther King Jr's **'dream'** of a harmonious world FREE of our species' historic, immensely troubled state or condition—a fabulous time when all humans would be able to proclaim that we are '**Free at last! Free at last! Thank God Almighty, we are free at last!'** ('I Have A Dream' speech, 28 Aug. 1963) from our age-old insecure fear and doubt about our worth and the resulting psychosis that made us humans so defensive and retaliatory towards one another.

Yes, the quintessential shaking of our fist at the heavens was an affirmation by us humans that one day, one day, we would be able to explain ourselves, explain that, despite all appearances to the contrary, we are *not* fundamentally evil, god-defiling, meaningless and worthless blights on this Earth after all—that there *is* a reason we became the angry, egocentric and alienated species we have been.

In his 1971 song *Peace Train*, Cat Stevens (who now calls himself Yusuf Islam) also wrote and sang about the dream of a TRANSFORMED, human-condition-ameliorated world, when we could leave the terrible darkness of our cave-like prison of alienated self-estrangement and return to an untroubled, peaceful, integrated state: **'I've been smiling lately, dreaming about the world as one. And I believe it could be, some day it's going to come. Cause out on the edge of darkness there rides a peace train. Oh peace train take this country, come take me home again.'** And then there are the lyrics to another of Stevens' songs from 1971, *Changes IV*: **'Don't you feel a change a coming, from another side of time. Breaking down the walls of silence, lifting shadows from your mind…Yesterday has past, now let's all start the living for the one that's going to last…when the clouds have all gone…and the beauty of all things is uncovered again…Don't you feel the day is coming, and it won't be too soon, when the people of the world can all live in one room, when we shake off the ancient chains of our tomb.'** The words of Walter Earl Brown's 1968 song *If I Can Dream*, which was performed by Elvis Presley, are equally prophetic: **'There must be peace and understanding sometime, strong winds of promise that will blow away all the doubt and fear. If I can dream of a warmer sun where hope keeps shining on everyone…We're trapped in a world that's troubled with pain…Still I am sure that the answer's gonna come somehow, out there in the dark, there's a beckoning candle.'** The song *Aquarius*, from the rock musical *Hair* (which premiered in 1967), similarly anticipated a time of **'Harmony and understanding, sympathy and trust abounding. No more falsehoods or derisions, golden living dreams of visions…And the mind's true liberation …We dance unto the dawn of day'** (Lyrics by James Rado & Gerome Ragni). *Hair* also contained the song that pleaded to **'Let The Sunshine In'** (ibid).

As mentioned, one of the founders of the New Age Movement, the American author Marilyn Ferguson, was looking forward to a human-condition-ameliorated new world when she wrote, **'Maybe** [the French Jesuit priest, scientist and philosopher] **Teilhard de Chardin was right; maybe we are moving toward an omega point** [final unification of our split selves]**—Maybe we can finally resolve the planet's inner conflict between its neurotic self (which we've created and which is unreal) and its real self. Our real self knows how to commune, how to create…From everything I've seen people really urgently want the kind of new beginning…**[that I am] **talking about** [where humans will live in] **cooperation instead of competition'** (*New Age* mag. Aug. 1982).

Sir Bob Geldof, the Irish rock singer, songwriter and political activist who was knighted for his humanitarian initiatives in Africa, recognised how alienated from its true self or soul, and thus lost, the human race has become with his emphasis on the phrase **'Deep in the Heart of Nowhere'** in the lyrics and title of a song from his 1986 album, also titled *Deep in the Heart of Nowhere*. In another song from the same album, Sir Bob pleaded the desperate plight of the world with the words, **'What are we going to do because it can't go on…This is the world calling. God help us'** (*This is the World Calling*). His lyrics to another song on the same album recognise just how desperate the human race has been for answers: **'Searching through their sacred books for the holy grail of "why", but the total sum of knowledge knows no more than you or I'** (*August Was a Heavy Month*). While religious texts have been the best reservoir of denial-free knowledge the human race has had, there was no scientific knowledge available at the time they were written to enable the denial-free thinkers or prophets involved in creating those great religious texts to answer all the **'why'**s about our human condition.

The words of many of singer-songwriter Bob Dylan's early songs are deeply prophetic yearnings for, and anticipations of, an end to our lonely, cave-dwelling, self-estranged, split-off-from-our-true-self, alienated, seemingly lost and meaningless existence through the arrival at last of a human-condition-understood-and-ameliorated world of FREEDOM—notably in *Like A Rolling Stone* (1965), which asked, **'How does it feel, how does it feel to be on your own with no direction home, like a complete unknown, like a rolling stone'**; and in *Mr. Tambourine Man* (1964), when Dylan sang, **'I'm not sleepy and there is no place I'm going to…I'm branded on my feet, I have no one to meet, and the ancient empty street's too dead for dreaming…Then take me disappearin' through the smoke rings of my mind, down the foggy ruins of time…far from the twisted reach of crazy sorrow… Hey! Mr. Tambourine Man, play a song for me'**; and in *When The Ship Comes In* (1963) when Dylan sang of **'The hour that the ship** [the dignifying, reconciling understanding of humans] **comes in…And the morning will be a-breaking…And the words that are used for to get the ship confused** [all our false denials] / **Will not be understood as they're spoken** [the denials will be seen through] / **For the chains** [holding the truth back] **of the sea will have busted in the night and be buried on the bottom of the ocean…And like Goliath they'll** [all our denials will] **be conquered'**; and in *The Times They Are A-Changin'* (1963) when he anticipated how **'the** [human-condition-afflicted] **present now will later be past'**; and in *All Along the Watchtower* (1968) when he demanded that **'There must be some way out of here…There's too much confusion, I can't get no relief…There are many here among us who feel that life is but a joke…So let us not talk falsely now, the hour is getting late. All along the watchtower, princes kept the view** [waiting and watching for the time when understanding of the human condition would finally arrive and humans would no longer have to live in a state of sad and pathetic confusion where everyone has to depend on denial to cope and as a result talk so falsely]**…Two riders were approaching** [the approaching duality of the wonderfully all-liberating but at the same time dreadfully all-exposing truth about our human condition], **the wind began to howl** [the coming terrifying storm of the all-exposing truth—as it says in the Bible, you will know when the truth about the human condition arrives because it will be **'like the lightning, which flashes and lights up the sky from one end to the other'** (Luke 17:24 & Matt. 24:27)]**'**; and, finally, in *Blowin' In The Wind* (1962) he pleaded, **'how many years can some people exist before they're allowed to be free?'**

Expressing a similar exasperation to Dylan's **'I can't get no relief'** were singer-songwriters Mick Jagger and Keith Richards of The Rolling Stones with their 1965 song *I Can't Get No Satisfaction*—a track that in 2004 was voted by a panel of experts assembled by the world's leading rock music magazine *Rolling Stone* as the second-greatest song of all time behind Dylan's *Like A Rolling Stone*: **'I can't get no satisfaction, I can't get no satisfaction, 'cause I try and I try and I try and I try…When I'm drivin' in my car, and that man comes on the radio and he's tellin' me more and more about some useless** [human-condition-denying, superficial] **information supposed to fire my imagination…I can't get no satisfaction, When I'm watchin' my TV and that man comes on to tell me how white my shirts can be, well, he can't be a man, 'cause he doesn't smoke the same cigarettes as me…I can't get no satisfaction, 'cause I try and I try. When I'm ridin' 'round the world and I'm doin' this and I'm signin' that and I'm tryin' to make some girl who tells me, baby better come back later next week, 'cause you see I'm on a losing streak…I can't get no satisfaction. That's what I say.'** Singer-songwriter Tracy Chapman's 1986 release *Why?* also contains honest descriptions of the utter hypocrisy of our human-condition-afflicted lives before anticipating a time when the underlying truth about that tragic state would finally be revealed: **'Why do the babies starve, when there's enough**

food to feed the world. Why when there're so many of us, are there people still alone. Why are the missiles called peace keepers, when they're aimed to kill. Why is a woman still not safe, when she's in her home. Love is hate, war is peace, no is yes, and we're all free. But somebody's gonna have to answer, the time is coming soon, amidst all these questions and contradictions, there're some who seek the truth. But somebody's gonna have to answer, the time is coming soon, when the blind remove their blinders, and the speechless speak the truth.' (While *I Can't Get No Satisfaction* and *Like A Rolling Stone* have been voted the greatest songs of all time, I have both heard (in the case of *Dancing Queen*, Grant Denyer, Channel 7's *Sunrise*, 2 Mar. 2011) and read (in the case of *Crazy*, accessed Mar. 2011 at: <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Patsy_Cline>) that the two most played songs on jukeboxes are ABBA's *Dancing Queen* (about being **'young and sweet, only seventeen…**[and] **having the time of your life…**[where you] **leave 'em burning'**) and Patsy Cline's *Crazy* (about being **'Crazy for thinking that my love could hold you'**)—yes, for reasons that will be explained in Part 7:1, young women have owned the world, their beauty has been so extraordinary, so inspiring and exciting, that there *was* nothing comparable to it in the dead, human-condition-afflicted world; and yes, older women therefore suffered from the loss of innocent youthfulness' intoxicating effect.)

Creedence Clearwater Revival's 1970 song *Who'll Stop the Rain*, written and sung by the band's lead vocalist John Fogerty, contains these lyrics of hunger for FREEDOM from all the confusion: **'Long as I remember the rain's been coming down. Clouds of mystery pouring confusion on the ground. Good men through the ages trying to find the sun, and I wonder, still I wonder who'll stop the rain.'** As stated, it wasn't until science had found sufficient understanding of the mechanisms and workings of our world that the human condition could be explained. As will be fully described in Part 4, until science had done its job and found sufficient knowledge to make explanation of the human condition possible, all the **'good men'** in the world couldn't **'find the sun'**; find the liberating understanding of the human condition and **'stop the rain'**, stop the **'clouds of mystery pouring confusion on the ground'**. And even when science *had* accumulated sufficient knowledge for the human condition to be explained there still remained a great deal of fearful truth to have to face to reach that liberating insight—as Billy Joel experienced and described in his 1993 song *River of Dreams*: **'In the middle of the night I go walking in my sleep, from the mountains of faith…through the valley of fear…through the jungle of doubt…through the desert of truth…to the river so deep…that is runnin' to the promised land** [of our FREEDOM from our human-condition-imprisoned state]**…but the river is wide and it's too hard to cross** [there are truths too terrifying to confront and try to think about]**…I try to cross to the opposite side so I can finally find what I've been looking for…I've been searching for something taken out of my soul.'** We needed the reconciling understanding of the human condition that would allow us to resuscitate and re-integrate ourselves with our original, innocent, soulful state—but finding that truth meant confronting the imperfections of our more recent past. In her 1994 song *New Beginning*, Tracy Chapman acknowledged our species' current decimated, corrupted, 'fallen', damaged, upset, hurt, dysfunctional condition and the path we had to take to a liberated and healed new beginning: **'The world is broken into fragments and pieces that once were joined together in a unified whole…The whole world's broke and it ain't worth fixing. It's time to start all over, make a new beginning…change our lives and paths; create a new world…There's too much fighting, too little understanding…We need to…make a new** [truthful] **language. With these we'll redefine the world and start all over.'**

In his 1971 song *Imagine*, John Lennon, a member of the most famous band of the 1960s (and perhaps of all-time), the wholesome The Beatles, asked us to **'imagine there's no heaven… no hell below us'**, a world without the condemning differentiation of good and evil, a world liberated from the insecurity of the human condition and thus the need for religion, where there is **'Nothing to kill or die for, and no religion too…all the people living life in peace…No need for greed or hunger, a brotherhood of man…all the people sharing all the world…**[when] **the world will be as one.'** Absolutely exasperated with the dishonest, empty-of-any-truth, cave-dwelling world of psychotic denial and delusion we humans have had to live in, and so eager for the arrival of the truth about the human condition that would finally bring about the healed and ameliorated world that he could **'imagine'**, Lennon composed *Just Gimme Some Truth* (1971) in which he pleaded for honesty: **'All I want is the truth, just gimme some truth. I've had enough of reading things by neurotic…politicians…I'm sick to death of seeing things from tight-lipped…chauvinists…I've had enough of watching scenes of schizophrenic…prima-donnas…I'm sick and tired of hearing things from uptight…hypocrites…All I want is the truth now, just gimme some truth NOW.'** The **'truth'** *is* what the world has been desperate for, however, as we are going to see in all the coming descriptions and analysis of the human condition, that **'truth'** can be terrifyingly exposing and confronting—making the solution to all that frightening exposure of the TRANSFORMED LIFEFORCE STATE so immensely precious.

All these lyrics about the hunger for the liberating understanding of the human condition are reminiscent of the admonition the ancients had emblazoned across their temples: **'Man, know thyself.'** Only through finding the relieving *understanding of ourselves* could we end our imprisonment in a cave-dwelling state of alienation—or, to use religious terminology, end our **'banished'** existence **'from the Garden of Eden'** (Gen. 3:23) state of our original innocence and by so doing return not to an innocent state, because we now have **'the knowledge** [the understanding] **of good and evil'** (ibid. 2:9, 2:17, 3:5), but to a secure, integrated, peaceful state of being—and, as a result of that change in us, enable the rehabilitation of our planet to its former state of unexploited, unpolluted, unspoiled beauty.

Mark Seymour, the aforementioned lead singer and songwriter with the Australian rock band Hunters and Collectors, was prescient when, in his already cited 1993 song *Holy Grail*, he sang about a **'dream'** of a time when humans would be able to rise up from their human-condition-depressed-oppressed-and-repressed state and take the all-crucial unifying, ego-freeing and Earth-healing understanding of our species that, for so long, we had been searching for across the four corners of the world: **'Woke up this morning from the strangest dream, I was in the biggest army the world had ever seen, we were marching as one on the road to the Holy Grail** [to liberating understanding]**. Started out seeking fortune and glory, it's a short song but it's a hell of a story, when you spend your lifetime trying to get your hands, on the Holy Grail. Well have you heard about the Great Crusade? We ran into millions but nobody got paid** [selfless cooperation replaced selfish greed]**, yeah we razed four corners of the globe for the Holy Grail. All the locals scattered, they were hiding in the snow. We were so far from home, so how were we to know there'd be nothing left to plunder when we stumbled on the Holy Grail? We were so full of beans but we were dying like flies** [humans were pretending to be happy but in truth they were all but dead with alienation]**, and those big black birds, they were circling in the sky, and you know what they say, yeah nobody deserves to die** [humanity was entering the end play state of terminal alienation]**. Oh but I've been searching for an**

easy way, to escape the cold light of day [I have tried to live in denial]**. I've been high and I've been low** [I have lived a manic depressive, bipolar existence of oscillating between being able to block out the reality of my immensely corrupted condition enough to feel some relief, and being unable to block it out]**, but I've got nowhere else to go** [trying to live through denial had run its course]**. There's nowhere else to go! I followed orders** [I have tried to live through deferment to laws, rules and faith]**, God knows where I've been, but I woke up alone, all my wounds were clean** [I woke up in the human-condition-reconciled, liberated, TRANSFORMED state]**.'** In the Bible the prophet Joel expressed the exact same anticipation: **'Like dawn spreading across the mountains a large and mighty army comes, such as never was of old nor ever will be in ages to come…Before them the land is like the garden of Eden, behind them, a desert waste—nothing escapes them. They have the appearance of horses; they gallop along like cavalry. With a noise like that of chariots…like a mighty army…They all march in line, not swerving from their course. They do not jostle each other…The day of the Lord is great** [the day of the arrival of the out-of-cave, denial-free, honest words of liberating, egocentricity-ending, nature-repairing truth about our human condition is great]**'** (Joel 2). After saying that **'the day of the Lord** [truth] **is great'**, Joel immediately goes on to warn of how frighteningly exposing of our corrupted human condition the truth about the human condition will be, saying that that day is going to be so **'dreadful. Who can endure it?'** As to how we **'endure'** the arrival of the wonderfully dignifying, healing, ameliorating and all-liberating—but at the same time all-exposing, **'dreadful'**—naked truth about ourselves *is* an immense problem for us, but thankfully there is an easy, totally effective and glorious solution. This wonderful solution that leads to the TRANSFORMED STATE where we leave all our upset behind in a 'suitcase' as dealt with was described in Part 3:10. In the Bible the prophet Isaiah also described the arrival of the world-changing, utterly inspired TRANSFORMED WAY OF LIVING when he said: **'He** [understanding] **lifts up a banner for the distant nations, he whistles for those at the ends of the earth. Here they come, swiftly and speedily! Not one of them grows tired or stumbles, not one slumbers or sleeps; not a belt is loosened at the waist, not a sandal thong is broken. Their arrows are sharp, all their bows are strung; their horses' hoofs seem like flint, their chariot wheels like a whirlwind. Their roar is like that of the lion, they roar like young lions; they growl as they seize their prey and carry it off with no-one to rescue. In that day they will roar over it like the roaring of the sea'** (Isa. 5:26–30).

The Irish rock band U2 has also made, and indeed continues to make, a great contribution to the stable of songs that convey the hunger for a human-condition-ameliorated, integrated world—as the following examples attest. For starters, their immensely popular 1987 song *I Still Haven't Found What I'm Looking For*, which was written by the band's members and sung by their lead singer Bono, contains the following powerful lyrics: **'I have climbed the highest mountain…Only to be with you…I have kissed honey lips** [I have tried to believe in and live through the inspiration of women's beauty]**…But I still haven't found what I'm looking for…I have held the hand of a devil…I was cold as a stone** [I've experienced the dark behaviour and loneliness of a human-condition-afflicted existence] **But I still haven't found what I'm looking for…I believe in the Kingdom Come when all the colours will bleed into one** [the time when the human race will finally be unified through dignifying, insecurity-eliminating self-knowledge] **But yes, I'm still running** [still waiting desperately for that great breakthrough insight that will make that possible] **You…carried the cross of my shame, you know I believe it** [I have also tried to live through religious faith] **But I still haven't found what I'm looking for** [but I/we still haven't found the all-important, lynch-pin,

unlocking *liberating understanding* of our human condition]**.'** In 1988 U2 recorded a version of Dylan's aforementioned song of yearning anticipation, *All Along the Watchtower*, and in the same year Bono wrote and sang of his own human-condition-prison-defying, rock-and-roll-fired-up attitude to life in the band's *God Part II*: **'Don't believe in excess, success is to give… Don't believe in the sixties, the golden age of pop. You** [only] **glorify the past when the future dries up…** [I'm determinedly] **gonna kick the darkness till it bleeds daylight.** [until it lets the truth out, because] **I, I believe in love** [and I, like you too, are not going to give up on that dream]**.'** *Spider-Man: Turn Off the Dark*, a 2011 rock musical about the superhero, also features music and lyrics by U2 members Bono and The Edge. While the title's reference to turning off the dark obviously refers to the battle against evil, it is also imbued with a powerful double meaning, namely that of the human race's desperate need to find enlightening understanding of our human condition—which only a denial-free thinking prophet, the superhero that, in truth, all superheroes represented the hope of, could find.

This desire for enlightenment and liberty from the darkness of the human condition is also apparent in the band's 1987 song *Where The Streets Have No Name* (also written and sung by Bono), which contains these exceptionally prophetic words: **'I want to tear down the walls** [of our prison of having to live in denial/alienation] **that hold me inside, I want to reach out and touch the flame** [I want the truth even though it's going to be searing]**, where the streets have no name** [I want the human-condition-resolved world where we no longer have to own and egocentrically put our names on everything]**. I want to feel sunlight** [of liberating enlightenment] **on my face, see that dust cloud** [of all the destructive effects of our upset] **disappear without a trace, I want to take shelter from the poison rain, where the streets have no name…We're still building and burning down love, burning down love** [destroying beauty and denying truth]**. And when I go there, I go there with you, (it's all I can do)** [all I can do is live through the inspiration of women's beauty]**. The city's a flood, and our love turns to rust** [the romantic dream of married togetherness when we are in truth all so differently and, in almost all cases, so extremely alienated is a dream that doesn't easily last]**. We're beaten and blown by the wind, trampled in dust. I'll show you a place, high on a desert plain, where the streets have no name'**—and on a few live recordings taken during U2's 1997-98 'Popmart Tour' Bono included these lyrics at the song's end: **'Then there will be no toil or sorrow, then there will be no time of pain, then there will be no time.'** Another sublime world **'high on a desert plain, where the streets have no name'**, where **'there will be no toil or sorrow'**, **'no time of pain'**, in fact **'no'** emphasis on **'time'** at all, is clearly a TRANSFORMED place FREE of the insecurity of the human condition where, as mentioned, no one is having to egocentrically name their particular street. It is a marvellously poetic description of the dream of a world where humans' insecure, 'must-somehow-prove-that-I-am-not-bad', embattled, conscious thinking ego has finally been satisfied at the fundamental level—which is with the trustable, first-principle-based, biological understanding of *why*, despite all appearances to the contrary, we humans are good and not a bad, evil, meaningless, worthless, flawed, throw-away species after all.

Bono's reference to a time when **'there will be no toil or sorrow, then there will be no time of pain'** is exactly the same vision that is expressed in the Bible where it states that **'Another book** [will be]**…opened which is the book of life** [the human-condition-explaining and humanity-liberating book]**…**[and] **a new heaven and a new earth** [will appear] **for the first heaven and the first earth** [will have]**…passed away…**[and the dignifying full truth about our condition] **will wipe every**

tear from…[our] **eyes. There will be no more death or mourning or crying or pain, for the old order of things has passed away'** (Rev. 20:12, 21:1, 4). Buddhist scripture contains precisely the same anticipation of this fabulous time that has now at last begun when humans **'will with a perfect voice preach the true Dharma** [present the supreme wisdom, namely understanding of the human condition]**, which is auspicious and removes all ill'**, saying, **'Human beings are then without any blemishes, moral offences are unknown among them, and they are full of zest and joy. Their bodies are very large and their skin has a fine hue. Their strength is quite extraordinary'** (Maitreyavyakarana, tr. Edward Conze, *Buddhist Scriptures*, 1959, pp.238-242).

It should be emphasised that Bono singing of wanting **'to reach out and touch the flame, where the streets have no name'** is an intuitive recognition that the dignifying and thus liberating truth is also going to be the all-exposing and confronting *naked* truth about ourselves, something searing to go near. Recall that in his cave allegory of the human condition, Plato also used the metaphor of fire to describe this problem of the exposure that the truth about our condition would unavoidably bring when he said, **'And if he** [the cave prisoner] **were made to look directly at the light of the fire** [look at the confronting truth about our highly imperfect, less-than-ideal human condition]**, it would hurt his eyes…And if he were forcibly dragged up the steep and rocky ascent and not let go till he had been dragged out into the sunlight** [into the presence of the searing truth about our immensely hurt/damaged/broken/corrupted/fallen/imperfect human state or condition]**, the process would be a painful one, to which he would much object, and when he emerged into the light his eyes would be…overwhelmed by the brightness of it'**. Again, thankfully there is an easy, totally effective and glorious solution to the problem of the exposure that occurs with the arrival of the naked truth about ourselves, which is the TRANSFORMED WAY OF LIVING described in Part 3:10.

At this point it is worth including more lyrics from two of The Doors' songs, *Waiting for the Sun* and *Break on Through*. In *Waiting for the Sun* Jim Morrison (who, at 27, in essence, chose to die at the door of the new world demanding to be let through rather than have anything more to do with the effectively dead world of our current upset, all-busted-up, human-condition-afflicted existence) wrote and sang: **'At first flash of Eden** [at the first rays of the light of liberating understanding of a human-condition-ameliorated new world] **we race down to the sea. Standing there on freedom's shore, waiting for the sun** [waiting for the liberating understanding of the human condition to come flooding in]**, waiting for the sun, waiting for the sun. Can you feel it?** [feel how good it is going to be?] **Now that Spring has come. That it's time to live in the scattered sun** [live with the sun/truth everywhere]**. Waiting for the sun, waiting for the sun, waiting for the sun, waiting for the sun. Waiting, waiting, waiting, waiting, waiting, waiting, waiting, waiting. Waiting for you to come along** [**'you'** being the sun/truth]**. Waiting for you to hear my song** [pleading with you/the sun/the truth to come and liberate us from the human condition at last]**. Waiting for you to come along, waiting for you to tell me what went wrong** [explain the whole confusing mess]**. This is the strangest life I've ever known** [it's been a bewilderingly mad, devoid-of-any-truth world to have to live in]**. Yeah! [scream] Can you feel? Now that Spring has come. That it's time to live in the scattered sun. Waiting for the sun, waiting for the sun, waiting for the sun, waiting for the sun.'** And from *Break on Through*, also written and sung by Jim Morrison: **'You know day destroys night** [truth destroys the denial/lies]**, night divides the day** [our cave-dwelling, alienated denial separates us from the liberating light of truth]**. Tried to run, tried to hide** [tried to live in the cave state of denial, but ultimately humanity had to]**, break on through to the other side** [cure ourselves of our human-condition-afflicted, cave-dwelling state of bondage, as Plato

described it]**. We chased our pleasures here, dug our treasures there** [tried to find satisfaction through escapist materialism]**, but can you still recall the time we cried, break on through to the other side. Yeah! C'mon, yeah. Everybody loves my baby, she get high. I found an island in your arms, country in your eyes. Arms that chain us, eyes that lie** [as will be explained later in Part 7:1, women's beauty, their child-like neotenous image of innocence—cute features of large eyes, snub nose, dome forehead, etc—has inspired men to dream of a pure, human-condition-FREE world but the truth is women are necessarily as psychologically corrupted as men, and thus women's inspiration of 'heaven', of a human-condition-FREE, idyllic world, has only been an illusion and thus transitory]**, break on through to the other side. Oh, yeah! Made the scene, week to week, day to day, hour to hour** [tried to go along with the escapist, deluded, artificial, superficial, effectively-dead world of denial]**. The gate is straight, deep and wide** [the real path to our species' FREEDOM lay in plumbing the terrifying depths of the issue of our corrupted, fallen, less-than-ideal state or condition, which had to be done if we were to]**, break on through to the other side.'** Jim Morrison was certainly an extraordinarily courageous, truthful, prophetic thinker. The best documentary I have seen on Morrison is *When You're Strange: A film about The Doors* (Directed by Tom DiCillo, 2009).

With the world entering unendurable, end-play levels of distress, dysfunction and ever more protective-but-deadening, 'cave-dwelling', escapist denial and its alienation to cope with the increasing horror of our condition, this breakthrough understanding of the human condition comes at the eleventh hour for the human race. Now, instead of the imminent threat of an endless darkness for the human race from terminal levels of the soul-less, bitterly-cold-and-lonely, self-estranged state of dishonest alienation, what we see before us is a fabulous vista of the human race transfigured by the glorification and exaltation of dignifying, liberating, uplifting, ameliorating, healing, redeeming, integrating, unifying, soul-resuscitating *self-knowledge*. The title of U2's 1988 song *Love Rescue Me* can be read as '*Truth* Rescue Me' because the ultimate love for humans *is* really the truth. Written by Bono with input from Bob Dylan (which, incidentally, is an extraordinary combination because, along with John Lennon and Jim Morrison, Bono and Dylan are possibly the most prophetic lyricists of all time—well, at least of contemporary times, because no doubt some of the ancient minstrels and bards, whose work I am not so familiar with, must have also been capable of extraordinarily prophetic compositions), this phenomenally prophetic song acknowledges the despair of our current condition but concludes with the awesome vision of our species' FREEDOM from that state: **'Love** [truth] **rescue me / Come forth and speak to me / Raise me up and don't let me fall / No man is my enemy** [I don't want to be living with so much hate inside me anymore] / **My own hands imprison me** [but I'm imprisoned by the unbearable dilemma of my own flawed, imperfect, embattled, less-than-ideal human condition] / **Love** [truth] **rescue me // Many strangers have I met / On the road to my regret / Many lost who seek to find themselves in me / They ask me to reveal / The very thoughts they would conceal** [many have wanted the hidden truths about our species' unendurable condition to be revealed and the human race to be liberated from its tortured state] / **Love** [truth] **rescue me // And the sun in the sky / Makes a shadow of you and I** [exposes the imperfection of our lives] / **Stretching out as the sun sinks in the sea** [we have only ever been able to cope by blocking out the glare of the issue of our deeply troubled and flawed state] / **I'm here without a name** [alienated] / **In the palace of my shame** [my dishonesty] / **I said, love** [truth] **rescue me // In the cold mirror of a glass / I see my reflection pass / I see the dark shades of what I used to be** [see the

depressing contrast of what I am now with my lost state of innocence] / **I see the purple of her eyes** [see the false enticement of the image of attractive innocence that women's neotenous, child-like beauty tricks men into believing is real innocence] / **The scarlet of my lies** [men's deluded, massively arrogant egocentric lives]**…Yeah I'm here without a name / In the palace of my shame / I said love rescue me** // [At this point in the song there is a very long pause, then suddenly the song picks up again but this time describing a whole new situation and world] **I've conquered my past** / **The future is here at last** / **I stand at the entrance to a new world I can see** / **The ruins to the right of me** / **Will soon have lost sight of me** / **Love rescue me** [I have finally found the dignifying, uplifting, loving, TRANSFORMING truth that makes sense of our imperfect human state or condition and liberates me and the world from the darkness of that human-condition-afflicted existence, thereby introducing a new, TRANSFORMED world for humanity where we all can leave our old psychotic and neurotic baggage behind forever]**.'** Bono wrote a similar exciting song of anticipation of our species' TRANSFORMATION from a human-condition-afflicted existence in 1987, which U2 performed with blues legend B.B. King. Titled *When Love Comes To Town*, the song features the lyrics, **'I was a sailor, I was lost at sea / I was under the waves…But I did what I did before love** [truth] **came to town…I've seen love conquer the great divide** [through all my experiences of trying to live through romance, through materialism, through religion, etc, etc, I know now that *only* the reconciling truth can heal our split selves]**…When love comes to town I'm gonna jump that train** [when the liberating, TRANSFORMING truth about the human condition finally arrives I'm 'out of here'; leaving the old dead world behind forever—as will be everyone else because, as Cat Stevens similarly anticipated, **'out on the edge of darkness there rides a peace train'** that has at last arrived to **'take'** us **'home again'**]**.'**

What was 'rock and roll' if not totally optimistic, all-out, rock-solid *'defiance, determination and resilience'* to one day achieve FREEDOM from our species' historic state of unjust condemnation—determination to, as Bono sang, **'kick the darkness till it bleeds** [the] **daylight'** of the truth about us humans and end the damned condemnation of our species FOR EVER! What did Dylan famously say about Elvis Presley—**'Hearing him for the first time was like busting out of jail.'** John Lennon famously reiterated the sentiment, saying, **'Before Elvis there was nothing'**—there was not all-out determination and optimism, there was no rock and roll, there was just endless decades and epochs and ages of resigned, lonely music—although Ludwig van Beethoven's 1824 *Ninth Symphony* does contain a full chorus of human voices rising to the final height of glorious anticipation of resolution and freedom from the human condition with the words **'Joy'**, **'Joyful, as a hero to victory!'**, **'Join in our jubilation!'**, **'We enter, drunk with fire, into your sanctuary…Your magic reunites…All men become brothers…All good, all bad…Be embraced, millions! This kiss for the whole world!'** (Lyrics from Friedrich von Schiller's 1785 poem *Ode to Joy*, Accessed 31 Jan. 2011 at: <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Symphony_No._9_(Beethoven)>).

Jerry Lee Lewis, Chuck Berry and Little Richard were also locked onto the immensely excited driving beat that lay at the heart of rock and roll of anticipation of our species' liberation from the horror of the human condition—*especially* that belt-it-out, blast-out-of-here, boiling-with-excitement, completely-raging supernova from Ferriday, Louisiana, Jerry Lee Lewis—who was rightly the first performer inducted into the Rock and Roll Hall of Fame. In the 1992 documentary *Mojo Working: The Making of Modern Music*, which contains a wonderful collection of footage and commentary about Jerry Lee Lewis, writer Charles 'Dr Rock' White reported that **'John Lennon came into Jerry Lee Lewis' dressing room…and he walked**

over to Jerry Lee and…bent down and kissed Jerry Lee's feet…[and then he] **walked out speechless'**. I wholeheartedly agree with Lennon's gesture. To me no one's music channelled the excitement of the anticipation of the liberation of the human race from the human condition as purely as Jerry Lee Lewis' did. If you listen to the live recording of Jerry Lee's April 5, 1964 performance at the Star Club in Hamburg, Germany, especially the tracks *Hound Dog*, *Long Tall Sally* and *Whole Lotta Shakin' Goin' On*, you will hear what **'is regarded by many music journalists as one of the wildest and greatest rock and roll concert albums ever'** (Wikipedia 2011). The *Allmusic* database said about that performance that Jerry Lee **'sounds possessed'** and as **'rocking harder than anybody had before or since…words can't describe the music'** (<https://www.allmusic.com/album/live-at-the-star-club-hamburg-mw0000678925>). Jerry Lee's performances were just drenched in the excitement of breaking free from the dungeon of our species' tortured condition. In fact, my vision is of a hysteria of millions and millions and millions of excited people with Jerry Lee's piano being held aloft out in front and Jerry Lee standing on top of it, flicking his hair back and hitching his pants up, as he used to do—and filling the air is the musical build-up to humanity's great breakthrough to its FREEDOM in *Prologue/Crunchy Granola Suite*, from Neil Diamond's 1972 *Hot August Night* album. But then, to actually take us through the door to the new world that understanding of the human condition now makes possible, instead of Diamond's *Crunchy Granola Suite* vocals coming in, Jerry Lee would start singing 'Great Balls of Fire, Let's get out of here, LET'S GO!', to an immense roar of unbelievable relief and excitement from the flood of humanity bursting through that doorway to its FREEDOM. One of our WTM members, Tony Gowing, has actually written a song titled *LET'S GO* that he sings with our WTM band, The Denialators—you can watch a rendition of this song at <www.humancondition.com/denialators>.

Maybe to be fair we should have all our rock and roll stars (and they were 'stars', beacons of light in the terrible darkness of our human-condition-afflicted world) up on that piano with Jerry Lee taking us through that great doorway to our FREEDOM—Big Joe Turner, Bill Haley, Elvis, Chuck Berry, Little Richard, Buddy Holly, John Lennon, Jim Morrison, Bob Dylan, Bono, Johnny O'Keefe, etc, etc. Bugger it, we all deserve to be up on that fucking piano, the whole seven billion of us because, as we can now at last understand, we is all such incredible legends—we can all just yell our bloody heads off, even those like me who can't sing a note. What a party we are gonna have now!!

I can't sing at all, however, in about 1969 (when I was 23 years old) I did write the following poem that powerfully anticipates our species' liberation from the human condition—note the coincidence of using the analogy of horses with Joel's and Isaiah's descriptions of the TRANSFORMED STATE: **'This is a story you see, just a story—but for you / Um—I remember a long time ago in the distant future a timeless day / a sunlit cloudless day when all things were fine / when we all slow-danced our way to breakfast in the sun // You see the day awoke with music / Can you imagine one thousand horses slow galloping towards you across a vast plain / and we loved that day so much / We all danced like Isadora Duncan through the morning light // We skipped and twirled and spun about / Fairies were there like dragonflies over a pool / Little girls with wings they hovered and flew about / their small voices you could hear / You see it was that kind of morning // When the afternoon arrived it was big and bold and beautiful / In worn out jeans and bouncing breasts we began / to fight—our way—into another day / into something new—to jive our way into the night /**

from sunshine into a thunderstorm // We all took our place, rank upon rank we came / as an army with Hendrix out in front / and the music busted the horizon into shreds / By God we broke the world apart / The pieces were of different colours and there were so many people / We danced in coloured dust, we left in sweat no room at all / We had a ball in gowns of grey and red / There were things that happened that nobody knew / Bigger and better, I had written on my sweater / Where there was sky there was music, huge clouds of it / and there were storms of gold with coloured lights / It was so good we cried tears into our eyes / In a tug of war of love we had no strength left at all / Dear God we cried but he only sighed and / whispered strength through leaves of laughter // On and on we came in bold ranks of silvered gold / to lead a world that didn't know to somewhere it didn't care / It couldn't last, it had to end and yet it had an endless end / We were so happy in balloons of coloured bubbles that wouldn't bust / and we couldn't, couldn't quench our lust / There we were all together for ever and ever / and tomorrow had better beware because / when we've wept and slept we will be there to shake its bloody neck.' As I talk about later in Part 10:4, this poem is an indication of how strong my vision has always been of being able to solve the human condition.

Drawing by Jeremy Griffith © 2010-2013 Fedmex Pty Ltd

The poster I drew (above) for the WTM's December 2010 1960s theme party to celebrate our project-saving-and-thus-world-saving victory in court also captures something of the excitement of the human race set free from the human condition. (Our legal victory came after a 15-year struggle against a defamatory 1995 Australian Broadcasting Corporation television program and *Sydney Morning Herald* newspaper feature article that sought to stigmatise our organisation as a dangerous anti-social organisation and me as its deluded megalomanic leader. Ultimately both publications were completely discredited by a series of official rulings

and public apologies culminating in a 2010 judgment that found my work was real science rather than the mindless dogma that characterises mind-controlling sects, which was how the defamatory publications sought to portray my work. As the full-page advertisement we ran in *The Australian* newspaper after our victory (see <www.humancondition.com/vindication>) explains, it was an incredibly hard-won and an incalculably precious victory against the inevitable ferocious backlash of persecution that we had to endure since the early 1990s for daring to address the historically forbidden issue of the human condition.) Our excitement over our victory for our world-saving project is also evident in footage from our party, which can be viewed at <www.humancondition.com/denialators>. This is the video I mentioned earlier, in which Tony Gowing sings his song, *LET'S GO*.

I should explain more fully that the significance of the musical build-up in Diamond's *Prologue/Crunchy Granola Suite* is that it—like the build-up to the chorus of voices in Beethoven's *Ninth Symphony*, and in the progression from quietness to blasting-with-excitement in my poem above—charts the whole of humanity's two million year journey of conscious thought and inquiry: from its beginnings in the lonely, cold, dark wilderness of complete ignorance and bewilderment, to gradually accumulating more and more knowledge, but at the same time having to fight harder and harder against ever increasing levels of upset but all the time knowing we are getting closer to finding the liberating understanding of our upset, corrupted, fallen condition—until, finally, we reach the crescendo of humanity's breakthrough of achieving that all-liberating and TRANSFORMING dignifying, reconciling, ameliorating *understanding* of ourselves. There is the same gradual build-up from our beginnings in a lonely dark wilderness to a great crescendo of excitement when we finally find liberating understanding in the sensationally exciting Irish stepdancing phenomenon *Riverdance* that swept the world in the mid-1990s. YouTube has various clips of *Riverdance*, with some performances charting better than others humanity's immensely heroic river of progress from lonely ignorance to TRANSFORMING enlightenment.

It is a bit long but I should include here Sir Laurens van der Post's wonderful description of humanity's incredibly heroic journey all the way from the emergence of life to full consciousness to finally, at **'the end of the road'**, **'awaken' 'pure and complete'**. Sir Laurens wrote, **'I was allowed to attend a victory parade, as it were, of all the life that has ever been. I saw all that has ever been come streaming through the long lanes and corridors of my blood, through their arch of admiralty, round the inner-square and then straight down past my own white lighted Hall. Out of the darkness that preceded Genesis and flood, it began with a glimmer and a worm of the unformed earth in love with the light to come. Yes! a worm with a lantern, a glow-worm with phosphorescent uniform, marched proudly at the head, and behind came great streams of being protozoic and pre-historic. Nothing was excluded and everything included, their small fires of being clearly lit, tended and well beloved. This, it was said, is the true, the noble heroic and unique crusade of the love of life. For look, among them not a brain but only matter tentatively and awkwardly assembled. Yet remark on their bearing and the trust with which they hurl themselves into the uncomprehended battle. Ah! tears of love and gratitude burned in my eyes at so urgently moving and life confiding a sight. To feel, at last, the burden that they carry for me in my own blood, to know at every second several of these reflected in white corpuscle and scarlet cell are dying unflinchingly in battle for my all, to know that giant lizard and lion as well as unicorn came after, and were hurled too into similar struggle and defence of the totality of all. I was allowed, too, to**

see the first man and registered the seismographic thrill of the marching column at the appearance of so skilled and complex a champion. I was allowed to speak to him and I touched his skin riddled with snake bite, his shoulder pierced by mastodon's spike, his skull deep-scarred with sabre-tooth's claw. And as reverently and tenderly I took his hand shaking with marshy malarial fever, I was moved to pity him by the evidence of such dread and unending war. But he would have none of it. He looked me fearless in the eye and in a voice that boomed like a drum in his stomach said: "Brother, it was worth it. Whatever they tell you, add this, it was worth it."

I spoke to a Bushman half-eaten by a lion in the Kalahari, his only vessel a brittle ostrich egg with red and black triangles painted neatly on it, now broken and sand scattered. He looked in my grey eyes with the brown eyes of a people at dusk, slanted to bridge a chasm behind the face of a dying member of a dying and vanishing race. He too, my dying nomad brother, said: "Add, add quick before I go, 'it was worth it'." I spoke to an aborigine in the bight of the great gulf Tattooed with dung he said: "I vanish, but it was worth it." In New Guinea, I met a stone-age Papuan, his black skin sheened with green after centuries in the jungle between basin and fall of water and spurting volcano, and he too said: "Doubt it not, it was worth it." Everyone said, "Lovely gift of a life that we blindly trust burns with such loving fire in the dark that at any price, no matter how great, it is worth it."

Yes, they all agreed and utterly convinced me, so that I can never doubt again. I wept when the great procession came to an end, for one and all, great and small—I loved them all. Yes, even to the worm that brought up the rear, with shaded night light and a nurse's white, in its dress concealing a phial of the drug of the greater sleep made with a touch of the hand of God's great, good night. Yes…I love them all; I believe them; I am ready for battle; and to continue at their head the journey of them all to the end of the road in my blood. At last, purified and complete, I am ready to awaken and defend my love' (*The Face Beside the Fire*, 1953, pp.292-294 of 312).

Interestingly, rock and roll music almost died in the late 1950s, and it never fully regained the raging raw power and excitement of its first few years.

For a start, its visionaries were all taken out one way or another. In May 1958, 22-year-old Jerry Lee Lewis was publicly condemned when it was revealed that he had married his 13-year-old third cousin (which wasn't illegal or all that unusual in Louisiana at that time), a controversy his career never truly recovered from. In January 1958, 25-year-old Little Richard enrolled in Bible College and denounced rock and roll—and almost everywhere else rock and roll was being slammed by the establishment as sexually depraved 'devil's music'. In December 1959, 33-year-old Chuck Berry was sentenced to five years in jail, of which he was eventually forced to serve three, from 1961 to 1963; a former employee of his had been arrested on a prostitution charge and, following a trial that was fuelled by racism, Chuck himself ended up in jail. On 3 February 1959, 22-year-old Buddy Holly died in a plane crash. Having been inducted into the army, 23-year-old Elvis Presley entered the ranks in March 1958 and as John Lennon famously said **'Elvis died in the army'**, because after he was discharged in 1960 his songs, like *It's Now Or Never* and *Are You Lonesome Tonight?*, lacked the raw energy and power of his earlier songs.

As is often the case with visionary inspirations, their clarity is at a maximum when they are initially conceived and from thereon they become confused, diluted and polluted with other less relevant and clear-sighted influences. In the case of the core vision behind rock and roll of its incredibly exciting anticipation of the liberation of the human race (as all the rock and roll lyrics that have been included testify), the 1950s music of its visionaries, in particular

the music of Jerry Lee, Elvis, Little Richard and Chuck Berry, was full of that pulsing, wild energetic excitement. The music of the 1960s was still full of excited optimism that humanity was going to break through to the sunrise of its FREEDOM from the human condition, but the raw energy from the excitement of that vision that was so apparent in the initial 1950s rock and roll music was gradually muted and eventually changed into angry, aggressive, upset music—progressing from funk, to punk and on to the head-banging, totally hurt, alienated, mind-numbing, vibrating-with-distress 'death' music of today. Accurately representing the rapid generational increase in alienation that has occurred in the last 60 years—which, in the last 35 years, has gone from the 1970s-born **'X generation'** to the 1980s-born **'Y generation'** to the terminally alienated 1990s-born **'Z'** generation—music has also regressed from celebration to retaliation, from happiness and joy to anger and hate, from innocence and fun to upset and distress in only a few decades.

Epitomising this head-banging, totally hurt, alienated, mind-numbing, vibrating-with-distress 'death' music of today is the music and lyrics of the American heavy metal band With Life In Mind. Their music is a terrifyingly honest reflection of the terminal level of alienation that the human race as a whole has now arrived at, but they are certainly not unique. At the time of writing this inclusion about the band With Life In Mind, which was February 2012, the online store Relapse, which specialises in the heavy, 'death' metal music so popular amongst young people today, listed the following bands as their top selling artists: Death, Repulsion, Toxic Holocaust/Midnight, Neurosis, Spawn of Possession and Brutal Truth. These band names alone reveal this end play state of alienation that the human race has arrived at.

The pain and honesty of the music of With Life In Mind is apparent in the lyrics of one of their songs, which is actually titled *The Human Condition*: **'We're staring through the eyes of a bitter soul. Constantly surrounded by this empty feeling…Never good enough for those ideals that seem to mean the most…Driven into madness, I see no end in sight, and inadequacy seems like the only means to pass through this life. And I sit and ask myself when will it end? The art of contention is an uphill battle I'm not ready to fight.'** Yes, if we didn't resign ourselves to giving up trying to **'conten**[d]**'** with it, confront it, stop trying to live **'with'** the issue of **'life in mind'**, we certainly would be **'driven into madness'** with **'no end in sight'** to the unbearably depressing **'empty feeling'** caused by the terrible **'inadequacy'** of our seemingly horrifically imperfect **'human condition'**! Denial of the human condition *has* been the only way we have been able to cope with the human condition while we couldn't explain it! More of the terrifyingly honest lyrics of With Life In Mind will be included later in Part 7:5, but the following provides a further sample of their deadly accurate thoughts on the human condition: **'It scares me to death to think of what I have become…This self loathing can only get me so far'**; **'Our innocence is lost'**; **'I can't express all the hate that's led me here and all the filth that swallows us whole…A world shrouded in darkness…Fear is driven into our minds everywhere we look'**; **'We've been lying to ourselves for so long, we truly forgot what it means to be alive…How could we ever recover? Lost in oblivion…Shackled in chains, bound and held down…We could never face our own reflections in the mirror'**; **'We've all been asleep since the beginning of time. Why are we so scared to use our minds?'**; **'You're the king of a world you built for yourself, but nothing more than a fraud in reality'**; **'How do we save ourselves from this misery…So desperate for the answers…We're straining on the last bit of hope we have left. No one hears our cries. And no one sees us screaming'**; **'Our fight is the struggle of man…This is the end.'**

So the incredible innocence, excitement and idealism of the post-war 1960s generation that was so apparent in so many of the young people who attended the Woodstock Festival in the state of New York in August 1969 didn't last long. As the commentary in the *My Generation* episode of the 2007 BBC documentary *Seven Ages of Rock* recognised, **'after the 1967 climax of the summer of love…the innocent optimism of the 1960s gave way to more volatile, uncertain times…A utopia like 1967 couldn't possibly last…no longer could you be an innocent flower child…The 1969 Woodstock Festival would see the sun set on the hippie dream…**[After The Rolling Stones' December 1969 Altamont Festival where a man was murdered in the audience] **the innocence of the 1960s was lost forever'**—but the **'sun'** HAD NOT **'set' 'forever'** on the **'optimism'** of the 1950s and **'1960s' 'dream'** of a human-condition-reconciled **'utopia'** BECAUSE IT HAS RE-EMERGED AS THE INSPIRATION BEHIND THE FINDING OF THE HUMAN-RACE-TRANSFORMING UNDERSTANDING OF THE HUMAN CONDITION THAT IS BEING PRESENTED HERE. The vision behind rock and roll has been realised. Although John Lennon is not here to see the fulfilment of all his imaginings, he did at least know what was coming for humanity, and *was* **'around'** for its beginnings—as footage from a 2010 documentary about him indicates: **'This 1960s bit was just a sniff, it was just waking up in the morning and we haven't even got to dinner time yet, and I just can't wait, I just can't wait, I'm so glad to be around.'** (*Discovering Lennon*, 3DD Productions).

Overall, the story of how rock and roll was nearly silenced provides a good example of how fragile any visionary undertaking is in its infancy. New ideas have to fight *so* hard to survive their inauguration, as we in the WTM know only too well.

The reason for the relative innocence of the post-war 1960s generation and the inspirational part it played in my capacity to find these insights into the human condition will be talked about in Part 5:1, however, I should mention here that the innocence of that era was mainly due to the immense relief that followed the ending of the Second World War. After such terrible bloodletting, which amounts to a valving off of upset, there is always a period of enormous relief and freshness, especially among those on the side of victory against tyranny. In fact, there can't have been any other period in modern history where there was as much innocent idealism and optimism as the 'flower power', 'Age of Aquarius' era of the 1960s when the post-war 'baby boom' generation was growing up. Science, the organised and systemised pursuit of knowledge, was sufficiently developed for the biological explanation of the human condition to be found, and there also seemed to be—and, as it turned out, was—enough sound innocence in the population for that explanation to be truthfully and thus effectively assembled by someone exceptionally innocent and thus exceptionally free of denial. Much more will be said about how this understanding of the human condition was found in upcoming Parts of this presentation.

In conclusion, while upset humans normally couldn't and wouldn't allow themselves to admit the existence of another TRANSFORMED, human-condition-FREE world—because it made living with their tortured, empty human-condition-afflicted existence unbearable—nearly all the rock and roll songs that have been included in this Part were 'top of the chart' hit songs, songs that a great number of people gave their enthusiastic support to as being meaningful and relevant. In fact, these songs represent the most powerful of affirmations that, despite all appearances to the contrary, we humans are NOT fundamentally evil, bad, worthless creatures and ONE DAY, ONE DAY, we were going to explain in undeniable,

trustable, first principle, biological terms *why* that is true and, by so doing, end our tortured, human-condition-afflicted, condemned existence forever—and it is that wonderful day of humankind's understanding-based, self-knowledge-achieved, **'enlightenment'**-found-of-**'our-human-condition'**, **'delusions'-'cured'**, **'blind**[ness]**'**-ending, **'cave-prison'-'released'** FREEDOM from the human condition and resulting TRANSFORMATION of the human race that has now, at last, finally, at the end of a long, long, cold night in the wilderness, ARRIVED—the time, as the 1960s rock musical *Hair* anticipated, of our **'mind's true liberation'**. That great influential American folksinger and songwriter Woody Guthrie was right when he anticipated that the human race was **'Bound for Glory'** (the title of Guthrie's 1943 autobiography).

Part 3:13 The difficulty of the 'Deaf Effect' when reading about the human condition

Before continuing, it is worth reiterating the warning that was provided earlier in Part 2:3 about the problem of the 'deaf effect' that often occurs when reading about the subject of the human condition. The fact of the matter is our minds have such an entrenched resistance to trespassing anywhere near the subject of the human condition that when we try to read discussion about the human condition our protective denials begin to kick in and block the words and their meaning from entering our conscious awareness. At a certain point the words just wash over us, there is no absorption of them. Our minds effectively become 'deaf' to any more discussion of the human condition.

There has already been much to contend with—such as the mention of the term 'human condition' itself and the dreaded 'A' word (alienation) many hundreds of times. The reader has to expect to be in psychological shock and finding it difficult to 'hear' what is being talked about. You may even be reluctant to continue, despite the cautious encouragement given earlier at the end of Part 2:3, and by now hopefully having at least an awareness that the human condition has at last been safely explained and that humans are the all-meaningful heroes of life on Earth and that a fabulous existence now awaits us.

The problem of the 'deaf effect' is so real that, unable to take in what has been said or written, our mind can infer that nothing of substance has been provided, or what has been said or written doesn't make any sense and, unaware of the real reason our mind can't 'hear' what was said or written, decides it must be because the material was poorly expressed or lacking in persuasive argument or incomprehensively dense. Our mind becomes defensive of its habituated way of thinking; it simply will not allow the transparency in. As was explained in Part 3:10, this exposure of the human condition that necessarily has to accompany the explanation of how we resolve that condition is really the exposure-day, truth-day, honesty-day—in fact 'judgment day'—we humans have long anticipated and feared. Importantly, however, this is not a time of condemning 'judgment', but a time of compassionate understanding—as a Turkish poet once said, judgment day is **'Not the day of judgment but the day of understanding'** (Merle Severy, 'The World of Süleyman the Magnificent', *National Geographic*, Nov. 1987). Thus, while this is a time of compassionate understanding of our embattled, alienated, human-condition-afflicted lives, re-engaging with the truth of it does, nevertheless, come as a great shock, and shocks do take time to work through.

It is worth re-including part of the quote by Plato that was referred to in Part 3:10 as it illustrates how he foreshadowed this problem of the 'deaf effect'. In *The Republic*, Plato wrote that **'if he** [the cave prisoner] **were made to look directly at the light of the fire** [again the fire represents the unconfrontable issue of our less-than-ideal human condition]**, it would hurt his eyes and he would turn back and take refuge in the things which he could see** [take refuge in all the denials that he has become accustomed to]**, which he would think really far clearer than the things being shown him. And if he were forcibly dragged up the steep and rocky ascent** [out of the cave of denial] **and not let go till he had been dragged out into the sunlight** [shown the truthful liberating—but at the same time exposing—explanation of the human condition]**, the process would be a painful one, to which he would much object, and when he emerged into the light his eyes would be so overwhelmed by the brightness of it that he wouldn't be able to see a single one of the things he was now told were real.'** Plato has anticipated that the cave prisoner—humans living in denial of the issue of the human condition—would **'take refuge in the things which he could see, which he would think really far clearer than the things being shown him'** and he **'wouldn't be able to see a single one of the things he was now told were real'**—would be 'deaf' to description and analysis of the human condition.

The Bible contains descriptions similar to Plato's, of the extent of the historic resistance, denial and block-out that now exists in the human mind to any discussion of the human condition, or of concepts that bring the issue into focus. The prophet Isaiah complained about the reception to his denial-free words, saying, **'"You will be ever hearing, but never understanding; you will be ever seeing, but never perceiving." This people's heart has become calloused** [alienated]**; they hardly hear with their ears, and they have closed their eyes'** (Isa. 6:9,10, footnote). Experiencing the same reception to his denial-free, 'out-of-cave' thoughts, Christ repeated Isaiah's words (see Matt. 13:13-15), saying, **'Why is my language not clear to you? Because you are unable to hear what I say…The reason you do not hear is that you do not belong to God** [your non-ideal, seemingly ungodly, human-condition-afflicted state causes you to block-out or deny any exposing and confronting truth about that state]**'** (John 8:43-47).

Referring to the words of the prophet Amos in the Bible, the great psychiatrist R.D. Laing summarised the situation as it exists today, saying, **'There is a prophecy in Amos** [Amos 8:11] **that there will be a time when there will be a famine in the land, "not a famine for bread, nor a thirst for water, but of *hearing* the words of the Lord** [the denial-free words of truth about the human condition]**." That time has now come to pass. It is the present age'** (*The Politics of Experience* and *The Bird of Paradise*, 1967, p.118 of 156). The Lebanese-American denial-free thinker or prophet Kahlil Gibran (1883-1931) lamented the deafness of people to his denial-free thoughts when he said, **'I am a stranger in this world, and there is no one in the Universe who understands the language I speak'** (*The Lonely Poet*, in *The Treasured Writings of Kahlil Gibran*, p.152 of 902).

In intuitive recognition of this problem of the 'deafening' or, depending on what metaphor we like to use, 'blinding' effect of the truth about our human condition when it arrives, on Dorothy's arrival at her Emerald City destination in the story of *The Wizard of Oz*, she had to wear special green sunglasses because, as the gatekeeper to the Emerald City warned, **'if you did not wear spectacles the brightness and glory of the Emerald City would blind you'** (*The Wonderful Wizard of Oz*, Frank Baum, first published in 1900).

So people reading this presentation about the human condition for the first time should expect to experience the 'deaf effect', as the following examples, some of which were

mentioned earlier in Part 2:3, illustrate. For instance, one reader of my books admitted that **'When I first read your books all I saw were a lot of black marks on white paper'** (comment by WTM Supporter Greg Plecko, Mar. 2000). Another gave this very accurate description of the 'deaf effect': **'reading Griffith is like reading another language—you know its English, you can understand the words, but the concepts are so basic and so different that they are almost incomprehensible—its a paradigm shift of a read'** (Forum: "Governments across Europe tremble as angry people take to the streets", comments by 'straight' on the Members Forum. Accessed May 2009 at: <https://www.peakprosperity.com/forum-topic/governments-across-europe-tremble-as-angry-people-take-to-the-streets/- comment-14909>). A lawyer made this comment: **'When I read your book I found the content very difficult to absorb, so much so in fact I found it impossible telling someone what the book was even about'** (WTM records, 6 June 2009). A married couple said, **'We have tried very hard to read *Beyond*** [my second book, published in 1991, *Beyond the Human Condition*]**; in fact my wife and I would sit in bed and read a page together, and then re-read it a number of times, but still we couldn't understand what was written there'** (WTM Supporter H. Saunders reporting a friend's comment, Oct. 1998). Some viewers have found it so difficult 'hearing' the content of the Introductory Videos that, in their frustration, they have requested **'an executive summary'** (WTM records, 18 May 2010), even though the Introductions in those videos provide just that. Another reader recognised the problem when he wrote that **'The words in your books have in my experience brought up emotional reactions in people and they reject the information, not able to get behind them and experience the profundity of where you are coming from…Your insights are so head on as to cripple some people'** (WTM records, Jan. 1993). Similarly, **'From the reactions of people who have borrowed my copies of *Free* and *Beyond*** [*Free: The End of the Human Condition*, published in 1988, was my first book] **I have started to wonder if the complete holistic picture presented may be too much to accept and absorb in one hit'** (New Zealand WTM Supporter P. Sadler, letter to author, 8 Nov. 1995).

Another consequence of the 'deaf effect' is that even if, when reading about the human condition, our mind *does* comprehend what is being written, often shortly afterwards it can't recall what it was that was explained. This occurs because while our mind may have initially comprehended what was written, when it begins to absorb the confronting implications it blocks out what it 'heard'. Marianne Velmans, a director of Doubleday publishers in the UK, courageously and generously admitted that **'I find your theories fascinating, but I also find your arguments elusively receding from my mind as soon as I stop reading them. I can understand that this is totally a failing on my part'** (Letter to author, 3 June 1993). The following is another description of how easy it is for the upset/resigned mind to slip back into denial when studying these understandings of the human condition: **'One thing I've found that occurs quite regularly** [when reading these explanations of the human condition] **is I feel I understand something completely but then have trouble "turning my mind" back to this sometime later (could be a couple of days, weeks etc). In some cases I have to "wade back through" to get back to the same level of understanding'** (an extract from a letter to the WTM from WTM member Jimmy, 31 Jan. 2012). As mentioned at the beginning of Part 3:12, some of the composers of the songs quoted in that Part have, in later life, denied the suggestion that there was any prophetic element to the words they wrote when they were younger and/or in an inspired state. The example was given of the Australian singer-songwriter Mark Seymour (who wrote the prophetic lyrics of the song *The Holy Grail*) referring in his 2008 memoir *Thirteen Tonne Theory: Life Inside Hunters and Collectors*, to **'kook'** responses to **'The Grail'**, dismissively saying about my own response that I was

suggesting his lyrics were **'somehow…connected with the dawning of a new consciousness'** (p.343 of 388). But as I explained at the beginning of Part 3:12, the problem with any acknowledgment of another wonderful, human-condition-free world is that it makes living with the terrible emptiness of our existing lives too unbearable. While we do all carry an awareness just below the surface of our consciousness of the potential for this fabulous other world, it is only in rare, inspired moments that we can afford to allow that awareness to bubble to the surface before having to block it out once more. We can get the truth up in an inspired moment, or during an inspired period in our lives, but later on be unable to recall the real significance, context and meaning of what we described.

Another common response to my writing is that it is **'too repetitive'**. In order to explain this response it first needs to be appreciated that, at best, our minds can only tolerate the subject of the human condition being alluded to remotely and briefly. Acceptable glancing references to the human condition include: **'the meaning of humans and their place in the world'**, **'our human predicament or situation'**, **'our troubled human state and nature'**, **'what it is to be human'**, **'the dark side of our nature'**, **'the riddle of life'**, **'why are we the way we are'** and **'the root of human conflict'**. The truth is, we humans have only been able to talk about the human condition in code, in ways that only the initiated can understand. We limit ourselves to esoteric inference and innuendo. We appeal to the shared intuitive awareness in others of the need to evade the deeper confronting truths about human life. We talk of certain things being 'self-evident'. We intellectualise the truth, learn to live with it at arm's length. At base we find a way to safely live in Plato's dark 'cave' of denial of the truth about ourselves. Continued direct and open description and analysis of the human condition greatly affronts our mind. Our mind doesn't want to keep hearing description of the subject but it cannot admit this to itself without admitting it is practicing denial, without admitting and confronting its alienation, which, obviously it cannot do otherwise it wouldn't be living in alienation—we can't be alienated and not be alienated. Something *is* occurring repeatedly, but it is *not* repetition of the same particular concept or material, it is the repeated raising of a subject the human mind has become deeply committed to blocking out—it is the continual elaboration and analysis of a long-forbidden and exiled subject.

Importantly, the 'deaf effect' can be overcome with patient re-reading of what has been written. Gradually the compassionate framework for both understanding and coping with our condition rescues our mind from feeling it has to defend itself by denying the truth and as that happens so our mind becomes more able to take in, or 'hear', what is being said. A typical experience when giving introductory talks about the human condition is that people who attend a second talk will very often say the second talk was a much, much better presentation than the first which they thought was disjointed and hard to follow. It's not the talk that has improved, in fact each presentation is virtually the same, rather it's the listener's capacity to hear what is being said that has dramatically improved. All new subjects take time to adjust to, but in the case of the human condition it's not its 'newness' that is the problem that we have to apply patience to, but our deep historic fear of a subject we know only too well. What is new to us is having the subject raised. In his description of the human condition in *The Republic*, Plato actually recognised that it is patience that makes human-condition-confronting information accessible. When Plato warned that when the cave prisoner **'emerged**

into the light his eyes would be so overwhelmed by the brightness of it that he wouldn't be able to see a single one of the things he was now told were real', he did add, **'Certainly not at first, because he would need to grow accustomed to the light before he could see things in the world outside the cave.'** Plato then even emphasised how relieved the liberated prisoner would be to be free of his old dishonest existence by saying that once he had become **'accustomed to the light'**, **'when he thought of his first home and what passed for wisdom there and of his fellow-prisoners, don't you think he would congratulate himself on his good fortune and be sorry for them?'** (tr. H.D.P. Lee, 1955, p.280 of 405). Patience certainly is rewarded when it comes to absorbing understanding of the human condition.

The whole situation produced by the deaf effect problem was articulately summarised in the following passage from an article that was published online in 2011: **'I read it** [Jeremy Griffith's book *A Species In Denial*] **in 2005, and at the time it was not an easy read. The core concepts keep slipping from my mental grasp, at the time I put it down to bad writing, however a second reading revealed something the Author had indicated from the outset—*your mind doesn't want to understand the content*. The second read was quick and painless…**[and I was then able to see that] **The cause of the malaise is exposed, remedied and the reader is left with at the very least an understanding of themselves, and for me something of an optimism for the future'** ('Fitzy', *Humanitus Interruptus – Great Minds of Today*, 21 Oct. 2011; see <www.wtmsources.com/106>).

It should be said that if the ongoing description of the human condition does become impenetrable the reader can always progress to the next Part and return later when, having better digested the dignifying defence of our species' current embattled and corrupted state, the descriptions will be less 'deafening'. The other option, which we highly recommend, is to participate in the WTM Deaf Effect Course which can be accessed at <www.humancondition.com/wtm-deaf-effect-course>.

Part 3:14 The non-falsifiable situation

This is an appropriate point to address the problem of the 'non-falsifiable situation'. There has been an inference that those who oppose this information are suffering from denial. In fact, I will say that reading my books amounts to an alienation test—the more alienated the reader, the more their mind will resist the truth that is being presented. In support of this I cite Christ, who said, **'everyone who does evil** [has become corrupted] **hates the light** [the unevasive, denial-free truth]**, and will not come into the light for fear that his deeds will be exposed'** (John 3:20), and Plato, who has already been quoted as saying, **'if he** [the cave prisoner] **were forcibly dragged up the steep and rocky ascent** [out of the cave]**…into the sunlight…he would much object…his eyes would be so overwhelmed by the brightness…he would turn back and take refuge in the things which he could see'** (*Plato The Republic*, tr. H.D.P. Lee, 1955, p.280 of 405). Once you propose that alienation is almost universal, people who then disagree with or oppose what you are putting forward can feel as though they are being dismissed as being alienated, evasive and 'in denial', leaving them no way to disprove or falsify the explanation being put forward.

In addressing this conundrum, the first point to consider is that I did not create the dilemma of the human condition that produced alienation in humans. It is not a ploy to defeat criticism, as some have implied.

Secondly, and more importantly, the problem only really exists at a hypothetical level, because the ideas being presented here can be tested as true or otherwise; they are not untestable hypotheses that must be blindly accepted on faith. For example, the existence of denial of the issue of the human condition can easily be established by scientific investigation. I have already quoted many references to and descriptions of denial as initial evidence of its occurrence. But since humans are the subject of this particular study, each person can experience and thus know the truth or otherwise of what is being put forward. Once the explanations are presented and applied—as is done here and in my other books—you will discover they are able to make such sense of human behaviour that your own and everyone else's behaviour becomes transparent. As the *Encarta* summary of Plato's allegory that was referred to in Part 3:10 states, once free of the cave, the prisoners recognise that **'the only things they have seen heretofore are shadows and appearances'**, not **'the real world'** at all. This new-found transparency confirms that this understanding is the long-sought explanation of the human condition.

Part 4
The Old Biology
The history of biology up to the arrival of the psychosis-addressing-and-solving, *real* explanation of the human condition

Part 4:1 To explain the human condition science had to be invented, a process Socrates, Plato and Aristotle initiated

As emphasised throughout Parts 1, 2 and 3, the liberation from the upset state of the human condition depended on finding sufficient knowledge to be able to explain the human condition. As described in Part 3:10, Plato recognised that **'enlightenment'** of our **'imperfect' 'human condition'** had to be found for the human race to be **'released from'** the 'bonds' of our **'cave'**-like **'prison'** of 'almost blind' alienated denial. In that same Part, Jacob Bronowski was recorded as saying, **'Knowledge is our destiny. Self-knowledge, at last bringing together the experience of the arts and the explanations of science, waits ahead of us.'**

Since time immemorial we have known the elements involved in the human condition of instinct and intellect—they are, after all, recognised in the story of the Garden of Eden, which was written some 3,500 years ago by Moses—but we couldn't explain *how* and *why* these elements clashed to produce humans' upset state. Every description of the human condition simply ended with the conclusion that we humans are bad, evil, worthless beings. For instance, in the story of **'the Garden of Eden'** we were **'banished'** as evil—we took the **'fruit' 'from the tree of…knowledge'**, became conscious and went in search of knowledge and as a result became destructively behaved, supposedly evil beings deserving of eviction from the 'Garden' of our original, pre-conscious, instinctive innocent state.

We have always known that other animals couldn't reason like we humans could, that we were 'smart' while they were 'ignorant', but we didn't know the mechanisms behind the two states of intellect and instinct. Vague, abstract, metaphorical, metaphysical, mythological and mystical accounts of our human state and predicament, like 'taking the fruit from the tree of knowledge in the Garden of Eden', weren't enlightening our situation. We were never going to explain the human condition and end the underlying insecurity of our predicament until we committed ourselves to building up a first-principle-based, rational, testable and verifiable understanding of the nature, mechanisms and workings of our world. Science, from the Latin *scientia*, meaning **'knowledge'**, had to be invented, developed and formalised and it was this realisation and development that proved to be the most important, core contribution of the golden era of Greece, a period that lasted from around 500 to 300 BC.

The Greek philosopher Socrates (c.469-399 BC) greatly contributed to the establishment of science when, in response to every comment directed to him, he asked, 'Why?' In fact, Socrates' refusal to stop questioning the metaphysical descriptions of the gods of his day resulted in his enforced suicide. As he famously said in his own defence at his trial, **'the**

unexamined life is not worth living' (Plato's dialogue *Apology*, c.380 BC, tr. Benjamin Jowett), and similarly **'the only good is knowledge and the only evil is ignorance'** (Diogenes Laertius, *Lives of Eminent Philosophers*, c.225 AD). Socrates knew that knowledge alone would be the clarifier and eliminator of mystery and superstition, specifically the mystery of our seemingly horrifically imperfect human condition. He said we had to think—an instruction his student Plato (c.429-347 BC) took to the next level, beginning the thinking in earnest. The 'problem' with Plato's thinking, however, was that it was *unbearably* honest. For instance, he asked the rhetorical question: **'isn't it obvious whether it's better for a blind man or a clear-sighted one to keep an eye on anything?'** (*Plato The Republic*, tr. H.D.P. Lee, 1955, p.244 of 405). In other words, surely it made sense for the exceptionally upset-free or uncorrupted and thus exceptionally alienation-free, **'clear-sighted'**, **'blind**[ness]**'**-free, sound and relatively innocent—**'the true philosophers…those whose passion is to see the truth'** (ibid. p.238), the **'philosopher kings'** or **'philosopher rulers'** or **'philosopher princes'** or **'philosopher guardians'** as he variously described them—to lead a society. Such honesty was untenable because differentiation between individuals according to degrees of alienation or soundness left those no longer innocent unjustly condemned as bad and unworthy. As will be explained more fully as this understanding of the human condition is fleshed out, until we were able to explain the human condition and by so doing defend and understand the upset, corrupted state, any acknowledgement of who was upset and who wasn't only led to prejudice, to the more innocent condemning the more upset as bad or evil. We can now see that while some people became more upset than others as a result of humanity's heroic battle against ignorance, *no* human is bad or evil or unworthy. Plato was too honest in what he advocated. Clearly a denial-based way of participating in the search for knowledge, namely reductionist, mechanistic science, had to be developed, which is what Aristotle (c.384-322 BC), a student of Plato, went on to do.

This next quote alludes to this fundamental difference between the denial-free approach taken by Plato and the denial-committed strategy that Aristotle adopted. While the denial-complying, human-condition-avoiding attitude of mechanistic science hasn't yet been properly explained, and the negative-entropy-driven, order-developing, integrative, cooperative, selfless, loving theme and meaning of existence outlined only briefly in Part 3:4, it may be difficult for the reader to fully comprehend this reference to Plato and Aristotle, however, it should be possible to gain from it some insight into their different attitudes: **'Plato was ever aspiring to intuitions of a truth which in this world** [that most people live in] **could never be wholly revealed,—a truth of which glimpses only could be obtained, partly by the most abstract powers of thought, partly by the imagination…Plato…was an artist, and clothed all his thoughts in beauty; and if there be (as there surely is) a truth which is above the truth of** [mechanistic] **scientific knowledge, that was the truth after which Plato aspired. Aristotle's aspirations were for methodised experience and the definite'** (*Aristotle*, Sir Alexander Grant, 1877, p.6 of 196, from a series titled *Ancient Classics*). Plato was actually just as scientifically rigorous—as **'methodised'** and interested in the **'definite'**—as Aristotle, the primary difference between them was that Aristotle, like the great majority of the human race, wasn't sound and secure enough in self to confront the **'beauty'** of **'a truth' 'as there surely is' 'which is above the truth of** [mechanistic] **scientific knowledge'**, **'a truth of which glimpses only could be obtained'** by most people, **'a truth which in this world** [that most people live in] **could never be wholly revealed'**, namely the truth of the integrative, cooperative, selfless, loving meaning or

theme of existence, which Plato recognised in his books when he spoke of **'the Good'** and **'the absolute'**. Plato was one of the rare few people in history who was sound and secure enough in self to confront the issue of the human condition (as the quote above acknowledged, **'Plato was ever aspiring to intuitions of a truth which in this world** [that most people live in] **could never be wholly revealed'**, namely the truth of Integrative Meaning). His ability to confront the issue of the human condition enabled him to lay the foundations for denial-free, so-called 'holistic' or 'teleological' science. Aristotle, on the other hand, suffered from the upset state of the human condition (like virtually everyone else) and therefore had to live in denial of the issue of the human condition and any truths that brought that issue into focus—most particularly, as will be explained, the truth of Integrative Meaning. He wasn't sound enough to confront this **'truth'**; for him it **'could never be wholly revealed'**. Aristotle intuitively understood that science, humanity's vehicle for inquiry into the mechanisms and workings of our world, would have to comply with humanity's almost universal need to live in denial of the issue of the human condition and any truths that brought it into focus. Upset humans couldn't be faced with the issue of the human condition until it could be solved because if they were such an encounter could lead to suicidal depression. As a result, Aristotle developed the discipline of denial-complying, human-condition-avoiding, focus-down-on-the-details-not-up-at-the-unbearable-whole-view, so-called 'mechanistic' or 'reductionist' science.

And so it was that these men, Socrates, Plato and Aristotle, from three inter-connected generations in one brief period in human history, respectively formalised the principle of science of asking 'why', and the two approaches to scientific thinking: unevasive, denial-free holistic, teleological science, and evasive, denial-complying mechanistic, reductionist science (both approaches will be explained more fully shortly). It was an incalculably important and absolutely extraordinary achievement. But while denial-based mechanistic thinking *was* extremely valuable, ultimately it was the integrity of denial-free thinking that Plato initiated that could and would progress science fastest and furthest. The problem, as we shall see, however, is that denial-free thinkers are extremely rare.

Part 4:2 Even with the development of science, it wasn't until Darwin introduced his idea of natural selection that it finally became possible to explain the human condition

Once the discipline of science was established, it was then a matter of finding sufficient knowledge about the workings of our world to make possible the explanation of the human condition that would liberate the human race from the horror of the insecurity and resulting psychosis and neurosis of that condition forever. And it was that all-important process of accumulating knowledge, over many generations, that eventually led to Charles Darwin making his breakthrough insight into how species emerged through the process of natural selection.

Darwin's idea of natural selection was a critically important breakthrough not only because it allowed us to understand how the great variety of life on Earth emerged, but because it finally enabled us to explain the human condition. This enlightenment of our troubled condition became possible after Darwin introduced his idea of natural selection

because with understanding of the process of natural selection we were finally in a position to explain that our instincts were only *orientations* to and not *understandings* of the world around us, which, as has now been revealed, is the key to explaining the human condition.

Of course, when molecular biologists James Watson and Francis Crick found the mechanism behind natural selection of the DNA molecule in 1953 we were even *better* equipped to explain that natural selection was only an orientating and not an understanding system, but with the publication of Darwin's idea of natural selection in 1859 we had sufficient knowledge to explain the difference between being orientated by instincts and being able to consciously understand the nature of change.

Darwin explained that some varieties of individuals succeed in reproducing more than others in a given environment, which led to species becoming adapted or orientated to situations, so although genes were yet to be discovered we had the necessary insight to determine that instincts are only orientations and not understandings. Once we understood the principle of natural selection we had the potential to explain the human condition.

I should clarify an earlier statement I made in Part 3, when I said that it was with the arrival of the ability to explain the difference in the way genes and nerves process information that it first became possible to explain the human condition. This is not entirely correct. Rather, it was the ability to understand the *effect* of the way genes process information, namely the process of natural selection, that allowed the human condition to be explained. As mentioned above, Darwin's explanation of the process of natural selection was not based on being able to understand the way genes work—genes hadn't even been discovered in Darwin's time. Darwin didn't understand the physical mechanism behind natural selection. He didn't know how traits passed from one generation to the next. That insight required Watson and Crick's discovery of the structure of the DNA molecule. What Darwin *did* work out was how species changed through the natural selection of individuals who were better adapted to their environment. He explained how, through natural selection, species were orientated to their environment both physically and behaviourally. These behavioural orientations were what we had long recognised as the innate or born-with instincts of animals.

What is so significant about Darwin's breakthrough in terms of being able to explain the human condition is that once we knew instincts were only orientations we were in a position to realise the basic difference between our instincts and our intellect. We were in a position to realise that our instinctive self's orientations to the world would have, in effect, been intolerant of our fully conscious mind's experiments in managing our lives from a basis of understanding.

Similarly, with the discovery of the nervous system and nerves' ability to remember events, which, as was explained in Part 3:3, is the basis for reasoning, insightful learning, we could clearly explain why consciousness was insightful—and, knowing that, we could then explain why an instinctive orientation would have, in effect, been intolerant of a fully conscious, insightful, self-managing mind. The difference between knowing the mechanism behind consciousness and knowing the mechanism behind instincts in terms of being able to explain the human condition is that we already knew consciousness was a thinking, reasoning, intelligent, insightful learning system without having to know the mechanism that made that possible, whereas with instincts that wasn't the case. With instincts we weren't able to clearly

know that they were only an orientation to the world until Darwin explained the principle of natural selection. Essentially, the greater our ability to understand the mechanisms by which our instinct and our reasoning intellect worked, the easier it became to see into, explain and understand the dilemma of the human condition.

Part 4:3 Since the human condition could be explained once Darwin presented his idea of natural selection in 1859, why did it take well over a century for it to be explained?

The previous Part raised a very obvious question: if, after Darwin introduced his idea of natural selection, there was sufficient knowledge to explain the human condition, why did it take well over a century for someone to actually do so?

The problem was that in order to explain the human condition it had to be confronted, but confronting the issue of the human condition without the explanation for it has been an impossibility for virtually all humans. If you suffered from upset—if you were selfishly self-preoccupied with angers and frustrations, and with hurts to your ideal-world-expecting soul, which virtually all humans have been as a result of their encounters with the upset world during their infancy and childhood—then you could not afford to recognise any truths that exposed and condemned such imperfect behaviour and soul-devastation. You could not afford to reach the conclusion that you were a destructive, corrupted, damaged, worthless, evil being, because if you did you would become so depressed you could very well suicide.

As explained in Part 3:8, it was this depressing confrontation with their apparent imperfection that adolescents encountered prior to deciding that they had no choice but to resign themselves to a life living in denial of the issue of the human condition. I included in that Part a powerful description from Carl Jung to illustrate just how utterly devastating unrestricted self-confrontation has been for upset humans: **'When it** [our **'shadow'**, the negative aspects of ourselves] **appears…it is quite within the bounds of possibility for a man to recognize the relative evil of his nature, but it is a rare and shattering experience for him to gaze into the face of absolute evil.'** To avoid the **'shattering experience'** of having to **'gaze into the face of absolute evil'** from looking at the **'shadow'** of your corrupted condition it has been best to avoid any deep, penetrating, truthful thinking, because almost all thinking at a deeper level would bring you into contact with the issue of the human condition: 'There's a tree with lovely autumn leaves; isn't it amazing how beautiful nature can be, I wonder why some things are beautiful while others are not—I wonder why I'm not beautiful inside... aaahhhhh!!!!' William Wordsworth certainly wasn't exaggerating when he wrote, **'To me the meanest flower that blows can give thoughts that do often lie too deep for tears'** (*Intimations of Immortality*, 1807), for it is true that even the plainest flower can remind us of the unbearably depressing issue of our 'fallen' condition. Yes, as Rod Quantock was quoted as saying, **'Thinking can get you into terrible downwards spirals of doubt'**; Albert Camus similarly acknowledged the danger of thinking when he wrote that **'Beginning to think is beginning to be undermined.'** And Bertrand Russell wasn't overstating the issue when he observed that **'Many people would sooner die than think.'** The fact of the matter is only an existence absolutely dedicated to escapism and superficiality has been at all bearable for virtually all humans. Very few minds

could afford to go anywhere near the issue of the human condition—hence the century-long lack of any effective work on, and thus progress with, and thus insight into, the all-important issue of the human condition since Darwin made explanation of it possible.

The fundamental problem was that virtually everyone was resigned to not admitting that the issue of the human condition even existed, let alone trying to confront, think about and investigate it. It has been a bizarre case of virtually no one admitting to the existence of the all-important, underlying issue in all human affairs of the human condition—let alone anyone believing that it was a subject that needed to be explained or, more to the point, that it was *the* subject that science had to solve if there was to be a future for the human race. People's minds weren't focused on trying to think about the human condition, quite the reverse—virtually everyone's mind was focused on trying *not* to think about it.

Of course if you hadn't experienced the depressing terror of trying to confront the human condition when you were an adolescent and hadn't, as a result, become resigned to denying the subject ever existed, the human condition was the one great preoccupation and focus of your mind, as it was for children before they resigned—because it is the stark staring obvious, *real* question about human behaviour. In the spectrum of upset and resulting alienation that has inevitably existed on Earth there have always been a rare few individuals at the exceptionally upset-free, alienation-free end of the spectrum. Unlike virtually the entire human race, these unresigned, denial-free thinkers, who have historically been referred to as 'prophets', were naturally desperately interested in the glaringly important question of why the world was in such a state of chaos and why humans behaved so appallingly. While this was the position of a rare few unresigned, denial-free thinkers, the great majority of humans who were resigned to living in denial of the issue of the human condition didn't want to know anything about that terrifying issue—which is why there has been so little analysis of the subject, even though it is *the* most important of subjects.

As we will see shortly, few people have recognised even the two elements involved in the human condition of instinct and intellect, and even fewer have been sound enough—that is, sufficiently free of upset—to confront the subject of the human condition without becoming suicidally depressed.

As Aristotle recognised, even science—humanity's vehicle for enquiry into the nature of our world—has had to comply with this universal need to live in denial of the potentially suicidally depressing issue of the human condition. Yes, far from being practitioners of an allegedly rigorously objective and impartial 'scientific method', scientists have necessarily had to deny/avoid, by whatever dishonest means possible, any insights that brought the unbearably depressing and thus unconfrontable subject of the human condition into focus. Ideas could only be followed up to the point where they didn't condemn upset humans, which meant many critically important truths were either avoided or severely misrepresented. In fact, we will see that science, as it has been practiced, was a great castle of lies. Scientists have necessarily been mechanistic not holistic; they have reduced their focus to only looking down at the details about the mechanisms of the workings of our world and avoided the whole view of the issue of the human condition because for almost all humans that whole view has been

dangerously depressing. Science has very much been part of Plato's cave-world of living in denial of the human condition. It follows that since mechanistic science was practicing denial of the issue of the human condition and any truths that brought that issue into focus, it was in no position to explain the human condition. You can't build the truth from lies.

Finding the explanation of the human condition required a denial-free approach, an approach that progressed from a base that *could* admit some very important truths that humans living in denial of the human condition *could not* afford to admit and confront—the most important of which are summarised next.

Part 4:4 Six Unconfrontable Truths blocking access to understanding of the human condition

Anyone wanting to think truthfully about the human condition—specifically about the two elements involved in the human condition of our instinct and intellect—and, by so doing, try to explain the human condition, had to be able to confront certain truths that have been so unbearably depressing for the upset human race that they have been almost universally denied: firstly, the truth of the issue of the human condition itself, the issue of why aren't humans cooperative, selfless and loving?; secondly, the truth of Integrative Meaning; thirdly, the true nature of consciousness; fourthly, the truth that our species' instinctive orientation is to behaving in an utterly cooperative, harmonious, gentle loving way; fifthly, the differences in alienation between human individuals, races, genders, generations, countries, civilisations and cultures; and sixthly, the truth of the importance of nurturing in human life. Looking at these truths we can see why they have been so unbearably confronting and therefore why the upset human race and its vehicle for inquiry into the nature of our world—mechanistic science—has lived in denial of them.

Part 4:4A Firstly, we have been unable to confront the issue of the human condition itself, the issue of why aren't humans cooperative, selfless and loving?

Above all other truths, we, the upset human race could not afford to confront the issue of the human condition itself—the issue of why *aren't* humans cooperative, selfless and loving? Trying to face down the truth of our less-than-ideally-behaved, even 'fallen' or corrupted human condition without understanding of it could lead to suicidal depression—it is, as Jung described the situation, a **'shattering experience…to gaze into the face of absolute evil'**. And the more the explanation of the human condition is fleshed out, the more apparent it will be just how extremely upset—that is, angry, egocentric and alienated—the human race has become after two million years of having lived with unjust condemnation that it couldn't refute. It is only now with the explanation and thus defence of the upset state that it becomes safe to begin to confront the truth of the extent of the upset within the human race and the issue it raises of the human condition.

Part 4:4B Secondly, upset humans have had to deny the truth of Integrative Meaning

The second unbearable truth that upset humans have had to deny is the most fundamental of all truths—Integrative Meaning. While the concept of Integrative Meaning was briefly touched upon in Part 3:4, it now needs to be more fully explained. (This topic will also be looked at in even greater detail in Part 8:1, as part of the overall description provided there of the development of order of matter on Earth.)

If we look around, everything we see is a hierarchy of ordered matter. A tree is a hierarchy of ordered matter, a collection of parts—it has a trunk, limbs, roots, leaves, bark and wood cells. Our bodies are a collection of parts. Our homes are an assemblage of parts. Everywhere we look there are hierarchies of ordered matter, collections of elements or parts. Furthermore, what we see happening across these collection of parts or arrangements of matter or wholes is a tendency to develop ever larger and more stable wholes. Overall, everywhere we look matter is integrating. Indeed, it's even apparent that over the eons a chaotic universe has organised, and continues to organise, itself into stars, planets and galaxies.

Development of Order or Integration of Matter on Earth
A similar chart appears in Arthur Koestler's 1978 book, *Janus: A Summing Up*

The above chart summarises the very obvious development of order of matter on Earth. Our world is constructed from some 94 naturally occurring elements—hydrogen, helium, lithium, beryllium, boron, etc. These elements came together to form stable arrangements. For example, two hydrogen atoms with their single positive charges came together with one oxygen atom with its double negative charge to form the stable relationship known as water.

Over time larger molecules and compounds developed. Eventually macro compounds formed. These subsequently integrated to form virus-like organisms, which in turn came together or integrated to form single-celled organisms, which in turn integrated to form multicellular organisms, which in turn integrated to form societies of single species, which in turn integrate to form stable, ordered arrangements of different species.

The law of physics that accounts for this integration of matter is known as the 'Second Path of the Second Law of Thermodynamics', or 'Negative Entropy', which states that in an open system, such as that which exists on Earth, where energy can come into the system from outside it (in Earth's case, from the sun), matter integrates; it develops order. Thus, subject to the influence of Negative Entropy, the 94 elements from which our world is built develop ever larger and more stable wholes.

So what is happening everywhere we look is that order is developing—larger in space and more stable in time arrangements of matter are forming. It is as plain as day that that is what is happening in our world. Everything is a hierarchy of ordered matter and everywhere matter is integrating, and yet we have denied this truth—but we have done so for an *extremely* good reason, which is that the truth of Integrative Meaning has, in fact, been the most confronting and condemning of all truths for the upset human race.

The reason it has been so confronting and condemning is that for a collection of parts to stay together as a whole the parts of the whole must cooperate, behave selflessly, place the maintenance of the whole above the maintenance of themselves. For a larger whole to form and hold together, for matter to integrate, the parts of the developing whole have to, in effect, consider the welfare of the larger whole over their own because if they don't cooperate, if they behave selfishly, then the whole disintegrates—the parts break down into the elementary building blocks of matter from which they were assembled. Put simply, selfishness is divisive or disintegrative while selflessness is integrative.

Selflessness is actually the theme of existence because it is the glue that holds wholes together; it is, in fact, the true meaning of the word 'love'—with the old Christian word for love being **'caritas'**, meaning charity or giving or selflessness (see Col. 3:14, 1 Cor. 13:1-13, 10:24 and John 15:13). Of these biblical references, Colossians 3:14 perfectly summarises the integrative significance of love: **'And over all these virtues put on love, which binds them all together in perfect unity.'** In John 15:13 we also see that Christ emphasised the unconditionally selfless significance of the word 'love' when he said, **'Greater love has no-one than this, that one lay down his life for his friends.'** Yes, 'love' is cooperative selflessness—and not just selflessness, but *unconditional selflessness* or altruism, the capacity, if called upon, to make a full, self-sacrificing commitment to the maintenance of the larger whole. <u>The problem with this truth of the theme of the integrative process being selflessness, ideally unconditional selflessness, is that it confronts us humans squarely with the issue of the human condition. If the meaning of existence is to be cooperative, loving and selfless, then why are we humans competitive, aggressive and selfish? If the theme of existence is to be integrative, why are we divisively behaved?</u> Despite it being such an obvious truth, Integrative Meaning has been so condemning of the upset human race that we have had no choice but to live in deep denial of it.

The simple fact is, for a larger whole to form and hold together, for matter to integrate, the parts must cooperate not compete, they must be selfless not selfish. But since the competitive, aggressive and selfish *divisive* behaviour of upset humans is the polar opposite of cooperative, loving and selfless *integrative* behaviour, this truth of Integrative Meaning has been the most horrifically condemning of truths for upset humans. No other truth raised the issue of the human condition, the issue of the lack of ideal behaviour in our lives, as completely as the truth of Integrative Meaning.

Furthermore, the integrative, cooperative, loving theme of existence is also actually what 'God' is the personification of—a truth we recognise when we say **'God is love'** (1 John 4:8,16). Monotheism, the belief that there is only one God, is an insight that goes back as far as 4,000 years ago to two very great denial-free thinkers or prophets, the pharaoh Akhenaton, who reigned in Egypt from approximately 1,350 to 1,335 BC, and the Hebrew prophet Abraham, who was alive around 2,000 BC. With the human condition explained and our divisive state understood, all humans can now safely admit and recognise that there has only been one God, one all-dominating truth, which is Integrative Meaning. Integration and the selflessness or love that enables it to occur *is* the theme of existence, is 'God', is the all-dominating and all-pervading universal truth about our world.

The problem was that until we could explain why we have been divisive and not integrative (we were, by all appearances, 'unlovable'), we couldn't afford to demystify our concept of God and explain that God is Integrative Meaning. Until we could explain our human condition we had no choice but to leave the concept of God in a safely abstract, undefined state, but with our divisive, non-integrative behaviour now defended we can safely demystify this religious concept of God and explain in first-principle-based, scientific terms who, or more precisely, what, God is—the personification of the Negative Entropy-driven integrative, cooperative, loving, selfless, order-developing ideals, theme, purpose and meaning of life.

So although the truth of Integrative Meaning is extremely obvious, with evidence of the hierarchy of the order of matter everywhere we look, it was important for humanity that denial-complying mechanistic science found a way to deny what seemed such a totally condemning truth. This was easily achieved through the simple assertion that there is no meaning or purpose or theme in existence and that while change does occur it is a random, purposeless, directionless, meaningless, blind process. And, as stated, to cope with the imbued recognition of integrative ideality and meaning in the religious concept of 'God', science simply left the concept of 'God' undefined, maintaining it was a strictly abstract, metaphysical and spiritual concept unrelated to the scientific domain—an inexplicable deity, a supernatural being seated on a throne somewhere high above the clouds in a remote blue heaven who we can worship as someone superior to us while avoiding any direct comparisons with our divisively behaved selves. Religion and science were firmly demarcated as two entirely unrelated subjects.

Only when understanding of the human condition was found, as it now is, would it be safe to demystify God—and reconcile religion and science. As the visionary French Jesuit palaeontologist and philosopher (he was actually a denial-free thinker or prophet) Pierre Teilhard de Chardin (1881-1955) once said, **'I can see a direction and a line of progress for life, a line and a direction which are in fact so well marked that I am convinced their reality will be universally admitted by the science of tomorrow'** (*The Phenomenon of Man*, 1938, p.142 of 320). With this statement,

de Chardin was recognising firstly how obvious the truth of the integrative, order-of-matter-developing theme of existence really is. And secondly that this truth of the integrative **'direction'** or theme or purpose or meaning of existence wouldn't be able to be **'admitted'** until the human-condition-resolved **'science of tomorrow'** emerged. Yes, 'yesterday's' mechanistic scientists *have been* reductionist and mechanistic, *not* teleological and holistic; they couldn't admit to Integrative Meaning because it was a suicidally depressing truth.

It should be noted that despite this need to deny the development of order of matter on Earth, or Integrative Meaning, and acknowledge that it is what we mean by 'God', there have been a rare few scientists who have courageously acknowledged both. The very great German-born physicist Albert Einstein (1879-1955) and British physicist Stephen Hawking (1942-) are two such scientists. As Hawking once said, **'I would use the term God as the embodiment of the laws of physics'** (*Master of the Universe*, BBC, 1989). Three years later Hawking went further, saying, **'The overwhelming impression is of order** [in the universe]**. The more we discover about the universe, the more we find that it is governed by rational laws. If one liked, one could say that this order was the work of God. Einstein thought so…We could call order by the name of God'** ('The Time of His Life' by Gregory Benford, *Sydney Morning Herald*, 28 Apr. 2002). The 1997 PBS documentary *Einstein Revealed* reported Einstein as saying that **'over time, I have come to realise that behind everything is an order that we glimpse only indirectly** [because it's unbearably confronting/condemning!]**. This is religiousness. In this sense, I am a religious man.'** 'Holism' is also a term that recognises Integrative Meaning. Coined by the great South African denial-free thinker or prophet Jan Smuts (1870-1950), it means **'the tendency in nature to form wholes'** (*Concise Oxford Dict*. 5th edn, 1964). 'Teleology', another term that recognises Integrative Meaning, means **'the belief that purpose and design are a part of nature'** (*Macquarie Dict*. 3rd edn, 1998).

It is getting a bit ahead of the sequence of concepts being presented, nevertheless, it should at least be briefly pointed out that coming off such a fundamentally false base as mechanistic science has been—in denying such a fundamental truth as Integrative Meaning—has meant its ability to interpret its own findings has been deeply compromised, which is why it has struggled to make much sense of the real nature of life on Earth, specifically *human* nature. Denial-complying mechanistic science has been a very superficial and thus ineffective form of enquiry, which is why so much of the world has lost faith in science. The American General Omar Bradley, who rose to eminence during the Second World War, highlighted the extreme deficiency of mechanistic science when he said, **'The world has achieved brilliance…without conscience. Ours is a world of nuclear giants and ethical infants'** (Armistice Day Address, 10 Nov. 1948, *Collected Writings of General Omar N. Bradley*, Vol.1). Carl Jung also recognised science's failure to provide us with enlightening information about ourselves when he said that **'Man everywhere is dangerously unaware of himself. We really know nothing about the nature of man, and unless we hurry to get to know ourselves we are in dangerous trouble'** (*Jung and the Story of Our Time*, Laurens van der Post, 1976, p.239 of 275). My professor of biology at Sydney University, Charles Birch (1918-2009), was another who bravely spoke the truth when he said, '[mechanistic] **science can't deal with subjectivity…what we were all taught in universities is pretty much a dead end'** (From recording of Birch's 1993 FHA/WTM Open Day address—see <www.humancondition.com/prof-charles-birch>). In short, mechanistic science hasn't been able to deal with the truth about ourselves and our world. The renowned English physicist and science

writer Paul Davies (1946-) recognised this deficiency when he said, **'For 300 years science has been dominated by extremely mechanistic thinking. According to this view of the world all physical systems are regarded as basically machines…I have little doubt that much of the alienation and demoralisation that people feel in our so-called scientific age stems from the bleak sterility of mechanistic thought'** ('Living in a non-material world—the new scientific consciousness', *The Australian*, 9 Oct. 1991).

Plato also recognised the destructive effect denial—especially denial of Integrative Meaning—has had on our intellect's capacity to think effectively, writing that **'when the soul** [which, as will be explained when the fourth unconfrontable truth is described, is our species' integratively orientated original instinctual self] **uses the instrumentality of the body** [uses the body's intellect with its preoccupation with denial] **for any inquiry…it is drawn away by the body into the realm of the variable, and loses its way and becomes confused and dizzy, as though it were fuddled** [drunk]**…But when it investigates by itself** [free of human-condition-avoiding, intellectual denial]**, it passes into the realm of the pure and everlasting and immortal and changeless, and being of a kindred nature, when it is once independent and free from interference, consorts with it always and strays no longer, but remains, in that realm of the absolute** [Integrative Meaning]**, constant and invariable'** (*Phaedo*, tr. H. Tredennick).

Plato also referred to the need to be able **'to look straight at reality'** if we are to effectively **'learn'** when he wrote that **'this capacity** [of **a mind…to see clearly**] **is innate in each man's mind** [we are born with a truthful, instinctive orientation to the cooperative, loving, integrative meaning of existence]**, and that the faculty by which he learns is like an eye which cannot be turned from darkness to light unless the whole body is turned; in the same way the mind as a whole must be turned away from the world of change until it can bear to look straight at reality, and at the brightest of all realities which is what we call the Good** [Integrative Meaning or God]**'** (*The Republic*, tr. H.D.P. Lee, 1955, p.283 of 405).

Mechanistic science has suffered very greatly from an inability to think truthfully and thus effectively—as we will see, it certainly has **'los**[t] **its way and become confused and dizzy, as though it were fuddled** [drunk]**'**. Arthur Schopenhauer's description of how dishonesty blocks access to the truth has already been referred to, but his wise words are worth repeating here: **'The discovery of truth is prevented most effectively…by prejudice, which…stands in the path of truth and is then like a contrary wind driving a ship away from land.'** As will be explained, we were never going to get to the liberating truth about the crux problem facing our species of the human condition through lies, most especially the denial of Integrative Meaning.

When Birch said that **'what we were all taught in universities is pretty much a dead end'**, he was prescient in his choice of words, because **'dead end'** is an apt description for the stalled state of science today, in particular, as we will see, of the stalled state of that discipline within science of biology. In fact, he also once said, **'Biology has not made any real advance since Darwin'** (In recorded conversation with this author, 20 Mar. 1987). The overall situation faced by mechanistic science was summarised in this further quote from Birch: **'the traditional framework of thinking in science is not adequate for solving the really hard problems'** (ABC Radio National, *Ockham's Razor*, 16 Apr. 1997). As we will see, the **'hard**[est] **problem'** of all for denial-complying mechanistic science to solve has been the all-important issue of the human condition.

It will become apparent as this presentation continues that living in denial of Integrative Meaning, and many other important truths, has been very necessary, but it has also had tragic consequences in terms of making progress in understanding our world and our place in it.

Part 4:4C Thirdly, we have had to live in denial of what consciousness really is

A phenomenon that should become abundantly clear by the end of this book is that wherever there is polarised debate, it is a sure sign that the issue of the human condition is involved. The subject of 'consciousness' is one such example, for it has caused as much polarisation as any issue debated by humans; indeed, anyone who has searched the term 'consciousness' will have found it to be a subject surrounded by extraordinary controversy, confusion and mystery. BUT, there is a *very* good reason for this, and it is not because consciousness is an impenetrably complex subject, as we are often told—it is because consciousness raises the unbearable issue of the human condition!

The truth is, the subject of consciousness brings our mind *so* quickly into contact with the unbearably depressing issue of the human condition that 'consciousness' has become synonymous with—indeed code for—the problem of the human condition.

In his book *Complexity*, the science writer Roger Lewin described the great difficulty humans have had trying to **'illuminate the phenomena of consciousness'** as **'a tough challenge… perhaps the toughest of all'** (1993, p.153 of 208). To illustrate the nature and extent of the difficulty, Lewin relayed the philosopher René Descartes' own disturbed reaction when he tried to **'contemplate consciousness'**: **'So serious are the doubts into which I have been thrown…that I can neither put them out of my mind nor see any way of resolving them. It feels as if I have fallen unexpectedly into a deep whirlpool which tumbles me around so that I can neither stand on the bottom nor swim up to the top'** (p.154). Yes, consciousness has indeed been a fearful realm in which to delve!

Exactly *why* the subject of consciousness raised the hitherto unbearable issue of the human condition and therefore why it caused such a fearful, all-our-moorings-taken-from-under-us, **'deep whirlpool'** of terrible depression can be accounted for by two very good reasons.

The first reason is that trying to think about consciousness meant trying to understand what—when we humans are the only fully conscious, reasoning, intelligent, extraordinarily clever, 'can-get-a-man-on-the-Moon' animal—is so intelligent and clever about being so competitive, selfish and aggressive, in fact, *so* ruthlessly competitive, brutal and even murderous, that human life has become all but unbearable and we have nearly destroyed our own planet?! *Any* contemplation about the nature of our conscious intellect invariably brought us into contact with the unbearable conclusion that it was the most destructive force the world has ever known. Yes, that our fully conscious, reasoning, intelligent, insightful, aware, knowing, understanding human mind has, it seems, unconsciously, irrationally, unintelligently, unthinkingly, indifferently, uncaringly and stupidly almost destroyed the whole planet we live on, and also brought human existence to a state of unbearably lonely, alienated, egocentricity-crazed, aggressive, hateful dysfunctionality, has been an *extremely* confronting matter to think about. No wonder, as it says in Genesis in the Bible, having taken the **'fruit' 'from the tree of…knowledge'** (3:3, 2:17) that was **'desirable for gaining wisdom'** (3:6)—that is, having become fully conscious, thinking, knowledge-finding beings—we humans became so destructively behaved, so apparently lacking in **'wisdom'**, that we seemingly deserved to be condemned and **'banished…from the Garden of Eden'** (3:23) as defiling, unworthy, evil beings!

So while our conscious mind or intellect is, without doubt, the culminating achievement of the grand experiment in nature that we call life, it also appeared to be the most destructive and thus seemingly evil force to ever have appeared on Earth. Our conscious mind appeared to be to blame for all the devastation and human suffering in the world! Instead of being wonderful, our conscious mind appeared to be the plague of the planet! *That* is how **'serious are the doubts'** that thinking about consciousness produced within us!

The second reason why the subject of consciousness has been so unbearably depressing to confront was because thinking about the nature of consciousness quickly brought us into contact with the unbearably depressing truth of Integrative Meaning. The explanation of what consciousness actually is will reveal the problem because as we will see, while consciousness itself is actually a simple and obvious phenomenon to explain, its *meaning* has very confronting implications.

As briefly explained in Part 3:3, and this will be more fully explained in Part 8:7A, nerves were originally developed for the coordination of movement in animals, but, once developed, their ability to store impressions—which is what we refer to as 'memory'—gave rise to the potential to develop understanding of cause and effect. If you can remember past events, you can compare them with current events and identify regularly occurring experiences. This knowledge of, or insight into, what has commonly occurred in the past enables you to predict what is likely to happen in the future and to adjust your behaviour accordingly. Once insights into the nature of change are put into effect, the self-modified behaviour starts to provide feedback, refining the insights further. Predictions are compared with outcomes and so on. Much developed, and such refinement occurred in the human brain, nerves can sufficiently *associate* information to *reason* how experiences are related, learn to *understand* and become CONSCIOUS of, or aware of, or *intelligent* about, the relationship between events that occur through time. Thus consciousness means being sufficiently aware of how experiences are related to attempt to manage change from a basis of understanding.

In the context of explaining the human condition, what is so significant about this process is that once our nerve-based learning system became sufficiently developed for us to become conscious and able to effectively manage events, our conscious intellect was then in a position to wrest control from our gene-based learning system's instincts, which, up until then, had been controlling our lives. Basically, once our self-adjusting conscious mind emerged it was capable of taking over the management of our lives from the instinctive orientations we had acquired through the natural selection of genetic traits that adapted us to our environment. However, it was at this juncture, when our conscious intellect challenged our instincts for control, that a terrible battle broke out between our instincts and intellect, the effect of which, as explained in Part 3:2 using the Adam Stork analogy, was the extremely competitive, selfish and aggressive state that we call the human condition.

The problem with admitting this, in truth, obvious explanation of how our conscious brain works is that it meant admitting information could be associated and simplified—it meant admitting to insight—which was only a short step away from realising the *ultimate* insight, which is the integrative theme or meaning or purpose or direction of existence, which in turn immediately confronted us with our own inconsistency with that meaning.

Yes, as just explained in Part 4:4B, to admit to Integrative Meaning meant having to face the fact that our competitive and aggressive behaviour is seemingly totally at odds with the integrative direction of life, no less. The development and maintenance of the order of matter requires that the parts of developing wholes cooperate *not* compete. *Integrative* meaning confronts us squarely with our *divisive* human condition. Better to deny the existence of purpose in the first place by avoiding the possibility that information could be associated, refined and simplified. Admitting that our brain can associate information, reason, and become insightful about how experiences are related, learn to understand and become conscious of the relationship of events that occur through time and refine those insights further, leading all the way to the deduction of the meaning of all experience, which is to order or integrate matter, was *not* something the upset human race wanted to do. In short, admitting that information could be simplified or refined meant admitting to an ultimate refinement or law, confronting us with our inconsistency with that law, namely with the law of Integrative Meaning.

Demonstrating our masterful evasion of the nature of consciousness we used words like 'conscious', 'intelligent', 'understanding', 'reason' and 'insight' regularly without ever actually identifying what we are conscious of, intelligent about, understanding, reasoning or having an insight into, which is how events or experiences are related. The conventional obscure, evasive definition of intelligence is 'the ability to think abstractly'. The other imprecise, obscure, evasive phrase used whenever we wanted to refer to the uniqueness of our intelligence without actually saying what our conscious, understanding, insightful intelligence is, was to say that 'We are the species that is able to reflect upon itself.' So to name the area of the brain that associates and simplifies information as the 'association cortex' was, in fact, a slip of our evasive guard. Of course, when we weren't 'on our guard' against exposure few would deny that information can be associated, simplified and meaning found. In fact, most of us would say we do it every day of our lives—if we didn't, we wouldn't have a word for 'insight'. That is the amazing aspect about our denial of anything that brings the dilemma of the human condition into focus: it is not unusual for us humans to accept an idea up to a point, but as soon as it starts to lead to a confronting conclusion, pretend it doesn't exist—and do so without batting an eyelid.

So, unable—until now—to answer this deepest and darkest of all questions of our species' consciousness-induced, 'good-and-evil'-afflicted, less-than-ideally-behaved, seemingly-imperfect, even 'fallen' or corrupted, human condition, we learnt to avoid the whole depressing subject of consciousness and the issue it raised of the human condition. In terms then of the task of finding understanding of the human condition, it is clear that if you can't think about what consciousness really is—again, recognise that the nerve-based learning system, unlike the gene-based learning system, can associate information, reason how experiences are related, learn to understand and become conscious of the relationship of events that occur through time—then you have not even arrived at the starting blocks in terms of thinking effectively about what produced the human condition.

A great deal more will be said in Part 8:7A about what consciousness really is, and why we have had to live in denial of that simple explanation. The other important question of 'How did we humans become fully conscious while other species didn't?' was briefly answered in Part 3:11 and will also be fully explained in Part 8:7B.

Part 4:4D Fourthly, the upset human race has had to deny the truth that our species once instinctively lived in a completely integrated, cooperative, harmonious state

In the case of the other element involved in the explanation of the human condition of our species' original instinctive orientation—the part of us that unjustly condemned our intellect—this element, as we will now see, has been an even more treacherous topic to navigate than the nature of our conscious intellect. This is because thinking about our species' original instinctive orientation very quickly led our mind to the unbearably confronting memory, that all humans carry, of an upset-free, cooperatively orientated, innocent time in our species' instinctive past—a time before the fabled 'fall' that all our mythologies, such as the story of the Garden of Eden, recognise occurred when we became a fully conscious species.

While we have had to deny it, we all intuitively know that our species' pre-conscious instinctive state was one of living innocently in a harmonious, cooperative, loving, peaceful idyllic state—our awareness of which is apparent in our recognition of the existence of that 'voice' within all of us of an ideal-behaviour-demanding, altruistic, instinctive, 'moral' 'conscience'.

As was explained in Part 3:4, in the explanation of the battle that emerged between our instinctive self and our intellect one very big question arose: 'But what was our species' particular instinctive orientation? We once must have been controlled by instincts as other animals are, but since our original instinctive orientation obviously wasn't to a migratory flight path such as in the 'Adam Stork' analogy, what was our species' original instinctive orientation?' The answer, as outlined in Part 3:4, is that our species' original instinctive self or soul's orientation was, as we all intuitively know if we are honest, to behaving in an utterly cooperative, loving, harmonious, unconditionally selfless, altruistic way.

If it is true, which in truth we know it is, that our ancestors did once live in a cooperative, harmonious, loving state then that would certainly be an *extremely* confronting truth for today's extremely upset, corrupted, angry, egocentric and alienated humans. In the Adam Stork analogy, Adam became upset because he was defying an instinctive flight path, but if *our* instinctive orientation was to behaving in an utterly cooperative, loving, unconditionally selfless, altruistic, harmonious way then *our* upset must be infinitely greater than Adam's. Since the meaning of existence is to be integrative, that is cooperative, loving and unconditionally selflessly behaved, and we were behaving in a completely opposite way, namely competitive, aggressive and selfish, then when we defied our instincts we were defying the integrative ideals of existence—we were defying 'God'! Such defiance would have made us *extremely* guilt-ridden and thus *extremely* upset, which is exactly what happened. 'Flying off course' in our case, necessary as it was, was an *incredibly* upsetting act of defiance—which is why we humans have been capable of *extremely* angry, mean, cruel and aggressive behaviour.

The next immense question to be answered, and this is a question for biologists, is 'How could we humans have developed such a wonderful instinctive orientation?' To elaborate, 'How could we have developed an instinctive orientation to behaving in an utterly cooperative, all-loving, harmonious, unconditionally selfless, altruistic way?' Mythologies might assert that we once lived in an unconditionally selfless, fully cooperative, integrative,

ideal way, and we all do carry an awareness that we did, but the question this raises for biologists is how could a species possibly develop such an unconditionally selfless, fully integrated state? How did we develop our altruistic-behaviour-demanding moral conscience?

To appreciate why this is such a big question for biologists to answer we need to consider how the gene-based learning system—the system that gives species their instinctive orientations—works.

While much more will be said about the gene-based information processing or learning system later in Part 8, there is a particular limitation to developing the order of matter on Earth using the gene-based learning system that needs to be explained now. Genetic refinement or learning—what Darwin described as 'natural selection'—works by selecting genetic traits that survive through time. Since only genetic traits that survive and carry on can become established in a species, it follows that traits that don't carry on, such as self-sacrificing, altruistic traits, normally can't become established genetically. Natural selection can't normally develop unconditionally selfless, altruistic traits in a species because such traits are self-eliminating. To elaborate, while selflessness, indeed not just selflessness but unconditional selflessness—the capacity to, if required, make a full, self-sacrificing commitment to the maintenance of the larger whole—is the glue that best holds wholes together, such unconditionally selfless, altruistic traits cannot normally be developed genetically. In fact, the gene-based learning system could not develop selflessness beyond what is referred to as reciprocity, where a selfless act is reciprocated with a selfless act; in such cases the selfless act is intrinsically still selfish, as traits have to be if they are to carry on and become established in a species. The fact is, only traits that are in effect selfish—traits that ensure their own reproduction—can become established in a species.

So while unconditional selflessness is the glue that best holds wholes together, if an unconditionally selfless trait emerges and practices such self-sacrificial behaviour it won't tend to carry on and therefore it normally cannot become selected for genetically. This inability of genes in almost every situation to develop unconditionally selfless or altruistic traits means the gene-based learning system is limited in its ability to integrate matter. The best 'glue' for developing wholes and holding them together is unconditional selflessness, but in almost every situation genetics is unable to develop such 'glue'. The result is that in almost every situation only a degree of integration of members of species can be achieved genetically.

That was a brief description of the reason why genes can't normally develop unconditional selflessness or altruism, which we can now appreciate makes the question of how could we humans have ever developed unconditionally selfless, altruistic instincts such a perplexing one for biology. How could we possibly have developed 'give-your-life-for-others-without-care-for-self', altruistic genetic traits if such traits self-eliminate and thus, seemingly, cannot become established in a species? How could we humans have acquired our altruistic moral conscience?

The reason I have said that 'normally', 'in almost every situation' genetics can't develop unconditional selflessness is because there was, in fact, one way it could, which was the way our ape ancestors developed an instinctive capacity to behave unconditionally selflessly. As outlined in Part 3:4 (and again this will be explained in greater detail in Part 8:4B), that one way was through <u>nurturing</u>.

While nurturing is a selfish trait, as genetic traits have to be (by nurturing and fostering the next generation—which has the parent's nurturing trait—the nurturing trait is selfishly ensuring that it carries on from generation to generation), from an observer's point of view it *appears* to be selfless behaviour. The mother is giving her offspring food, warmth, shelter, support and protection for *apparently* nothing in return. This point is most significant, because it means from the infant's perspective its mother is treating it with real love, which is unconditional selflessness. The infant's brain is therefore being trained or conditioned or indoctrinated or inscribed with unconditional selflessness, and with enough training in selflessness the infant will become an adult who behaves unconditionally selflessly.

The 'trick' in this 'love-indoctrination' process lies in the fact that nurturing is encouraged genetically because the better the infants are cared for, the greater are their chances of survival, however, there is an integrative side effect, which is that the more infants are nurtured the more their brain is trained in unconditional selflessness. There are very few situations in biology where animals appear to behave selflessly towards other animals—normally, they each selfishly compete for food, shelter, space and mating opportunities. Maternalism, a mother's fostering of her infant, is one of the few situations where an animal appears to be behaving selflessly towards another animal and it was this *appearance* of selflessness that exists in the maternal situation that provided the integrative opportunity for the development of love-indoctrination, the training of individuals in unconditional selflessness. And with this unconditional selfless behaviour recurring over many generations, the unconditionally selfless behaviour will become instinctive—a moral soul will be established—because genes will inevitably follow and reinforce any development process, in this they are not selective. The difficulty was in getting the development of unconditional selflessness to occur in the first place, for once it was regularly occurring it would naturally become instinctive over time.

To develop nurturing—this 'trick' for overcoming the genetic learning system's seeming inability to develop unconditional selflessness—a species required the capacity to allow its offspring to remain in the infancy stage long enough for the infant's brain to become indoctrinated with unconditional selflessness. As mentioned, zebras have to be capable of independent flight almost as soon as they are born, which gives them little opportunity to be trained in selflessness. Primates, however, are especially facilitated for leaving offspring in infancy and thus developing love-indoctrination. Being semi-upright as a result of their arboreal heritage, their arms are free to carry a helpless, dependent infant. Species that cannot carry and easily look after their infants cannot develop love-indoctrination. Upright walking and its resulting bipedalism in humans is a direct product of the love-indoctrination process, which means bipedalism must have emerged early on in the development of humans, as fossil records now confirm.

As mentioned in Part 3:4, and again this point will be more fully dealt with in Part 8:4, nurturing was the main influence or prime mover in human development—not tool use or upright walking or language development or mastery of fire or any one of the other evasive explanations that denial-complying biologists have been putting forward in the mountain of books that have been published on human origins. It was our ape ancestor's exceptional facility to develop nurturing that enabled us to acquire an instinctive orientation to behaving

in an utterly cooperative, non-competitive, fully harmonious and loving way towards each other—that gave us our moral soul, the voice of which is our 'moral conscience'. This time in our primate past when we lived in such an idyllic state—which the bonobos are currently on the threshold of living in—was our 'time in the Garden of Eden', our 'Golden Age', the 'dream time' in our past, as our mythologies have recognised. In his 1990 book *Memories & Visions of Paradise*, the American author Richard Heinberg provides ample documentation of how our mythologies captured the truth of a cooperative, pre-human-condition-afflicted, innocent past for humanity, writing that **'Every religion begins with the recognition that human consciousness has been separated from the divine Source, that a former sense of oneness…has been lost… everywhere in religion and myth there is an acknowledgment that we have departed from an original… innocence'** (pp.81-82 of 282). The eighth century BC Greek poet Hesiod also referred to this 'Golden Age' in our species' past in his poem *Works and Days*: **'When gods alike and mortals rose to birth / A golden race the immortals formed on earth…Like gods they lived, with calm untroubled mind / Free from the toils and anguish of our kind / Nor e'er decrepit age misshaped their frame…Strangers to ill, their lives in feasts flowed by…Dying they sank in sleep, nor seemed to die / Theirs was each good; the life-sustaining soil / Yielded its copious fruits, unbribed by toil / They with abundant goods 'midst quiet lands / All willing shared the gathering of their hands.'**

The immense problem with recognising the existence of such a wonderfully cooperative, pre-human-condition-afflicted, innocent and loving past is its complete contrast with our present immensely upset, corrupted, competitive, aggressive and selfish, seemingly non-integrative state. Until we could explain the human condition—explain why we became corrupted, 'fell from grace', lost our innocence, explain why we became such a competitive, aggressive and selfish species—this truth of an utterly cooperative, unconditionally-selfless-behaving past was devastatingly, unbearably, totally exposing, condemning and confronting; suicidally depressing in fact.

The question this, in turn, raises is: 'How did we cope with the truth of our species' wonderfully cooperative and loving past while we didn't have the explanation of the human condition?' Obviously we tried to deny that we ever once lived in such a wonderful state. Although our mythologies recognised the truth that we *did* once live in a state of wonderful innocence, such assertions were invariably dismissed as nothing more than an unsubstantiated, without-any-factual-base, unscientific, fanciful, romantic dream of some impossible, never-did-exist-in-reality, unrealistic, idyllic, utopian, beyond-this-world existence. As has been mentioned and will be fully described later in Part 8:4, the truth is the bonobos provide ample evidence for the possibility of the existence of a cooperative, harmonious existence in our past. But denial-complying mechanistic science simply didn't want to recognise the existence of such evidence. As a result, very little research has been done on bonobos, to the extent that they have been described as **'the forgotten ape'** (*Bonobos: The Forgotten Ape*, Frans de Waal & Frans Lanting, 1997). We can now understand why.

To maintain the denial that we ever once lived in such a wonderful state we also needed to come up with a biological justification for our divisive behaviour, which duly developed around misrepresenting the fact that genes are selfish to excuse our selfish behaviour. Denial-complying, mechanistic biologists simply asserted that humans are selfish because our genes are selfish. We were told we are competitive, aggressive and selfish because of

our instinctive animal heritage; that we have savage animal instincts that make us selfishly fight and compete for food, shelter, territory and a mate. Needing some justification for our divisive behaviour the upset human race held on to this excuse, even though, as has already been emphasised, this 'selfish gene' explanation for our human behaviour conveniently overlooked the fact that our behaviour involves our unique fully conscious thinking mind—that descriptions of our behaviour, such as egocentric, arrogant, deluded, optimistic, pessimistic, artificial, hateful, mean, immoral, guilty, evil, depressed, inspired, psychotic, alienated, all imply there is a *psychological* dimension to *our* behaviour. We held on to the 'genes are selfish and that's why we are selfish' excuse despite there obviously being a psychological issue involved in our behaviour. We have suffered from a consciousness-derived, *psychological* HUMAN CONDITION, *not* an instinct-controlled animal condition—our condition is unique to us fully conscious humans.

The fact that genes are selfish doesn't mean that there is no other purpose to existence other than to selfishly replicate your genes, as denial-complying mechanistic biologists argue. Rather, it is simply a *limitation* of the gene-based information processing or learning system that genes are selfish. The meaning of existence *is* to integrate or develop the order of matter, a process that is most assisted by unconditional selflessness, which means the gene-based learning system would develop unconditional selflessness *if it could*. The fact that it can't simply reflects its *limitation* as a tool for developing the order of matter. Again, the history of denial of Integrative Meaning and of all the false excuses biology has given us for our divisive behaviour will be explained and described in greater detail shortly in upcoming Parts of this book.

While the truth that we humans have cooperatively orientated, altruistic instincts has been an unbearable truth for the upset human race to face, the question arises: why didn't biologists recognise that any instinctive orientation would have challenged and opposed our fully conscious mind's experiments in understanding? The story of Adam Stork, for example, explains how instincts became at odds with the intellect, but Adam Stork's orientation was only to a flight path. Certainly, the development of cooperatively orientated moral instincts in humans greatly compounded the 'criticism' our intellect received from our particular instinctive orientation—for we weren't just at war with some flight path like a stork who became fully conscious would have been, we were at war with cooperative, integrative meaning of existence, with that all-pervading truth that we have personified as 'God' no less. Our sense of guilt from our instinctive orientation was extreme, but the question remains: why didn't biologists recognise that any instinctive orientation would have in effect criticised an emerging self-managing consciousness?

The answer is that any thinking about the instinctive orientations of animals brought into focus the question of our species' own instinctive orientation, which we have all known is to behave in a cooperative, so-called moral way, yet we didn't want to go near that acknowledgment. We saw with intelligence how we didn't want to think about how our rational, reasoning conscious mind worked because we didn't want to have to face either the truth of 'Well, if I am so cleverly insightful why do I have to behave in such a dumb, apparently non-insightful destructively selfish, angry, egocentric and competitive way?', or

the truth that information could be simplified or refined because it meant admitting to the unconfrontable ultimate refinement or law of Integrative Meaning. To avoid having to face these truths we employed a strategy of making sure we wouldn't begin to think about how the reasoning conscious mind works. The same situation and strategy applied to thinking about the mechanism behind instincts because any such thinking would all too soon bring us into contact with the subject of, and truth of, our moral instincts and so to avoid such an encounter we practiced not thinking about the nature of instincts at all. As a result, it is now very hard to find any analysis of what instincts actually are and how they develop. We discussed at length the selective breeding of livestock such as of horses and cattle, for example, about how we are readily, over only a few generations, able to change their physical appearance and instinctive behaviour, but we never talked about how much the innumerable wars in Europe, for instance, must have bled mainland Europeans dry of a great deal of innocence and left them relatively instinctively upset, cynical and alienated compared with other populations who hadn't experienced such bloodshed and anguish. Like the issue of what consciousness actually is, the whole issue of instincts has been a big 'no-go zone'. The human race, and virtually all its biologists, have been hiding very deep inside Plato's dark cave of denial.

In fact, the next great truth that the human race has practiced living in denial of while the human condition couldn't be explained is this truth of the differences in alienation between not only individual humans but human races, genders, generations, civilisations and cultures as a result of their various exposure to the upsetting battle of the human condition.

Part 4:4E Fifthly, the upset human race has had to deny the differences in upset between human individuals, races, genders, generations, civilisations and cultures.

This truth of the differences in alienation that inevitably resulted from humans' differing encounters with humanity's upsetting search for knowledge is really an extension of the just described fourth great unconfrontable truth that we humans once lived instinctively in an utterly integrated, cooperative, loving, harmonious state. If, in our distant past, we humans lived in a cooperative, loving state and then the upsetting search for knowledge began, which was the case, then naturally people are going to vary in how much exposure they have had with that upsetting struggle and how angry, egocentric and alienated they have become as a result. What this means is that admitting that our distant ancestors lived in a cooperative, selfless and loving state was not only devastating because it confronted us with the truth of the present extremely corrupted competitive, selfish and aggressive state of the human race in general, it was *also* devastating because it confronted us with the truth that individual humans are going to vary in how upset or soul-corrupted or innocence-destroyed they have become. While the human race as a whole is no longer innocent, there is naturally also different degrees of angry, egocentric and alienated upset amongst individuals, and while we couldn't explain the corrupted state of humanity as a whole and thus face that overall truth, we also couldn't face the truth that some humans and groups of humans were more upset/corrupted than others.

The particular problem has been that without the redeeming explanation of the human condition any admission of some humans being more or less upset/corrupted than others only led to the prejudiced view of some humans being better or worse, superior or inferior, more worthy or less worthy, than others. To avoid the human race as a whole being condemned as bad and worthless the truth of our species' innocent past had to be denied, and, similarly, to avoid the possibility of the prejudiced view of some humans being better or worse than others, the whole notion of differences in soul-devastated, innocence-destroyed upset anger, egocentricity and alienation between humans had to be avoided.

While this fact of there being differences in upset, particularly differences in alienation, between individuals, races, genders, generations, countries, civilisations and cultures is really only an aspect, a sub-set, of the fourth great unconfrontable truth that we humans once lived instinctively in an utterly integrated, cooperative, loving, harmonious state, it is such a significant aspect, in terms of truth that has been unbearable to face, that it does deserve to be recognised in its own right as one of the great unconfrontable truths.

Of course, it is an obvious truth that humans are variously upset as a result of their differing degrees of exposure to the upsetting battle of the human condition. Someone growing up in the human-condition-embattled, soul-destroying red light district of Kings Cross in Sydney is obviously going to be more upset/corrupted than someone who grew up in the relatively sheltered, innocent countryside. It is the most obvious of truths but without the dignifying and redeeming explanation of the human condition any discussion about some people being more innocent than others left those no longer innocent feeling condemned as bad, inferior and worthless—and it also left the possibility of them being treated as such, which could then lead to their retaliation against that mistreatment. In fact, even the presence of relatively innocent people could be so confronting and condemning that those no longer innocent couldn't bear it and had to retaliate by attacking and even killing those more innocent in order to remove their condemning presence from their lives. Again, this is all perfectly described in the Bible in the aforementioned story of Cain and Abel: **'Abel kept flocks,** [he lived the nomadic life of a shepherd, staying close to nature and innocence] **and Cain worked the soil** [he cultivated crops and domesticated animals and as a result was able to become settled and develop towns and cities and through greater interaction with other humans became increasingly upset]**…Cain was** [became] **very angry, and his face was downcast** [he became depressed about his upset, corrupted state and]**…Cain attacked his** [relatively innocent and thus unwittingly confronting and condemning] **brother Abel and killed him'** (Gen. 4:2, 5, 8).

The simple fact is the longer the battle to find understanding went on, the more upset humans became—and the simple fact that flows from this is that those people and races who have been in the thick of the battle a long time will be more upset—and also more instinctively adapted to upset, including becoming instinctively cynical and selfish—than those who haven't been in the thick of the battle for as long—and the simple fact that flows from *that* is that all manner of insecurities, inequalities and frustrations are going to arise from those differences.

Innocence has been affected by upset everywhere, and vice versa. As will be explained in Part 7:1, men have oppressed women because of women's relative innocence. Older people have tended to limit young people's access to power and position because young people could

be too innocent and naive about the realities of life under the duress of the human condition. When we get up in the morning we are much fresher, more enthusiastic and idealistic than we are by the end of the day, such that our end-of-the-day-just-want-some-luxury-self wouldn't entertain the more optimistic and altruistic enterprises of our more soulful, socially healthy and operational morning-self. By evening, most people are in need of a gin and tonic (or two or three or four) to escape the tribulations of their day's exertions under the duress of the human condition. Whatever idealistic, selfless, soul-inspired enterprises they might have been thinking about in the morning have, by day's end, been replaced by a selfish preoccupation with a need for ego-reinforcement from others, relief from exertion, and for escape from the whole horror of life under the duress of the human condition.

The point being made here is that having to live with all the stresses from a deeply upset, human-condition-afflicted world has meant that in the course of one day in the life of a resigned human he or she regresses from a state of fresh, boundless energy and enthusiasm all the way to a state of physical and emotional exhaustion. Such has been the change in the mindset of humans over one day, let alone over a lifetime, over generations, and over the whole two million year upsetting journey of humanity from its original state of innocent idealism to its variously embattled, punch-drunk, distressed, soul-exhausted state today! Everywhere that the battle of the human condition has been raging there have been differences in upset with all manner of consequences, some extremely unjust, even horrifically tragic.

The situation in Fiji provides a good case-study of what occurred when races of different degrees of upset cohabitated. In the late 1800s British colonists brought Indians to Fiji as indentured labour to farm sugar cane, and by the mid-1960s half the Fijian population was Indian. As a result, a serious conflict arose between the Indian and native Fijians, which we can now understand. The issue is the Indian Fijians, coming from an older and thus naturally more cynical, human-condition-toughened, human-condition-realistic and thus opportunistic civilisation, have been so industrious and materially successful that they now monopolise the small business sector in Fiji to the extent that the native Fijians feel their country has been taken over by the Indian Fijians; for their part, however, the Indian Fijians also feel discriminated against. Indian Fijian sugar growers in particular feel this inequity, for while they produce 90 percent of the country's sugar, they are only allowed to lease land from the native Fijians (who own 90 percent of the land). Furthermore, since gaining independence in 1970 the native Fijians have ensured their domination of the political process—a state of affairs that was reinforced in 1990 when the Fijian constitution restricted the Indians to a maximum of 27 seats in the country's 71-seat Parliament. When this provision was amended in 1997 the Indians came to dominate the political scene, successfully electing an Indian Prime Minister in the late 1990s. This situation, however, was overthrown in 2000 when the native Fijians led a coup—and they have remained in power ever since. As mentioned, the Indian Fijians come from a very ancient civilisation in India, one where innocence has long given way to more upset-adapted humans. In comparison, the native Fijians are still relatively innocent, yet to become embattled, hardened and upset-adapted. They aren't manically driven to win power and glory like more embattled, upset-adapted races, preferring to spend their day tranquilly occupied by such activities as playing music, drinking the sedating kava and eating taro roots from their gardens. It is akin to a 20-year-old, or thereabouts, equivalent race having

to co-exist and compete with a toughened, cynical, more-upset-and-thus-more-insecure-about-their-goodness-and-thus-more-driven-to-find-ego-reinforcement, opportunistic 50-year-old, or thereabouts, equivalent race.

Trying to manage differences in upset between individuals, races, genders, generations, countries, civilisations and cultures has been extremely difficult, but once the prejudiced views of some individuals, races, genders, generations, countries, civilisations or cultures being either good or bad, superior or inferior, more worthwhile or less worthwhile, arose terrible atrocities and injustices very often followed. In the last century alone, we have seen the Holocaust in which approximately six million European Jews were exterminated by the Nazis during the Second World War; the attempted 'ethnic cleansing' by the Bantu Hutu of an estimated 800,000 of the more upset-adapted Nilotic Tutsi in 100 days of bloodshed in Rwanda in 1994; Idi Amin literally throwing out of Uganda, in 1972, all the Indians and Pakistanis, some 40,000-80,000 people, who owned and operated most of the businesses there because he claimed **'they** [were] **sabotaging the economy of the country'** (*Jet* mag. 14 Sept. 1972); the racial segregation of apartheid in South Africa that was enforced between 1948-1993; and the 'White Australia Policy', which in essence restricted 'non-white' immigration to Australia and wasn't completely abolished until 1973.

Discrimination—the management of human interactions based on levels of innocence or lack thereof—is not in itself bad or immoral; after all, we go to great lengths to protect the innocence of children. What *is* wrong or immoral is to base those management decisions on judgments about the goodness or badness, superiority or inferiority, worthiness or unworthiness, of different *states* of innocence. Unable to explain the human condition, explain the *good* reason for the upset, soul-and-innocence-destroyed, corrupted state of humans, any acknowledgement of differences in upset almost always led to those who were more upset feeling and/or being condemned as bad or inferior or worthless, and, in response, retaliating, in which case *no* differentiation according to levels of upset could afford to be tolerated. The 'White Australia Policy' was wrong and couldn't be tolerated *not* because humans aren't differently upset but because it led to prejudiced/wrong views about some races being better or superior than others, which invariably led to serious and damaging consequences.

As I mentioned in Part 4:1, Plato quite sensibly wanted to have the least ego-embattled/most innocent—the **'philosopher kings'** or **'philosopher rulers'** or **'philosopher princes'** or **'philosopher guardians'** as he variously described them—lead society. He wrote, **'isn't it obvious whether it's better for a blind man** [an alienated person] **or a clear-sighted one** [an innocent, ego-unembattled, denial-free, honest person] **to keep an eye on anything'** (*Plato The Republic*, tr. H.D.P. Lee, 1955, p.244 of 405), arguing that **'If you get, in public affairs, men who are so morally impoverished that they have nothing they can contribute themselves, but who hope to snatch some compensation for their own inadequacy from a political career, there can never be good government. They start fighting for power…**[whereas those who pursue a life] **of true philosophy** [honest, unresigned, egocentricity-free thought] **which looks down on political power…**[should be] **the only men to get power…men who do not love it** [who don't egocentrically hunger for power, fame, fortune and glory]**…rulers** [who] **come to their duties with least enthusiasm'** (p.286). Completely **'obvious'** as Plato's idea was of having

the most innocent run society, such honesty was untenable and couldn't be tolerated because differentiation between individuals according to degrees of alienation or soundness left those no longer innocent unjustly condemned as bad and unworthy. (Once again it should be pointed out that it wasn't as though we didn't know who was soul-corrupted, upset and alienated and who was relatively innocent—to ignore, deny, repress and, in the extreme, persecute to the point even, in the case of Christ, of crucifying innocence, as we have done because we found their honest, truthful innocent soundness too confronting, we had to first be able to recognise it. It would have been as easy, indeed, probably much easier, to design exams that tested a person's level of alienation or soundness or soulfulness quotient, their SQ, than it was to design exams that tested their intelligence quotient or IQ.)

So, clearly, until we were able to explain the human condition and by so doing defend and understand the upset, corrupted state, any acknowledgement of who was upset and who wasn't only led to dangerous prejudice, especially so-called 'racist' views of some races being viewed as being either superior or inferior or more worthy or less worthy than others. Without the defence for upset it was virtually impossible to talk about upset in a way that didn't infer that it was somehow bad. It is only now that the human condition is explained that the essential equality of goodness of all people is at last established. While all humans *are* variously upset, *all humans are equally good because upset was a result of an unavoidable and necessary battle humanity has had to wage to find knowledge*. The equality of goodness of all people is a first-principle-established, fundamental and universal truth now. Humanity no longer has to rely on dogmatic assertions that **'all men are created equal'**, purely on the basis that it is a **'self-evident'** truth, as the United States' Declaration of Independence asserts, because we can now *explain*, *understand* and *know* that the equality of *all* humans is a fundamental truth. We can now understand *why* everyone is equally worthy, and that no one is superior or inferior, and that *everyone* deserves the **'rights'** of **'life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness'** (ibid). Prejudice, the view that some individuals, races, genders, generations, countries, civilisations or cultures are either superior or inferior to others, is eliminated by understanding of the human condition. In fact, with understanding of the human condition the concepts of good and bad, superior and inferior, worthy or unworthy, disappear from our conceptualisation of ourselves.

We haven't been able to talk about different levels of innocence without condemning those more corrupted as bad when they are not. In which case, a lie that said there was no difference in alienation between people was less of a lie than a partial truth that said there were differences with some people being 'good' and others 'bad'. The end result of taking this denial to the extreme was the emergence of an unsaid, blanket rule where no one was allowed to say anything meaningful about human behaviour—to the extent that, as has already been mentioned, even the children's nursery rhyme *Baa Black Sheep* was said to be racist and should instead be recited as **'Baa baa *rainbow* sheep'** (London's *Daily Telegraph*, 18 Feb. 1997). Political correctness was a dogma that became ridiculous and yet that is where the human race wound up—in a state where totally superficial, truthless non-sense reigned! Feminists are now saying there is no real difference between the sexes and now even men can give birth through some weird surgery!

Under this blanket rule, in order to avoid prejudice we were not allowed to talk about different individuals, races, genders, generations, countries, civilisations or cultures being more or less innocent than other individuals, races, genders, generations, countries, civilisations or cultures. In science, denial of differences in the innocence of races was such that when Sir Laurens van der Post dared to write about the relative innocence of the Bushmen people of the Kalahari in his many books, a biographer of Sir Laurens' life's work said that his writings about the innocence of the Bushmen made the **'academic experts' 'absolutely berserk with rage'** (J.D.F. Jones, ABC Radio, *Late Night Live*, 25 Feb. 2002)! (Much more will be said in Part 5:2 about science's denial of the relative innocence of so-called 'primitive' races.) No one was allowed to talk about such differences and yet they were the only differences that would make real sense of the different behaviours that each human exhibits. If we wanted to understand human behaviour, we *had* to look at how upset we humans have been, specifically how alienated we have been. As R.D. Laing said, **'Our alienation goes to the roots. The realization of this is the essential springboard for any serious reflection on any aspect of present inter-human life'** (*The Politics of Experience* and *The Bird of Paradise*, 1967, p.12 of 156). Yes, tragically, because of our monumental insecurity about our human condition that has forced us to live in denial of such all-important truths as the existence of differences in alienation between people, of Integrative Meaning, of the existence of the human condition, of what consciousness really is, of the fact that our species once lived in a cooperative, loving state, and, as will be explained next in Part 4:4F, of the importance of nurturing in our upbringing, science has provided us with more insights into the behaviour of elephants, and of tiny little insects like tree-hoppers, than it has about our *own* species' behaviour!

To find understanding of the human condition all the great truths just referred to had to be accepted, not denied. The whole denial-based scientific paradigm had to be defied and ignored for the new human-condition-understood world to emerge. However, what now has to be explained is that when that new, truthful, human-condition-understanding world finally emerges, as it now finally has, a problem still remains, which is with the human race having practiced such extreme denial—having buried itself so deep inside Plato's dark cave of denial—there is now a mountain of truth to suddenly have to confront, most particularly, the extent of alienation and loss of innocence in humans today. As such, the liberation of the human race is unavoidably and necessarily also 'judgment day', exposure day, honesty day, truth day, transparency day, revelation day—the time when, as it says in the Bible, **'your nakedness will be exposed'** (Isa. 47:3). It can't be any other way. We can't have the truth and not have the truth, but the problem is that while all the upset that the denials/lies/degrees of alienation have been concealing is now safely explained and defended it is still a shock to have it all exposed, particularly the differences in alienation between people and groups of people. This outcome, where the differences in alienation between people is suddenly revealed, is also referred to in the Bible where, immediately after describing the arrival of the all-exposing, shocking truth about the human condition as being **'like the lightning, which flashes and lights up the sky from one end to the other'** (Luke 17:24, see also Matt. 24:27), Christ describes how **'two people will be in one bed; one will be taken** [revealed as sound, non-alienated] **and the other left** [revealed as being alienated]**. Two women will be grinding corn together; one will be taken and the other**

left' (Luke 17:34, 35; see also Matt. 24:40). Again, it has to be stressed that **'judgment day'** is not a time when some will be judged as deserving of being **'taken'** to heaven and others **'left'** rejected, but a time of compassionate understanding of everyone. With the arrival of understanding of the human condition no one is going to be **'left'** behind. As already emphasised, and as will be explained in Part 9 when the TRANSFORMED LIFEFORCE STATE is described in detail, *all* humans will be able to *fully* participate in the new human-condition-liberated world. There will be no inequality, no prejudice and no discrimination of *anyone*. Our species' liberation from the human condition comes at a price, which is exposure of all our falseness/lies/denials, but that price is not too high because the TRANSFORMED WAY OF LIVING allows everyone to *joyously* cope with that exposure.

Much more will be said about this denial of differences in alienation between individual humans and groups of humans in Parts 5:2, 7:4 and 7:5.

Part 4:4F Sixthly, the upset human race has had to deny that nurturing played the all-important role in both the maturation of our species and in the maturation of our own lives.

The sixth unbearably confronting truth that made thinking about the issue of the human condition unbearably confronting for the upset human race is the truth of the importance of nurturing in both the maturation of our species and in the maturation of our own lives.

As described in Part 4:4D, and this will be more fully explained in Part 8:4B, it was nurturing that allowed our ape ancestors to develop an instinctive orientation to living unconditionally selflessly and thus cooperatively. We humans still naturally carry instinctive expectations of receiving the amount of nurturing that all children received during this time when we did live in a totally cooperative, all-loving state, but since the battle of the human condition emerged obviously no child has received that amount of nurturing and, as a result, all children today are variously compromised/hurt/damaged/corrupted by that lack of reinforcing unconditional love. Not surprisingly, it follows that this truth of the importance of nurturing has been unbearably condemning for virtually all people today who haven't received adequate nurturing in their own upbringing, and for virtually all parents who have been trying but failing to adequately nurture their offspring. As the teacher and best-selling author about children, John Marsden, acknowledged, **'The biggest crime you can commit in our society is to be a failure as a parent and people would rather admit to being an axe murderer than being a bad father or mother'** ('A Single Mum's Guide to Raising Boys', *Sunday Life* mag. *Sun-Herald*, 7 July 2002). The so-called 'nature vs. nurture' debate has in truth not been about the evidence for one argument over the other, rather it is a manifestation of the terror most people have of confronting the truth of the significance of nurturing in their own lives and in the lives of their children and wanting to deny it by any means they can find, no matter how dishonest. Attributing our personalities to the influence of 'nature', to the influence of our genetic make-up, is so much less condemning than having to admit the immensely important role nurturing played in the formation of our character.

Taking all of this into consideration, it is little wonder that the truth about the importance of nurturing has been another of the unbearably condemning truths for the upset human race.

Summary of why the elements of instinct and intellect involved in producing the upset state of the human condition have been so difficult to acknowledge, think about and thus investigate.

The six truths that have been outlined are the main truths that the upset human race has found unbearable to think about, and being unable to think about them has meant that even recognising the obvious elements involved in the human condition of our instinct and intellect has been too difficult for virtually all humans—let alone trying to think about the nature of those elements and how their differences might have produced the upset state of our human condition! The result is that although the human condition has been the most important issue to solve, virtually no one has been able to go near it.

It should be said that these six truths are only some of the more prominent truths that the upset, insecure, human-condition-afflicted human race has had to live in denial of. As this presentation progresses it will become apparent that there have been many, many truths that have not been safe to admit. Only with the full truth, the explanation of the human condition found, as it now is, does it become safe to acknowledge all these truths—*only now* can upset humans stop living in denial and leave Plato's dark cave where they have been hiding and face the glaring light of the sun, which symbolises all the truth that, until now, has had to be denied.

Part 4:5 The history of the search for understanding of the human condition

The stalling point in finding the explanation of the human condition has been the almost universal inability to confront and think honestly about the obvious elements involved in producing the upset state of the human condition—our instinct and our intellect. However, having now described the six truths that had to be admitted and confronted in order to explain the human condition it can be appreciated why thinking about the human condition has been impossible for virtually all humans. As mentioned, Rod Quantock, Albert Camus and Bertrand Russell certainly weren't exaggerating when they recognised the danger of thinking truthfully and thus deeply in the following, respective quotes: **'Thinking can get you into terrible downwards spirals of doubt'**, **'Beginning to think is beginning to be undermined'** and **'Many people would sooner die than think.'**

Only a truthful, denial-free, 'out-of-cave' approach could hope to confront, think about and explain the human condition, but, as we will now see, such denial-free thinking has been almost non-existent.

As mentioned, science—humanity's designated vehicle for investigating the nature of our world and our place in it—was also stalled in its ability to look into and explain the human condition. As humans who, like the rest of humanity, suffered from the human condition, the great majority of scientists have necessarily had to live in denial of the issue of the human condition and of any truths that brought that issue into focus; they have, in almost all cases, been mechanistic, focusing their thoughts away from the overarching whole view of

Integrative Meaning and down into the details and mechanisms behind the workings of our world in the hope that if they could accumulate sufficient understanding of those details and mechanisms a non-mechanistic, denial-free-thinking scientist might one day be able to use those insights to explain the human condition, at which point *everyone* could safely confront the whole view of Integrative Meaning and any truths that related to it—which is what has, at long last, finally occurred.

I now need to outline the history of this all-important search for understanding of ourselves, understanding of our less-than-ideal, seemingly imperfect, good-and-evil-afflicted, upset state of the human condition. In doing so we will see that this search was undertaken by four categories of thinkers.

The four categories of thinkers involved in the history of the search for understanding of the human condition:

The First Category comprises those thinkers who, despite the fearful difficulties almost all humans have of recognising even the elements of moral instincts and a corrupting intellect, managed to admit the involvement of those elements in producing the upset state of the human condition.

The Second Category comprises the few very brave individuals who managed to not only admit the elements involved in the human condition of our moral instincts and a corrupting intellect, but *also* attempted to explain how those elements produced that upset psychosis.

The Third Category contains those who recognised the involvement of the elements of instinct and intellect in the psychosis of our human condition, but avoided the issue of the human condition by denying we have moral instincts.

The Fourth Category comprises the great majority of the human race, including the great majority of scientists. This category contains those who avoided the whole issue of a psychosis in our human situation by simply blaming our selfish and aggressive behaviour on supposed brutish and savage animal instincts that lurk within us and which our intellect has to control.

Part 4:6 First Category of Thinker: Those who admitted the involvement of our moral instincts and corrupting intellect in producing the upset state of the human condition

As has been emphasised, humans have known since time immemorial that our moral instincts and corrupting conscious intellect are the elements involved in producing the upset state of the human condition, but without Darwin's insight into the process of natural selection, which revealed that instincts are only orientations, it was not possible to explain *why* the clash between our moral instincts and conscious intellect occurred. So when we humans shook our fist at the heavens we were basically asserting our intrinsic belief that, despite that instinctive voice within us of our moral conscience making us feel guilty for being so competitive, aggressive and selfish, we, our conscious thinking self or sense of 'I', was not fundamentally bad.

Mythologies', including religions', recognition of the involvement of our moral instincts and corrupting intellect in producing the upset state of the human condition

The elements of instinct and intellect involved in producing the upset state of the human condition are recognised in all mythologies. As mentioned in Part 4:4D, in his book *Memories & Visions of Paradise*, Richard Heinberg described how every mythology contains a recognition that before becoming conscious and corrupted, humans lived in an upset-free, innocent instinctive state: **'Every religion begins with the recognition that human consciousness has been separated from the divine Source, that a former sense of oneness…has been lost…everywhere in religion and myth there is an acknowledgment that we have departed from an original…innocence…the cause of the Fall is described variously as disobedience, as the eating of a forbidden fruit, and as spiritual amnesia** [alienation]**.'**

Within Christianity, in the Bible there is a passage in Ecclesiastes that reads, **'God made mankind upright** [uncorrupted]**, but men have gone in search of many schemes** [understandings]**'** (7:29). Christ similarly spoke of a time when God **'loved** [us] **before the creation of the** [upset] **world'** (John 17:24), and a time of **'the glory…before the** [upset] **world began'** (John 17:5). The story of the Garden of Eden in the book of Genesis, which was written by Moses some 3,500 years ago, recognised the underlying elements in the human condition of instinct and intellect; in it we were told that we were **'created…in the image of God'** (1:27), presumably meaning that we were once perfectly orientated to the cooperative, selfless, loving ideals of life, but that Adam and Eve then ate the **'fruit…from the tree of the knowledge of good and evil'** (ibid. 3:3, 2:17) because it was **'desirable for gaining wisdom'** (ibid. 3:6), and as a result they/we had to suffer being **'banished…from the Garden of Eden'** (ibid. 3:23) of our species' original state of innocence because that act brought forth the emergence of **'sin'** (ibid. 4:7). Our upset state developed, which then had to one day be understood in order for us to become **'like God, knowing good and evil'** (ibid. 3:3); one day we had to find understanding of the upset state of our human condition and by doing so ameliorate it and return to the cooperative, Godly ideal state. In short, when we humans became fully conscious and went in search of understanding our upset corrupted, 'fallen', innocence-destroyed, supposedly 'sinful', 'guilty' state emerged.

Zen Buddhism also recognises the loss of an uncontaminated, pure state as result of the intervening conscious mind, referring to **'the affective contamination (*klesha*)'** or **'the interference of the conscious mind predominated by intellection (*vijnana*)'** (*Zen Buddhism & Psychoanalysis*, D.J. Suzuki, Erich Fromm, Richard Demartino, 1960, p.20). And, as mentioned in Part 4:4D, the eighth century BC Greek poet Hesiod was another who referred to an innocent, upset-free, 'Golden Age' in our species' past in this passage from his poem *Works and Days*: **'When gods alike and mortals rose to birth / A golden race the immortals formed on earth…Like gods they lived, with calm untroubled mind / Free from the toils and anguish of our kind / Nor e'er decrepit age misshaped their frame…Strangers to ill, their lives in feasts flowed by…Dying they sank in sleep, nor seemed to die / Theirs was each good; the life-sustaining soil / Yielded its copious fruits, unbribed by toil / They with abundant goods 'midst quiet lands / All willing shared the gathering of their hands.'**

Although denial-complying mechanistic science has dismissed mythological and religious assertions of a paradisal, 'Golden Age' in our past as nothing more than unsubstantiated, without-any-factual-base, impossible, fanciful, unscientific, romantic dreams (despite the scientific evidence provided by the bonobos), the fact that our mythologies all recognise that

our distant ancestors did live in an idyllic, loving state shows that if we were prepared to think truthfully about the human condition it wasn't too difficult to come to the realisation that our ancestors did once live in such an idyllic state that we fully conscious, highly intelligent humans have radically departed from.

The problem, however, was that at the time these mythologies were created even if we *were* prepared to think in a denial-free, truthful way about the issue of the human condition and, in doing so, came to the realisation that we have loving instincts and a corrupting intellect, we still would not have been in a position to explain HOW or WHY those elements of instinct and intellect produced our corrupted state. We could not have explained that the intellect is actually the hero and *not* the villain it's been portrayed as in all mythologies because, as emphasised, the ability to explain the human condition wasn't possible until Darwin presented his idea of natural selection.

Plato's admission of the involvement of our moral instincts and corrupting intellect in producing the upset state of the human condition

As we've already established, Plato was an extremely honest, denial-free thinker whose mind was focused on **'the enlightenment or ignorance of our human conditions'**. Given the extreme accuracy of his description of the human race being imprisoned in a dark cave of denial, it is not surprising that he also recognised and wrote about the conflict and struggle between our ideal-behaviour-demanding instincts and our corrupting intellect. In his 360 BC dialogue *Phaedrus*, Plato described our underlying situation using the allegory of a two-horsed chariot: **'Let the figure be composite—a pair of winged horses and a charioteer. Now the winged horses and the charioteers of the gods are all of them noble and of noble descent, but those of other races are mixed; the human charioteer drives his in a pair; and one of them is noble and of noble breed, and the other is ignoble and of ignoble breed; and the driving of them of necessity gives a great deal of trouble to him'** (tr. Benjamin Jowett). Plato was saying that in an ideal situation, specifically that of the charioteer of the **'gods'**, the instinct and intellect would be in harmony, that there would be no **'trouble'** to have to be managed or mediated by the **'charioteer'**, the owner of those two parts—they, the instinct and the intellect, would be **'all of them noble and of noble descent'**.

Plato then said that while this would be the ideal situation the reality in all species other than humans, **'those of other races'**, is that the two elements have a **'mixed'** influence. Clearly what he was saying was that in non-human animals the intellect has not become sufficiently developed to attempt to take over management of the animal's behaviour—as Aldous Huxley so truthfully and insightfully said, **'Non-rational creatures do not look before or after, but live in the animal eternity of a perpetual present; instinct is their animal grace and constant inspiration; and they are never tempted to live otherwise than in accord with their own…immanent law.'**

Plato went on to say that in the case of humans, however, the **'ignoble' 'horse'**, which is clearly the intellect, dominates to the point of causing **'a great deal of trouble'**. He said that when we became fully conscious, the conflict within us between these main elements of instinct and intellect became such that **'one of them is noble and of noble breed, and the other is ignoble and of ignoble breed; and the driving of them of necessity gives a great deal of trouble to him** [to us, the controller or **'charioteer'** of our instincts and intellect]**'**.

Further on in *Phaedrus* Plato returned to the two-horsed chariot allegory, elaborating that **'one of the horses was good and the other bad…the right-hand horse is upright and cleanly made…his colour is white…he is a lover of honour and modesty and temperance…The other is a crooked lumbering animal… of a dark colour…the mate of insolence and pride, shag-eared and deaf…heedless of the** [charioteer]**… plunges and runs away, giving all manner of trouble to his companion and the charioteer…**[until] **at last, when he persists in plaguing them, they yield and agree to do as he bids them.'** This is as clear a description as we could wish for of the upset, **'crooked lumbering'**, **'dark'**, **'mate of insolence and pride, shag-eared and deaf** [alienated]**'** intellect rising in defiant **'heedless'** influence until it finally usurps management from our cooperatively orientated, ideally behaved, **'upright and cleanly made'**, **'white'**, **'lover of honour and modesty and temperance'** original instinctive self or soul that we acquired when our ape ancestors lived in an innocent, **'Garden of Eden'**, 'Golden' existence.

An exceptional denial-free thinker, Plato had no trouble admitting to an innocent, **'upright and cleanly made'**, 'Golden Age' in humanity's past, and he presented a flawless account of how our intellect came to challenge our ideal-behaviour-demanding instincts. But like Moses with his story of consciousness developing in the Garden of Eden, Plato was still only able to view our intellect as an evil, **'bad'**, **'ignoble'** influence in our lives. Despite being the greatest of philosophers, Plato couldn't explain the human condition. He could describe the situation perfectly but he still couldn't deliver the clarifying, psychosis-addressing-and-relieving explanation—he couldn't explain HOW we humans could be good when we appeared to be bad.

I should mention that there have been different interpretations of Plato's two-horsed chariot analogy than the obvious one I have just given. The main denial-based misinterpretation argues that the charioteer is our reasoning mind that must learn to master and control the two horses in our make-up of our supposed savage aggressive and selfish animal instincts and wanton sexual desires. To illustrate this misinterpretation, Australia's greatest ever educator, Sir James Darling, described how the English poet laureate Robert Bridges, in his 1927 poem *The Testament of Beauty*, referred to **'Plato's two-horsed chariot, the charioteer Reason driving the two components of man's character, the instincts of Selfhood and Breed, or Sex'** (*The Education of a Civilized Man*, 1962, p.70 of 223).

Firstly, to look at Bridges' misinterpretation of the charioteer as being our reasoning intellect. As described in Part 4:4C, we humans have been so insecure about our reasoning intellect, so unable to cope with the possibility that it has been the most destructive force the world has ever seen, so not wanting to see it as the **'bad'** and **'ignoble'** influence that Plato so honestly did, that we have tried to present it in the most positive light possible. In this case, Bridges has interpreted the charioteer as being our reasoning mind, the superior, noble, controlling master of our supposed brutish animal instincts and wanton sexuality, when, as has been explained, Plato's charioteer can be none other than *us*, the individual resulting from the effects of *both* our instinct and our intellect.

Secondly, to look at Bridges' misinterpretation of the two horses being **'the instincts of Selfhood and Breed, or Sex'**. As just mentioned in Part 4:4D, rather than admit that our human instinctive orientation was to behaving in an utterly cooperative, selfless, loving way—as the

'good', **'upright and cleanly made'**, **'white'**, **'a love of honour and modesty and temperance'** that Plato so honestly acknowledged it as—many tried to blame our corrupt behaviour on supposed brutish, savage, selfish and aggressive animal instincts in our make-up, just as Bridges did when he talked about our **'instincts of Selfhood and Breed, or Sex'**. Obviously, however, neither of these supposed **'horses'** of brutish, selfish animal instincts or wanton sexuality could be described as **'good'**, **'upright and cleanly made'**, **'white'**, **'a love of honour and modesty and temperance'**, so this interpretation cannot be right.

In his poem, Bridges tried to explain this second anomaly by saying our **'charioteer Reason'** had to learn, through good nurturing and education, to control and master our supposed brutish animal instincts and, in so doing, both develop a moral sense and learn to convert wanton sexuality into spiritual love. However, again, Plato didn't describe the two horses as bad and then both of them *becoming* good—he described one as being bad and the other good, so by this reasoning Bridges is also incorrect.

In summary, once we are familiar with the classic denials of claiming that we humans have brutish, savage, selfish, aggressive, divisive instincts, and making our intellect out to be the noble, good aspect of ourselves that has to control our barbaric instincts (when the truth was completely the reverse, namely that our instincts were noble and that the emergence of our conscious intellect was what caused all our upset), it becomes very clear that Bridges' reasoning is a denial-based misinterpretation of Plato's meaning.

I should include with this presentation of Plato's analogy of the two-horsed chariot his recognition of our cooperatively orientated, all-loving instinctive self or soul. Of the more than two dozen dialogues Plato composed, *The Republic* and the *Phaedo* (both of which were written during his inspired middle period) are considered his greatest works. The dialogue in the *Phaedo* commenced with the assertion that humans are born with the ability to recognise what is ideal and what is not, that humans have an innate ability to know when something **'falls short'** of, or **'inadequately resembles'**, or lacks **'equality'** with what is ideal (*Phaedo*, tr. H. Tredennick). Plato went on to say that if we obtained **'knowledge of these standards…these absolute realities, such as beauty and goodness…before our birth, and possessed it when we were born, we had knowledge, both before and at the moment of birth, not only of equality and relative magnitudes, but of all absolute standards. Our present argument applies no more to equality than it does to absolute beauty, goodness, uprightness, holiness, and, as I maintain, all those characteristics which we designate in our discussions by the term "absolute"'** (ibid). Plato was acknowledging that humans are born with not only what we now refer to as a moral 'conscience', an ability to recognise what is 'right' and 'wrong' behaviour—in fact, what is consistent with the **'absolute'** of Integrative Meaning—but with an awareness of what is beautiful and what is not. Plato linked our innate awareness of **'these absolute realities, such as beauty and goodness'** with our soul, saying, **'it is logically just as certain that our souls exist before our birth as it is that these realities exist…**[and our] **soul is in every possible way more like the invariable'**, which he described as **'the pure and everlasting and immortal and changeless…realm of the absolute'**. In a beautifully unambiguous statement Plato went on to say that our **'soul resembles the divine'** (ibid).

Plato clearly had no trouble confronting and admitting that we humans have an instinctive orientation to the cooperative ideals of life. His capacity to think in a denial-free way was so great that had he known of Darwin's idea of natural selection he would no doubt have been able to explain the human condition, explain why **'the driving of'** the **'two horses'** has **'give**[n] **a great deal of trouble to'** us, the **'charioteer'**, and the ensuing 2,300 years of terrible bloodshed and suffering would have been avoided—but, of course, the discipline of science that led to Darwin's great insight was only being formulated during Plato's time; indeed, as has been explained, Plato played a significant part in its development.

The sixteenth century English parliamentarian and author Lord Brooke Fulke Greville described our human condition in these partially honest and partially dishonest terms: **'Oh wearisome Condition of Humanity! Borne under one Law, to another bound: Vainely begot, and yet forbidden vanity, Created sicke, commanded to be sound: What meaneth Nature by these diverse Lawes? Passion and Reason, selfe-division cause'** (*Mustapha*, *c*.1594–96). Greville has been very truthful and insightful in recognising that our **'wearisome Condition'** arises from a war between our instincts and reasoning intellect, however in using the Social Darwinist-type idea that our instincts were brutal, savage, competitive and **'vain'**, and that these ugly **'sick' 'Passion**[s]**'** had to be controlled or **'forbidden'** by both religious '**command**[ment]**'** and **'Reason**[ing]**'** thought in order for us to be **'sound'**, was a reverse of the truth lie, because it was our instincts that were **'sound'** and the emergence of our reasoning intellect that led us to become **'sick'**.

While discussing Greville's quote I should mention that although Aldous Huxley acknowledged how other animals live obedient to their instincts while we were tempted to challenge them, saying, **'Non-rational creatures do not look before or after, but live in the animal eternity of a perpetual present; instinct is their animal grace and constant inspiration; and they are never tempted to live otherwise than in accord with their own dharma** [law]**, or immanent** [intrinsic] **law'** (*The Perennial Philosophy*, 1946, p.141 of 352), unlike our mythologies and Plato, Huxley didn't acknowledge that we humans have cooperative, idealistic, moral instincts, because he went on to say that **'man…has no instincts to tell him what to do;** [he] **must rely on personal cleverness, rather than on inspiration from the divine Nature of Things'** (ibid). Huxley went further, agreeing with Greville, saying that Greville's **'wearisome condition of humanity'** referred to a **'chronic civil war between passion and prudence and, on a higher level of awareness and ethical sensibility, between egotism and dawning spirituality'** (ibid).

We saw how Robert Bridges misinterpreted Plato's honest description of the human condition as our reasoning mind having to learn to control our supposedly brutish animal instincts and our wanton sexuality. Greville and Huxley's interpretation here, of the clash being between the **'passion'** of **'egotism'** and the **'prudence'** of a **'dawning spirituality'**, is a similar denial-based misinterpretation of the real elements involved in the human condition of our ideal-behaviour-demanding instincts and our non-ideally-behaved intellect. Like Bridges and Greville, Huxley was trying to suggest that the task for us conscious, reasoning humans was to **'pruden**[tly]**'** learn to control, even **'spiritual**[ly]**'** aspire to transcend, our destructive **'passion**[ate]**' 'egotism'** rather than be honest about it, confront the underlying issue of the

human condition and, through doing so, explain and resolve that underlying dilemma. It is dishonest, denial-based, defensive thinking rather than honest thinking, and although defensive thinking can temporarily make us feel better about ourselves, it couldn't bring about healing understanding. Arguing that our **'human' 'condition'** is about a battle between the passion of our ego and the need for our reasoning mind to control that passion doesn't make sense of what we all know the **'human' 'condition'** to be all about, namely a battle between our moral instincts and our corruptly-behaved intellect. Also, we aren't **'born'** to be egocentric, rather we *become* egocentric as a result of the insecurity that develops in us as we grow up. And it is obviously our instinctive moral conscience that **'command**[s]**'** us **'to be sound'** and not act with **'vanity'**. Further, Greville's discussion about the hypocrisy of our moral instincts makes it very clear it was our moral instincts that he was referring to, not our ego.

However, as mentioned in Part 4:4C, despite these dishonest, denial-based, defensive views, Huxley's recognition that non-rational animals are obedient to their instincts and never tempted to live otherwise is a truthful acknowledgment that non-rational animals don't disobey their instincts, which leaves the insightful inference that we rational creatures have been tempted to do so. Huxley made some real progress in thinking about the elements involved in the human condition before veering off into denial, a pattern we will shortly see also occurred in biology when scientists such as E.O. Wilson and Robert Wright set out with Darwin's truthful biological insights only to develop biological explanations that were deeply committed to denial of the issue of the human condition, dangerously so in Wilson's case. The truth has been bearable up to a point, after which it was deemed intolerable.

The issue of the human condition was a very difficult subject to stay thinking truthfully about. In fact, as we will see, it couldn't be penetrated unless you were sound enough to never have become resigned to living in denial—a fact William Wordsworth acknowledged when, as will be described below, he spoke of **'Thou best Philosopher, who yet dost keep / Thy heritage, thou Eye among the blind / That, deaf and silent, read'st the eternal deep / Haunted for ever by the eternal mind / Mighty Prophet! Seer blest! / On whom those truths do rest / Which we are toiling all our lives to find / In darkness lost, the darkness of the grave.'**

William Shakespeare's recognition of the dilemma of the human condition

In approximately 1601 the greatest of all playwrights, the Englishman William Shakespeare (c.1564-1616), had the character Hamlet, from the play of the same name, famously say: **'What a piece of work is a man! How noble in reason! How infinite in faculty! In form and moving how express and admirable! In action how like an angel! In apprehension how like a god! The beauty of the world! The paragon of animals! And yet, to me, what is this quintessence of dust? Man delights not me'** (*Hamlet*, Act 2 Scene 2). While Shakespeare didn't acknowledge the involvement of moral instincts in the dilemma of the human condition in this passage, he has recognised the core dilemma of our condition of being **'like a god'** in our intellectual capacity for **'apprehension'** (which is our capacity to consciously understand cause and effect and be insightful) and yet capable of behaving in such an 'un-Godly way as to be an **'**[un] **delight**[ful]**'**, **'quintessence of dust'**, nasty **'piece of work'**. Again, the intellect is still only able to be regarded as bad or 'un-Godly'.

William Wordsworth's admission of the involvement of our moral instincts and corrupting intellect in producing the upset state of the human condition

Plato's acknowledgment that our **'soul resembles the divine'** is echoed in one of the greatest (that is, most honest) poems ever written, the English poet laureate William Wordsworth's *Intimations of Immortality from Recollections of Early Childhood* (1807), in the most wonderful line, **'But trailing clouds of glory do we come / From God, who is our home.'**

As we are about to see, while Wordsworth (1770-1850) wasn't able to *explain* the conflict between our moral instinctive self and newer conscious self, with this poem he did most truthfully and accurately recognise the nature of the conflict, writing, **'High instincts before which our mortal Nature** [our troubled, insecure, selfish, life-and-death-preoccupied conscious self] / **Did tremble like a guilty thing surprised.'**

Wordsworth began his incredible poem by bravely recalling the fabled state of cooperative harmony and enthralment that our distant ape ancestors lived in before 'the fall', before the emergence of our present good-and-evil-stricken state of upset—a state that children still come into the world innocently expecting, and when they don't encounter it are deeply troubled and then psychologically forced to resign to living a life of alienating, deadening, soul-destroying denial of that magically wonderful existence. He wrote: **'There was a time when meadow, grove, and streams / The earth, and every common sight / To me did seem / Apparelled in celestial light / The glory and the freshness of a dream / It is not now as it hath been of yore / Turn wheresoe'er I may / By night or day / The things which I have seen I now can see no more // The Rainbow comes and goes / And lovely is the Rose / The Moon doth with delight / Look round her when the heavens are bare / Waters on a starry night / Are beautiful and fair / The sunshine is a glorious birth / But yet I know, where'er I go / That there hath past away a glory from the earth.'**

Wordsworth went on to describe how nature and the innocence of youth reminded him of this lost paradise, this soulful, all-loving, all-trusting and all-sensitive world that when he resigned he had to block out, live in denial of, become alienated from: **'Thou Child of Joy / Shout round me, let me hear thy shouts, thou happy Shepherd-boy! // Ye blessed Creatures, I have heard the call / Ye to each other make; I see / The heavens laugh with you in your jubilee / …While Earth herself is adorning / This sweet May-morning / And the Children are culling / On every side / In a thousand valleys far and wide.'**

Wordsworth was then reminded of his own human-condition-afflicted state of lost innocence and the associated alienation from his soul that had set in after he resigned, adding: **'But there's a Tree, of many, one / A single Field which I have looked upon / Both of them speak of something that is gone / …Whither is fled the visionary gleam? / Where is it now, the glory and the dream? // Our birth is but a sleep and a forgetting / The Soul that rises with us, our life's Star / Hath had elsewhere its setting / And cometh from afar / Not in entire forgetfulness / And not in utter nakedness / But trailing clouds of glory do we come / From God, who is our home / Heaven lies about us in our infancy! / Shades of the prison-house begin to close / Upon the growing Boy / …And by the vision splendid / Is on his way attended / At length the Man perceives it die away / And fade into the light of common day / …Forget the glories he hath known / And that imperial palace whence he came.'** Note again Wordsworth's acknowledgment that our species' original self or soul's instinctive memory is of a loving, harmonious existence: **'The Soul that rises with us, our life's Star / Hath had elsewhere its setting / And cometh from afar / Not in entire forgetfulness / And not in utter nakedness / But trailing clouds of glory do we come / From God** [the representation of the integrative, cooperative, loving ideal state]**, who is our home.'**

Most remarkably, Wordsworth proceeded to acknowledge that only a denial-free thinker or **'prophet'** could plumb the depths of the much repressed, denied and forgotten realm where the truths needed to think effectively about the human condition reside: **'Thou best Philosopher, who yet dost keep / Thy heritage, thou Eye among the blind / That, deaf and silent, read'st the eternal deep / Haunted for ever by the eternal mind / Mighty Prophet! Seer blest! / On whom those truths do rest / Which we are toiling all our lives to find / In darkness lost, the darkness of the grave.'** The **'darkness lost, the darkness of the grave'**, and the **'Shades of the prison-house** [that] **begin to close'** that Wordsworth referred to earlier, perfectly equates with Plato's cave existence.

Even more extraordinarily, Wordsworth went on to very truthfully and thus accurately recognise that our loss of innocence and sensitivity—the corrupted state of the human condition—was due to a clash between our original innocent instinctive self and our more recent conscious-thinking, self-managing intellectual self: **'High instincts before which our mortal Nature / Did tremble like a guilty thing surprised.'** Again, however, what is missing is the biological explanation for WHY our conscious **'mortal'** self was made to **'tremble'** and feel **'guilty'** by our moralising **'High instincts'**. He wrote: **'But for those obstinate questionings / Of sense and outward things / Fallings from us, vanishings / Blank misgivings of a Creature / Moving about in worlds not realised / High instincts before which our mortal Nature / Did tremble like a guilty thing surprised / But for those first affections / Those shadowy recollections / Which, be they what they may / Are yet the fountain-light of all our day / Are yet a master-light of all our seeing / … Hence in a season of calm weather / Though inland far we be / Our Souls have sight of that immortal sea / Which brought us hither / Can in a moment travel thither / And see the Children sport upon the shore / And hear the mighty waters rolling evermore // Then sing, ye Birds, sing, sing a joyous song!'** Wordsworth's reference to **'those obstinate questionings'** is a reference to our species' historic inability to explain the human condition, which we eventually resigned ourselves to having to stop thinking about, hence those questions are **'Fallings from us, vanishings'**, resulting in a state of alienated **'Blank misgivings of a Creature / Moving about in worlds not realised'**, in a place **'far' 'inland'** from our true self or soul. Wordsworth then wrote that although we humans had to become resigned to a life of deadening, **'blank'** denial, in rare moments when our mind managed to find some relief from the agony of the human condition—**'a season of calm weather'**—we could, **'in a moment'** of inspiration from **'see**[ing] **the Children sport upon the shore'**, be reconnected to the greater truth of our species' destiny of one day finding relieving understanding of our human condition, at which time we will be able to **'hear the mighty waters rolling evermore'**—know and be able to savour the all-wonderful, true world forever, which the finding of understanding of the human condition has finally made possible.

Regarding the lines in his poem, **'obstinate questionings / Of sense and outward things / Fallings from us, vanishings'**, Wordsworth once acknowledged that he was referring to an abyss of depression that he as a boy, and in truth all adolescents, experienced when he/they tried to face down the issue of the human condition—struggled with the **'obstinate questionings'**—before resigning to a **'blank'** life of denial, writing that **'Nothing was more difficult for me in childhood than to admit the notion of death as a state applicable to my own being…Many times while going to school have I grasped at a wall or tree to recall myself from this abyss of idealism to the reality. At that time I was afraid of such processes. In later periods of life I have deplored, as we have all reason to do, a subjugation of an opposite character, and have rejoiced over the remembrances'** (*The Fenwick Notes of*

William Wordsworth, dictated to Isabella Fenwick in 1843). Wordsworth's description of having **'grasped at a wall or tree to recall myself** [bring myself back] **from this abyss of** [the suicidally depressing comparison of] **idealism to the reality'** of a human-condition-afflicted **'state'** of **'being'** equivalent to **'death'** is as powerful a description as we can hope to find of what adolescents experienced during Resignation. (Later in Parts 6:1 and 9:1, I include a picture I have drawn of this **'abyss'** of suicidal depression that trying to think about the human condition has caused humans.)

Wordsworth concluded his absolutely extraordinary honest poem with this description of the agony of our human condition: **'The Clouds that gather round the setting sun / Do take a sober colouring from an eye / That hath kept watch o'er man's mortality / …To me the meanest flower that blows can give / Thoughts that do often lie too deep for tears.'** Thus the emergence of our good-and-evil-human-condition-stricken state made us red-eyed from being worried about our life's value, meaning and worth. Wordsworth was saying that our anxiety over our mortality now is due to being insecure about our life's value and worth—hence the reference in the poem's title to the **'intimations of immortality'** we had during our species' pre-'fallen', pristine, innocent, uncorrupted, secure, loved-and-loving **'early childhood'**. The thoughts that became buried so deep that they were beyond the reach of our everyday emotional selves (they are **'too deep for tears'**) are the thoughts about our species' present corrupted state that the beauty of even the plainest flower can remind us of, if we let it—if we have not practiced mentally denying and burying the issue deeply enough.

Again, that assemblage of words in Wordsworth's great poem—**'But trailing clouds of glory do we come'**—must surely be about the most beautiful description of any subject ever written, so it's fitting that the subject the description has been reserved for also happens to be the most beautiful of subjects, namely that child within us, our species' Garden-of-Eden-nurseried, heavenly, cooperatively-nurtured-and-orientated, original, instinctive self or soul.

Sir Laurens van der Post's admission of the involvement of our moral instincts and corrupting intellect in producing the upset state of the human condition

Much more will be said in Parts 5:2 and 10:4 about the work of Sir Laurens van der Post, the pre-eminent philosopher of the twentieth century from South Africa, especially about his writings about the relatively innocent Bushmen people of the Kalahari desert, however, in terms of his ability to acknowledge the involvement of our moral instincts and corrupting intellect in producing the upset state of the human condition the following passage from his 1984 book *Testament to the Bushmen* is worth citing here. In it Sir Laurens bravely acknowledged that **'before the dawning of individual consciousness'** humans lived in a state of **'togetherness'**—a state that he said we have had such a hunger to return to that it has been **'like an unappeasable homesickness at the base of the human heart'**. He wrote: **'This shrill, brittle, self-important life of today is by comparison a graveyard where the living are dead and the dead are alive and talking** [through our soul] **in the still, small, clear voice of a love and trust in life that we have for the moment lost…**[there was a time when] **All on earth and in the universe were still members and family of the early race seeking comfort and warmth through the long, cold night before the dawning of individual consciousness in a togetherness which still gnaws like an unappeasable homesickness at the base of the human heart'** (pp.127-128 of 176). In an even more explicit reference, Sir Laurens also recognised the actual **'war'** that exists between our original innocent instinctive self and our newer

intellect when he wrote, **'I spoke to you earlier on of this dark child of nature, this other primitive man within each one of us with whom <u>we are at war in our spirit</u>'** (*The Dark Eye in Africa*, 1955, p.154 of 159).

Significantly, while Sir Laurens was able to clearly recognise the **'war'** between our original, innocent, instinctive soulful **'child of nature'** and our newer **'individual conscious'** intellect or **'spirit'** he wasn't able to explain the reason for the **'war'**. As described in Parts 5:2 and 10:4, his great vision was the **'hope'** that by **'reveal**[ing]**'** the **'inner life'** of the **'child'** in **'man'** he **'might start the first movement towards a reconciliation'**, a **'hope'** of **'reconciliation'** that has been achieved in my book *FREEDOM*.

In recognising the relative innocence of the Bushmen people of the Kalahari, Sir Laurens defiantly rebelled against the practice of denial of the truth that we humans *did* once live in an upset-free innocent state prior to the emergence of the human condition. For example, he wrote that **'There was indeed a <u>cruelly denied and neglected first child of life</u>, a Bushman <u>in each of us</u>'** (*The Heart of The Hunter*, 1961, p.126 of 233). He even described the relatively uncorrupted harmony and sensitivity of the more innocent state of the Bushman, writing that **'He** [the Bushman] **and his needs were committed to the nature of Africa and the swing of its wide seasons as a fish to the sea. He and they all participated so deeply of one another's being that the experience could almost be called mystical. For instance, he seemed to *know* what it actually felt like to be an elephant, a lion, an antelope, a steenbuck, a lizard, a striped mouse, mantis, baobab tree, yellow-crested cobra, or starry-eyed amaryllis, to mention only a few of the brilliant multitudes through which he so nimbly moved. Even as a child it seemed to me that his world was one without secrets between one form of being and another'** (*The Lost World of the Kalahari*, 1958, p.21 of 253). (Again, more will be said in Part 5:2 about science's denial of the relative innocence of so-called 'primitive' races.)

In discussing these primitive states, it might be mentioned that while the English novelist and poet <u>D.H. Lawrence</u> (1885-1930) did not acknowledge the elements of instinct and intellect involved in the upset state of the human condition, he did bravely recognise our species' lost state of sensitive innocence when he wrote that **'In the dust, where we have buried / The silent races and their abominations** [their confronting innocence] **/ We have buried so much of the delicate magic of life'** (*Son of Woman: The Story of D.H. Lawrence,* D.H. Lawrence, 1931, p.227 of 402). The French philosopher <u>Jean-Jacques Rousseau</u> (1712-1778) was another who bravely acknowledged the innocence of our original instinctive state and our present corrupted state when he wrote that **'nothing is more gentle than man in his primitive state'** (*The Social Contract and Discourses*, 1755; tr. G.D.H. Cole, pub. 1913, Book IV, *The Origin of Inequality*, p.198 of 269) and that **'Man is born free but is everywhere in chains'** (*Le Contrat Social*, 1762 [published in English as *The Social Contract*, 1791]).

<u>Bruce Chatwin's admission of the involvement of our moral instincts and corrupting intellect in producing the upset state of the human condition</u>

In his best-selling 1987 book *The Songlines*, the English explorer and philosopher Bruce Chatwin bravely and honestly recognised the harmony that originally existed between our own instinct and still not fully developed intellect when he wrote that '[the third century theologian Origen argued that] **at the beginning of human history, men were under supernatural protection, so there was no division between their divine and human natures: or, to rephrase the passage, there was no contradiction between a man's instinctual life and his reason'** (*The Songlines*, 1987, p.227 of 325). Chatwin was saying that prior to our species becoming fully conscious the emerging

conscious state wasn't at odds with our instincts. Obviously the conscious mind was not sufficiently developed to challenge the instincts and take over management our life; the **'divine'**, integratively-orientated, 'Godly' instincts were still in control. But while Chatwin implied that a **'contradiction'** and **'division'** occurred when **'reason'** developed, he still didn't provide clarifying explanation for *how* and *why* it happened.

Also in *The Songlines*, Chatwin bravely acknowledges how all mythologies recognise that our species did once live in a state of innocence, writing that **'Every mythology remembers the innocence of the first state: Adam in the Garden, the peaceful Hyperboreans, the Uttarakurus or "the Men of Perfect Virtue" of the Taoists. Pessimists often interpret the story of the Golden Age as a tendency to turn our backs on the ills of the present, and sigh for the happiness of youth. But nothing in Hesiod's text exceeds the bounds of probability. The real or half-real tribes which hover on the fringe of ancient geographies—Atavantes, Fenni, Parrossits or the dancing Spermatophagi—have their modern equivalents in the Bushman, the Shoshonean, the Eskimo and the Aboriginal'** (p.227 of 325).

Summary of the admissions given so far of the involvement of our moral instincts and corrupting intellect in producing the upset state of the human condition

To summarise to this point, mythologies, including Moses' 3,500 year old story of the Garden of Eden, truthfully acknowledged the two elements involved in producing the human condition: the cooperatively orientated, idealistic, innocent instincts, and the emergence of the less-than-ideally-behaved fully conscious intellect.

Over 2,300 years ago Plato similarly acknowledged these elements of the instinctive moral, **'good'**, **'upright and cleanly made'**, **'lover of honour and modesty and temperance'**, **'white' 'horse'** and the rebellious, **'trouble**[some]**'**, **'bad'**, **'crooked'**, **'mate of insolence and pride, shag-eared and deaf'**, **'black' 'horse'** of the conscious intellect.

In approximately 1595 Greville truthfully recognised that our wearisome condition arises from a war between our instincts and reasoning intellect, but denied we have cooperative and loving, moral instincts and instead dishonestly asserted we have savage competitive instincts.

Around 1601 Shakespeare, while not recognising the element of ideal-behaviour-demanding, moral instincts, did acknowledge the element of our corrupted-behaviour-producing powers of apprehension or reasoning.

In 1807 Wordsworth recognised both elements of our ideal-behaviour-demanding, moral instincts and our insecure, mortality-aware conscious mind.

In 1946 Aldous Huxley didn't recognise the element involved of our cooperative instincts but did truthfully recognise that non-rational animals have stayed obedient to their instinctive orientations, while, by inference, we rational beings haven't.

In the mid to late 1900s Sir Laurens van der Post recognised the war between our original pre-conscious, innocent instinctive self and our newer conscious self.

In 1987 Bruce Chatwin recognised that originally there was no contradiction between our original innocent instinctual state and our emerging rational mind.

Significantly, while considerable truth about the elements involved in the human condition was acknowledged by all the men mentioned here, none were able to explain how and why the cataclysmic clash between our instincts and intellect occurred.

Thus, in the creation of our mythologies and amongst brave contemporary thinkers there have been those who perfectly described the elements involved in the human condition. I have described Wordsworth, van der Post, Lawrence, Rousseau and Chatwin as 'brave' because each admitted to the truth that we humans once lived in a cooperative, harmonious, loving, innocent state—the instinctive memory of which is our moral conscience. Wordsworth acknowledged that our **'Soul that rises with us, our life's Star…cometh from afar…trailing clouds of glory do we come / From God, who is our home.'** Chatwin bravely admitted that **'at the beginning of human history…**[we had] **divine…natures…**[that were] **instinctual'**.

Before concluding this Part, I should mention that mythologies often expressed the truth about our species' past state of uncorrupted innocence in story form where their meaning is not always clear. The benefit of presenting the truth in such a way was that it allowed people to recognise the truth that the mythology contained only to the extent that they were secure enough to do so. For example, even Plato's two-horsed chariot allegory, the meaning of which is relatively unambiguous despite being presented in story form, has been interpreted in a way that avoided acknowledging that when Plato wrote of the **'white' 'horse'** that was **'noble'** and the **'dark' 'horse'** which was **'ignoble'**, **'shag-eared'** and **'trouble**[some]**'**, he was in fact referring to our original instinctive, cooperatively orientated, innocent self and our newer immensely upset, conscious self.

Part 4:7 Second Category of Thinker: Those who admitted the involvement of our moral instincts and corrupting intellect in producing the upset state of the human condition and who attempted to explain how those elements produced that upset psychosis

In Part 4:6 it was shown that throughout history there have been honest thinkers who did acknowledge the role of the elements of moral instincts and a corrupting conscious intellect in producing the upset state of the human condition.

While it was an immense contribution in its own right, the ability to *describe* the elements involved in producing the upset state of the human condition, which some exceptionally sound thinkers like Moses and Plato have done, ultimately got us nowhere in terms of being able to *explain* the human condition. What needed to be explained was *how* and *why* the two parts of ourselves clashed because only then would we finally be able to explain that there was a good reason for the clash and resulting upset. Insight into the *how* and *why*, however, depended on finding sufficient knowledge about the workings of our world to make that explanation possible. Science had to be invented and developed and it was that scientific enquiry that led to Darwin's breakthrough idea of natural selection. As such, we now need to look at those individuals who went further and not only bravely admitted the involvement of these elements, but, in a display of even greater courage, also attempted to analyse and explain how the conflict between our moral instincts and corrupting conscious intellect produced the upset state of the human condition—and who did so with the benefit of knowing about Darwin's idea of natural selection.

Nikolai Berdyaev's admission of the involvement of our moral instincts and corrupting intellect in producing the upset state of the human condition and attempt to explain how those elements produced that upset psychosis

In his 1931 book *The Destiny of Man*, in a chapter actually titled 'The Origin of Good and Evil', the Russian philosopher Nikolai Berdyaev (1874–1948) wrote that **'The memory of a lost paradise, of a Golden Age, is very deep in man, together with a sense of guilt and sin and a dream of regaining the Kingdom of Heaven which sometimes assumes the form of a Utopia or an earthly paradise… We are faced with a profound enigma: how could man have renounced paradise which he recalls so longingly in our world-aeon? How could he have fallen away from it?…The exile of man from paradise means that man fell away from God…Not everything was revealed to man in paradise, and ignorance was the condition of the life in it. It was the realm of the unconscious…Man rejected the bliss and wholeness of Eden and chose the pain and tragedy of cosmic life in order to explore his destiny to its inmost depths. This was the birth of consciousness with its painful dividedness. In falling away from the harmony of paradise and from unity with God, man began to make distinctions and valuations, tasted the fruit of the tree of knowledge and found himself on this side of good and evil…Man preferred death and the bitterness of discrimination to the blissful and innocent life of ignorance…Paradise is the unconscious wholeness of nature, the realm of instinct. There is in it no division between subject and object, no reflection, no painful conflict of consciousness with the unconscious'** (tr. N. Duddington, 1960, p.36 & 38 of 310). Further on he wrote that **'man is an irrational, paradoxical, essentially tragic being in whom two worlds, two opposite principles, are at war…Philosophers and scientists have done very little to elucidate the problem of man'** (p.49). Further on still he wrote that **'For a long time psychology was one of the dullest and most fruitless of sciences…It was as though psychologists could not find the lever which was to set their work in motion…The old psychologists were wrong in assuming that man was a healthy creature, mainly conscious and intellectual, and should be studied from that point of view. Man is a sick being, with a strong unconscious life…The human soul is divided, an agonizing conflict between opposing elements is going on in it…the distinction between the conscious and the subconscious mind is fundamental for the new psychology. Mental disorders are due to the conflict between the two'** (pp.67-68).

In these amazingly honest passages, Berdyaev is saying that the psychological rehabilitation of the human race could not begin until we were able to *explain* and thus understand the **'agonizing conflict'** and resulting **'painful dividedness' 'between'** our **'conscious'** intellect and our now much-denied-and-repressed-and-thus-**'subconscious'** instinctive self or soul that once experienced a **'Golden Age'** when we lived in **'an earthly' 'harmony of paradise'** in **'unity with God'** that was **'the bliss and wholeness of Eden'**, **'the unconscious wholeness of nature, the realm of instinct'**. Only with that **'lever'** found could our **'dream of regaining the** [**'God**[ly]', **'harmony'**, **'unity'** and **'wholeness'** of the] **Kingdom of Heaven which sometimes assumes the form of a Utopia or an earthly paradise'** be realised, as it now finally can.

Just as Moses recognised in his story of the Garden of Eden that taking the **'fruit…from the tree of the knowledge of good and evil'** (Gen. 3:3, 2:17) was **'desirable for gaining wisdom'** (ibid. 3:6), because man **'will** [then] **be like God, knowing** [understanding] **good and evil'** (ibid. 3:5), Berdyaev similarly saw that man **'began to make distinctions and valuations, tasted the fruit of the tree of knowledge' 'in order to explore his destiny to its inmost depths'**. However, also like Moses, Berdyaev didn't answer the question of *why* finding knowledge meant that man **'fell away from God'**; he didn't explain *why* man **'renounced paradise'** and **'found himself on this side of good and evil' 'with a sense of guilt and sin'**.

Berdyaev very perceptively recognised that **'Mental disorders are due to the conflict between' 'the conscious and the subconscious mind'** and that **'the distinction between the conscious and the subconscious mind is fundamental for the new psychology'** that will ameliorate or heal the **'mental disorders'** that are **'due to the conflict between the two'**. In terms of what the all-important **'distinction'** is, Berdyaev also accurately recognised that the **'subconscious'** is a state of **'ignorance'** while **'consciousness'** involves being able **'to make distinctions and valuations, taste…the fruit of the tree of knowledge'**, but he didn't explain what **'the conflict'** actually was that arose from those **'distinctions'**—he didn't explain that the instincts were only orientations that were, in effect, *intolerant* of the conscious intellect's search for knowledge, its memory-based search for understanding of cause and effect, and that the intellect had to *defy* the instincts and that it was that defiance that was so upsetting and caused humans to become sufferers of **'good and evil'**. It was Darwin's clarification that instincts are only *orientations*, not *understandings*, that made explanation of how the upset **'evil'** state emerged possible—a clarification that Berdyaev, who lived after Darwin, had access to but personally wasn't able to employ to explain *why* the conflict between the **'ignorance'** of **'the realm of instinct'** and the **'reflect**[ive]**'**, **'distinctions'**-recognising **'conscious'** state occurred.

From reading Berdyaev's books, it is clear he was thinking analytically, truthfully and accurately about the problem of the human condition, but ultimately he was unable to reach all the way to the bottom of the problem and realise what **'the distinction between the conscious and the subconscious mind** [that] **is fundamental for the new psychology'** actually was, and when trying to explain the human condition if you miss by a little, you miss by a mile. As a result, Berdyaev's thinking ended up complex and intellectual, basically confused, when the truth, if you stay on its course and reach it, is simple and straightforward. 'Staying on its course' doesn't mean that a great deal of thinking is not required to find the simple truth; in fact, a great deal of thinking back and forth with 'this' idea and then 'that' idea is needed before the answer to a problem, the fully accountable, right idea, finally falls out.

The difficulty of 'staying the course' is that to keep on thinking back and forth about the particular problem of the human condition, as Berdyaev had clearly begun to do, has been an impossible task for almost all humans because the subject of the human condition has been so unbearably condemning and thus confronting and thus depressing for almost all humans. Berdyaev himself recognised that the stalling point to thinking effectively, especially about the issue of the human condition, was the need for an honest, denial-free, human-condition-confronting-*not*-human-condition-avoiding approach. In *The Destiny of Man* he wrote that **'Knowledge requires great daring. It means victory over ancient, primeval terror. Fear makes the search for truth and the knowledge of it impossible. Knowledge implies fearlessness…it must also be said of knowledge that it is bitter, and there is no escaping that bitterness…Particularly bitter is moral knowledge, the knowledge of good and evil** [which is the issue of the human condition]**. But the bitterness is due to the fallen state of the world, and in no way undermines the value of knowledge… it must be said that the very distinction between good and evil is a bitter distinction, the bitterest thing in the world…Moral knowledge is the most bitter and the most fearless of all for in it sin and evil are revealed to us along with the meaning and value of life. There is a deadly pain in the very distinction of good and evil, of the valuable and the worthless. We cannot rest in the thought that that distinction is ultimate. The longing for God in the human heart springs from the fact that we cannot bear to be faced**

for ever with the distinction between good and evil…Ethics must be both theoretical and practical, i.e. it must call for the moral reformation of life and a revaluation of values as well as for their acceptance. And this implies that ethics is bound to contain a prophetic element. It must be a revelation of a clear conscience, unclouded by social conventions [most particularly unpolluted by the all-pervading attitude of denial]**; it must be a *critique of pure conscience*'** (pp.14-16). Berdyaev knew the human condition had to be solved if the human race was to survive—as he said, **'We cannot rest in the thought that that distinction is ultimate. The longing for God in the human heart springs from the fact that we cannot bear to be faced for ever with the distinction between good and evil'**—however, he also recognised that solving it required **'a prophetic' '*critique of pure conscience*'** that was **'unclouded by social conventions'** of denial. Only those who weren't made to feel **'worthless'** when thinking about the human condition—that is, only those who hadn't been exposed to upset in their infancy and childhood and were thus relatively free or innocent of upset, only those with a **'*pure conscience*'**—could hope to **'fearless**[ly]**'** face and investigate the issue of the human condition. Otherwise a **'deadly pain'** from the **'ancient** [two million-year-old]**, primeval terror'** that trying to think about the human condition can cause would be encountered. Recall Carl Jung's description of how encountering the **'shadow'**, the negative aspects of being human, could be a **'shattering experience'** because it meant having **'to gaze into the face of absolute evil'**. Since the ideals are to be *cooperative*, *loving* and *selfless*, the *competitive*, *aggressive* and *selfish* nature of the upset human condition is, if we face the full truth of it, the diabolical opposite state to ideality—it is a **'bitter'**, apparently **'evil'**, **'worthless'** state.

Without the explanation/defence for the human condition, trying to confront it meant having to admit you were **'worthless'**—a **'shattering'**, suicidally depressing conclusion for anyone to reach, which is why everyone who suffered from the upset state of the human condition wouldn't allow themselves to go on that thought journey. Virtually everyone has been living deep inside Plato's cave of denial of the issue of the human condition. Since no one who was upset would allow themselves to go near the realisation that they were **'worthless'**, it follows that virtually everyone has been living an extremely escapist, almost completely alienated artificial and superficial existence—which, with the defence for the human condition now found, can thankfully all end. No longer can **'thinking'**, as Quantock said, **'get you into terrible downwards spirals of doubt'**, or, as Camus said, lead to you becoming psychologically **'undermined'**. We can go anywhere in our thinking now without encountering **'a deadly pain'**. The **'distinction between good and evil'** has, as Berdyaev hoped, finally been eliminated.

Since thinking truthfully about the issue of the human condition for those who were upset resulted in the **'primeval terror'** and **'shattering' 'deadly pain'** of the realisation that they were **'worthless'**, Berdyaev must have had a relatively well-nurtured upbringing and, as a result, been relatively sound and secure in himself—he must have been, to a degree, a denial-free, sound **'prophetic'** thinker—to think about the issue of the human condition as deeply as he did, even though he evidently wasn't sound enough to 'stay on course' and take his honest thinking all the way to the bottom of the problem. But at least Berdyaev survived the truthful thought journey that he did go on—others did not, as we will now see.

(Note, the process of rehabilitating the human race from its **'painful'**, **'fallen'**, **'sick'** upset state through the **'lever'** of **'the new psychology'** of being able to explain how **'the distinction between the conscious and the subconscious mind'** caused the **'good and evil'**-afflicted human condition is the TRANSFORMATION that was explained in Part 3:10 and which will be elaborated upon in Part 9 and described by those practicing it in Section 3 of *Freedom Expanded: Book 2*.)

Eugene Marais' admission of the involvement of our moral instincts and corrupting intellect in producing the upset state of the human condition and attempt to explain how those elements produced that upset psychosis

The South African lawyer and naturalist Eugène Marais (1872–1936), who in the early 1900s was the first person to study primates in their natural habitat, was an exceptionally honest thinker. His ground-breaking observation of baboons was documented in his seminal book, *The Soul of the Ape* (written between 1916 and 1936, and published posthumously in 1969). If you immerse yourself in this title, and that of another of his books, *The Soul of the White Ant* (1937), you can sense that Marais was very unevasive: he did not live in Plato's cave of denial because he spoke openly about 'soul', which is forbidden in denial-complying mechanistic science—as the psychologist Ronald Conway noted, **'Soul is customarily suspected in empirical psychology and analytical philosophy as a disreputable entity'** (*The Australian*, 10 May 2000). The reason **'soul'** has been **'a disreputable entity'** is because, as stated in Part 4:4D, it represented the fourth most unbearably confronting truth for upset humans to have to face. We humans once lived in an utterly cooperative, integrative, selfless, loving, innocent ideal state, the instinctive memory of which we refer to as our 'soul'. Unable to explain our present corrupted, non-ideal condition, the upset human race has had no choice but to deny the truth of our species' soulful, cooperative, integrative, selfless, loving, innocent past. Marais was breaking the rules of denial by mentioning 'soul'. In fact, denial-complying mechanistic science didn't even allow use of the word 'love' and has no interpretation for it, even though 'love', like 'soul', is one of our most used words and recognised emotions—indeed 'soul' is one of the most recognised elements of our make-up. The linguist Robin Allott summarised mechanistic science's attitude to love when he said, **'Love has been described as a taboo subject, not serious, not appropriate for scientific study'** ('Evolutionary Aspects of Love and Empathy', *Journal of Social and Evolutionary Systems*, 1992, Vol.15, No.4 353-370). As described in Part 4:4B (and this will be further explained in Part 8:1), love is the selflessness that holds wholes together, it is the very theme of existence, the most **'serious**[ly]**'** important subject of all, as is the subject of our 'soul'—but like 'soul', love has also been one of the most condemning and thus depressing and thus **'disreputable'**, **'taboo'** subjects of all. What our soul really is, and what love really is, the upset human race didn't want to know!

The problem with denying such **'serious**[ly]**'** important issues as 'soul' and 'love' is that it completely undermines your ability to think effectively. You can't build the truth from lies. Any thinking that went on in Plato's cave of denial was extremely ineffective and thus superficial and mostly meaningless. The great danger, however—as Marais was to discover—

with **'fearless**[ly]**'** trying to think about such **'serious**[ly]**'** important issues as 'soul' and 'love', and thus think effectively, was that it meant confronting the issue of the human condition and that, as Berdyaev and Jung warned, could lead to the **'primeval terror'** and **'shattering' 'deadly pain'** of realising you were **'worthless'**.

Marais **'fearless**[ly]**'** pursued the human-condition-confronting issue of our species' **'communal'**, **'moral or altruistic'** instinctive self or soul. In 1926 he wrote: **'I want to tell you something of our work…in comparative psychology. We set out to study the behaviour of our baboons, in the first instance…It was here we first came into contact with the communal mind. In time, we realized the troop was dominated by a psyche which resided in no single individual. It induced behaviour which, in the case of human society, we call "moral" or "altruistic"…It was the study of this communal mind which directed us to the termites'** (*The Road to Waterberg and other essays*, 1972, p. 145 of 175). Marais' mention of his study of the **'communal mind'** in **'termites'** is a reference to another immensely truthful, integrative-meaning-confronting investigation that he undertook, which he described in *The Soul of the White Ant*. In that book he **'fearless**[ly]**'** talked about the **'group psyche or soul'** (p.50 of 154) of the termite colony, concluding with the revolutionary, integrative-meaning-recognising insight that a termite colony is a single organism—that **'the termitary is a separate and perfect animal'** (ibid. p.64), a cooperative, fully integrated collection of parts like **'our own bodies'** (ibid. p.60). (Note, the biological means by which ants, termites and bees integrated to form the individual that is the colony will be fully explained in Part 8:3.)

So Marais, through his observations of the baboons and termites and his great honesty—his truthful, effective thinking—was able to make some very penetrating insights. Indeed, in his Introduction to *The Soul of the Ape*, the renowned American anthropologist Robert Ardrey wrote the following of Marais: **'As a scientist he was unique, supreme in his time, yet a worker in a science then unborn'** (p.7 of 171). While Marais was **'the first man in the history of science to conduct a prolonged study of one of man's primate relatives in a state of nature'** (ibid. p.12), the real frontier for science that was **'then unborn'** that Marais pioneered was his study of **'the evolutionary origins of the subconscious mind in man'** (ibid. p.8). While, as Ardrey pointed out, Sigmund Freud **'presented us with the concept of the unconscious mind'** (ibid. p.24-25), it was Marais who set out on the discovery of **'the evolutionary origins of the subconscious mind in man'**. In fact, Ardrey referred to Marais as the **'prophet' 'of biology's new challenge'** to be **'concern**[ed] **with' 'the behaviour of men'** (ibid. p.32-33). Use of the description **'prophet'** for someone seeking to understand **'the behaviour of men'** was intuitively accurate because, as Berdyaev said, truthful thinking about the question of the immorality of our human behaviour or **'ethics is bound to contain a <u>prophetic</u> element. It must be a revelation of a clear conscience, unclouded by social conventions'** of lies/denial.

The power of Marais' honest, relatively denial-free, **'prophetic'**, insightful thinking is particularly evident in the inroads he made into the all-important issue of the **'origins of'** the immoral **'behaviour of men'**, namely the issue of the human condition—and, in the process, into **'the evolutionary origins of the subconscious mind in man'**. In *The Soul of the Ape* Marais wrote that **'The great frontier between the two types of mentality is the line which separates non-primate mammals from apes and monkeys. On one side of that line behaviour is dominated by hereditary memory, and on the other by individual causal memory…The phyletic history of the primate soul can clearly be traced in the mental evolution of the human child. The highest primate, man, is born an instinctive animal. All its behaviour for a long period after birth is dominated by the instinctive mentality…it has no**

memory, no conception of cause and effect, no consciousness…As the new soul, the soul of the individual memory slowly emerges, the instinctive soul becomes just as slowly submerged…For a time it is almost as though there were a struggle between the two' (pp.77-79). In *The Soul of the White Ant* Marais also recognised that the **'instinct…is incapable of deviation from a certain fixed way of behaving… This inherited memory is in every respect a terrible tyrant'** (p.45). He further realised that **'the so-called "subliminal soul" in man—the "subconscious" mentality—is none other than this old "animal"** [instinctive] **mentality which has been put out of action by the new mentality'** (*The Road to Waterberg and other essays*, p.149). Again, we can recognise much of the Adam Stork analogy in this description, of becoming conscious and, as consciousness emerged, a **'struggle'** with the inflexible, **'tyran**[nical]**'** instincts erupting. Marais not only acknowledged the elements of instincts and conscious intellect involved in the human condition, he, like Berdyaev, was considering how the two elements interacted. Had he pursued and developed his insight into the emerging **'struggle'** between the inflexible, **'tyran**[nical]**' 'instinctive soul'** or **'hereditary memory'** and the new **'conscious' 'memory'**-based, **'cause and effect'**-understanding, **'individual causal memory',** he could have realised, as I did, that the *good* reason why the conscious intellect had to defy the tyrannical instincts was because the conscious mind *had to* search for *understanding* of **'cause and effect'**, and further that it was that particular guilt-producing **'struggle'** that *caused* the upset competitive, aggressive and selfish, corrupted human nature.

Again, to miss the truth by a little was to miss it by a mile, and Marais' thinking ended up confused and lost—moreover, in thinking so honestly but not reaching the full truth, Marais was left dangerously exposed to depressing self-confrontation and resulting self-doubt. Indeed, Sir Laurens van der Post was warning of the dangers of the unbearable depression that lay in wait if you attempted to look into the human condition when you were not sound enough to do so, when he wrote that **'He who tries to go down into the labyrinthine pit of himself, to travel the swirling, misty netherlands below sea-level through which the harsh road to heaven and wholeness runs, is doomed to fail and never see the light where night joins day unless he goes out of love in search of love'** (*The Face Beside the Fire*, 1953, p.290 of 311).

In his thinking about what caused **'the pain of consciousness'** (*The Soul of the Ape*, p.90 & 91), **'mental gloom'** (p.92), **'pessimism and lack of joyousness…mental misery'** (p.93)—in fact, thinking about humanity's **'march towards the madhouse'** (*My Friends the Baboons*, 1939, p.9 of 124), its march towards terminal levels of alienation—Marais did accurately recognise that human depression came with the emergence of consciousness; that it **'is due to…some kind of suffering inseparable from the new** [conscious] **mind which…it** [man] **has acquired in the course of evolution'** (*The Soul of the Ape*, p.98); that **'human consciousness** [is]**…the whole and only cause of this quality of psychological suffering'** (ibid. p.101). He also accurately recognised that our pre-conscious instincts were intruding into our conscious mind and causing **'havoc'** and **'delusional insanity'**—causing the **'pain'**, **'misery'** and **'psychological suffering'** of the human condition—but he didn't identify the *right* reason for how the intruding instincts were causing the distress. For example, he recognised that **'Normal mental pain in man, generally speaking, is tidal in character. With sunrise…it is at its lowest ebb, to reach its highest flow in the evening'** (ibid. p.101), but to explain this he said that **'All communal animals, for instance, are "selected" to feel this moment of depression at sunset in order to bring the troop closely together at their time of greatest danger. It can be easily understood how these centres, long submerged in man, can become confusingly active in consciousness. If for any reason they become functional again while**

the cortex is still active, they work havoc as delusional insanity…It is a real "possession", a possession by his [an insane person's] **own ancient "animal" mind, which thrusts its activity through into his normal consciousness. Very few observers fail to recognize the essentially "animal-like" change which insanity entails'** (*The Road to Waterberg and other essays*, p.152-154). The truth is, in the mornings upset humans are generally fresh from a night's rest—it's when their happy, instinctive soulful state is closest to the surface. It's only as the day wears on that the **'mental misery'** of thinking about the imperfections of the human condition begins to dominate. Our **'animal'** instincts are instinctive memories of a loving, happy, ideal state, and it was when this **'ancient "animal"** [ideal-behaviour-demanding] **mind…thrusts its activity through** [from its long psychologically blocked-out/denied and thus repressed, **'subconscious'**, **'unconscious'** state] **into…normal consciousness'** that **'insanity'** occurred. Two million years living in a conscious state of horrific upset from criticism from our instincts has been the *real* nightmare in the human brain, not the welling up of an ancient instinctive fear of being attacked by predators once the sun went down.

I should say that when you have lots of love and generosity—lots of psychological security of self—the losses and difficulties encountered in life are not unbearable or destabilising. Baboons have not yet developed the fully nurtured, completely cooperative, integrated state that our Australopithecine ancestors developed and which bonobos are on the threshold of developing—baboon societies are, for instance, still patriarchal. So they are not as imbued with the security of self and certainty about the greater truth of the integrative potential of life that comes with being fully orientated to Integrative Meaning and its theme of unconditional selflessness or love as our Australopithecine ancestors were. This means baboons won't cope with anxieties, such as about the danger of predators, as well as our Australopithecine ancestors would have. The point is, while there are some very good clues to be found about the origins of our species' instinctive self or soul in the behaviour of baboons, they don't provide anything like as good an insight into our soul's origins as bonobos. Baboons are only in the very early stages of becoming integrated through nurturing.

Marais was close to the truth in blaming our **'ancient "animal" mind, which thrusts its activity through into his normal consciousness'** for our **'pain of consciousness'**—because our ideal-behaviour-demanding, integratively orientated, moral instinctive conscience *is* what upset our **'memory'**-based, **'cause and effect'**-**'concept**[ualising]**'**, conscious intellect—but he was wrong about how our **'ancient "animal" mind'** made us so upset/**'insane'**. (Note the ease with which Marais acknowledges that consciousness is simply a product of nerves' ability to remember events and thus understand or conceptualise the relationship between cause and effect. As was described in Part 4:4C, truth-avoiding, mechanistic scientists have lived in denial of the true nature of consciousness because it meant having to confront the unbearable issue of the human condition.) Marais was thinking truthfully about the origin of our moral instincts when he talked about the **'group psyche or soul'**, the **'communal mind'** which is **'moral or altruistic'**, but thinking about that truth, and many other truths related to Integrative Meaning and our present lack of compliance with it, could be suicidally depressing, and Marais did increasingly suffer from depression. He began taking drugs to try to escape the depression but, most tragically, did eventually commit suicide.

To elaborate, Marais courageously and accurately recognised that **'If mankind wishes to escape the doom which now threatens its existence on earth** [it must undertake]**…the study of this evil** [of the pain of consciousness]**'** (*My Friends the Baboons*, p.10-11), however, doing so and thinking about human behaviour, namely the **'pain of consciousness'** that is the issue of the human condition, led him to suicidal depression. It is true that Marais's very beautiful young wife died as a result of a uterine infection after giving birth to their only child, and Marais never got over losing her. And it is also true that a **'world famous' 'Nobel Prize'**-winning **'European author' 'took half of Marais's lifework and published it as his own'**, and that this **'plagiarizing'** (*The Soul of the Ape*, p.16-18) contributed to Marais' despair. But the real reason behind the demons Marais faced was his truthful thinking. While I never had to contend with the tragedy of the death of a wife, some years ago an eminent scientist plagiarised my explanation of the human condition and while that was very disappointing and we achieved redress, never at any point did I feel devastated. Postulating about the causes of Marais' suicide in his Introduction to *The Soul of the Ape*, Ardrey wrote that **'Perhaps his tragic sense as a poet overcame the creative optimism of the scientist'** (ibid. p.44). The **'tragic sense as a poet'** is about as close as the resigned, denial-practising world could come to acknowledging the courageous **'prophetic'**, human-condition-confronting truthfulness of Marais' thinking, which, again as Berdyaev and Jung warned, could lead to the **'primeval terror'** and **'shattering' 'deadly pain'** of realising you were **'worthless'**—although Ardrey did manage to refer to the **'inner pain'** that came with having **'overwhelming insight'** when he described Marais as being **'the damned and the saved, with all his complexities of inner pain and overwhelming insight'** (ibid. p.29). And Marais himself did acknowledge **'the dim and remote regions of the mind into which it** [his enquiry] **led me'** (ibid. p.20).

Ardrey honoured the **'fearlessness'** of Marais' thinking by dedicating his 1961 book *African Genesis* to his memory. Unfortunately, *African Genesis* is a book about how man is naturally an aggressive animal, which is a view Marais didn't subscribe to—as mentioned, Marais' great interest was in **'the study of** [the] **communal mind' 'which in the case of human society, we call "moral" or "altruistic"'**. As will be explained in Part 4:9, efforts to misrepresent our altruistic, moral soul as brutish and aggressive was a way of avoiding the issue of the human condition. I think Ardrey's admiration of Marais was a subconscious love of a **'fearlessness'** that he himself didn't possess.

Trying to face down the truth about our corrupted human condition, as Marais so courageously attempted to do, but without having access to the explanation for the human condition, has been, as emphasised, a suicidally depressing prospect for virtually all humans. We can see that even for relatively sound people, as Marais must have been to even attempt to analyse the human condition, looking into the human condition has been an extremely dangerous exercise. Many who tried, like Marais and the scientist-philosopher Arthur Koestler, whose work we will look at next, eventually took their own lives. The Swiss psychoanalyst Carl Jung (1875-1961) went mad when he tried to confront his deeper self and the issue of the human condition that resides there, requiring three years to get over the

psychologically devastating effects of his journey—he did, however, unearth a lot of truth about the human condition through thinking in an honest, human-condition-confronting rather than a dishonest, human-condition-avoiding way. This extract from an article about Ronald Hayman's 2000 biography of Jung, *Life of Jung*, describes the journey Jung undertook into his **'unconscious counterposition'**: **'He** [Jung] **claimed to have acquired the knack of catching unconscious material "in flagrante", and his** [1963] **book *Memories, Dreams, Reflections* suggests his behaviour was heroic—that he was making a dangerous expedition into the unconscious for the sake of scientific discovery. Several dreams involved subterranean staircases and caverns, which suggested that his fantasies were located somewhere underground. In December 1913, he says, he decided to drop downwards. "I let myself fall. It was as if the floor literally gave way underneath me and I plummeted into dark depths"…It took about three years to recover from the breakdown…It was during Jung's breakdown that he arrived at some of his most important concepts…Had it not been for his breakdown, Jung might never have developed the technique he called active imagination, based on conversations with his anima** [the soulful, more female side of himself] **and with fantasy figures. He told patients to draw or paint characters from dreams or fantasies, and to interrogate them. This was like praying to an internal god, "for there are answers inside you if you are not afraid of them". It was a matter of "letting the unconscious come up"'** ('An edited extract from *Life of Jung*', *Good Weekend* mag. *Sydney Morning Herald*, 5 Feb. 2000). Saying **'there are answers inside you if you are not <u>afraid</u> of them'** is confirmation of what Berdyaev said, that **'Knowledge requires great daring. It means victory over ancient, primeval terror. <u>Fear</u> makes the search for truth and the knowledge of it impossible. Knowledge implies fearlessness.'**

<u>Arthur Koestler's admission of the involvement of our instincts and corrupting intellect in producing the upset state of the human condition and attempt to explain how those elements produced that upset psychosis</u>

While the Hungarian-born British scientist-philosopher Arthur Koestler (1905-1983) didn't, to my knowledge, recognise that we humans have moral instincts, he, nevertheless, belongs in this category because in every other aspect of his thinking he sought to confront and explain the human condition. The courage and integrity of his thinking is particularly apparent in how prepared he was to acknowledge that the issue of the human condition was the all-important issue that had to be addressed, that the dishonest approach of reductionist, mechanistic science had to be changed for a solution to the human condition to be found, and that the most important aspect of that change had to involve the recognition of Integrative Meaning.

In his 1978 book *Janus: A Summing Up*, Koestler wrote that **'*homo sapiens* is not a reasonable being – for if he were, he would not have made such a bloody mess of his history…The first step towards a possible therapy is a correct diagnosis of what went wrong with our species'** (p.5 of 354).

Koestler courageously made the obvious, but almost universally denied, point that our 'human condition' is not the same as the non-human, competitive and aggressive, must-reproduce-your-genes, savage-instincts 'animal condition', writing that the murderous, paranoiac, duplicitous **'symptoms of the mental disorder which appears to be endemic in our species… are specifically and uniquely human, and not found in any other species. Thus it seems only logical that our search for explanations** [of our human condition] **should also concentrate primarily on those attributes of *homo sapiens* which are exclusively human and not shared by the rest of the animal kingdom. But however obvious this conclusion may seem, it runs counter to the prevailing reductionist trend.**

"Reductionism" is the philosophical belief that all human activities can be "reduced" to – i.e., explained by – the [competitive and aggressive, must-reproduce-your-genes] **behavioural responses of lower animals – Pavlov's dogs, Skinner's rats and pigeons, Lorenz's greylag geese, Morris's hairless apes…That is why the scientific establishment has so pitifully failed to define the predicament of man'** (p.19).

In seeking the **'causes' 'of the human condition'** (pp.8, 9), Koestler identified the elements of instinct and intellect involved in the human condition and sought an explanation for how they might have produced the human condition by referring to the American neurologist Paul MacLean's theory (which will be looked at later in this Part) that human behaviour suffers from an inadequate co-ordination between the rational neocortex and the instinctual limbic areas of our brain—as Koestler described MacLean's concept: **'the brain explosion** [in humans] **gave rise to a mentally unbalanced species in which old brain and new brain, emotion and intellect, faith and reason, were at loggerheads'** (ibid. p.10). This recognition of humans having an old instinctive brain and a newer cognitive brain that are at **'loggerheads'** was on the right track to explaining the human condition, but the cause of the conflict was not correctly identified by either MacLean or by Koestler.

Koestler was always a brave, honest thinker. Bruce Chatwin, who we have already identified as a courageous thinker himself, made reference to Koestler's honest recognition that our species' present psychotic condition arose from a conflict between our instinct and intellect in his 1987 book *The Songlines*: **'London, 1970: At a public lecture I listened to Arthur Koestler airing his opinion that the human species was mad. He claimed that, as a result of an inadequate co-ordination between two areas of the brain—the "rational" neocortex and the "instinctual" hypothalamus—Man had somehow acquired the "unique, murderous, delusional streak" that propelled him, inevitably, to murder, to torture and to war'** (p. 237 of 325).

In *Janus*, Koestler went on to complain of **'the sterile deserts of reductionist philosophy'**, asserting that **'a correct diagnosis of the condition of man** [had to be] **based on a new approach to the sciences of life'** (p.20). He then set about establishing that **'new approach'** by courageously acknowledging that **'hierarchic organization is a fundamental principle of living nature'** (p.30)—using the diagram of the integrative development of order of matter to illustrate his point (pp.28-29). (A version of this diagram was included earlier in Part 4:4B.) Koestler wrote courageously of **'the active striving of living matter towards** [**order**] [p.223]**'**, of **'a drive towards synthesis, towards growth, towards wholeness** [p.224]**'**. He said, **'the integrative tendency has the dual function of coordinating the constituent parts of a system in its existing state, *and* of generating new levels of organization in evolving hierarchies** [p.225]**'**. On the origin of the **'integrative tendency'** he explained that **'One of the basic doctrines of the nineteenth-century mechanistic world-view was Clausius' famous "Second Law of Thermodynamics". It asserted that the universe was running down towards its final dissolution because its energy is being steadily, inexorably dissipated into the random motion of molecules, until it ends up as a single, amorphous bubble of gas with a uniform temperature just above absolute zero: cosmos dissolving into chaos** [p.222] **…It was in fact a physicist, not a biologist, the Nobel laureate Erwin Schrödinger, who put an end to the tyranny of the Second Law with his celebrated dictum: "What an organism feeds on is negative entropy"** [p.223] **…Negative entropy is thus a somewhat perverse way of referring to the power of living organisms to "build up" instead of running down, to create complex structures out of simpler elements, integrated patterns out of shapelessness, order out of disorder. The same irrepressible building-up tendency is manifested in the progress of evolution** [p.223]**.'**

I should mention that Koestler tried to cope with the fact that Integrative Meaning confronts us with our selfish, disintegrative behaviour by saying we have a responsibility to both maintain self *and* maintain the whole, but the truth is that ideally the priority always has to be the whole. The *real* justification for our selfish nature is the instinct versus intellect explanation of the human condition.

Koestler bravely and boldly emphasised the stalled situation of all of science, but of biology and psychology in particular, when he said that the human-condition-issue-avoiding, Integrative-Meaning-denying, God-shunning, whole-view-evading, details-only-focused, blind, Plato's-cave-dwelling attitude of mechanistic, reductionist science has **'taken the life out of biology as well as psychology'**, writing in *Janus* that **'although the facts** [of the integration of matter] **were there for everyone to see, orthodox evolutionists were reluctant to accept their theoretical implications. The idea that living organisms, in contrast to machines, were primarily *active*, and not merely *reactive*; that instead of passively adapting to their environment they were…creating…new patterns of structure…such ideas were profoundly distasteful to** [Social] **Darwinians, behaviourists and reductionists in general** [p.222] **…Evolution has been compared to a journey from an unknown origin towards an unknown destination, a sailing along a vast ocean; but we can at least chart the route… and there is no denying that there is a wind which makes the sails move…the purposiveness of all vital processes…Causality and finality are complementary principles in the sciences of life; if you take out finality and purpose you have taken the life out of biology as well as psychology** [p.226]**.'**

In trying to confront and explain the human condition, and in boldly recognising the extremely confronting truth of Integrative Meaning, Koestler was clearly an exceptionally brave and, by inference, a remarkably sound, prophetic thinker. In fact, he was frequently described as a **'prophet'**, and it was even said of him that **'It's undeniable that Koestler had one of the most highly developed messiah complexes of the twentieth century'** (*Sydney Morning Herald*, 1 Dec. 1986). Although the term 'messiah complex' is often used derogatively, **'messiah'** in dictionaries means **'liberator'** and since what is required to liberate humanity from the human condition is, as Berdyaev said, the **'fearless'** preparedness to confront the issue of the human condition, Koestler was certainly messianic because, as has been explained, only by confronting the human condition could liberating understanding of the human condition ever be found. It should be emphasised, however, that the real 'messiah' or liberator of humanity is science which found the understandings of the way our world works, in particular the nature of the gene and nerve based learning systems, that made explanation of the human condition possible. We can even tell from the title of Koestler's 1978 book *Janus: A Summing Up*, that his life's work was bravely focused on the issue of **'Janus'**, the two-faced, good-and-evil, human-condition afflicted state of humanity—**'Janus'** being the Roman deity depicted with two faces fixed in opposing directions.

But while Koestler was obviously an exceptionally courageous and a remarkably sound thinker, he, like Marais before him, was eventually overwhelmed by the truths he was confronting, committing suicide in 1983. While it is true that at the time of his death Koestler was suffering from debilitating diseases, the agony of looking into the human condition no doubt played a significant part in his demise, as this review by Michael Pollak of the 1983 book *Arthur Koestler: The story of a friendship*, written by Koestler's close friend George Mikes, recognised: **'In the end, Arthur Koestler was crushed by overpowering physical pain, by**

Parkinson's disease and leukaemia. Combined with mystical self-doubts and overwhelming pessimism, his burden became too much and he gathered up colossal self-discipline to carry out a suicide pact with his wife Cynthia' (*Sydney Morning Herald*, 21 Jan. 1984).

In his recent biography of Koestler, Michael Scammell included this accurate description of him: **'Koestler was the embodiment of an uncompromised, unafraid, international idealism'** (*Koestler: The Literary and Political Odyssey of a Twentieth-Century Skeptic*, Michael Scammell, 2009, p.211 of 689). The **'international idealism'**—the ideal state, **'the memory of a lost paradise'** that the human race has been striving to **'regain'**, as Berdyaev described it—is a world free of the corrupted state of the human condition. Scammell noted that Koestler even dubbed his yearning for this absolute state as **'absolutitis'** (pp.75, 409).

I should mention that Koestler bequeathed his estate to establishing a school for the study of the paranormal. Yes, the truth is that the intuitions and sensitivities that seem so beyond our normal awareness that we call them 'paranormal' are really 'ultra-normal' or 'ultra-natural'; it is just that we humans are so alienated that there is a world of sensitivity we have lost access to, so it was another illustration of Koestler's honesty of thought that he tried to stimulate study of our repressed sensitivities and awarenesses. As Berdyaev said, **'Man is a sick being, with a strong unconscious life'**. It is this **'strong unconscious life'** that we have lost access to.

Paul MacLean's admission of the involvement of our altruistic instincts and conscious intellect in producing the human condition

In the 1950s the American neurologist and author Paul MacLean (1913-2007) developed his theory of 'the triune brain', which states that humans are a mentally unbalanced species because of an inadequate coordination between our emotional old brain and our cognitive new brain. In his books *A triune concept of the brain and behaviour* (1973) and *The Triune Brain in Evolution: Role in Paleocerebral Functions* (1990), MacLean proposed that humans have not one brain but three, each originating from a different stage of our evolutionary history. He said there is the inner original reptilian brain that comprises the brainstem and cerebellum, which tends to be rigid, compulsive and ritualistic, intent on repeating the same behaviours over and over. This brain controls muscles, balance and autonomic functions such as breathing and heartbeat. Then there is the middle 'limbic' brain, which comprises the amygdala, hypothalamus and hippocampus and is prominent in lower mammals. Derived, he argued, from survival being dependent on the avoidance of pain and on the repetition of pleasure, MacLean described the limbic brain as being concerned with emotions and instincts, in particular feeding, fight or flight reactions, sexual behaviour and maternal care. And thirdly, there is the outer neo or cerebral cortex brain of higher mammals, which is concerned with reason, invention and abstract thought. Although all animals have a neocortex, in most cases it is relatively small—the exception being primates, and in humans in particular it is massive, constituting five-sixths of our large brain. Scientists had assumed that the neocortex effectively dominated the brain's lower levels, but MacLean differed, arguing that having originated from separate stages of evolutionary history the three brains were relatively independent systems. He said that **'the three evolutionary formations might be imagined as three interconnected biological computers, with each having its own special intelligence, its own subjectivity, its own sense of time and space, and its own memory, motor, and other functions'** (*The Triune Brain in Evolution*, p.9 of 672).

Because of the independence between these three brains MacLean saw them as frequently being dissociated and in conflict, with the lower limbic system that rules emotions even capable of hijacking the higher mental functions when it so chooses. As such, MacLean perceived great danger in the limbic system's power, viewing the limbic brain as the seat of our altruistic value judgments instead of the supposedly more appropriate advanced neocortex. According to MacLean, the limbic system decides whether our higher brain has a 'good' idea or not, whether it feels true and right. MacLean explained this concern in *The Triune Brain in Evolution*, documenting how, during seizures, certain epileptics experience what they variously describe as **'feelings of eternal harmony'**, **'immense joy'**, **'paradisiacal happiness'**, **'feelings completely out of this world'**, **'what it was like to be in heaven'**, **'feelings of familiarity or *déjà vu*'**, **'feeling of enhanced awareness or the feeling of clairvoyance'**, of having **'clear, bright thoughts'**, that **'seem as if "this is what the world is all about—this is the absolute truth"'** and that their thoughts during these episodes or auras **'seem so much more important and vital than they do in ordinary living'** (pp.446-449). Referring to such studies of epilepsy where **'a patient may experience during the aura free-floating, affective feelings of conviction of what is real, true, and important'**, MacLean was prompted to ask, **'Does this mean that this primitive [limbic] part of the brain with an incapacity for verbal communication generates the feelings of conviction that we attach to our beliefs, regardless of whether they are true or false? It is one thing to have the anciently derived limbic system to assure us of the authenticity of such things as food or a mate, but where do we stand if we must depend on the mental emanations of this same system for belief in our ideas, concepts, and theories? In the intellectual sphere, it would be as though we are continually tried by a jury that cannot read or write'** (p.453). In the following extract from an interview recorded in the 1986 book *The Three-Pound Universe*, by J. Hooper and D. Teresi, MacLean elaborated, saying, **'While the neo-cortex, with its sensory equipment, surveys the outer world, the limbic system takes its cues from within. It has a loose grip on reality.'** The interview went on to describe how **'In the 1940's MacLean became fascinated with the "limbic storms" suffered by patients with temporal-lobe epilepsy. "During seizures," he recalls, "they'd have this Eureka feeling all out of context—feelings of revelation, that this is the truth, the absolute truth, and nothing but the truth." All on its own, without the reality check of the neo-cortex, the limbic system seems to produce sensations of déjà-vu or jamais-vu, sudden memories, waking dreams, messages from God, even religious conversions…"You know what bugs me most about the brain?" MacLean says suddenly. "It's that the limbic system, this primitive brain that can neither read nor write, provides us with the feeling of what is real, true and important. And this disturbs me, because this inarticulate brain sits like a jury and tells this glorified computer up there, the neo-cortex, 'Yes, you can believe this'"…This is fine if it happens to be a bit of food or if it happens to be someone I'm courting - "Yes, it's a female, or yes, it's a male." But if it's saying, "Yes, it's a good idea. Go out and peddle this one," how can we believe anything?'** (pp.48-49). In the electronic book *Laws of Wisdom*, the author, who is known only as 'Ralph', provides this analysis of the above quote: **'MacLean warns us not to fall for the soul trap of the middle brain. The limbic system is likely to think anything is true, anything is sacred, and to build thought around desires. His insights underscore the need for thinking to not be the slave of feeling; it should stand in its own right. You shouldn't leave your higher brain out of the value judgment process anymore than you should leave your emotions out of choosing a mate.'**

There are some very important points to make about MacLean's triune brain interpretation. Firstly, citing an inadequate coordination between our old and new brain is on the right track to explaining the upset state of our human condition, but it doesn't extend to the bottom of the problem. The limbic brain and the neocortex do have their **'own special**

intelligence', their **'own subjectivity'**, their **'own sense of time and space'**, and their **'own memory, motor, and other functions'**, and these differences do produce dissociation and conflict between the two brains, but what is it about the different intelligences and resulting subjectivities and senses of time and space and memories that actually *causes* the conflict between these two particular brains? Even the 3,500-year-old story of the Garden of Eden recognised that taking the fruit from the tree of knowledge—becoming conscious—led to our divisive, corrupted, 'evil' state.

In the 1930s the philosopher George Gurdjieff wrote *Beelzebub's Tales to His Grandson*, a novel in which he recognised that man is a **'three-brained being'**—one brain for the spirit (intellect), one for the soul (the emotional instinctive self) and one for the body (the primitive, foundation part of our mind). The outstanding question in all these accounts, however, is what particularly is it about the differences between our old brain and new brain that causes them to be in conflict? Why are they uncoordinated? Humans have known since time immemorial that they have conflicting parts of themselves, in particular an altruistic conscience that condemns any divisive behaviour that our conscious mind might put into practice. People have even questioned whether the explanation of the human condition that I put forward is original, citing others such as Arthur Koestler or Paul MacLean or Plato or Gurdjieff as having previously recognised the instinct versus intellect conflict. What is significant is that none of the other accounts recognised that the conflict between our instinct and intellect occurred because instincts are only orientations so when the insightful nerve-based learning system became sufficiently able to understand cause and effect to wrest management of self from the instincts the instinctive orientations would have challenged that takeover, leaving the intellect no choice other than to defy that resistance, with that necessary defiance being the explanation for our angry, egocentric and alienated human-condition-afflicted state. Once seen it is an extremely obvious explanation for our human condition, but as biologist Allan Savory recognised, **'whenever there has been a major insoluble problem for mankind, the answer, when finally found, has always been very simple'**.

The other very important point to make about MacLean's account of the triune brain is that he failed to recognise the significance of the emotional instinctive self that **'sits like a jury and tells the neo-cortex, "Yes, you can believe this."'** He said it **'bugs me'** that we have **'this primitive brain'** that tells us **'what is real, true and important'**, adding that it **'is fine'** for our primitive instinctive brain to tell us what is a good **'bit of food'** or a suitable mate, but not what constitutes **'a good idea'**. As has been emphasised, our instinctive orientation was to behaving in an utterly cooperative, integrative, harmonious way. We did once live compliant with this integrative, cooperative meaning of existence. We *did* once live in an ideal, 'Golden', 'Garden of Eden', 'Godly', 'heavenly' state, free of corruption and the agony of the human condition—hence the **'feelings of eternal harmony'**, **'immense joy'**, **'paradisiacal happiness'**, **'feelings completely out of this world'**, **'what it was like to be in heaven'**, **'feelings of familiarity or *déjà vu*'**, **'feeling of enhanced awareness or the feeling of clairvoyance'**, of having **'clear, bright thoughts'**, that **'seem as if "this is what the world is all about—this is the absolute truth"'** that epileptic seizures can suddenly give access to through the immensely alienated, denial-committed, cave-dwelling state that blocks 'normal', human-condition-afflicted humans' access to this ecstatic state. Later it will be explained how drugs have been used throughout history to help traditional healers, such as shamans, break through the now deeply habituated overburden of alienation in the human

mind and re-access our instinctive self or soul's original all-loving, integratively-orientated and immensely happy free state. Far from our older instinctive limbic brain being a **'soul trap'** that has no **'grip on reality'** and which we have to avoid being a **'slave'** to, our instinctive self or soul's integratively-orientated, moral conscience is the only thing that has saved humans from living out their upset anger, egocentricity and alienation to the full! As for our instinctive self or soul not being able to read or write or understand language, it can still *sense* if a behaviour is selfish or aggressive—after all, we weren't initially adapted to *understanding* how to behave cooperatively, only to the *effects* of behaving cooperatively. MacLean's inability to properly interpret what he is observing and, above all, to reach the deeper understanding of why there has been conflict between our moral instincts and conscious intellect has to have been because of his inability to confront the issue of the human condition. We can see that the way MacLean was able to avoid properly confronting the human condition was to dismiss our moral instincts as being a **'soul trap'** that has no **'grip on reality'** which our superior conscious mind has to avoid being a **'slave'** to.

So while MacLean truthfully recognised that there was a conflict between our old and our new brain due to there being differences between the two, he wasn't able to properly understand what is was about those differences that caused the conflict. Further, while he truthfully recognised that our species' old instinctive limbic brain is idealistic in its orientation, he denied that it had any moral authority.

The other very significant achievement of MacLean's thinking, which hasn't been acknowledged so far in this presentation, is that he did recognise that our ancestors' maternal care of infants is how they were able to overcome the selfish, 'survival of the fittest' natural selection process and develop altruistic, moral instincts. So MacLean is another thinker like John Fiske and myself who recognised that nurturing is how we humans acquired our moral soul.

In summary, there have been a few brave adults who tried to think truthfully about the issue of the human condition despite not being sound enough to do so and while they managed to make penetrating insights into the dilemma of the human condition, some, namely Marais and Koestler, eventually paid the enormous personal price of suffering suicidal depression.

Part 4:8 Third Category of Thinker: Those who recognised the involvement of the elements of instinct and intellect in the psychosis of our human condition, but who avoided the issue of the human condition by denying we have moral instincts

With the examples set by Marais and Koestler, we can now see very clearly how dangerously, suicidally depressing it has been for virtually all humans trying to confront and think honestly about the issue of the human condition. It is now *very* clear why virtually everyone has been committed to avoiding the subject—a practice we will see undertaken in earnest in the remaining two categories of approaches to the all-important issue that had to be solved of the human condition.

The third variety of thinkers who recognised instinct and intellect as the key elements involved in our human predicament includes those who, while acknowledging the elements, denied that we humans did once live in an innocent, cooperative, harmonious, loving state. These thinkers were, in fact, not trying to confront the human condition, but *avoid* it.

Erich Neumann's recognition of the involvement of the elements of instinct and intellect in the psychosis of our human condition but avoidance of the issue of the human condition by denying we have moral instincts

Erich Neumann (1905-1960), an analytical psychologist who has been described as Carl Jung's most gifted student, also recognised the battle and rift between humans' already established non-understanding, **'unconscious'**, instinctual self and our newer **'conscious'** intellectual self. In his 1949 book *The Origins and History of Consciousness*, Neumann wrote that **'Whereas, originally, the opposites could function side by side without undue strain and without excluding one another, now, with the development and elaboration of the opposition between conscious and unconscious, they fly apart. That is to say, it is no longer possible for an object to be loved and hated at the same time. Ego and consciousness identify themselves in principle with one side of the opposition and leave the other in the unconscious, either preventing it from coming up at all, i.e., consciously suppressing it, or else repressing it, i.e., eliminating it from consciousness without being aware of doing so. Only deep psychological analysis can then discover the unconscious counterposition'** (p.117 of 493). In saying that once the instinct and intellect **'fly apart'** it is **'Only deep psychological analysis can then discover the unconscious counterposition'**, Neumann was recognising that you couldn't get back to the innocent state and all the truths that reside there if you were living in denial of all the truths associated with the innocent state. Having denied all those truths you were in no position to think effectively—and for most people if they wanted to try to think truthfully and thus effectively, as Carl Jung did, they faced terrible inner demons—a **'primeval terror'**, as Berdyaev described the horror of facing the issue of the human condition.

Having recognised that denial blocks access to the truth Neumann, hypocritically, went on to adopt just such denial. He avoided the issue of the human condition by denying that we humans did once live in a cooperative harmonious state—a paradisal, 'Golden', 'Garden of Eden', innocent state from which we have departed, or as Berdyaev said, **'fallen'** from. While Neumann and a number of other analysts of our human situation, such as Carl Jung, Ken Wilber and Carl Sagan, did recognise the involvement of the elements of instinct and intellect in our unique human situation, they dismissed the idea that we humans did once live in a cooperative, harmonious, peaceful, loving state as nothing more than a nostalgia for the security of infancy—in fact, as nothing more than **'a metaphor for the womb'** (*Memories & Visions of Paradise*, Richard Heinberg, 1990, p.194 of 282). For example, in *The Origins and History of Consciousness*, Neumann wrote that **'The dawn state of perfect containment and contentment was never an historical state'** (p.15), this time **'before the coming of the opposites'** was **'a prenatal time'** in **'the uroborus'** or **'the maternal womb'** (pp.12-13). Ken Wilber, the popular 'new age', 'human potential' advocate, similarly wrote that **'mankind did not historically fall *down* from Heaven; it fell *up* and out of the uroborus'** or womb (*Up From Eden: A Transpersonal View of Human Evolution*, 1981, p.298-299 of 372). The truth is that this time when we lived in a cooperative harmonious state *did* exist—it *was* an historical state.

As stated, apart from a few like Berdyaev, Marais and Koestler, these thinkers weren't trying to confront and explain the human condition—they were actually trying to avoid the issue by denying that we have an instinctive moral conscience that was acquired during a time when our ancient Australopithecine ancestors lived in an utterly cooperative state. Their strategy was to maintain that there is no basis for our moral conscience, hence no guilt, hence no real confrontation with the issue of the human condition. Shortly, in Part 4:12, we will see how this same tactic for avoiding having to truthfully confront the issue of the human condition by maintaining there is no basis for our moral conscience was taken to the extreme by biologists, one of whom actually dismissed our moral conscience as nothing more than **'a euphemism'**! The big difference between the presentations put forward by the biologists who will be mentioned in Part 4:12 and that put forward by Neumann is that at least Neumann recognised that there was an underlying psychosis involved in our human situation that had to be explained, despite the ultimate dishonesty of his attempt to do so.

As initially emphasised, you could never reach the truth about the human condition from a position of denial, and that is why these thinkers who denied our moral soul couldn't get to the full truth about the human condition. The impasse and stalling point has been the inability to confront the issue of the human condition.

Julian Jaynes' recognition of the involvement of the elements of instinct and intellect in the psychosis of our human condition, but avoidance of the issue of the human condition

While his analysis of our human situation was flawed in a different way to that of Neumann's efforts, the American psychologist Julian Jaynes' (1920-1997) theory of the breakdown of what he called the 'bicameral mind' (as presented in his 1975 book, *The Origin of Consciousness and the Breakdown of the Bicameral Mind*) should be included in this Part on those thinkers who recognised the elements of instinct and intellect in the psychosis of our human condition, but avoided the issue of the human condition.

In his 1985 book *Bone Games*, the American author and journalist Rob Schultheis provided this good summary of Jaynes' theory: **'According to Jaynes, humankind was once possessed of a mystical, intuitive kind of consciousness, the kind we today would call "possessed"; modern consciousness as we know it simply did not exist. This prelogical mind was ruled by, and dwelled in, the right side of the brain, the side of the brain that is now subordinate. The two sides of the brain switched roles, the left becoming dominant, about three thousand years ago, according to Jaynes; he refers to the biblical passage (Genesis 3:5) in which the serpent promises Eve that "ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil". Knowing good and evil killed the old radiantly innocent self; this old self reappears from time to time in the form of oracles, divine visitations, visions, etc.—see Muir, Lindbergh, etc.—but for the most part it is buried deep beneath the problem-solving, prosaic self of the brain's left hemisphere. Jaynes believes that if we could integrate the two, the "god-run" self of the right hemisphere and the linear self of the left, we would be truly superior beings'**.

Using Schultheis' terms, Jaynes did recognise that there was a time when **'modern consciousness' 'did not exist'** and humans were purely **'intuitive'** and that later the logical, **'conscious' 'brain'** usurped management from and **'killed'** the **'old' 'prelogical'**, **'radiantly innocent'**, **'god-run' 'intuitive'**, instinctive **'brain'**. However, it wasn't a switching of dominance from the more lateral and imaginative right side of our brain to the more sequential, logical left side of

our brain that caused the upset, corrupted, alienated, sensitivity-destroying human condition, but rather the difference in the way genes and nerves process information.

In the human brain, one side (the right) specialises in general pattern recognition while the other specialises in specific sequence recognition. One is lateral or creative or imaginative while the other is vertical or logical or sequential. One stands back to 'spot' any overall emerging relationship while the other goes right in to take the heart of the matter to its conclusion. We need both because logic alone could lead us up a dead-end pathway of thought. For example, we can imagine that for a while our thinking mind could have assumed that the most obvious similarity between fruits was that they were brightly coloured. However, with more experience the similarity that proved to have the greatest relevance in the emerging overall picture was their edibility. Similar processes occurred in genetic 'thinking'. Dinosaurs seemed like a successful idea at one stage, but due to changing influences, possibly the effects of a massive meteorite hitting Earth, they ultimately proved to be a wrong idea, prompting 'nature' to back off that avenue of approach and take up another, namely the development of warm-blooded mammals. When one thought process leads to a dead-end our mind has to back track and find another way in: from the general to the particular and back to the general, in and out, back and forth, until our thinking finally breaks through to the correct understanding. The first form of thinking to wither during alienation was imaginative thought because wandering around freely in your mind all too easily brought you into contact with unbearable truths such as Integrative Meaning. On the other hand, if we got onto a logical train of thought that at the outset did not raise criticism of us there was a much better chance it would stay safely non-judgmental. Children have always had wonderful imaginations, but often not as adults—the reason being that children had yet to learn to avoid free/open/adventurous/lateral thinking; they had yet to resign themselves to living in denial of the issue of the human condition. Edward de Bono, who attempts to re-train people to use their imagination and has popularised the process under the term 'lateral thinking', once said that **'often the pupil who is not considered bright will be the best thinker'** (*The Australian*, 3 March 1975). Because mental cleverness is what led us to defy our instincts, it follows that the cleverer we were, the sooner we challenged our instincts and became upset and alienated. Cleverness and alienation have been linked, hence the less clever have tended to be the least alienated and thus the most truthful and thus the best thinkers.

Jaynes truthfully recognised that humans have lost access to a seemingly magical, all-sensitive, and inspired original instinctive self, but to try to explain it by claiming, as he did, that the capacity for self-awareness and introspection emerged with the development of language and then writing only some 3,000 years ago, and that prior to that people were not capable of introspection—that, for example, the writers of the *Iliad* and sections of the Old Testament lacked the ability to be self-aware—is absurd. The denial-based, immensely alienated upset state of the human condition is a deeply ancient condition. All the psychosis and its resulting upset in us that led us to using sex as a way of attacking the innocence of women, to covering our lust-inspiring naked bodies with clothes, to hunting animals because their innocence unjustly condemned us, to women seeking to adorn their bodies to make them more sexually attractive, to men becoming so angry that they went to war against each other, to the emergence of humour to lighten the load of the extraordinary extent of the dishonesty in our lives, etc, etc, all reveal, if we are prepared to be even slightly honest, that the upset state of the human condition is an extremely ancient, in fact two-million-year-old, condition.

Jaynes' theory does not represent a profound analysis of the human condition. In fact, it is so superficial as to be dishonest and human-condition-avoiding. So although Jaynes doesn't deny our all-sensitive and loving moral soul like Neumann did, his treatise does belong in this category of those who recognised the elements involved of instinct and intellect but avoided the issue of the human condition.

Robert A. Johnson's recognition of the involvement of the elements of instinct and intellect in the psychosis of our human condition but avoidance of the issue of the human condition

In his 1974 book *He: Understanding Masculine Psychology*, the American Jungian analyst Robert A. Johnson (1921-) described the agony of adolescents having to resign themselves to a life of denial of the unconfrontable issue of the human condition. In doing so, Johnson recognised the **'unconscious perfection'** of the pre-conscious **'Eden'** state that humans had to suffer the **'pain'** of leaving in order to eventually achieve **'a conscious reconciliation of the inner and outer'** worlds. He wrote: **'It is painful to watch a young man become aware that the world is not just joy and happiness, to watch the disintegration of his childlike beauty, faith, and optimism. This is regrettable but necessary. If we are not cast out of the Garden of Eden, there can be no heavenly Jerusalem…According to tradition, there are potentially three stages of psychological development for a man. The archetypal pattern is that one goes from the unconscious perfection of childhood, to the conscious imperfection of middle life, to conscious perfection of old age. One moves from an innocent wholeness, in which the inner world and the outer world are united, to a separation and differentiation between the inner and outer worlds with an accompanying sense of life's duality, and then, hopefully, at last to satori or enlightenment, a conscious reconciliation of the inner and outer once again in harmonious wholeness…we have to get out of the Garden of Eden before we can even start for the heavenly Jerusalem, even though they are the same place. The man's first step out of Eden into the pain of duality gives him his Fisher King wound…Alienation is the current term for it'** (pp.10-11 of 97). (The **'Fisher King'** is a character in the great European legend of King Arthur and his knights of the round table. The **'Fisher King'** and his **'wound'** is explained in paragraph 1263 of *FREEDOM*.)

Johnson has here accurately described the psychological journey that the human race has had to go on from **'innocent wholeness, in which the inner world and the outer world are united, to a separation and differentiation between the inner and outer worlds with an accompanying sense of life's duality…to satori or enlightenment, a conscious reconciliation of the inner and outer once again in harmonious wholeness'** through the finding of understanding of the human condition. But that is not Johnson's meaning. He's not talking about the actual finding of understanding of the human condition that leads to the end of the human condition, but of individual humans arriving at an *intuitive* reconciliation of the imperfections of human life as it has existed under the duress of the human condition. He is counselling young men about the journey they have to go on, telling them they have to strive towards eventually achieving a mature, sophisticated, somewhat peaceful appreciation that life isn't meant to be ideal but is part of some greater struggle the human race is yet to complete—which is actually to endure the upset state of the human condition until we found the understanding of it that would ameliorate it, but that objective isn't made clear by Johnson. However, in giving his counsel, what Johnson has unintentionally done is describe the *actual* nature of that journey. He has inadvertently described the **'tradition** [of the]**…three stages of psychological development for a man**

[including of the human race as a whole]**…from the unconscious perfection of** [the individual's and humanity's] **childhood, to the conscious imperfection of** [the individual's and humanity's] **middle life, to conscious perfection of** [the individual's and humanity's] **old age'**.

Part 4:9 Fourth Category of Thinker: The great majority of the human race who avoided the whole issue of a psychosis in our human situation by simply blaming our selfish and aggressive behaviour on supposed brutish and savage animal instincts within us that our intellect supposedly has to control

In the preceding three categories I have summarised the various admissions I have either come across or been told about of the involvement of the elements of our instinct and conscious intellect in the problem of the human condition. While some of the individuals referred to veered away from trying to confront the issue of the human condition, they did at least all take the first step that was required to find the explanation of the dilemma (and the resulting upset psychosis) of the human condition, of recognising the underlying elements involved of our instincts and intellect. What we are going to see now is how almost everyone else in the world, including virtually all scientists, totally avoided the whole issue of the real dilemma and psychosis of our human condition by simply blaming our selfish and aggressive behaviour on supposed brutish and savage animal instincts within us that our intellect has to control.

To understand why the upset human race adopted the savage-animal-instincts-in-us excuse for our divisive behaviour, we need to briefly revisit the predicament faced by upset humans that led to this development.

Most people, in fact virtually all adults, have avoided anything to do with the issue of the psychological dilemma and resulting psychosis and neurosis of our human condition. Even beginning to vaguely contemplate the nature of our human situation has been too psychologically dangerous for upset humans—as described in Part 4:4C, even asking the obvious initial question of 'What makes humans unique?' has been a 'no-go zone'. Clearly what is so unique about us humans is that we are conscious, but thinking about that was a slippery slope as it quickly raised the depressing question: 'Well, if we are fully conscious, reasoning, intelligent, extremely clever animals, what is so intelligent, clever and smart about being so aggressive and selfish that we have nearly destroyed our own planet?'

Similarly, to start thinking truthfully about the other element that must play a significant role in our situation of our instinctive heritage—the fact that like other animals we too must have once been controlled by instincts—was even more treacherous as it very quickly led to the unbearably confronting memory, that all humans carry, of an upset-free, cooperatively orientated, innocent time in our species' instinctive past, a time before the fabled 'fall' that all our mythologies recognise took place when we became fully conscious—as Richard Heinberg bravely acknowledged in his aforementioned book, *Memories & Visions of Paradise*: **'Every religion begins with the recognition that human consciousness has been separated from the divine Source, that a former sense of oneness…has been lost…everywhere in religion and myth there is an acknowledgment that we have departed from an original…innocence.'** While we have had to deny it, we all intuitively know that our species' pre-conscious instinctive state was one

of living innocently in a harmonious, cooperative, loving, peaceful state. As Berdyaev said, **'The memory of a lost paradise, of a Golden Age, is very deep in man.'** Sir Laurens van der Post was someone who was sound and thus secure enough in self to reveal this deeper awareness that all humans carry of our species' innocent past that contrasts so completely with our current immensely upset state when he wrote, **'This shrill, brittle, self-important life of today is by comparison a graveyard where the living are dead and the dead are alive and talking** [through our instinctive soul] **in the still, small, clear voice of a love and trust in life that we have for the moment lost…**[there was a time when] **All on earth and in the universe were still members and family of the early race seeking comfort and warmth through the long, cold night before the dawning of individual consciousness in a togetherness which still gnaws like an unappeasable homesickness at the base of the human heart'** (*Testament to the Bushmen*, 1984, pp.127-128 of 176). Chatwin similarly admitted this truth about our species' past **'divine'** innocent state when, as mentioned earlier, he said that '[the third century theologian Origen argued that] **at the beginning of human history, men were under supernatural protection, so there was no division between their divine and human natures: or, to rephrase the passage, there was no contradiction between man's instinctual life and his reason.'** Moses likewise acknowledged this truth when he said that **'God created man in his own image'** (Gen. 1:27)—in other words, the integrative process of developing the order of matter on Earth originally created humans in an unconditionally selflessly behaved, cooperative, loving, integrative state. Moses also said that **'in the Garden of Eden** [ibid. 2:15]**…The man and his wife were both naked, and they felt no shame'** (ibid. 2:25). We did once live alongside nature in an innocent state.

There have been some very obvious truths that all humans have known but have had to live in denial of. In fact, these truths—specifically that humans once lived in an upset-free, cooperative, harmonious, loving instinctive state and that our more recent conscious state has been characterised by anything but intelligent, smart behaviour—are so obvious that, as was described in Part 3:8, when children, at the age of about 10 or 11, began to think philosophically about life they were so aware of them and the questions they raised about the extreme imperfections of humans' present existence that it only took a few years of contemplation before they became so horrifically depressed that they resigned themselves to a life of denial, determining never again to revisit those thoughts and the questions they raised. The reason I talk about Resignation in the past tense is because with understanding of the human condition now found no child needs to resign his or her self to a life of living in denial ever again.

As was made abundantly clear by what happened to Marais and Koestler, and, to a lesser extent, Jung, without understanding of the human condition it has been suicidally depressing for upset humans to even begin to think truthfully about the human condition and make the initial realisation that our human situation is characterised by a conscious self that has been superimposed on a pre-conscious, innocent instinctive self.

This situation raises an obvious question: if the issue of the human condition has been impossible for upset humans to even begin to think about, how has the upset human race been coping? We had to have *some* way of defending ourselves. We couldn't just stand around refusing to think for fear of the consequences—after all, we had to continue to think in order to accumulate the knowledge that would one day allow the human condition to be explained. The upset human race had to find some way to argue that we were

worthy beings, some way to validate ourselves. We had to find some justification for our lives, however dishonest that justification might be, and that is exactly what we did—we invented an excuse for our species' seemingly highly imperfect, upset state. In fact, as will be described shortly, not only did the upset human race find a way to think from a defensive, dishonest base, we went on to create a whole world of literature, analysis and discussion based entirely on those dishonest foundations. And this dishonest paradigm, or way of viewing existence, became so well established that virtually everyone believed it was the true and only world. Indeed, the intellectual world of dishonesty eventually became *so* refined and *so* well established that the very real possibility and great danger was that it would be impossible for anyone to see through the lies and replace them with honest understanding. As we will see, that world of very deep denial-based delusion and illusion is the world we humans inhabit today. Indeed, Plato, that greatest of all philosophers, was one of the very rare humans who was sound and thus honest enough to see through and expose this state of extreme denial with his cave allegory.

So what was the false excuse that the upset human race came up with that totally avoided recognising the obvious elements of moral instincts and a corrupting intellect as being involved in producing the dilemma and resulting upset psychosis of our human condition and yet allowed us to supposedly explain and justify our competitive, aggressive and selfish behaviour, and upon which the upset human race has built this all-pervasive dishonest world in which we now live? The contrived excuse that we came up with was to simply assert that 'Such behaviour is only natural because, after all, other animals are always competing with each other, fighting and killing each other; other animals are **"red in tooth and claw"** (from *In Memoriam*, Alfred Tennyson, 1850) so that is why we are.' Upset humans scanned the horizon for an excuse and said, 'Well, animals aggressively attack each other so that is why we behave like that.' They argued that '*Selfish, self-preservation behaviour is only natural because that is what every other species practices. When we behave aggressively and selfishly it is just our animal instincts asserting themselves. The task for us conscious, intelligent humans is to use our marvellous reasoning mind to control those savage and brutish animal instincts within us*.'

So instead of our conscious intellect being the guilty party, in the sense of being that part of ourselves that caused us to 'fall from grace' and have to be banished from the Garden of Eden of our original innocent, cooperatively orientated, all-loving, moral instinctive state (as Moses, Plato and all our mythologies have so honestly admitted), our conscious intellect was made out to be the faultless, good part of ourselves—a manipulation of the truth that condemned our instincts as the villain: 'Wonderful, we *are* good, our conscious self is good and our instincts are awful, what a relief, I, my conscious thinking self, feels terrific.' Never mind that this was all an outrageous, reverse-of-the-truth lie. What a trick! Instead of our instinctive past being a **'paradise'**, **'Golden Age'** of **'togetherness'** before **'the dawning of individual consciousness'** brought about a world of highly intelligent people living an immensely insecure, **'shrill, brittle, self-important life'**, which in truth is **'a graveyard where the living are dead'**, our instincts were deemed bad while our intellect was viewed as wonderful! What a complete and terrible assault on the truth, but what a relief for our upset, corrupting intellect! We, our conscious thinking self, had finally made ourselves out to be the hero that we have always intuitively believed

we were, but have never been able to prove, but it was a hollow 'achievement' based on an absolute lie! We had lifted the burden of guilt, the psychological insecurity of the issue of our less-than-ideally-behaved human condition, but we had done so fraudulently. The elements involved in the human condition of moral instincts and a corrupting intellect weren't being looked at honestly, rather, the complete opposite was occurring—those elements were being totally misrepresented. The human condition wasn't being confronted—it was being hidden behind the biggest mountain of lies that could possibly be assembled!

Basically, by denying that we have moral instincts and that the influence of our intellect was corrupting we could convince ourselves that there was simply no dilemma about our existence to have to be explained—no moral conscience that our conscious self was in defiance of, therefore no guilt and therefore no dilemma and resulting psychosis of the human condition to have to be dealt with.

Berdyaev exposed the extreme dishonesty of this reverse-of-the-truth lie that 'our instincts are the villains and our intellect is guiltless, secure, in-control, psychosis-free and healthy'—a denial that reflects the all-dominant attitude on planet Earth today—when he observed that **'psychologists were wrong in assuming that man was a healthy creature, mainly conscious and intellectual, and should be studied from that point of view. Man is a sick being, with a strong unconscious life'** (*The Destiny of Man*, 1931, tr. N. Duddington, 1960, pp.67-68 of 310). He also clearly indicated that understanding of the human condition depended on acknowledging, not denying, that **'The human soul is divided, an agonizing conflict between opposing elements is going on in it…the distinction between the conscious and the subconscious mind is fundamental for the new psychology. Mental disorders are due to the conflict between the two'** (ibid). As Berdyaev accurately summarised, **'man is an irrational, paradoxical, essentially tragic being in whom two worlds, two opposite principles, are at war…Philosophers and scientists have done very little to elucidate the problem of man'** (ibid. p.49). Carl Jung similarly recognised that **'Man everywhere is dangerously unaware of himself. We really know nothing about the nature of man, and unless we hurry to get to know ourselves we are in dangerous trouble'** (*Jung and the Story of Our Time*, Laurens van der Post, 1976, p.239 of 275).

Again, the reason **'Philosophers and scientists have done very little to elucidate the problem of man'**—that is, **'elucidate the problem of man'** in an honest, truthful, genuinely accountable way—was because no one has been prepared to fully confront the subject of the human condition, and thus no one has been in a position to reach all the way to the bottom of the problem in their thinking and by so doing explain and resolve it. The English poet Gerard Manley Hopkins (1844-1889) described the horror of looking into the problem of the human condition and the consequences of doing so when he wrote, **'O the mind, mind has mountains; cliffs of fall / Frightful, sheer, no-man-fathomed'** (from the sonnet *No Worst, There Is None*, 1885). The issue of the human condition hasn't been **'fathomed'** because no one has been able to survive the psychologically depressing **'cliffs of fall / Frightful, sheer'** that thinking about the issue caused.

Shortly, we will follow the development of this great denial/lie that we humans are competitive, aggressive and selfish because we have brutish and savage animal instincts. In particular, we will see how biologists took this great lie and fashioned it into a supposed rigorous, first-principle-based scientific explanation of human behaviour. We will see how

they created a whole world of dishonesty, an immense castle of lies, a great paradigm of madness where everyone in the world swans around, seemingly confident that the mental world they are living in is completely rational and sound, making jokes and slapping each other on the back in happy reassurance that all is well and good, awarding each other Nobel Prizes for being brilliant, etc, etc—basically sinking deeper and deeper into a terrible swamp of delusion! However, before describing this industrious development of an immense castle of lies about human behaviour, we need to look at the great and inherent danger of creating so much dishonest delusion in the first place, necessary as it was prior to having the defence of the understanding of the human condition.

Part 4:10 The danger of excessive denial/dishonesty/alienation in science

In this Part I will describe how the extraordinarily dishonest excuse that 'humans' competitive, aggressive and selfish behaviour is due to supposed brutal and savage animal instincts within us' was developed and advanced by denial-complying biologists into a whole world of dishonest explanation for human behaviour.

At the outset it needs to be re-emphasised that if we were to be honest, even for a moment, the descriptions we have for our human behaviour, such as egocentric, arrogant, evil, shameful, guilty, contemptuous, alienated, psychotic, depressed, deluded, artificial, fake, pretentious, superficial, escapist, defensive, hateful, mean, spiteful, vindictive, sadistic, denial-ridden, immoral, manic, inspired, pessimistic, optimistic, all imply a *psychological* dimension to our behaviour. Animals do kill each other, lions do stalk and tear the throats out of zebras, but that has nothing to do with *our* behaviour—few would think to apply the adjectives listed above to any animal other than humans. It is completely dishonest, a total denial in fact, to argue that the reason we humans are so aggressive is because our animal instincts 'wired' us that way.

Claiming that we are selfish because our genes are selfish contains no acknowledgment of the obvious involvement in our unique human situation of our fully conscious thinking mind. *Ours is a psychologically derived condition*. It really was absurd to try to relate our species' mind-controlled, psychologically troubled *human condition* to other animals' gene-controlled, selfish *animal condition*—and yet that is what the upset human race had to do in its desperation to excuse its corrupted condition while it couldn't truthfully explain it.

The savage-animal-instincts-in-us excuse also overlooked the fact that we humans have altruistic, cooperative, loving *moral instincts*—what we recognise as our '*conscience*'—and these moral instincts are *not* derived from reciprocity, from situations where you only do something for others in return for a benefit from them (a claim, as we are about to see, biologists tried to argue), but from *unconditionally* selfless, *fully* altruistic, *truly* loving, *genuinely* moral instincts in us that, as explained in Part 4:4D, were acquired through the nurturing, love-indoctrination process. Our original instinctive state was the *opposite* of being competitive, selfish and aggressive: it was cooperative, selfless and loving.

Using the Adam Stork analogy we can now see the extent of the dishonesty because that analogy explains that we humans became *more* upset as consciousness evolved. The Adam Stork analogy undermines the excuse that 'we-are-**'red in tooth and claw'**-because-animals-are' because it reveals that we started out innocent, free of upset, living in a **'paradise'**, **'Golden Age'** of **'togetherness'** and that the upset state is a *newly* acquired state. It explains that 'We *became* upset, we didn't start out this way—we started out free of upset.' We humans once lived in a harmonious, Garden-of-Eden-like, upset-free, innocent state, which all mythologies recognise, as Richard Heinberg documented.

Despite the transparent falseness of the 'savage-animal-instincts-in-us' excuse for our divisive behaviour, without the truthful explanation of the human condition adopting that excuse was necessary. What now needs to be described is how, with the development of science, this 'our selfishness is only natural, it's just our animal instincts' necessary excuse but terrible lie was supposedly given a biological basis—and, as a result, became the springboard for a great raft of supposedly rational, scientific, biological thinking on human behaviour.

Although biologists were the ones charged with the responsibility of the all-important search for understanding of human behaviour, what we are about to see is that they dangerously and *irresponsibly* diverted that search down a deep and dark road of terrible dishonesty. It is one thing for the layman to adopt the excuse that our selfish and aggressive behaviour is no different from the selfish and aggressive behaviour we see in nature, but it's a serious development indeed for that excuse to be adopted by science and society as the basis of all supposedly rational thinking about human behaviour. To see how dangerously dishonest biological thinking became, we need to revisit the role that science has had to play, and the strategy it had to adopt.

As brave as it was, the fact of the matter is that recognising the elements involved in our human situation of our innocent instincts and corrupting conscious intellect (as all our mythologies did, and as Moses, Plato and some other thinkers did) <u>ultimately got us nowhere, because we had to find sufficient knowledge to allow us to explain *why* and *how* these elements produced the upset state of the human condition</u>. *Only* knowledge could liberate us. Science had to be invented and developed. The human race had to set about accumulating a first-principle-based understanding of the mechanisms and workings of our world in the hope and faith that one day, with sufficient knowledge found, we would finally be able to explain how and why the elements in our make-up of our innocent, cooperatively orientated instincts and our conscious intellect produced the upset state of our human condition.

Necessarily, while accumulating this knowledge, any truths that brought humanity into contact with the unbearably depressing issue of the human condition had to be denied. As has been explained, science has not been holistic, it has been mechanistic and reductionist—it has avoided the whole view of the issue of the human condition. It has directed its focus away from the whole overview of the issue of the human condition and down into finding understanding of the details of the mechanisms and workings of our world. Science set about accumulating knowledge, while all the time avoiding any truths that brought the unbearably depressing issue of the human condition into focus. Science has been objective not subjective in its orientation; it has ardently avoided the subjective issue of the human condition. (Note,

as mentioned, 'holism' actually means **'the tendency in nature to form wholes'** (*Concise Oxford Dict.* 5th edn, 1964); it is a recognition of Integrative Meaning, so it doesn't itself mean to take 'the whole view' of existence. Even though they sound the same, 'holism' is not 'wholeism'. Nevertheless, recognition of Integrative Meaning involves recognising 'the whole view' because it is one of the great truths that any truthful, effective, human-condition-confronting whole view of life depends on.)

The obvious limitation, however, of this tactic of avoiding the whole view of the issue of the human condition was how was mechanistic science ever going to use the understandings of the mechanisms and workings of our world to explain the human condition when it was denying any truths that brought the issue of the human condition into focus? As has been emphasised a number of times already, you can't build the truth with lies.

The answer to this riddle is that when mechanistic, reductionist science had accumulated sufficient understanding of the mechanisms and workings of our world to make explanation of the human condition possible, someone, taking a denial-free, human-condition-confronting *not* human-condition-avoiding, holistic approach, would be able to use mechanistic science's hard-won insights into the mechanisms and workings of our world to assemble the explanation of the human condition.

This 'plan' was all very well, but it ran the risk of producing a potentially very serious problem: the danger of the denial-complying, human-condition-avoiding, mechanistic, reductionist strategy becoming *so* well developed, *so* sophisticated in its refinement of lies, that it could become impossible to finally retrieve the truth from all those lies. Metaphorically speaking, the world could become so shrouded in darkness (lies) that no light (truth) could hope to penetrate it, and it was that degree of near total darkness, of near total denial of truth, that finally developed on Earth.

Nikolai Berdyaev recognised this great danger of alienation from the truth in mechanistic science when he wrote that **'Philosophy…regards him** [man] **as belonging to the kingdom of the spirit, while science studies man…as an object…Nothing that is an object…has meaning…The only way radically to distinguish between philosophy and science is to admit that philosophy is…knowledge of meaning and participation in meaning. Science and scientific foresight give man power and security, but they can also devastate his consciousness and sever him from reality. Indeed it might be said that science is based upon the alienation of man from reality and of reality from man…The historical method which…objectifies ideas, regarding them entirely from outside…**[means that] **the discovery of meaning becomes impossible. It is the enslavement of philosophy by science—scientific terrorism'** (*The Destiny of Man*, 1931, tr. N. Duddington, 1960, p.6-7 of 310).

The prophetic English poet and painter William Blake (1757-1827) similarly decried mechanistic science's **'alienation of man' 'from reality'** when he wrote, **'May God us keep from single vision and Newton's sleep!'** (*Letter to Thomas Butt*, 22 Nov. 1802).

The physicist Paul Davies also recognised the limitation and danger of mechanistic science when, in a quote included earlier, he commented that **'there is a deeper reason for the wide-spread antipathy. It is connected with the underlying philosophy of science itself. For 300 years science has been dominated by extremely mechanistic thinking. According to this view of the world all physical systems are regarded as basically machines…I have little doubt that much of the alienation and demoralisation that people feel in our so-called scientific age stems from the bleak sterility of**

mechanistic thought…Mechanistic thought has undoubtedly had a stifling effect on the human spirit. Liberation from this centuries-old straight jacket will enable human beings to re-integrate themselves and the physical world of which they are a part' ('Living in a non-material world—the new scientific consciousness', *The Australian*, 9 Oct. 1991).

The aforementioned biologist Charles Birch was another who emphasised the limitations and danger of the mechanistic approach when he wrote that **'Reductionism or Mechanism…is the dominant mode of science and is particularly applicable to biology as it is taught today…**[it is] **A view or model of livingness that leaves out feelings and consciousness…**[and] **I believe it has grave consequences… In the name of scientific objectivity we have been given an emasculated vision of the world and all that is in it. The wave of anti-science…is an extreme reaction to this malaise…I believe biologists and naturalists have a special responsibility to put another image before the world that does justice to the unity of life and all its manifestations of experience—aesthetic, religious and moral as well as intellectual and rational'** ('Two Ways of Interpreting Nature', *Australian Natural History,* Vol.21 No.2, 1983).

HRH The Prince of Wales, the heir to the British throne, has said that **'This imbalance, where mechanistic thinking is so predominant, goes back at least to Galileo's assertion that there is nothing in nature but quantity and motion…As a result, Nature has been completely objectified…and we are persuaded to concentrate on the material aspect of reality that fits within Galileo's scheme.'** He went on to talk about humanity's **'deep, inner crisis of the soul'** (*The Times*, 9 Jun. 2010).

Arthur Koestler also recognised the consequences of mechanistic, reductionist science's avoidance of the real issue involved in our human condition of our consciousness-induced psychosis when he wrote that the **'symptoms of the mental disorder which appears to be endemic in our species…are specifically and uniquely human, and not found in any other species. Thus it seems only logical that our search for explanations** [of human behaviour] **should also concentrate primarily on those attributes of *homo sapiens* which are exclusively human and not shared by the rest of the animal kingdom. But however obvious this conclusion may seem, it runs counter to the prevailing reductionist trend. "Reductionism" is the philosophical belief that all human activities can be "reduced" to – i.e., explained by – the** [non-psychosis involved] **behavioural responses of lower animals – Pavlov's dogs, Skinner's rats and pigeons, Lorenz's greylag geese, Morris's hairless apes…That is why the scientific establishment has so pitifully failed to define the predicament of man.'** Koestler complained of **'the sterile deserts of reductionist philosophy'**, asserting that **'a correct diagnosis of the condition of man** [had to be] **based on a new approach to the sciences of life'** (*Janus: A Summing Up*, 1978, pp.19, 20 of 354).

R.D. Laing emphasised the need for mechanistic science to investigate not just outer space but inner space, our consciousness-derived-and-induced human condition, when he wrote, **'The requirement of the present, the failure of the past, is the same: to provide a thoroughly self-conscious and self-critical human account of man…Our alienation goes to the roots. The realization of this is the essential springboard for any serious reflection on any aspect of present inter-human life** [pp.11-12 of 156] **…We respect the voyager, the explorer, the climber, the space man. It makes far more sense to me as a valid project—indeed, as a desperately urgently required project for our time—to explore the inner space and time of consciousness. Perhaps this is one of the few things that still make sense in our historical context. We are so out of touch with this realm** [so in denial of the issue of the human condition] **that many people can now argue seriously that it does not exist** [p.105]**'** (*The Politics of Experience* and *The Bird of Paradise*, 1967).

As mentioned in Part 4:4B, Plato recognised the destructive effect of denial on our intellect's capacity to think effectively, writing that **'when the soul** [our integratively orientated original instinctual self] **uses the instrumentality of the body** [uses the body's intellect with its preoccupation with denial] **for any inquiry…it is drawn away by the body into the realm of the variable, and loses its way and becomes confused and dizzy, as though it were fuddled** [drunk]**…But when it investigates by itself** [free of human-condition-avoiding, intellectual denial]**, it passes into the realm of the pure and everlasting and immortal and changeless, and being of a kindred nature, when it is once independent and free from interference, consorts with it always and strays no longer, but remains, in that realm of the absolute** [Integrative Meaning]**, constant and invariable'** (*Phaedo*, tr. H. Tredennick). He also referred to the need to be able **'to look straight at reality'** if we are to effectively **'learn'** when he wrote, **'this capacity** [of **a mind…to see clearly**] **is innate in each man's mind** [we are born with a truthful, instinctive orientation to the cooperative, loving, integrative meaning of existence]**, and that the faculty by which he learns is like an eye which cannot be turned from darkness to light unless the whole body is turned; in the same way the mind as a whole must be turned away from the world of change until it can bear to look straight at reality, and at the brightest of all realities which is what we call the Good** [Integrative Meaning or God]**'** (*The Republic*, tr. H.D.P. Lee, 1955, p.283 of 405).

But for **'Liberation from this centuries-old straight jacket'** and **'scientific terrorism'** of **'the bleak sterility of mechanistic thought'**, **'the sterile deserts of reductionist philosophy'**, with its **'confused and dizzy'**, **'emasculated vision of the world'**—and for **'biologists and naturalists** [to fulfil their]**… special responsibility to put another image before the world that does justice to the unity of life and all its manifestations of experience—aesthetic, religious and moral as well as intellectual and rational'** and put forward **'a correct diagnosis of the condition of man'**, and, as a result, for **'human beings to re-integrate themselves'** and end the **'sleep'** of **'the alienation of man from reality'** and resulting **'deep, inner crisis of the soul'—'the discovery of meaning'** for humans, understanding of their context and worth, understanding of the human condition in fact, had to be found, <u>and *that* required defying all the extreme **'alienation'** in **'mechanistic thinking'**</u>. In Part 3:11H we saw how the development of pseudo idealism took humanity to the very brink of terminal alienation. As we are about to see, the same danger to humanity of terminal alienation resulted from the dishonesty of the scientific establishment, particularly in the field of biology—which is ironic given it was from within that field that the liberating understanding of the human condition had to be found.

The challenge was to take only the elements of truth about the mechanisms and workings of our world that mechanistic science had found and avoid all the denials and dishonest 'reasonings' that mechanistic science has been employing—in particular, the denials of our moral instincts and corrupting intellect and use of the dishonest excuse that we are selfish and aggressive because we have selfish and aggressive animal instincts. As we are now going to see there has been a veritable mountain of false biological thinking about human behaviour that had to be defied for the truthful explanation of the human condition to be arrived at. In fact, *so* immense was the mountain of denial, and so entrenched had it become, that humanity ran the risk of making the truth impossible to reach. That was the great risk that the necessary strategy of denial held—that the truth might never be able to be extracted from the ever-accumulating mountain of lies. With everyone determinedly lying through their teeth, how was anyone supposed to defy all that dishonesty and think truthfully about our human

situation and find the *real* reason for all the upset madness in human behaviour. They were going to have to be exceptionally defiant of all the dishonest denial/bullshit flooding the Earth. In fact, they would have to go off alone and think everything through about human life from a truthful base, independent of and defiant of the mountain of terrible lies, which is exactly what I had to do and did. Not only that, when they finally brought back that truth about humans to all those living in denial they were then going to have to survive attacks from that world for daring to tell the truth—as psychologists and counsellors recognise, **'habitual…patterns** [of denial] **have a life of their own, and their will to live is very strong. They fight back with a vengeance when faced with annihilation'** (*Courage to Heal*, L. Davis & E. Bass, 1988, p.175 of 495). It has been an extremely difficult journey that is still not over because the resistance to virtually all the ideas being presented, which, as will be described later, has now subsided to a state of just-ignore-all-these-truthful-liberating-insights silence, still remains immense.

It has to be emphasised immediately that having necessarily been sound enough to defy the world of denial doesn't in any way make me a better person than anyone else. With understanding of the human condition we can appreciate that all humans are equally good, just variously upset as a result of different encounters with, and levels of participation in, humanity's heroic battle to champion the intellect over the ignorant instincts. The whole concept of superiority and inferiority in people is completely eliminated with understanding of the human condition. In the great spectrum of alienation that necessarily exists in the human population there have always been a few who were fortunate enough to not encounter the effects of the battle of the human condition and who were therefore relatively innocent and free of upset. According to their lot in the great battle that humanity was waging everyone had different roles to play, and the role of the exceptionally sound was to defy all the denials in the world as best they could. When humanity as a whole, through its vehicle for enquiry of mechanistic science, had found sufficient clues about the mechanisms and workings of our world then at that point there was a need for exceptional innocence to play a particular role of synthesising the denial-free explanation of the human condition, that is all. The journey to finding explanation of the human condition has required and involved the efforts of *everyone*.

Part 4:11 Darwin stopped short of participating in biological denial

Part 4:10 provided an overview description of the route science has taken—we now need to look more closely at what happened on that journey.

The area of enquiry within mechanistic science that was most relevant to finding the clues that would eventually make explanation of the human condition possible was biology, which deals with the science of life. As biological knowledge accumulated, questions, for instance, about the behaviour of different animals, were addressed and answers found. Eventually the question of the origin of the variety of life was addressed and the answer, discovered independently by both Charles Darwin and his contemporary Alfred Russel Wallace, was the process of 'natural selection'. It was at this point that the origin of human behaviour came into focus, which caused a great deal of nervousness because obviously human behaviour involves the issue of our human condition, the issue of why humans aren't ideally behaved.

I will now follow what happened in the quest to explain human behaviour when Charles Darwin put forward the idea of natural selection in his seminal 1859 book, *The Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection*.

Natural selection is the process by which some individuals in a population reproduce more than others in a given environment. Most significantly, in the first edition of *The Origin of Species* Darwin rightfully left it undecided as to whether those individuals who reproduced more could be viewed as winners, as being 'fitter', however, in later editions Darwin's associates, Herbert Spencer and the aforementioned Alfred Russel Wallace (see letter from Wallace to Darwin, 2 Jul. 1866), persuaded him to substitute the term 'natural selection' with the term 'survival of the fittest'. While Darwin's friend and staunch defender, the English biologist Thomas Henry Huxley described the term 'survival of the fittest' as an **'unlucky substitution'** (*Charles Darwin*, Sir Gavin de Beer, 1963, p.178 of 290), from the point of view of humanity needing to contrive an excuse for its divisive selfish, competitive and aggressive behaviour it was a *lucky* substitution because it suggested that the object of existence was to survive, providing upset humans with an excuse for their divisive selfish, have-to-take-care-of-self, aggressive and competitive behaviour.

As mentioned, the idea of natural selection states that some individuals reproduce and some don't, but as to whether that means that those that survive are 'fitter' or better, Darwin properly left that undecided. To understand why I've said it was 'rightfully' left undecided, the process of natural selection needs to be explained more fully.

As explained in Part 4:4B, one of the truths that the upset human race has had to live in denial of is the truth of Integrative Meaning, the truth that matter tends to come together or integrate to form ever larger and more stable wholes. For matter to integrate, and a larger whole to form and hold together, the parts of that developing whole have to, in effect, consider the welfare of the larger whole over their own. Selfishness is disintegrative while selflessness is integrative. Selflessness is the glue that holds wholes together; it is, in fact, the theme of the integrative process and actually what we mean by the word 'love', with the old Christian word for love being **'caritas'**, meaning charity or giving or selflessness (see Col. 3:14, 1 Cor. 13:1-13, 10:24 and John 15:13). Therefore, if God is our religious term for the integrative theme and meaning of existence, then it is true that **'God is love'** (1 John 4:8,16), or selflessness—and in fact, not just selflessness but *unconditional* selflessness, the capacity to, if required, make a full, self-sacrificing commitment to the maintenance of the larger whole. As explained in Part 4:4D, the limitation of the gene-based learning system is that it normally can't develop unconditional selflessness, because if an unconditionally selfless trait develops it doesn't tend to carry on, and in order to continue to exist genetically traits have to carry on. While unconditional selflessness is the glue that best holds wholes together, if an unconditionally selfless trait emerges and practices such self-sacrificial behaviour it won't tend to carry on and therefore it normally can't become selected for genetically. This inability of genes in almost every situation to develop unconditionally selfless or altruistic traits means that the gene-based learning system is limited in its ability to integrate matter. (The reason I have said that 'normally', 'in almost every situation' genetics can't develop unconditional selflessness is because there was, in fact, one way it could, which was the way our ape ancestors developed an instinctive capacity to behave unconditionally selflessly. How this was achieved, which

was through the nurturing, love-indoctrination process, was also briefly explained in Part 4:4D, and will be fully explained in Part 8:4B.)

We can now see why it was 'right' for Darwin to leave it undecided as to whether individuals who do manage to reproduce are 'fitter' or better than those who don't. It can be very meaningful for someone to give their life in the interest of the good of the whole and thus not reproduce their genes, as humans frequently do in war and in situations, for instance, where a person gives their life trying to save another from drowning. In fact, as mentioned, it can be completely consistent with the integrative meaning of existence for someone to give their life in the cause of maintaining the larger whole of their society and thus not reproduce. Self-sacrifice for the good of the whole is, in fact, the very theme of existence. While mechanistic science has not been able to admit the truth of Integrative Meaning (because it is too dangerously condemning of humans' divisive competitive, aggressive and selfish behaviour) and Darwin therefore couldn't explain why it was wrong to replace the word 'natural selection' with 'survival of the fittest', at least he initially knew to limit his description of how organisms adapt to change to the term 'natural selection'. In Darwin's *Second Part of his Big Species Book* (a book that Darwin wrote between 1856-1858 but never published in his lifetime, which he was going to call *Natural Selection* and that *The Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection* was a summary of) he explained what he meant by **'nature'**: **'By nature, I mean the laws ordained by God to govern the Universe'** (1975 Cambridge edition, ed. R.C. Stauffer, p.224). So Darwin was not an atheist, as many people believe—rather, he was secure enough to *not* have to live in denial of Integrative Meaning; he was able to recognise that natural selection was a process dedicated to developing the order of matter, as are all systems in the natural world (as has been explained in Part 4:4B). Further, Darwin was secure enough to readily admit the existence of an altruistic moral sense in us humans, writing in his 1871 book *The Descent of Man* that **'the moral sense affords the best and highest distinction between man and the lower animals'** (ch.4). While Darwin agreed to use the term 'survival of the fittest' because he accepted that talking about 'nature' 'selecting' was a somewhat misleading anthropomorphic personification of the process, he did prefer 'natural selection' because **'"Survival of the Fittest", he told** [Alfred Russel] **Wallace, lost the analogy between nature's selection and the** [pigeon] **fanciers'** (*Darwin*, Adrian Desmond & James Moore, 1992, p.535 of 856). Unlike Wallace who determinedly wanted to deny it (see *Darwin's Metaphor and the Philosophy of Science*, by Robert M. Young. Accessed 14 Oct. 2010 at: <http://www.human-nature.com/rmyoung/papers/paper8H.html>), Darwin wanted to relate natural selection to humans' purposeful, albeit artificial, selection because he wanted to preserve the idea of natural selection being a purposeful, teleological, integrative, order-developing, 'Godly' process. As mentioned, by **'nature'** Darwin explicitly meant **'the laws ordained by God to govern the Universe'**. Clearly Darwin wasn't like most of the human race, so upset and thus insecure that they desperately needed to embrace whatever excuse they could to escape the

pain of the human condition and misrepresent natural selection as a purposeless process. Like Moses and Plato, and the other truthful thinkers mentioned in the First and Second Categories, Darwin had no trouble admitting both Integrative Meaning and that we have an ideal-behaviour-orientated, moral soul.

Genetics is a way of processing information—some individuals and species manage to reproduce while others don't—but genetics normally can't develop unconditional selflessness because if an unconditionally selfless, altruistic trait emerges it doesn't tend to carry on. So although unconditional selflessness is meaningful, unconditionally selfless traits normally can't be developed genetically. Genetics is a limited tool for learning how to integrate matter because it normally can't learn unconditional selflessness—it would if it could, but the fact that it normally can't has been used to justify upset humans' selfish behaviour. The fact that selfish behaviour is almost universal in nature led upset humans to say, 'Well, that means that the meaning of existence is to be selfish.' Selfish, self-preservation, it was argued, was the natural way to behave. The most you can normally do in terms of supporting the integration of matter using genetic refinement is to develop reciprocity, where you behave selflessly on the condition that others will behave selflessly in return, which in the final analysis means the behaviour is still intrinsically selfish, as traits have to be to carry on genetically. Reciprocity works on the basis of 'I'll scratch your back if you scratch mine.'

Most significantly, in *The Origin of Species*, apart from referring to the way humans select pigeons and manipulate animals through breeding, Darwin made no attempt to explain human behaviour, despite the fact his book was called *The Origin of Species* and by inference should also account for the origins of human behaviour. It was a stark omission that can now be understood.

While Darwin was, as will now be explained, a very honest thinker (in fact, he was so honest he can be considered a denial-free thinker or prophet) he clearly knew he wasn't upset-free and thus sound and thus secure enough in self to fully confront the issue of the human condition. Darwin would have known full well that the next issue in biology that had to be confronted once the idea of natural selection was understood was obviously the issue of human behaviour, but he would have also been fully aware that doing so meant having to confront and try to explain the human condition, a confrontation he clearly felt he couldn't and, to his credit, didn't undertake. It is true that 12 years after the publication of *The Origin of Species* Darwin did publish a book titled *The Descent of Man and Selection in Relation to Sex* that discussed the idea of sexual selection being involved in the development of humans, however, while this idea of sexual selection was very insightful (because sexual selection did play a part in the nurturing that gave our species our instinctive orientation to behaving utterly cooperatively—as will be explained in Part 8:4D, females selected for more integrative males to mate with) it represented only a very tentative step in the exploration of the issue of the human condition.

While *The Origin of Species* contains no reference to human behaviour, it does feature this one very significant sentence at the end of the book: **'In the distant future I see open fields for far more important researches. Psychology will be based on a new foundation…Light will be thrown on the origin of man and his history'** (p.458 of 477). With this statement Darwin has clearly acknowledged that to undertake the **'far more important'** research into the development of our species' way of behaving—to understand our **'history'**, our selves, our less-than-ideal, corrupted human condition no less—**'light'** was going to have to be **'thrown on'** our **'psychology'**, on what has been going on in our species' heads, with our species' psychosis no less.

So Darwin knew that the next step biology had to take was to explain human behaviour, but he also knew that step, if truthfully undertaken, would involve confronting the issue of the human condition, the unbearably depressing issue for all but the exceptionally sound of the apparent imperfection of humans—for it would involve the issue of the psychosis and thus the **'psychology'** of humans—and by actively avoiding that step he clearly didn't feel secure enough in self to take it. So while Darwin was secure enough to acknowledge our moral soul and to cope with relating humans to animals, it's clear he wasn't sufficiently secure to *fully* confront the issue of the human condition.

Of course, there weren't many who were secure enough in self to even cope with the initial step that Darwin took of relating humans to animals, a situation Darwin was keenly aware of and greatly distressed by, to the extent that he developed Chronic Fatigue Syndrome (CFS), a debilitating illness that affected him for many years. (Although CFS hadn't been officially identified as an illness in Darwin's day, we know it is what he suffered from because of the accurate description he gave of his condition, such as **'I believe to a stranger's eyes, I should look quite a strong man, but I find I am not up to any exertion, & I am constantly tiring myself by very trifling things'** (Letter to Charles Lyell, 1841, *The Correspondence of Charles Darwin*, Vol.2, p.298). Indeed, there has been some discussion about renaming CFS the 'Charles Darwin Syndrome' (Roger Burns, 'Chronic Fatigue Syndrome Changing the Name', Sep. 1996;. see <www.wtmsources.com/123>)). The responsibility Darwin felt to bring his critically important, albeit limited, biological understanding of nature to an immensely insecure, human-condition-afflicted populous, many of whom were only able to cope with a non-confronting, abstract interpretation of our world—in particular that we humans weren't related to animals, but were divinely created by a personal, cosmic-magician-type, deity-in-the-clouds, abstract version of God—caused him immense anxiety and stress. Indeed, when the insecure, paranoid response to 'natural selection' subsided some 10 years after the publication of *The Origin of Species* Darwin's health quickly recovered: **'He was sending off letters to…his Cambridge friends and clergymen and he was saying "you long to crucify me alive" and so on…He felt the weight of the world on his shoulders. For 20 years he struggled against his destiny. For 20 years he had lived a double life, now his silence was over. In November 1859 he published *The Origin of Species* and waited for the coming storm…It created an immediate uproar…**[because] **he said that monkeys and humans came from a common ancestor…**[Then] **In just a decade his ideas had become part of the mainstream. With the great burden of evolution finally lifted from his shoulders his health improved dramatically. The miserable symptoms of over 30 years all but vanished'** (*Charles Darwin: Evolution's Voice*, Biography, A&E Television Networks, 1998). To know that you can and therefore must bring demystifying understanding to humans who are entrenched in all manner of mysticism and denial is an extremely burdensome and stressful responsibility.

Part 4:12 The great denials in biology of Social Darwinism, Sociobiology, Evolutionary Psychology, Multilevel Selection and Eusociality

Part 4:12A Denial-based mechanistic biology was bound to lose its way

Before presenting the great dishonest denials in biology of Social Darwinism, Sociobiology, Evolutionary Psychology, Multilevel Selection and Eusociality, the point should be made that trying to make sense of animal and plant behaviour, including our own human behaviour, while avoiding such fundamental truths as Integrative Meaning, was like trying to understand how a car functions having decided not to look under the bonnet at the engine—such thinking was bound to become lost and confused: 'Right, I think the steering wheel must have something to do with what makes the car go; yes, turning it initiates lateral forces of obtuse magnitude, verifying the monopoly of progress……No, it must be something to do with having an empty boot; yes, the vacant atmosphere catalyses the breeding of rats in Russia, inversely liberating untold energy, and we have carried out studies from every angle to prove our new Russian Rodent Theory. The model fits the data admirably.'!!

This may sound like an absurdly exaggerated comparison, but unfortunately it's frighteningly close to the truth. As mentioned in Parts 4:4B and 4:10, Plato recognised the destructive effect denial—especially denial of Integrative Meaning—has had on our intellect's capacity to think effectively when he wrote that **'when the soul** [our species' integratively orientated original instinctual self or soul] **uses the instrumentality of the body** [uses the body's intellect with its preoccupation with denial] **for any inquiry…it is drawn away by the body into the realm of the variable, and loses its way and becomes confused and dizzy, as though it were fuddled** [drunk]**…But when it investigates by itself** [free of human-condition-avoiding, intellectual denial]**, it passes into the realm of the pure and everlasting and immortal and changeless, and being of a kindred nature, when it is once independent and free from interference, consorts with it always and strays no longer, but remains, in that realm of the absolute** [Integrative Meaning]**, constant and invariable'** (*Phaedo*, tr. H. Tredennick). Plato also referred to the need to be able **'to look straight at reality'** if we are to effectively **'learn'** when he wrote that **'this capacity** [of **a mind…to see clearly**] **is innate in each man's mind** [we are born with a truthful, instinctive orientation to the cooperative, loving, integrative meaning of existence]**, and that the faculty by which he learns is like an eye which cannot be turned from darkness to light unless the whole body is turned; in the same way the mind as a whole must be turned away from the world of change until it can bear to look straight at reality, and at the brightest of all realities which is what we call the Good** [Integrative Meaning or God]**'** (*The Republic*, tr. H.D.P. Lee, 1955, p.283 of 405).

Human-condition-avoiding, denial-complying, intellectual-not-instinctual, mechanistic, reductionist science has suffered very greatly from an inability to think truthfully and thus effectively; it certainly has **'los**[t] **its way and become confused and dizzy, as though it were fuddled** [drunk]**'**. And since biology deals with behaviour, it is in fact the field of science that is most responsible for investigating the issue of the human condition, and since virtually all humans, including virtually all biologists, haven't been able to go anywhere near the issue of the human condition, we can expect that it is within biology that we will find dishonest intellectualism running wild; it is where we can expect to find extraordinary, indeed fantastic, examples of dishonesty, and the most extreme intellectualism, employing

increasingly complex arguments, more and more convoluted sentences with bigger and bigger words, to the extent that what is being said or 'reported' has become virtually incomprehensible. But, the inability to genuinely approach the subject of the human condition having taken on the task of doing so was a diabolically difficult situation for biologists to be in, with the desperate end result being that in order to conceal their failings they feel they have no choice but to go all-out to create the impression of having presented a brilliant analysis when, in truth, their theories are devoid of substance. Untangling such extreme intellectualism is difficult—for students of biology it must have been a nightmare—but, since I have been able to decipher and explain the human condition, I should be able to penetrate and demystify any version of the human condition, even mechanistic biologists' extremely dishonest, highly intellectualised interpretations of the behaviour of animals and plants. If I apply my soul-guided, human-condition-confronting-not-human-condition-avoiding mind that, as Plato said, can **'look straight at reality'** and thus **'see clearly'**, I should be able to get to the bottom of what these biologists are psychologically attempting to do, as well as to the essence of their supposed arguments.

I should explain that while I completed a Bachelor of Science degree in zoology at Sydney University in 1971, I, like the biology students I mentioned above, found much of the biological literature we were given to study very difficult to comprehend. But what I *did* gain was sufficient grounding in the principles of biology, particularly the principles of Darwin's idea of natural selection, to be in a position to take my truthful, human-condition-confronting-not-human-condition-avoiding approach off on its own and start thinking effectively about biology, especially about the biology of the human condition, the result of which is the true explanation of the development of order of matter that is presented in Parts 8:2 and 8:3 (a brief summary of which will be given next in Part 4:12B). While I maintained an interest in, and awareness of, what was taking place in the world of dishonest, mechanistic biology (a summary of which is given in my 2006 book, *The Great Exodus*), I basically left that world and began thinking about behaviour, especially human behaviour, on my own, eventually establishing, in 1983, an independent institution for the study and amelioration of the human condition, which is now called the World Transformation Movement. What all this means is that to provide this in-depth analysis of the great denials in biology of Social Darwinism, Sociobiology, Evolutionary Psychology, Multilevel Selection and Eusociality, I have had to look at a lot of biological literature that I had not previously read because of its dishonesty. What I learnt when, in April to July of 2012, I carried out this investigation into the world of dishonest biological thinking was a great shock to me, as it will no doubt be for the reader, for as you will see, the journey that denial-complying, human-condition-avoiding, mechanistic scientific thought has been on is a truly amazing saga of intrigue and counter-intrigue that has reached a very sad and lonely place; a place, as Plato predicted, that has **'los**[t] **its way and become confused and dizzy, as though it were fuddled** [drunk]**'**. It has resulted in a situation where there are now two polarised, left-wing and right-wing versions of biology, both of which are *completely* **'los**[t]**'** and **'confused'**—the same situation, in fact, that now afflicts the whole human race. Thank goodness then for the arrival of the liberating understanding of the human condition that safely and compassionately brings to an end this whole terrible, human-condition-afflicted, messed-up and traumatised state of the world.

I might say that it does seem a shame to subject the reader to the task of having to wade through all this human-condition-avoiding, denial-based, intellectualised biological thinking. Indeed, if you wish, you can avoid this nightmare and go straight to the denial-free, unadulterated, uncomplicated biological explanation of the story of the development of life on Earth that is presented in Part 8.

On the other hand, the full account of all the dishonest biological theories that is presented in Parts 4:12C to 4:12J *is* such an amazing saga of intrigue and counter-intrigue that you may actually want to read it, just as you would a high-drama, high-stakes crime novel—and a crime novel it certainly is, for there is just so much dishonesty involved, and on such an all-important issue as the biology of human nature!

If you do choose to read this 153 years of dishonest biology (from when Darwin published his idea of natural selection in 1859 to when this Part is being written in 2012) rather than go straight through to the honest biology, I will provide at least a brief summary of the truthful account of the development of order of matter on Earth that is more fully presented in Parts 8:2 and 8:3.

Part 4:12B Brief summary of the development of order of matter on Earth

As stated, the following is a very brief summary of the description of the development of order of matter on Earth that will be presented in Parts 8:2 and 8:3. It will provide a strong counterbalance to all the dishonest biology that will be presented.

As described in Part 4:4D and summarised in Part 4:11, self-sacrifice for the good of the whole—unconditional selflessness—is the glue that holds wholes together and as such is the very theme of the integrative process. Further, it was pointed out that the integrative *limitation* of the gene-based learning system is that it normally (that is, outside the nurturing, love-indoctrination situation) can't develop unconditional selflessness because if an unconditionally selfless trait develops it doesn't tend to carry on. The most selflessness that can normally be developed genetically is the selflessness that occurs in situations of reciprocity where a favour is given on the condition that it is returned, which really means that the selflessness is not selfless at all but selfish.

So again, while genetics has proved to be a marvellous tool for integrating matter—it produced the great variety of life that we have on Earth—it has this very significant limitation in that it normally can't develop unconditional selflessness and thus full integration. Each sexually reproducing individual plant or animal can develop traits for reciprocity, because such traits are in essence still selfish—they don't give away an advantage to other sexually reproducing individuals and therefore don't compromise the chances of the sexually reproducing individual to reproduce—but they cannot normally go beyond that and develop the capacity to behave unconditionally selflessly.

That is really all straightforward. What now needs to be considered is just how this inability to develop unconditional selflessness played out as the integration of matter developed from atoms, to molecules, to compounds, to macro-compounds, to virus-like organisms, to single-celled organisms, to multicellular organisms, to the next larger whole

of the fully integrated association of multicellular animals. It makes sense that at the level of integration where multicellular animals have been formed, the more those members of a species become integrated (or what has evasively been termed 'social', which basically means cooperative), the more competition for available food, shelter, territory and a mate intensifies. The more social or integrated sexually reproducing individual multicellular organisms become, the more competition develops between them, until it reaches a point where no further cooperative integration is possible. In the end, the selfish, divisive competition becomes so intense, in fact, that dominance hierarchy is the only way to bring some peace between the competing individuals. The benefit of dominance hierarchy is that, once established, the only time competition breaks out is when an opportunity arises to move up the dominance hierarchy; for the rest of the time there is relative peace. Dominance hierarchy is a sign that a species has developed as much integration as it possibly can. It is integratively 'maxed-out'; taken integration to the limit; developed as much integration as it possibly can.

Due to the establishment of dominance hierarchies the intense competition that integration has led to in highly social/integrated species is often hidden from view. It is only when an opportunity arises to move up the dominance hierarchy, or so-called 'peck order', that we see the real intensity of the competition that exists between members of a cooperative, or what we have called 'social', species. In my youth I remember feeding hens in our hen house and seeing a hen twist her leg and become temporarily crippled, at which point all the other hens immediately attacked her. In that instant it was suddenly apparent to me just how closely and intensely each hen was watching all the others for an opportunity to literally move up the peck order. The hen house was not at all the gregarious, peaceful community I thought it was; rather, it was a place of absolutely fierce competition! Charles Darwin recognised this truth about the real struggle in the lives of most animals when he wrote that **'It is difficult to believe in the dreadful but quiet war of organic beings, going on** [in] **the peaceful woods and smiling fields'** (12 Mar. 1839, *Charles Darwin's Notebooks*, Barrett et al., 1987, p.429). When we humans become free of the human condition we are going to be shocked by the agony of the animal condition; we are going to finally feel the distress that all the non-human animal species live under, where each member is fiercely and relentlessly having to compete with the other members to make sure it reproduces its genes.

So, as will be explained more fully in Part 8:2, this is where most animals are stranded, stuck in the 'animal condition' of forever having to compete and make sure their genes reproduce. That is the essential fact or rule or law of the gene-based natural selection process—genes are unavoidably selfish—but, *again*, that doesn't mean the meaning of existence is to be selfish; it is simply the limitation of the genetic tool for developing the order of matter. All of which raises the question: had the development of order of matter on Earth progressed as far as it could go at this point where the intensity of competition between sexually reproducing multicellular organisms had become so great that dominance hierarchy had to be employed? Well, it makes sense that since the limiting factor is that each sexually reproducing individual has to ensure it reproduces, one possibility is to elaborate the sexually reproducing individual, make it bigger, develop it so that there is more integration of matter within each sexually reproducing individual. As will be more fully explained in Part 8:3, elaborating the sexually reproducing individual is how single-celled organisms were able to

integrate to form multicellular organisms such as our bodies, and it is also how the completely integrated/social/colonial ants/bees/termites/wasps/beetles/shrimps/aphids/mole rats, etc, were able to form the next level of order of the integrated whole of multicellular members of a species. In multicellular organisms, each organism, while composed of many individual cells, remains one sexually reproducing individual. Similarly with ant/bee, etc, colonies, each colony, while composed of many ants/bees, etc, remains one sexually reproducing individual, one organism. As the prominent American biologist E.O. Wilson came to acknowledge in his 2012 book *The Social Conquest of Earth*, **'The queen and her offspring are often called superorganisms, but they may equally be called organisms'**; **'the mother queen and her progeny together** [are]**…the target of selection'** (pp.144 & 146 of 330). In the case of bees (the other completely social colonial species also employ a mechanism for retarding sexual maturation), the queen bee feeds a 'royal jelly' that causes sterility in all of her offspring that she intends to be workers. To ensure the reproduction of their genes these offspring then have to, through natural selection, develop the ability to support the queen because she carries their genes.

Elaborating the sexually reproducing individual allows the members of the elaborated sexually reproducing individual to develop the ability to at least *behave* unconditionally selflessly, which, as has been explained, is fundamental for the development of the fully cooperative integration of members into a new whole. The reason our body works so well is because each part has sublimated its needs to the greater good of the whole body—each part behaves in an unconditionally selfless way. Our skin, for example, is constantly growing and dying to protect our body. As has been mentioned, the leaves that fall in autumn do so to ensure the tree survives through winter. Ants and bees readily sacrifice themselves for the colony. Importantly, however, our body's skin, the tree's leaves and the ants/bees, etc, have only *behaved* unconditionally selflessly because their selflessness is not actually unconditional selflessness, it is not true altruism. This is because the self-sacrificing skin, leaves and ants/bees, etc, are all indirectly selfishly ensuring that their own genetic existence will be maintained by supporting the body or tree or ant/bee, etc, colony that carries the genes for their existence. Genetically—from the point of view of the genes' unavoidable need to reproduce—they are selflessly fostering the body/tree/colony to selfishly ensure their own genetic reproduction. Their apparently unconditionally selfless *behaviour* is not actually unconditional and thus altruistic, but rather a subtle form of selfishness. As pointed out, such reciprocity can develop genetically because it doesn't compromise the chances of the sexually reproducing individual to reproduce.

It now needs to be explained that <u>large animals couldn't employ this device of elaborating the sexually reproducing individual to develop a fully cooperative, integrated association or whole of their members because for them it involves too great a loss of the variability</u> that all species need to be able to adapt to changes in their environment. For example, if a female buffalo happened to be born with a particular mutation that caused her to produce a chemical in her milk that retarded the sexual maturation of her offspring such that her offspring then had to have selected mutations that inclined them to protect her for their genes to be successfully reproduced by her, and this became a common practice amongst buffalos, with every queen buffalo having, say, nine protector sacrificial buffalos, then the genetic variety of a population of 1,000 buffalos would be reduced to just 100, a drastic loss of variability. In the

case of ants/bees, etc, they are so small in relation to their environment that they can afford to have many fully integrated colonies in their environment without any significant loss of variability within their species.

Since integration is the theme of existence, all species *are* trying to become integrated and, according to how much their circumstances allow it given the limitation they are operating under of genes having to reproduce, they will have become integrated to some degree. It turns out that a number of large multicellular animal species have been partially successful in becoming integrated by *temporarily* elaborating the sexually reproducing individual. Many bird species, such as the Australian kookaburra, postpone their own reproduction for a few years after they fledge to selflessly help raise their parents' subsequent offspring; wolves, African wild dogs and meerkats do the same thing. However, to delay their chances of reproducing permanently would lead to too great a loss of variability in their species. Colonial mole rats are underground-living mammals that form fully integrated colonies of up to 300 members comprising one queen who uses hormones to inhibit the sexual maturation of nearly all the other rats who then act as workers and soldiers. A few sexual disperser caste are allowed to reach sexual maturity and these periodically escape their natal burrow to access other colonies and, in doing so, contribute to the genetic variety of the species. Significantly, mole rats are relatively small, typically maturing to only 8 to 10 centimetres (3 to 4 inches) in length.

What has been explained here is very significant for humans because it means that, as relatively large animals, we could not have employed the integrating device of elaborating the sexually reproducing individual either permanently, like ants and mole rats, or even temporarily, like wolves, to create the pre-conscious *fully* integrated state that I have asserted our australopithecine human ancestors developed through love-indoctrination, the instinctive memory of which is our moral conscience. Further, I have asserted that during that fully integrated, idyllic time in our past, our instinctive orientation was *not* reciprocity's subtle form of selfishness that the parts of a multicellular organism and workers in colonies of ants/bees, etc, practice, but to being truly altruistic, genuinely unconditionally selflessly behaved towards all of life; thus, even if we could have employed the device of elaborating the sexually reproducing individual it would still not come close to accounting for the origins of our *unconditionally* selfless, moral instinctive self or soul.

One last summarising point needs to be made about the stages of integration between multicellular members of a species to form the fully integrated larger whole of the Specie Individual. As was mentioned, all species are trying to become integrated, but the amount of integration they have been able to develop varies according to their circumstances. In particular it depends on how much selfless, cooperative behaviour they can develop before they reach the integration limit where they have to establish dominance hierarchy—and beyond that situation, on whether they can temporarily or fully elaborate the reproductive individual—and beyond that situation, on whether they can develop love-indoctrination. Many species have been able to develop a degree of selfless cooperation or socialness through developing some reciprocal selflessness (which is ultimately selfish behaviour and thus can be developed by natural selection); African buffalos, for example, form semi-cooperative, 'social' herds as the herd provides individuals, in particular newborn calves,

with physical protection against predators. Grazing animals in general form semi-cooperative, 'social' herds because, for one thing, if you are a grazing animal and have to have your head down feeding most of the time and you are in a herd it is likely that at least one member will have their head up and see an approaching predator and give a signal to the others of the threat. These are examples of reciprocal selflessness because while on occasion a member happens to be the selfless buffalo that most directly confronts the predator, or the grazing animal that draws attention to itself by giving the alarm call, on average each individual herd member benefits more than they risk from others making the defence or giving the alarm. It has already been explained how temporarily or permanently elaborating the reproductive individual enables cooperation to develop. What is significant is that under the limitation of the gene-based, natural selection process, while *a little* integration can be developed through occasional acts of reciprocal selflessness (such as occurs in buffalo herds), and *somewhat more* integration can be developed through temporarily elaborating the sexually reproducing individual (such as occurs in wolf packs), and *continuous* and thus *full* integration can be developed through permanently elaborating the sexually reproducing individual (as occurs in ant colonies), the *continuous* and thus *full* integration of sexually reproducing individuals to form the Species Individual can *only* occur through love-indoctrination (as is occuring in bonobos and occurred in our ape ancestors).

This was a brief summary of the integration of matter on Earth, with particular focus on why and where integration has become stalled, as that will be particularly relevant in the discussions that follow. Indeed, since what has been explained here is pivotal to the coming discussions, if any aspect remains unclear then I would recommend you read the fuller presentation in Parts 8:2 and 8:3.

Part 4:12C The full description of the denial-based biological theories, beginning with Social Darwinism

As explained in Part 4:11, when Darwin presented his theory of natural selection in 1859 he intuitively knew that he could not pursue the next step in biology, of confronting the unbearably depressing question for virtually all humans of the less-than-ideal, imperfect, human-condition-afflicted state of humans. Other biologists, however, were far, far less scrupulous. Unlike Darwin, who accepted that he wasn't sound enough to take the next step in biology of confronting the issue of the human condition and therefore stopped at that impasse, almost every biologist since has irresponsibly side-stepped that hurdle and gone on to develop whole libraries of fraudulent biological thinking about the behaviour of living organisms, including about the all-important issue of human behaviour.

Yes, human behaviour is *the* all-important issue for humanity, for science and for biology in particular, because *only* by understanding ourselves could we end the underlying insecurities that have caused our species' immensely destructive behaviour. And since the human condition is the all-important issue for biology, the advancement of a whole series of dishonest thinking about human behaviour by biologists was an extremely dangerous development because it threatened to subvert the *real* task for biologists of addressing and solving the human condition. Indeed, beyond subversion, it threatened to completely destroy

any chance humanity had of completing this task, because the way biologists side-stepped the issue of the human condition was by simply denying it even existed. As we will shortly see, this denial was attempted firstly by rejecting the existence of integrative purpose by claiming change was random, and secondly by finding ways to repudiate the fact that we humans have unconditionally selfless, altruistic moral instincts. After all, if there is no ideal, unconditionally selfless meaning to existence, and no unconditionally selflessly orientated moral nature in humans, then there is no dilemma of the human condition to have to explain! No ideals or alignment to an ideal state, no guilt, no problem—lie, lie, lie, but relief, relief, relief from the human condition!

The irony is, however, that while Darwin *did* responsibly step back from attempting to confront the issue of the human condition, refusing to engage in such disingenuous practices himself, he did, nevertheless, open the floodgates to the development of fraudulent, human-condition-side-stepping biological thinking when, as just explained in Part 4:11, he—this time to his *discredit* as a biologist—allowed his honest term 'natural selection' to be substituted by the dishonest term 'survival of the fittest'. In time, this 'survival of the fittest' corruption of Darwin's idea of natural selection became known as Social Darwinism—an all-pervading doctrine for upset humans that essentially claimed that 'when you dominated and defeated others you were simply meeting your biological obligations to be a success'. Through the misrepresentation of natural selection as a 'survival of the fittest' process, the so-called 'savage', 'barbaric', 'primitive', 'backward', 'brutish', 'bestial' *animal* behaviour excuse was given a supposed biological basis—a contrived, supposedly rational, biological excuse had finally been found for upset, human-condition-afflicted humans' extremely selfish egocentric need for power, fame, fortune and glory!

Part 4:12D Sociobiology

While the 'selfishness-is-natural' excuse put forward by Social Darwinists greatly relieved upset humans of the insecurity of their condition, there was always in the background an unsettling awareness that there were, in fact, situations in nature that challenged the idea that selfishness is universal. So while it is undisputable that most of nature *is* **'red in tooth and claw'**—that members of most species *do* selfishly compete and fight with each other for food, shelter, territory and a mate—it is also true that not all of nature is characterised by such selfishness, as evidenced by the three particular situations listed below.

FIRSTLY, selfless behaviour is not uncommon amongst animals, particularly in highly social species. For example, wolves and African wild dogs bring meat back to members of the pack not present at the kill. In numerous bird species, such as the Australian kookaburra, a breeding pair receives support in raising its young from other 'helper' birds who protect the nest from predators and help to feed the fledglings. Vampire bats regularly donate regurgitated blood to other members of their group who have failed to feed that night, ensuring they do not starve. Many animals also give alarm calls to alert others in their group to the presence of a predator, even though in doing so they seemingly attract attention to themselves and increase their personal risk of attack.

But while such *occasional* selfless behaviour certainly challenges the argument that selfishness is a natural, universal characteristic of nature, the *continually* selfless behaviour of ants and bees and the few other completely social colonial species, such as termites, leaves the argument in tatters. Indeed, in *The Origin of Species* Darwin considered the question of how the natural selection process, in which only traits that selfishly reproduce carry on, can possibly develop selfless traits, such as those exhibited by social ants and bees, to be the most serious challenge to his theory of evolution by natural selection.

When, in religious scripture, King Solomon said, **'Go to the ant…consider its ways and be wise'** (Proverbs 6:6), he has most often been interpreted as meaning, 'Look at the ants and acknowledge their industry.' However, the *real* meaning of that proverb is to look at the ants and acknowledge how selflessly and cooperatively they are behaving and, as a result of that behaviour, how functional, effective and harmoniously integrated their societies are, and ask ourselves why don't we humans behave like that? But whenever faced with human-condition-confronting truths such as this, we upset, competitive, aggressive and selfish, human-condition-afflicted humans invariably found a way of denying them. In this case, instead of advocating an examination of why ant societies function so well, which would quickly reveal that ants are extremely selfless, and becoming **'wise'** from making that observation, the proverb was evasively misinterpreted as referring to the *industry* of ants. Due to their extremely selfless, consider-the-larger-whole-above-self behaviour, ant and bee colonies are extraordinarily functional and harmoniously integrated—so much so, in fact, that the colony can be considered a single organism, a superorganism comprised of the queen and her many workers of different castes (such as food gatherers, soldiers, nest cleaners, nursery attendants, etc) selflessly working together for the greater good of the colony. The workers behave much like the parts of our body work together for its greater good; indeed, we can compare the food gathering worker ants to the red blood cells that scurry throughout our body selflessly delivering 'food' (oxygen) to all its parts. The 2004 award-winning documentary *Ants—Nature's Secret Power* admitted the power of selfless cooperation and its **'superorganism'**-creating effect in ants when it concluded that **'The secret of ant societies is their cooperation…**[it's what has enabled them to] **act as a superorganism…**[and become] **nature's true world power'** (produced by Adi Mayer Films, ORF Austrian Broadcasting Company with Docstar and WDR). The extreme selflessness of bees was also made clear in a documentary on bee colonies, which reported that **'when bees become sick they sacrifice themselves and leave the hive to die to prevent infecting the rest of the colony'**, and **'in the summer, the workers only live around 30 days because they literally work themselves to death'** (*Silence of the Bees*, produced by Partisan Pictures, Inc. and Thirteen/WNET for National Geographic Channel, 2007). In his book *The Soul of the White Ant*, Eugène Marais also made the same point when he observed that **'the termite…never rests or sleeps'** (1937, p.61 of 154).

Significantly, however, not only has the extremely selfless behaviour of ants, bees, termites—and the two dozen or so other completely social, fully integrated colonial varieties of multicellular animals, which includes some wasps, a species of beetle, several variety of shrimp, some gall-making aphids and two independently evolved mole rat species—been very exposing, confronting and condemning of us upset, divisive, selfish, competitive and aggressive, dysfunctionally behaved, human-condition-suffering humans, it was also very exposing, confronting and condemning because it presented stark evidence of the development

of order of matter on Earth. As explained in Part 4:4B, atoms have come together or integrated to form molecules, which in turn have integrated to form compounds, which have integrated to form virus-like organisms, then single-celled organisms, which have then integrated to form multicellular organisms, and now we have the example of how multicellular animals have come together to form the next level of order and larger whole of a fully integrated association of multicellular animals, the **'superorganism'**. Ants and bees and the few other completely social colonial animals just mentioned bear stark witness to the theme of existence, which is the development of order or integration of matter, a theme that, as emphasised in Part 4:4B, has been unbearably condemning of our apparent divisive, non-integrative human-condition-afflicted lives. In short, ants and bees and their like challenged the defence we were using against Integrative Meaning that change was directionless and random.

Yes, ants and bees and the few other completely social colonial species confronted us on all levels with the Godly, integrative meaning of existence—they confronted us with the elementary truth about existence, which is that selflessness is an ideal way to behave; *and* they confronted us with the overall truth about existence of Integrative Meaning. Having become a selflessly behaved, consider-the-larger-whole-above-self, fully integrated group of multicellular animals, within their colonies *they* were behaving in a way consistent with the next level of the integrative process, which is the way we knew we should be behaving!

The **SECOND** situation in nature that contradicts the idea that selfishness is universal is the existence of our own instinctive moral conscience that informs us that it isn't right to be selfishly inconsiderate of others and not live in accordance with Integrative Meaning. Our own charitable, consider-the-larger-whole-above-self, integration-orientated moral instincts also strongly contradicted the excuses we were using that 'selfishness is all that is occurring in nature, there's no such thing as an integrative process because change is directionless and random'.

Both situations listed thus far contribute to the **THIRD** situation in nature that contradicts the selfishness-is-universal interpretation, which is the obvious overall theme in *nature* of the integration of matter. As described in Part 4:4B, not only do we have moral instincts that inform us that selfless, cooperative, integrative behaviour is meaningful, our everyday observation of nature—be it animal, mineral or vegetable—reveals that truth. We are surrounded by examples of ordered matter, by arrangements of matter where the parts of the arrangement are behaving cooperatively. A tree's leaves, branches, trunk, roots and bark, and indeed all the cells of all those parts of the tree, live in a state of harmonious cooperation—even behaving selflessly, such as when leaves fall (in effect, give their life) in autumn so that the tree as a whole can better survive through winter. Again, our body is a similar collection of cooperating parts. Almost everywhere we look we see arrangements of ordered matter and we see how well those arrangements benefit from all the parts working together in a selfless fashion. In fact, in the instances where there isn't such cooperation, such as where we see competition and fighting between organisms, we realise how destabilising, disintegrative and divisive such behaviour is. Moreover, we are able to realise from observing our surroundings that there is a hierarchy of ordered matter—animals are a collection of parts, and, in the many societies of animals, each animal is a part of the larger whole of its society, and, in turn, societies of animals are all part of the larger whole of a developing 'ecosystem'. Indeed, all of

nature appears to be one vast system trying to create order out of an initial chaos of individual elements and parts. We even have a word, 'holism', which recognises **'the tendency in nature to form wholes'** (*Concise Oxford Dict*. 5th edn, 1964).

So, in summary, far from selfishness appearing to be the universal characteristic of life on Earth, some animals were behaving selflessly—considering others, the larger integrated whole, above their own interests. Such behaviour was particularly apparent in the communalism of ant and bee colonies. Also contradicting the 'selfishness-is-universal-in-nature-so-that's-why-we-are-selfish, there's-no-such-thing-as-an-integrative-process-because-change-is-directionless-and-random' excuse for our divisive, selfish, competitive and aggressive human condition was the existence of our moral conscience, as well as our everyday observations of the overall integrative theme in nature. These situations certainly placed humanity in a pickle, in deep trouble: how were we to get out of this highly exposing, confronting and condemning corner? Clearly what was desperately needed was the true dignifying and redeeming biological explanation of our less-than-ideally-behaved, competitive and aggressive human condition, but while that liberating insight remained unknown all that was possible was to somehow contrive an even trickier excuse than Social Darwinism for our divisive condition—one that could be used to counter the criticism emanating from these three situations.

Not only did a counter have to be found to these apparent contradictions to the notion that nature is entirely competitive and selfish, a growing view that nature is characterised by selflessness not selfishness had also to be countered. As was explained in some detail in Parts 3:11G and 3:11H, without the reconciling understanding of why humans became competitive, aggressive and selfish when the ideals—which our moral conscience expected us to behave in accordance with—are to be cooperative, loving and selfless, two opposing philosophical positions emerged. When the upset that unavoidably developed from the human race's search for knowledge became extreme some people, the right-wing, wanted to continue the upsetting, corrupting search for knowledge, while others, the left-wing, wanted to abandon that corrupting search and return to supporting more idealistic values. The result in biology was that, while not wanting to admit to Integrative Meaning too directly and by so doing have to confront the unbearable issue of the human condition, left-wing-supporting biologists did want to admit to a more integrative, ideal existence. So what happened is that right up until the 1960s these biologists resisted the right-wing, selfishness-and-competition-justifying Social Darwinist view and interpreted what was happening in the natural world as one immense order-developing, cooperative, selfless, loving process, however this meant overlooking the fact that the natural selection process involved in this development of order of matter is highly competitive and selfish.

There *is* a Negative-Entropy-driven, teleological, holistic, integrative, order-of-matter-developing direction to change, and natural selection has developed a great deal of integrated, ordered matter, namely the great variety of life we see on Earth, BUT, because of the limitation of the gene-based mechanism for developing that order of matter, which is that genetic traits have to reproduce if they are to carry on, natural selection *does* operate from an individualistic, selfish and competitive basis. Even though, overall, natural selection does develop order, it is in practice a highly competitive and selfish process. This is the great paradox of the natural

selection process: overall natural selection is dedicated to developing integrative order but it has to do it through extremely divisive competition! What this means is that those who opposed the Social Darwinist's emphasis on selfishness and stressed the development of order in nature were correct in recognising that life and nature are concerned with developing cooperative order, they were incorrect in overlooking the fact that at the operational level natural selection is a highly selfish and competitive process. What was basically occurring is that selfishness-emphasising right-wing biologists were rightly stressing the fact that the natural selection process is extremely selfish and competitive, while socialistic left-wing biologists were naively overlooking that reality and trying to emphasise the greater truth of the integration of matter. What was missing was the reconciling understanding that, as emphasised in the previous Part 4:12B, natural selection is a *limited* tool for achieving the integration of matter—that limitation being that only traits that are selfish can reproduce and thus carry on in the species.

Despite it being an extremely naive position to take to not recognise that natural selection is an extremely selfish and competitive process, many left-leaning biologists took that position anyway in an effort to counter the right-wing, selfishness-and-competition-justifying Social Darwinist view. For instance, in 1880 the Russian zoologist Karl Kessler maintained that (the underlinings are my emphasis) **'the progressive development of the animal kingdom, and especially of mankind, is favoured much more by** [selfless] **mutual support than by mutual struggle'** (Address titled *On the law of mutual aid* to the St Petersburg Society of Naturalists, Jan. 1880). The truth is, while there is an integrative, **'progressive development of the animal kingdom'**, the integrative limitation of the natural selection process is that, apart from in the case of **'mankind'**, it *only* **'favoured'** selfish **'struggle'**, not selfless **'mutual support'**. At the beginning of the twentieth century, another Russian zoologist, Peter Kropotkin, who as an avowed communist, was being extremely naive when he wrote about natural selection as being concerned with **'the progressive evolution of the species'** (Intro.), writing in his 1902 book *Mutual Aid: A Factor of Evolution*, for example, that **'in all these scenes of animal life which passed before my eyes, I saw Mutual Aid and Mutual Support carried on to an extent which made me suspect in it a feature of the greatest importance for the maintenance of life, the preservation of each species, and its further evolution'** (Intro.). Natural selection *is* part of a greater integrative, order-of-matter-developing, **'progressive'** process, but natural selection itself is limited to being *only* concerned with competition between sexually reproducing individuals, which means virtually **'all these scenes of animal life'** that we see **'before'** our **'eyes'** are *not* concerned with **'Mutual Aid and Mutual Support'** but with extreme competition between sexually reproducing individuals. This misrepresentation of natural selection as being socialistic rather than individualistic was still occurring into the 1960s—for instance, in his 1963 book *On Aggression*, the Nobel Prize-winning Austrian behaviourist Konrad Lorenz wrote frequently of behaviour having **'a species-preserving function'** (pp.23, 29, 30, 46, 50, 72, 85, 86, 87, 92, 104, 113, 119, 140, 141 of 324). The development of species *is* part of the integrative process, but the *behaviour* of a species is all about extreme competition between its sexually reproducing members. Each sexually reproducing individual is interested in its *own* **'preserv**[ation]**'**, not that of the **'species'**. In a similar misrepresentation of natural selection being interested in more than what assists the sexually reproducing individual to reproduce, in 1962 the English zoologist V.C. Wynne-Edwards argued that individual organisms restrain themselves from consuming food and from reproducing so that the *population* can avoid crashing to extinction (*Animal Dispersion in Relation to Social Behaviour*). Also, when in 1960 the eminent

American termite biologist Alfred E. Emerson put forward the view that all of nature was as functionally integrated as a termite colony ('The evolution of adaptation in population systems'; *Evolution after Darwin*, vol.1, ed. S. Tax, pp.301-348) he was naively overlooking the central principle of Darwin's idea of natural selection, which is that it is an extremely competitive and divisive process.

Yes, those who thought of the natural selection process in terms of sexually reproducing individuals being concerned with preserving the species were rightly described in the scientific literature as **'naive'**. The principle of natural selection asserts that only those individuals that successfully compete will manage to reproduce their characteristics, and that it is through this *competitive* process that the great variety of species, the integration of matter, on Earth developed.

So right-wing biologists, who were defending humanity's corrupting journey to find knowledge, were left with the task of countering the socialistic left-wing biologists' naive, pseudo idealistic, 'for the good of the group/species/larger whole' biological thinking that came dangerously close to acknowledging the unconfrontable truth of Integrative Meaning. They needed to remind everyone that natural selection is actually an extremely individualistic, competitive and selfish process, and they needed to maintain denial of the integrative theme of existence. Further, they needed to find a way to deal with the problem that the selfless behaviour being practiced by some social animals, especially ants and bees, and our own selfless, consider-the-welfare-of-others, moral conscience contradicts the selfishness-justifying argument that selfishness is universal in nature and that's why we are selfish. This was a tall order indeed, but during the 1960s and early 1970s right-wing biologists did manage to achieve this. The solution was a theory called Sociobiology, which eventually developed into the theory of Evolutionary Psychology, and its main architects were the British biologists William Hamilton and John Maynard Smith, and the American biologists George Williams and Edward (E.) O. Wilson.

This fight-back against the naive, pseudo idealism of left-wing biologists who were verging on letting the condemning truth of Integrative Meaning out, began in earnest when, after attending a lecture in 1965 on why people age and die by the aforementioned left-wing biologist Alfred E. Emerson, in which Emerson naively claimed that **'We've evolved to do it** [die] **so we get out of the way, so the young people can go on maintaining the species'**, George Williams stated that he **'thought it was absolute nonsense'** ('Stretching the Limits of Evolutionary Biology: A Profile of George Williams', Carl Zimmer, *Science*, 28 May 2004). His disgust prompted him to write his now famous 1966 book *Adaptation and Natural Selection* that basically reminded everyone that natural selection *is* an extremely individualistic, competitive and selfish process, so much so that it would overcome any inclination by organisms to selflessly consider the welfare of the group/species above their own welfare. It was this publication that in particular led to the kin-selection based theory of Sociobiology/Evolutionary Psychology that managed to re-assert the selfishness-is-all-that-is-occurring-in-nature view and provide the means to counter any recognition of Integrative Meaning. Hamilton, Maynard Smith, Williams and Wilson's contribution to the development of the 'get out of jail' (escape having to confront the human condition) theory of Sociobiology/Evolutionary Psychology will now be described in the process of explaining the theory.

We need to begin the description of how these men managed to get the human race 'out of jail' by explaining that incidences of apparent selfless behaviour practiced by some non-human animals, including the apparent selfless behaviour practiced by colonial living worker ants and bees and their kind, *can* be accounted for by the concept of reciprocal selflessness, which, as was described in the previous Part 4:12B, is not actually selfless behaviour but selfish behaviour—which means that at least for these situations where there is apparent selfless behaviour, the 'selfishness-is-all-that-is-occurring-in-nature', 'selfishness-is-just-the-way-life-works-and-that's-why-we-are-selfish', 'survival of the fittest', Social Darwinist account still stands. What will now also be described is that this reciprocal selflessness argument could supposedly also be used to assert that our selfless moral instincts were a manifestation of this 'reciprocal-selflessness-that-is-actually-selfishness', in which case, the 'selfishness-is-the-natural-way-to-behave', 'we-can't-help-it-if-we-are-selfish', 'survival of the fittest', Social Darwinist account would then be fully confirmed. HOWEVER, as will be explained, the 'reciprocal-selflessness-that-is-actually-selfishness' argument wasn't in itself sufficient to relieve humans of the agony of the human condition—something even more was needed; as we will see, a way had also to be found to avoid having to confront the truth of Integrative Meaning.

Firstly, to further explain how the concept of reciprocal selflessness reveals that the apparent selfless behaviour practiced by some non-human animals, including that of the colonial living worker ants and bees and their kind, is actually a form of selfishness.

While only developed as a theory in the early 1970s by biologists such as Robert Trivers, the reciprocal selflessness explanation for all apparent altruistic behaviour amongst non-human animals is, nevertheless, reasonably obvious for anyone thinking about natural selection. Clearly, unconditionally selfless traits tend to self-eliminate—that being the very definition of unconditional selflessness: doing something for others without incurring any personal benefit. As such, a self-eliminating trait can't become established through natural selection. But, a selfless act towards another that resulted in the recipient returning the favour—a selfless act that was *reciprocated*—clearly could be developed by natural selection, because the outcome was ultimately and mutually beneficial, not detrimental. Reciprocated acts of selflessness benefit both parties, which, in the final analysis, means the selflessness is actually selfishness.

To reiterate, Darwin's idea of natural selection revealed that organisms compete with other organisms to reproduce their characteristics, which, when the molecular biologists James Watson and Francis Crick identified the actual mechanism behind natural selection of the DNA molecule in 1953, we learnt meant reproducing their genes. If the gene for a trait doesn't manage to reproduce—if it doesn't successfully compete—then it can't become established in the species. Genes are intrinsically selfish. An unconditionally selfless trait—a trait that doesn't tend to reproduce and carry on—cannot normally become established in a species (that is, outside the love-indoctrination situation that, as was briefly explained in Part 4:4D and will be fully explained in Part 8:4B, allowed humans' unconditionally selfless moral instincts to develop). What this means—and this has already been explained and emphasised, such as in the previous Part 4:12B—is that the most amount of selflessness that can normally be developed genetically is reciprocal selflessness, where a favour is given in return for a favour, because the trait is still intrinsically selfish since both parties benefit. The trait is not

unconditionally selfless—it is still meeting the requirements of natural selection, which is that for a trait to become established it has to selfishly carry on from generation to generation.

Reciprocal-selflessness-that-is-actually-selfishness *does* actually explain all apparent selflessness in nature—the only exception being the *unconditionally* selfless behaviour that is characteristic of our moral instincts, which again was a result of the love-indoctrination process. For example, a reciprocal-selflessness explanation for the seemingly altruistic alarm calls given by vervet monkeys (which alert other monkeys to danger but seemingly expose the caller to an increased risk of predation) is that while giving an alarm call does expose the caller to increased risk, the caller also benefits from others giving the alarm call, so that overall there is a net benefit to each member in giving alarm calls. While the alarm-calling trait appears to be a selfless one, it actually leads to the reproduction of that trait, which, in the final analysis, means it is intrinsically selfish. It might be mentioned that the precondition for the development of this particular form of reciprocal selflessness, which is frequently called 'reciprocal altruism', is that those benefiting from the 'selflessness' remain present to return the favour. If a favour is given and the recipient is never seen again then the favour can't be reciprocated. So what is required for 'reciprocal altruism' to develop is for groups not to be too large and for the association with the others in the group to occur over a long period.

(Note that 'reciprocal altruism' should more properly be termed 'reciprocal *apparent* altruism', or 'reciprocal selflessness' as I have been calling it, because, as explained, being reciprocal the selflessness is actually a subtle form of selfishness—it is *not* real or true selflessness. Altruism means *unconditionally* selfless behaviour and this 'selfless' behaviour is not unconditionally selfless. Biologists have been using the term 'altruism' to describe apparent selfless behaviour amongst non-human animals when they should not. *Only* humans have been able to develop unconditionally selfless, truly altruistic behaviour, and we achieved that through love indoctrination, a process that is fully explained in Part 8:4B.)

If we think about it, the reciprocal-selflessness-that-is-actually-selfishness situation can even explain the apparent unconditionally selfless behaviour of the colonial-living worker ants and bees. While the sterile individual workers in the colonies of ants and bees (and this also applies to the other two dozen or so completely social colonial varieties of termite, wasp, beetle, shrimp, aphid, mole rat, and others) appear to be behaving unconditionally selflessly, they are actually each behaving *selfishly*, because by selflessly looking after their colony and queen, who carries the genes for their existence, they are indirectly *selfishly* ensuring the reproduction of their own genes. The sterile workers support the queen and she in turn reproduces their genes, which means that, despite appearances, the workers aren't behaving in an *unconditionally* selfless, truly altruistic way, but in a *conditionally* selfless way. The sterile workers' selfless support of the queen is conditional on the queen selflessly reproducing their genes. It is a situation of reciprocity where both parties benefit, which means that what is occurring is still, in essence, *selfish* behaviour. The seeming unconditionally selfless behaviour of the workers is actually a subtle or indirect form of *selfishness*. As such, the completely social ants, bees, termites, wasps, beetles, shrimps, aphids and mole rats (and others) aren't behaving unconditionally selflessly after all; they are behaving selfishly—a situation that, as mentioned, could supposedly also be used to argue that our own selfless moral instincts are a form of reciprocal-selflessness-that-is-actually-genetic-selfishness, thus supposedly

confirming 'the selfishness-is-all-that-is-occurring-in-nature, selfishness-is-the-natural-way-to-behave, we-can't-help-it-if-we-are-selfish, selfishness-is-just-the-way-life-works, 'survival of the fittest', Social Darwinist account.

However, in terms of avoiding the unbearable issue of the human condition, a very significant problem remained, which was that the reciprocal-selflessness-that-is-actually-selfishness account could still leave humans having to confront the truth of the integrative, development-of-order-of-matter theme of existence, which was unbearably condemning because, if accepted, it implied that we humans should be cooperative and selfless. The problem was that any recognition of the importance of the *group*, such as that worker ants and bees toil to preserve the *group* or society or larger whole of the colony, is a recognition of the integrative, hierarchical process, which, as has been mentioned, involves atoms coming together or integrating to form molecules, which in turn integrate to form compounds, which integrate to form single-celled organisms, which integrate to form multicellular organisms, which integrate to form *groups* or societies or unified associations of multicellular organisms. Even the word 'selflessness' involved in the concept of 'reciprocal selflessness' is condemning of upset, competitive and aggressive, human-condition-afflicted humans, because being selfless means showing consideration for the maintenance of a larger whole. It is a recognition of Integrative Meaning. The word 'sociality' was similarly dangerous because it too raised the idea of the development and maintenance of a larger whole. In the case of 'reciprocal altruism', such as exhibited by the alarm calls of vervet monkeys, while it is in the end selfish behaviour, it has occurred as a result of the whole integration-of-matter, development-of-order, socialisation process. Clearly what was needed to save humans from unbearable condemnation was a way of interpreting these situations in a way that *didn't* involve *any* group/larger whole/socialisation/integration emphasis or recognition—a way to describe what is happening in nature that *avoided even the possibility* of there being an integrative process, for example, a way that *eliminated* the possibility that the behaviour of vervet monkeys could be interpreted as being part of some integrative, order-developing, socialisation process. And it was precisely this *no*-larger-whole-emphasising, *no*-recognition-of-socialisation, *no*-integration-involved interpretation that Hamilton, Maynard Smith, Williams and Wilson ingeniously came up with. The concept was called 'kin selection' and it was the foundation idea behind Sociobiology.

Kin selection is actually a particular variety of reciprocal selflessness that is based on relatedness. It proposes that animals are more likely to behave selflessly towards relatives/kin who share at least some of their genes than towards those who are unrelated because by fostering their kin they are fostering the reproduction of their own genes that their kin share. Further, kin selection maintains that the closer the relationship and thus the more genes they share, the more selfless they are likely to be. In terms of relieving humans of the agony of the human condition, the great benefit of kin selection is that it is entirely focused on the individual, *not* on the group/colony/society/larger whole/integration of matter. As an encyclopaedic entry on kin selection notes (the italics are as they appear in the text): **'kin selection…theory…apparently showed how altruistic behaviour could evolve *without* the need for group-level selection'** (*Biological Altruism*, Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, 2008 revision). It was this 'not-the-group-but-the-individual' focus of kin selection that was so precious in helping humans avoid the unbearable issue of the human condition.

To take up the description again of George Williams' famous 1966 book *Adaptation and Natural Selection* in which he presented by far the most influential of the attacks that occurred in the 1960s and 1970s on the 'good of the species' type arguments—on those who maintained that selection could occur between sexually reproducing individuals for the benefit of the group or larger whole. In *Adaptation and Natural Selection* Williams said that traits that are **'for the good of the group'** might theoretically develop through a process of group selection or, more accurately, 'between-group selection', but that was so unlikely it would not, in fact, occur. He argued that group selection is such a weak evolutionary force that it could never overcome the power of individual selection, concluding that **'group-related adaptations do not, in fact, exist'** (p.93 of 307). Williams wrote: **'Only by a theory of between-group selection could we achieve a scientific explanation of group-related adaptations. However, I would question one of the premises on which the reasoning is based. Chapters 5 to 8** [of *Adaptation and Natural Selection*] **will be primarily a defence of the thesis that group-related adaptations do not, in fact, exist'** (pp.92-93). Later, in Part 4:12H-i, group selection will be explained more fully, but the following is a brief explanation of the **'theory of between-group selection'** and Williams' criticism of it. As has been emphasised, the biological reality is that genes are necessarily selfish; genetic traits have to reproduce if they are to become established in a species, and an unconditionally selfless, cooperative trait doesn't tend to reproduce. The result is that extreme competition exists amongst sexually reproducing individuals to ensure their genes reproduce; so much so that if an unconditionally selfless trait were to emerge amongst a group of sexually reproducing individuals it would be exploited by all those who were being selfish. There will always be individuals who in effect say, 'If you want to behave selflessly towards me, that's absolutely fine because it will benefit me, but don't expect me to return the favour'. Selflessness is going to be subverted, undermined by opportunist cheaters or free riders. While that is the basic reality of the natural selection process, the between-group selection theory argues that while within a group of sexually reproducing individuals selflessness is going to be subverted, if there are two groups in competition against each other and one has members who are more able to behave selflessly and help each other then that group will have an advantage over the other group that doesn't have such selfless, cooperative members, which means that unconditionally selfless cooperation supposedly could be able to be selected for. The problem with this theory, which is what Williams pointed out, is that the forces of individual selection are so strong that a group of selfless, cooperative sexually reproducing individuals is realistically never going to develop even though they would have an advantage over a group of selfish, non-cooperative sexually reproducing individuals because those who are being selfless in the group will be exploited by selfish opportunists—and thus, **'group-related adaptations do not, in fact, exist'**. Williams reiterated this view in his Preface to the 1996 reprint of *Adaptation and Natural Selection*: **'I concluded** [in *Adaptation and Natural Selection*]**…that group selection was not strong enough to produce…**[an] **adaptation…characterized by organisms' playing roles that would subordinate their individual interests for some higher value, as in the often proposed benefit to the species'** (p.xii).

Most significantly, the above description of the improbability of between-group selection working was in relation to groups of sexually reproducing individuals. What happened was that not only did Williams dismiss group selection as being a biologically unsound explanation for social behaviour amongst sexually reproducing individuals, he maintained

that *all* cooperative behaviour, including that of social ants and bees and their kind (and, as we will see later, kin selection theory was even used to supposedly explain our moral instincts), was not due to larger-whole-focused group selection but only to individual-focused kin selection, with any anomalies being either a product of **'misplaced parental behavior'** or **'incidental' 'consequences of individual activities'**. He wrote in *Adaptation and Natural Selection* that **'Selection within a population can lead to cooperative relations among closely related individuals, because the benefits of cooperation would go mainly to individuals with the genetic basis of cooperation, rather than to those of alternative genetic makeup. Selection at the genic level thus explains insect societies and analogous developments in other organisms. Other apparent examples of altruism are explained as misplaced parental behavior. They represent imperfections in the mechanisms that normally regulate the timing and execution of parental behavior. Benefits to the group often arise as incidental statistical consequences of individual activities, just as harmful effects may accumulate in the same way'** (p.vii). While using kin selection to supposedly explain *all* social behaviour, including the social behaviour of ants and bees and their kind, and even our social/moral instincts, achieved the key objective of eliminating any recognition of Integrative Meaning, it was an outrageous lie to do so. While it is true that between-group selection doesn't seem at all possible between groups of sexually reproducing individuals, where the individuals are part of an elaborated sexually reproducing individual, such as occurs in social ants and their kind, then of course the colonies/groups of these individuals do undergo between-group selection—colonies that are more cooperative will out-compete colonies that are not as cooperative. The issue is what constitutes the individual, but Williams/kin selection theorists didn't make this critical distinction, which, while it conveniently eliminates recognition of Integrative Meaning, is an outrageous lie. Between-group selection can take place when the groups involved are each composed of members of one sexually reproducing individual.

What Williams did to try to ignore the truth that social ants and their kind are part of an integrated, larger whole, an elaborated sexually reproducing individual, a 'superorganism' as some have called it, was to argue that the focus of the workers in the colonies was not on the queen and the maintenance of the colony, but on the reproduction of their own genes. According to Williams, the individual, *not* the group, was the target of the natural selection that was occurring, basically that the group had no significance beyond providing an environment for the genes to operate in. By way of providing further explanation of insect societies Williams **'directed [the reader] to Hamilton's papers'**, which he said dealt **'admirably'** with the subject (ibid. p.197).

Williams' citation of **'Hamilton's papers'** is a reference to two papers that had been published by William Hamilton two years earlier in 1964 and which featured the first formal mathematical treatment of kin selection theory for explaining the development of apparent altruistic behaviour ('The Genetical Evolution of Social Behaviour I and II', *Journal of Theoretical Biology* 7: 1-16, 17-32). Although the basic concept of kin selection was alluded to in the 1930s by biologists R.A. Fisher and J.B.S. Haldane (Haldane famously said that **'I would lay down my life for two brothers or eight cousins**), it was Hamilton who first developed it into a theory in these papers. In the particularly Integrative-Meaning-revealing, human-condition-confronting case of **'insect societies'**, the big contribution to the 'it's-the-individual-not-the-group' kin selection argument that Hamilton **'admirably'** made in the papers was the haplodiploid hypothesis. This hypothesis

refers to a peculiarity of the genetic system known as 'haplodiploidy', which exists in ants and bees, where females (all worker ants and bees are females) share, on average, more genes with their sisters than they do with their own offspring. In which case, a female worker is able to have more of her own genes survive into the next generation by helping the queen reproduce (thus increasing the number of sisters she will have) than by having offspring of her own. So that is why, according to Hamilton, sterile workers evolved—*not* to help the queen develop and maintain the colony, but to propagate their own genes. The point is that the haplodiploid hypothesis seemed to lend powerful credence to the theory of kin selection—in fact, it was what E.O. Wilson (whose work will be examined shortly) said for him **'initially gave the** [kin selection] **formula its magnetic power'** (*The Social Conquest of Earth*, 2012, p.169 of 330)). Again, in terms of the problem of colonial ants and bees being extremely revealing of the integrative theme of existence, the significance of kin selection theory is that it made the colony irrelevant, for according to kin selection theory, the colony and the sterile workers *only* evolved because it was the best way for the workers to reproduce their genes.

As was mentioned, and as we are going to see, while kin selection supposedly provided a way of eliminating the extremely exposing and condemning problem posed by ant and bee societies, it was also used to eliminate the exposing and condemning problem posed by our own take-care-of-others, moral inclinations. Our moral instincts were said to not be unconditionally selfless but selfish instincts because they were derived from selfishly fostering relatives who shared our genes. Understandably, the human-condition-relieving powers of kin selection's 'there-is-no-group/integration-of-matter-relevance', 'it's-only-the-individual-that-matters' interpretation is the reason why so many biologists in the last half of the twentieth century enthusiastically supported and adhered to **'Williams' first commandment: "Thou shall not apply the adaptationist** [natural selection] **program above the level of the individual"'** (David Sloan Wilson & Elliot Sober, 1994, 'Re-Introducing Group Selection to the Human Behavioral Sciences', *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 17 (4): pp.585-654).

While it is true that the sterile workers in the fully integrated, completely social colonial species of ants and bees and their kind *do* foster the queen in order to reproduce their genes, the object or purpose of doing so is not to selfishly benefit the individual worker, as kin selection theory proposes, but to selflessly support the development and maintenance of the larger *whole* of the colony. Again, we only have to look at what is occurring in the body of a multicellular animal to see very clearly what is happening. The individual parts (eyes, legs, heart, etc) of the body (and, as mentioned, the completely social colonies of animals *do* represent a fully integrated cooperative whole like a body) work to support the maintenance of the entire being, they are not working for themselves; it is the body as a *whole* that is the concern or focus or purpose of their existence, just as it is the development and maintenance of the larger whole of a multicellular plant that is the target of the natural selection process. When a tree loses its leaves in autumn, those leaves haven't given their life so that the genes for their existence will carry on in the tree that, as a result of their sacrifice, is better equipped to survive through winter—they have sacrificed themselves to ensure the larger *whole* of the tree survives. The object is the survival of the tree, not the survival of the leaves' genes. Kin selection theorists seek to explain the behaviour of colonial ants and their kind in a way that avoids any group/Integrative Meaning recognition, but in doing

so they take the 'no group relevance' argument and the kin selection theory too far, in fact to the point of ridiculousness, but such was the need to avoid the human condition. Later, when I describe how group selection theory was resurrected from this attack by Williams and others, in the 1990s we will see that the American biologist David Sloan Wilson and the American science philosopher Eliot Sober make the point that I have just made, writing that denial of the **'nested hierarchy of units'** in nature (the integration of matter) **'was just plain wrong'**. They pointed out that **'According to** [George] **Williams and** [Richard] **Dawkins…even sexually reproducing organisms do not qualify as units of selection'**, they are only what **'Dawkins… called "vehicles of selection"'**, **'environments'** for the **'selfish genes'** to achieve their goal of reproduction. They wondered **'why genes are suitable candidates for units of selection whereas organisms, groups and so on are not'** and complained that **'Gene-centered theorists frame-shift downward with enthusiasm but they are much more reluctant to frame-shift upward'** in **'the biological hierarchy…**[of] **nested series of units'**. They railed against **'gene-centered theorists…who claimed to explain the social insects without invoking group selection'**. This whole criticism of right-wing **'gene-centered theorists'** was an obvious and easy criticism to make because of course ant and bee superorganisms exist, and of course there is an integrating **'nested hierarchy'** of order of matter on Earth, but that overlooks the strategy employed when denying an unbearable truth: right-wing Evolutionary Psychologists weren't worried about the truth, only about finding a *possible* way of denying Integrative Meaning, which they sought to achieve through promoting their kin selection theory.

So, the great attraction of the kin selection interpretation of the cooperative/social behaviour of colonial ants and their kind was that it argued that 'There is no group significance, it's all about the individual maximising its chance to reproduce and there is nothing more to it than that.' Yes, in terms of contriving an excuse for our upset individualistic, self-preoccupied, selfish, egocentric, competitive and aggressive, human-condition-suffering state, kin selection's emphasis on the importance of the individual and not of the integration of the group/colony/larger whole was precious—especially for those who were extremely upset sufferers of the human condition.

It was at this point that Edward (E.) O. Wilson, the Harvard University-based biologist who had always been interested in ants, entered the scene. It will become quickly apparent to the reader that Wilson has an extremely astute radar for ideas in biology that have the potential to artificially relieve humans of the unbearable agony of the human condition. In the case of kin selection, it was Wilson who developed it into a fully evolved theory for excusing humans' individualistic, self-preoccupied, selfish, competitive and aggressive, human-condition-afflicted behaviour—he even did the branding for it, naming it Sociobiology. As we will see, he used this kin-selection-based misrepresentation of social behaviour to dismiss and denigrate our wonderful unconditionally selfless, genuinely altruistic, truly loving moral instinctive self or soul as nothing more than a selfish strategy for reproducing our genes. It was Wilson who took the idea of kin selection and developed it into a super weapon to dishonestly and artificially remove those three problems that Social Darwinism encountered—namely that the apparent selfless behaviour of some animals, especially ants and bees, contradicted the argument that selfishness is a universal characteristic in nature; that we humans have unconditionally selfless moral instincts; and that there is an integrative theme in nature.

Wilson first became aware of Hamilton's kin selection idea in 1965, a year after it was published, and while initially sceptical, he (as described in his 2012 book *The Social Conquest of Earth*) soon **'became enchanted by the originality and promised explanatory power of kin selection.** [And] **In 1965, with Bill Hamilton at my side, I defended the idea before a mostly hostile audience at the Royal Entomological Society of London'** (p.169 of 330). All humans suffer from the human condition but it is evident that Wilson suffers from it a great deal. For example, as will be described later, he abhors religion and the concept of God almost as much as Richard Dawkins, Oxford University's Professor of Public Understanding of Science, which is saying a lot because Dawkins absolutely loathes religion and the concept of God—to the point that the latter has said such things as **'"faith is one of the world's great evils, comparable to the smallpox virus, but harder to eradicate. The whole subject of God is a bore"…those who teach religion to small children are guilty of "child abuse"'** (quoted by Garth Wood, *The Spectator*, 20 Feb. 1999). As explained in Part 3:11H, the rejection of religion and the concept of God is a position many people adopted when they became overly upset; to mention some of what was said in Part 3:11H, 'By retaining the presence of a prophet's soundness and truth, religions reminded humans of their own corrupted state and their alienation from truth, which in turn accentuated their sense of guilt; as the author Mary McCarthy once wrote about religion, **'Only people who are very good can afford to become religious; with all the others it makes them worse'** (*Memories of a Catholic Girlhood*, 1957).' I believe—and, as we will see, Wilson's unsurpassed record in contriving human-condition-avoiding, supposedly-first-principle-based-biological denials (I will later call him 'the Lord of Lying') supports this opinion—that the reason Wilson **'became enchanted'** with the **'promised explanatory power of kin selection'** was its **'promised' 'power'** to avoid the issue of the human condition.

In 1975 Wilson published his most well-known book, *Sociobiology: The New Synthesis*, in which he explained for the general public that the apparent unconditionally selfless behaviour of completely social ants, bees, termites, wasps, beetles, shrimps, aphids and mole rats, and the other completely social colonial species, is actually reciprocal selflessness, which, as stated, means it is actually selfish not selfless behaviour. He went further, maintaining that Hamilton's haplodiploid hypothesis explanation for how sterile worker ants and bees evolved lent credence to kin selection's argument that the focus of natural selection was the individual not the group or larger whole. But, most significantly, Wilson extrapolated beyond the ant and bee situation to argue that kin selection also explained how **'altruistic behaviour could evolve *without* the need for group-level selection'** in *all* situations where selfless behaviour had been said to occur—*including even our own moral instincts!* He wrote (the underlining is mine): **'Sociobiology is defined as the systematic study of the biological basis of all social behavior. For the present it focuses on animal societies…**[However,] **One of the functions of sociobiology…is to reformulate the foundations of the social sciences [the study of human societies] in a way that draws these subjects into the Modern Synthesis'** (p.4 of 997).

Yes, it was Wilson's intention to have Sociobiology dismiss our wonderful *unconditionally* selfless, *truly* altruistic, *genuinely* loving, moral instinctive behaviour and nature as nothing more than kin selection's reciprocal selflessness where individuals selflessly help relatives because in doing so they are indirectly selfishly fostering the reproduction of their own genes that their relatives share, which if true, would mean our moral nature is fundamentally selfish and not selfless. In fact, this is the obvious reason why *Sociobiology:*

The New Synthesis became a famous text of such popular appeal. Indeed, the great attraction of the kin selection theory for social behaviour is that it maintains the selfishness-is-universal-and-natural-and-that-is-why-we-are-selfish excuse, and it is individualistic; its focus is on the individual, *not* on the colony/group/integration/development-of-the-order-of-matter. A 2008 article in *Wired Magazine* perfectly summarised this appeal when it reported that **'many prominent biologists, led by Richard Dawkins, author of *The Selfish Gene*, said no, there was no such thing as a superorganism: Evolution worked on the genes of self-serving individuals only, not groups'** ('E.O. Wilson Returns to the Hive With *Superorganism* Tome', by Josh McHugh, 20 Oct. 2008).

Through the advancement of Sociobiology's human-condition-side-stepping, selfishness-is-all-that-is-occurring-in-nature theory for social behaviour, dishonest biology had certainly gained a substantial head of steam!

So, how was kin selection applied to **'all social behavior'** so that no recognition of the integrative, development-of-order-of-matter process could occur—even the social behaviour **'of human societies'**?

We can begin by looking at some examples of how kin selection supposedly explained apparent selfless behaviour by and between multicellular non-human animal species who have remained sexual (that is, not become sterile and, as a result, effectively enslaved to their mother)—specifically those species who temporarily delay their own reproduction and during that time help the parents raise the next generation, such as wolves, African wild dogs, meerkats, and a number of bird species, including the Australian kookaburra. In such cases, kin selection argues that by successfully raising siblings these animals are indirectly fostering the reproduction of their own genes. However, a possible alternative explanation for this behaviour that *doesn't* involve kin selection might be that by delaying leaving 'home' these animals are giving themselves a greater chance of inheriting the territory occupied by their parents and thus a greater chance of reproducing. In the particular case of African wild dogs, individuals that delay their chances of reproducing and during that time help the dominant female or queen dog raise the next generation have been described as strongly kin-selected because such helpers were assumed to be invariably closely related to that offspring. However, a study has shown that this assumption is not always valid because no less than 25 percent of the packs observed actually contained non-breeding adults that provided parental care to unrelated pups (J. Weldon McNutt, 1996, 'Adoption in African wild dogs, *Lycaon pictus*', *Journal of Zoology*, 240: pp.163-173).

For situations of apparent selfless behaviour among multicellular animal species that haven't fully (like ants, etc) or temporarily (like wolves, etc) abandoned their own sexual reproduction, we can revisit the alarm calls given by vervet monkeys, which, while they may alert other monkeys to danger, seemingly expose the caller to an increased risk of predation. A study of these monkeys showed that such calls are more likely to occur if offspring is present, suggesting kin selection (Eckhart Arnold, 2008, *Explaining Altruism: A Simulation-Based Approach and Its Limits, Vol. 1*, p.151 of 310). However, an alternative explanation for the calls would be, as has been mentioned, that while giving an alarm call does expose the caller to increased risk, the caller also benefits from others giving the alarm call, so that overall there is a net benefit to

each member in giving alarm calls. Interestingly, when a female vervet monkey is attacked, non-relatives will often come to her aid, and studies show that the likelihood that help comes from a non-relative is strongly correlated to how recently the distressed monkey groomed its rescuer—further suggesting 'reciprocal altruism', where one individual helps another individual who is not necessarily related but with the expectation that the gesture will be repaid in-kind (Robert Seyfarth & Dorothy Cheney, 1984, 'Grooming, alliances and reciprocal altruism in vervet monkeys', *Nature*, 308: pp.541-543).

A study of the alarm calls given by prairie dogs found that they modified their rate of calling when closer to both offspring and non-descendant kin (cousins, etc), however, another study found that while some prairie dog individuals with nearby kin refuse to give alarm calls, others with no nearby kin do sometimes call (studies by John Hoogland; *Summary of Research and Teaching for John Hoogland*, accessed May 2012 at <https://www.umces.edu/sites/default/files/al/johnresearch.pdf>). The point being that there is no definitive evidence that kin selection is influencing the behaviour of all these animals.

While it is quite common for vampire bats to fail to feed on any given night, to go without food for a couple of days is potentially fatal. To offset this risk, however, bats are known to donate blood (through regurgitation) to other members of their group who have failed to feed, thus saving them from starvation. The kin selection explanation for such behaviour is based on the claim that feeding usually occurs between individuals of the same group who are, on average, cousins. However, researchers claim that such behaviour is a case of straightforward 'reciprocal altruism', for since vampire bats live in small groups and associate with each other over long periods of time, the pre-conditions for 'reciprocal altruism' are likely to be fulfilled. Further, in the same study it was shown that bats tend to share food with their close associates, were more likely to share with others that had recently shared with them, and do not share blood easily with new members of their group—all of which suggests that these blood-sharing ties are established over time (Gerald Wilkinson, 1984, 'Reciprocal Food Sharing in the Vampire Bat', *Nature*, 308: pp.181-184; Gerald Wilkinson, 1988, 'Reciprocal altruism in Bats and Other Mammals', *Ethology and Sociobiology*, 9: pp.85-100).

A study of sun-tailed monkey communities has apparently shown that maternal kin (kin related through their mothers) behaved more preferentially towards each other, although it is claimed that once kin were removed beyond that of half-siblings this bias dropped significantly (Marie Charpentier, 2008, 'Relatedness and Social Behaviors in Cercopithecus solatus', *International Journal of Primatology*, 29 (2): pp.487-495). A possible alternative explanation for such behaviour would be that being primates these monkeys have developed some love-indoctrinated empathy for those they have been raised with.

I should mention the other variety of apparent selfless behaviour that quite obviously doesn't involve any kin selection is the apparent selfless behaviour that occurs between different species, which is called 'mutualism' (the difference between 'mutualism' and 'reciprocal altruism' being that with 'reciprocal altruism' the benefits are spread over time rather than through a single interaction). For example, certain fish groom other species of fish to their mutual benefit, cleanliness on one hand and food on the other—a relationship that obviously involves strong sanctions against cheating; after all, were the groomed to eat its groomer it could never again use that particular groomer!

(Note again that I have described all the selfless behaviour referred to above as 'apparent selflessness' because all 'selfless' behaviour amongst animals, apart from the unconditionally selfless behaviour developed through love-indoctrination, is actually reciprocal selflessness, which means it is actually *selfishness*—because genes have to ensure they reproduce. All apparent selfless behaviour, outside of that which occurs through the love-indoctrination process, *has* to ultimately lead to the reproduction of the genes that account for that behaviour in order for that behaviour to become established, which means there is a selfish benefit to that behaviour—it is not *unconditionally* selfless behaviour, it is not *genuinely* altruistic. As such, non-human 'selfless' behaviour should be described as 'apparent selfless behaviour', or 'apparent altruistic behaviour', or, at the very least, have quotation marks around the world 'selfless' and 'altruistic' to indicate that such behaviour is not real or true selfless, altruistic behaviour.)

With regard to kin selection's supposed ability to explain **'all social behavior'**, including the social behaviour **'of human societies'**—that is, to supposedly explain our unconditionally selfless, moral nature—that claim will be dealt with in the following Parts, however, I will quickly address the issue here. As briefly explained in Part 4:4D, and as will be fully explained in Part 8:4B, it was through the nurturing, love-indoctrination process that we humans acquired an instinctive orientation to behaving *unconditionally* selflessly towards each other, and indeed towards all of life. Humans' capacity to behave *unconditionally* selflessly, such as that demonstrated by charity workers in caring for the poor and the suffering, *is not* based on any form of reciprocity; we humans have a moral conscience, an instinctive orientation to behaving in an *unconditionally* selfless, *truly* altruistic, *genuinely* loving way. It is ludicrous to suggest that through helping the poor and suffering in foreign lands a charity worker is somehow furthering their own chances of reproducing—the individuals benefitting would be entirely unrelated to the charity worker. **'**[M]**isplaced parental behavior'** or **'incidental' 'consequences of individual activities'** hardly explains our capacity to be *universally* benevolent. As the British journalist Bryan Appleyard pointed out about this fundamental flaw in kin selection, biologists **'still have a gaping hole in an attempt to explain altruism. If, for example, I help a blind man cross the street, it is plainly unlikely that I am being prompted to do this because he is a close relation and bears my genes. And the animal world is full of all sorts of elaborate forms of cooperation which extend far beyond the boundaries of mere relatedness'** (*Brave New Worlds: Staying Human in a Genetic Future*, 1998, p.112). However, that **'gaping hole'** in denial-complying, mechanistic biology's ability to explain the *truly* altruistic, unconditionally-selfless-to-*all*-humans behaviour that we are capable of is now filled by our capacity to truthfully explain the human condition and, in so doing, safely admit the whole integrative process—namely how the process of integrating matter struggled under the limitation of genes' inability to develop unconditional selflessness, and how our human ancestors were able to overcome that limitation through the development of love-indoctrination and develop *genuinely* altruistic, *unconditionally-selflessly*-inclined-to-all-humans-and-indeed-towards-all-of-life moral instincts.

Before outlining exactly what is wrong with kin selection, I should mention the work of John Maynard Smith, the second of the four main architects of the kin-selection-based theory of Sociobiology.

In 1964, the same year that William Hamilton published his two papers on kin selection, Maynard Smith, who has been described as **'legendary** [in his] **opposition to group selectionist thinking'** (Samir Okasha, 2005, 'Maynard Smith on the levels of selection question', *Biology and Philosophy*, Vol.20, No.5: pp.989-1010), published a paper titled 'Group Selection and Kin Selection' that was critical of naive group selection thinking and supported kin selection theory. It was in this paper that the term 'kin selection' was introduced. However, while Maynard Smith was a main player in the development of kin selection theory, he is more noted for his development of Evolutionary Game Theory (also called ESS theory for 'evolutionarily stable strategy'). He argued that by introducing mathematical models from 'game theory' into the study of animal behaviour he could explain, among other things, how cooperation could evolve among non-relatives without the need for group selection. I'm not sure of the soundness or otherwise of his mathematical models, and I'm not sure that anyone else is, but what I am certain of is that to try to use evolutionary game theory in this way was another desperate effort to eliminate any recognition of the integrative process. The real significance of evolutionary game theory is its ability to demonstrate that natural selection can be an extremely subtle process. Evolutionary game theorists have put forward many models evaluating the possible penalties and benefits of different strategies and interactions between animals, some of them remarkable, if not implausible—such as arguing that situations may arise where selfless behaviour is costly but the behavioural alternatives more costly, in which case selflessness may occur without reciprocity simply because it is the more 'cost-effective' or less harmful alternative. What is definitely true is that over time natural selection will ensure animals are extremely finely tuned to how best to survive and reproduce. As I write this, a butcher bird is perched on the edge of the bird bath that sits outside our window. Watching him I am wondering how long natural selection would allow him to sit in the sun and indulge in its warmth—my suspicion is that survival pressures are so intense for species that every action each individual performs will have been stripped of any behaviour that is at all frivolous. I think that one day when we humans are free of the human condition and can immerse ourselves in the agony of the animal condition we are going to be shocked at just how fiercely competitive and stressed their lives are. I love animals enormously, they are my great passion, they have always been my soul's true friend and my world is empty without them—if I was in jail I would need at least a mouse or a sparrow with me or I would die—but this love of animals doesn't mean I need to romanticise their lives, not see their reality for what it is. Looking at life through biology only makes you more empathetic with it, not less.

I often wonder about what could be described as 'short term successful vs long term unsuccessful' strategies. For example, since larger males of many species tend to win out against smaller males, there must be a very strong evolutionary selection for larger size, but eventually a drought or some other devastating environmental event will occur and suddenly

those with a smaller body who don't need as much food will have the advantage and thus be better able to survive. So, supposedly males of species in this situation are at the mercy of an endless cycle of getting bigger only to then have to become smaller—but possibly natural selection does eventually find a way of avoiding these boom-bust cycles, but just what that mechanism is I am not sure. Can natural selection avoid the 'short term successful, long term unsuccessful' trap for example? Possibly there are game theory studies that I am not aware of that have put forward an answer to this question.

Similarly, for a long time I couldn't believe how wasteful eucalyptus trees are. Unlike a beautifully ordered pine, or even a symmetrical oak, eucalypts have branches that grow in all directions and to different lengths, and they seem to be forever dropping dead branches and generally behaving in a chaotic way. Why hasn't natural selection 'tidied them up'? Eventually I worked out that eucalypts must be an 'upstart species'—they must have hit upon a breakthrough in evolution that they are so rapidly exploiting that they haven't had time to become refined in the new situation. Undoubtedly the breakthrough is that they are extraordinarily fire-encouraging (because of their very waxy, oily leaves and bark) and extremely fire-adapted (because of their epicormic buds that are kept protected by the outer bark but grow quickly after fire). Indeed, the fires that now erupt every 10 to 20 years in the all-dominating gum forests of Australia incinerate virtually all other wildlife, animal and vegetable, that happens to be in their path. Interestingly, in the history of Australia's flora **'the gums are…all but absent until a few tens of thousands of years ago'** (from a review of Ashley Hay's 2002 book *Gum, Bulletin* mag. 19 Nov. 2002). It was the arrival of humans to Australia a few tens of thousands of years ago, with their practice of burning off the scrub to both trap, and later attract, game to the short regrowth, that apparently enabled these gum trees to become so pervasive because evidently fires ignited by lightning strikes are too infrequent to allow the fire-weed, gum tree monoculture to develop the way it has in Australia. If fires from lightning strikes *had been* numerous enough to allow for the proliferation of gums then surely eucalypts would have appeared much earlier in the fossil record. Nowadays, of course, eucalypts are so successful in Australia that it is said that every variety of plant community will be dominated by a variety of eucalypt, with the one exception perhaps being the very dry inland that still seems to be dominated by acacias. I have read that, be it heathland, scrub, open woodland or forest, **'eucalypts always come out on top'**. Australians have come to love their eucalypts but in some ways they are like dangerous crocodiles planted tail-down everywhere—a 'predator' at the ready.

The point I am making is that 'the animal and plant condition' is an amazingly complex, refined and constantly refining existence, and evolutionary game theory is an evasive, superficial, pre-human-condition-understood, old-world recognition of the extraordinary subtlety of the natural selection process.

So what is the truth about the kin selection-based theory of Sociobiology? Certainly ant and bee and the other colonial species' social behaviour can be explained by reciprocal selflessness—which is, of course, actually selfishness because by supporting the queen the workers are ensuring she reproduces their genes. And certainly the social behaviour of the remaining non-human multicellular animal species can also be explained by reciprocal

selflessness, which again is actually selfishness because whatever apparent selfless behaviour they practice still needs to lead to the genes for that behaviour being reproduced. Both situations seemingly uphold the 'selfishness is universal, we can't help it if we behave selfishly because that's the way we were born' excuse, but the highly confronting, exposing and condemning integrative development of larger wholes (which the colonial ants and bees and the few other completely social colonial species bear such stark witness to) still needed to be eliminated. And to achieve that required the individual-only-emphasising, kin selection explanation (rather than the group/society/integration-recognising, 'reciprocal altruism'-type explanation) for the apparent selfless behaviour. The question is whether the kin selection explanation for **'all social behaviour'** is valid. (Again, the reason kin selection had to explain **'all'** social behaviour is because any social behaviour that wasn't able to be explained by kin selection would leave the door open to the possibility of social behaviour being evidence for Integrative Meaning. For Integrative Meaning to be avoided *all* social behaviour had to be able to be explained in an individual-interest-only, not integration-developing, way.)

A great deal of mathematical modeling has certainly been carried out to show how the relatedness of one individual to another might influence how much it could afford to support the other—and indeed it makes sense to me that kinship or relatedness *would* have been picked up by natural selection as a factor influencing reproductive success and therefore *would* be playing some part in the development of social/integrated behaviour of some species. However, I am sceptical that it plays as big a part as the proponents of kin selection-based Sociobiology would have us believe—especially when there are often less complex and more straightforward biological explanations for the behaviour that don't involve kin selection, such as those put forward in the situations described above. These examples also raise the issue of inconsistency, in that some species that share a lot of genetic material don't behave 'selflessly' and cooperatively, while other species that share little do. And despite every effort having been made to do so, kin selection certainly does *not* explain humans' *genuinely* altruistic, *all* loving, *unconditionally* selfless, moral instincts—our moral instinctive capacity to behave unconditionally selflessly towards *all* humans, even those who are not necessarily relatives, such as charity workers helping the poor and suffering in other countries. Again, **'misplaced parental behavior'** or **'incidental' 'consequences of individual activities'** hardly explains our capacity to be *universally* benevolent. Above all, given these inconsistencies, and just how horrific the agony of the human condition is, it is extremely likely that the attachment to and excessive promotion of kin selection is precisely because of its ability to deny Integrative Meaning and thus relieve us of the implications of that truth.

I now need to describe how the architect of the whole get-out-of-jail, human-condition-avoiding Sociobiology explanation for social behaviour, E.O. Wilson, himself now admits that his sociobiological theory is wrong. Yes, Wilson now admits that his whole, massive, 997-page, supposedly rigorously scientifically argued and evidenced tome is completely wrong! *Sociobiology: The New Synthesis* has so many mathematical equations, diagrams and charts you do suspect you are looking at the smoke and mirrors kit of an illusionist, and now its author has virtually admitted that it is indeed one big con job, although he plays it down as **'a phantom mathematical construction' 'misadventure'** (*The Social Conquest of Earth*, 2012, pp.181, 182 of 330)! Yes, in his latest—and reportedly last—book, *The Social Conquest of Earth*, Wilson appears

to have changed sides and stopped lying by admitting that **'kin selection theory is…incorrect'** (p.143), is **'inoperable'** (p.180), has **'failed'** (p.181), and **'does not work'** (ibid). As we are now going to see, Wilson does, to my and no doubt many others' enormous relief, admit his Sociobiology theory is flawed; however, what will be revealed shortly is that he actually hasn't changed his tune at all. Far from it. In fact, as has been alluded to throughout this presentation, we will see that with this *new* tome Wilson is actually introducing an even more sophisticated, tricky form of biological dishonesty—but, as I say, we will come to that shortly. For the present discussion, what is important is that in *The Social Conquest of Earth* Wilson does admit that his kin selection-based theory of Sociobiology is wrong.

Firstly, with regard to the haplodiploid hypothesis explanation for the development of ant and bee colonies that supposedly lent such powerful credence to the theory of kin selection, and which Wilson said for him **'initially gave the** [kin selection] **formula its magnetic power'**, in *The Social Conquest of Earth* Wilson has recognised that **'In the 1960s and 1970s, almost all the species known to have evolved eusociality were in the Hymenoptera** [who are haplodiploid]**. Thus the haplodiploid hypothesis seemingly had powerful support…By the 1990s, however, the haplodiploid hypothesis began to fail. The termites had never fitted this model of explanation. Then, more eusocial groups of species came to light** [colonial species of beetle, shrimp, aphid and mole rats] **that were diplodiploid** [where the haplodiploid hypothesis doesn't hold true] **rather than haplodiploid in sex determination'** (p.170). So, the haplodiploid hypothesis argument that was said to powerfully validate the theory of kin selection has been found to be unsustainable.

The most important concession in *The Social Conquest of Earth* is, however, Wilson's acknowledgement that the whole principle of kin selection's emphasis on the individual at the exclusion of the social, integrative process is fundamentally wrong. In explaining why, Wilson makes the same point I have always made, which is that it is the development and maintenance of the larger whole that is the objective of the natural selection process. As I said earlier, 'the individual parts (eyes, legs, heart, etc) of our body (and, the completely social colonies of animals *do* represent a fully integrated cooperate whole like a body) work to support the maintenance of our entire being, they are not working for themselves; it is the body as a whole that is the concern or focus or purpose of their existence.' In *The Social Conquest of Earth*, Wilson wrote that (the underlinings are my emphasis) **'The workers** [in the completely social/integrated—what Wilson calls 'eusocial'—ant, bee, termite, wasp, beetle, shrimp, aphid, mole rat and a few other colonies]**…are extensions of the queen's phenotype, in other words alternative expressions of her personal genes and those of the male with whom she mated. In effect, the workers are robots she has created in her image that allow her to generate more queens and males than would be possible if she were solitary…the origin and evolution of eusocial insects…is best tracked from queen to queen…with the workers…extensions of the mother queen. The queen and her offspring are often called superorganisms, but they may equally be called organisms. The worker…is part of the queen's phenotype, as teeth and fingers are part of your own phenotype** [pp.143-144] **…**[Kin selection theory, where] **colonial evolution is regarded as the interests of the individual worker pitted against the**

interests of its colony, may no longer be a useful concept on which to build models of genetic evolution in social insects [p.146]**'**. Yes, it is the **'colony'**, not the **'individual worker'**, that matters. Wilson went on to describe how Darwin also **'solved the puzzle' 'of how sterile workers could evolve by natural selection'** by realising **'the mother queen and her progeny together are the target of selection by the external environment. The ant colony is a family, he** [Darwin] **suggested, and "selection may be applied to the family, as well as to the individual, and may thus gain the desired end"** [*The Origin of Species*, ch.7]**'** (*The Social Conquest of Earth*, pp.146-147). Yes, **'the mother queen and her progeny together are the target of selection'** because that is the sexually reproducing individual, *not* the individual worker. The **'ant colony'** constitutes the sexually reproducing individual, which competes with other sexually reproducing individual colonies.

In *The Social Conquest of Earth* Wilson further disowns kin selection theory because he, like me, believes there are often more straightforward explanations for apparent selfless behaviour than those involving kin selection. He wrote: **'Even in the most meticulously analyzed cases presented by various authors as evidence for kin selection, it has been easy to devise explanations from standard natural-selection theory that are at least equally valid. They entail straightforward individual or group selection, or both. Kin selection may occur, but there is no case that presents compelling explanation for its role as the driving force of evolution'** (p.175). He goes on to give examples, including some that I have provided above, of how **'straightforward individual or group selection'** explanations can be **'at least equally valid'** as **'kin selection'** explanations. (I should emphasise that my support of 'group selection' is only in so far as it concerns selection occurring between groups where the group is one sexually reproducing individual, such as a multicellular organism or an ant colony, *not* in regard to selection occurring between groups with sexually reproducing individuals, which, as we will see later when Wilson's 2012 book *The Social Conquest of Earth* is more fully described, is an interpretation Wilson has for group selection that I don't agree with.) He also recognises the inconsistency problem, stating that **'relatedness can be identical in two systems yet cooperation is favoured in one system and not in the other. Conversely, two populations can have relatedness measures on the opposite ends of the spectrum and yet both structures be equally unable to support the evolution of cooperation'** (p.181). He then concludes with this statement: **'Kin selection, if it occurs at all in animals, must be a weak form of selection that occurs only in special conditions easily violated'** (p.181). Yes, **'there is no case that presents compelling explanation for its** [kin selection's] **role as the driving force of evolution'**, and the reason is because the real driving force of evolution is the development of order of matter, the integration of ever larger and more stable wholes—a process that Wilson virtually admits when he writes of the development of **'levels of biological organization, from molecule to population'** (p.173). The old evasive 'evolution-is-not-a-directed-but-random-process' is slipping and integration/'God' is poking its head into biological thinking! But not very far—for as we will shortly see, despite his renouncement of his former lies, with his new book Wilson actually takes biology on a whole new, even more outrageously dishonest course than he did with kin selection.

Part 4:12E Evolutionary Psychology

We will now follow, to its conclusion, Wilson's kin selection-based attack on the truth and see how it eventually evolved into a theory that actually dismissed our wonderful moral soul as **'nothing more than a euphemism'**, after which we will look at how a selfless-emphasising biological movement emerged to counter Wilson's selfishness-emphasising biology.

As mentioned, in his 1975 book *Sociobiology: The New Synthesis*, Wilson wrote that (again, the underlining is my emphasis) **'Sociobiology is defined as the systematic study of the biological basis of all social behavior. For the present it focuses on animal societies…**[However] **One of the functions of sociobiology…is to reformulate the foundations of the social sciences** [**the study of human societies**] **in a way that draws these subjects into the Modern Synthesis'** (p.4 of 997). So, **'For the present'**, Wilson was only focusing on non-human **'animal societies'**. With this comment, however, the door to a full-blown attack on our wonderful *unconditionally* selfless, *genuinely* altruistic, *truly* loving moral instinctive self or soul had been set ajar—so we now need to see how that door was flung wide open and the all-out attack delivered.

Firstly, it cannot be stressed enough how extremely dishonest and dangerous this attack was. While the selfless behaviour of all social non-human multicellular animal species *can be* explained by reciprocal selflessness, which is actually an indirect, subtle form of selfishness (because genes have to ensure they reproduce and carry on), humans' capacity to behave selflessly, such as charity workers caring for the poor and the suffering, *is not* based on reciprocity. We humans have an *unconditionally* selflessly orientated, *genuinely* altruistic, *truly* loving, moral conscience. As was briefly explained in Part 4:4D, and will be fully explained in Part 8:4B, while the highest level of selflessness that can *normally* be developed genetically is reciprocity, where a favour is given on the proviso that it is returned, there *was* a way for the integrative process of the development of order of matter to overcome this impasse and develop unconditionally selfless behaviour and that was through the nurturing, love-indoctrination process, which is how we humans acquired our unconditionally selfless, moral conscience. Therefore, since 'God' is the personification of the selfless, cooperative, loving, integrative ideal state, we humans were **'created…in the image of God'** (Gen. 1:27) because we did once live in that fully integrated, unconditionally selflessly behaved, cooperative, loving ideal state. The eighteenth century philosopher Immanuel Kant spoke the truth about the magnificent purity of our moral capacity for unconditional selflessness when he wrote (and, significantly, had inscribed on his tombstone) the following passage: **'Two things fill the mind with ever new and increasing admiration and awe: the starry heavens above me and the moral law within me'** (*Critique of Practical Reason*, 1788). The exceptionally honest Darwin was no less impressed when he said, **'the moral sense affords the best and highest distinction between man and the lower animals'** (*The Descent of Man*, 1871, ch.4). And yet the **'awe'**-inspiring, marvellously unconditionally selfless, al-*true*-istic, Integrative Meaning/God-representing moral grandeur of our species' original instinctive orientation or soul or psyche (from the Greek word *psykhe*, meaning **'breath, life, soul'** (*Online Etymology Dictionary*)) was poised to be dismissed as nothing more than a reciprocity-based, subtle form of selfishness, an inconsequential **'euphemism'**! But again, for upset humans such a dismissal of our moral sense was extremely relieving because it eradicated the guilt our moral conscience had been causing us—'Hey, with the kin

selection-based theory of Sociobiology we can dismiss our condemning, ideal-behaviour-demanding, guilt-producing, human-condition-causing moral sense as just a subtle form of selfishness. Phew, I feel so much better!' But while this dismissal of our moral conscience as nothing more than a subtle form of selfishness was immensely guilt-relieving for upset humans, it amounted to an all-out assault on the truth about the very nature of our species' instinctive self. In terms of the all-important need for biology to deliver understanding of human behaviour, biologists had instead decided to implement the biggest lie imaginable! For biologists this was the highest form of irresponsibility because the human race was depending on them to get to the truth about ourselves and deliver ameliorating insight into our troubled human condition, not bury us deeper in alienating lies. Unless humans found the biological understanding of ourselves we were doomed to live in tortured alienated darkness forever.

The truth is kin selection doesn't even begin to explain our moral nature. As Bryan Appleyard was quoted earlier as saying, biologists living in the denial-committed, mechanistic paradigm **'still have a gaping hole in an attempt to explain altruism. If, for example, I help a blind man cross the street, it is plainly unlikely that I am being prompted to do this because he is a close relation and bears my genes.'** But such has been the agony of the human condition that denial-committed biologists weren't put off from wrenching that **'gaping hole'** even further apart with their lying. And so only a year after *Sociobiology: The New Synthesis* was published the aforementioned, ardently truth-hating zoologist Richard Dawkins joined the great biological assault on truth, stating in his 1976 book *The Selfish Gene* that **'We** [humans] **are survival machines—robot vehicles blindly programmed to preserve the selfish molecules known as genes** [p.v of 352] **…we, and all other animals, are machines created by our genes…Much as we might wish to believe otherwise, universal love and the welfare of the species as a whole are concepts that simply do not make evolutionary sense** [p.2] **… <u>we are born selfish</u>** [p.3]**'** (1976 edn).

Emboldened, Wilson took the step he threatened to take in *Sociobiology: The New Synthesis*, when he predicted that Sociobiology would eventually be applied to **'the study of human societies'**, publishing in 1978 (just two years after Dawkins' book) the provocatively titled *On Human Nature*, in which he focused directly on biology's supposed ability to explain (actually to dismiss) our wonderful moral soul as nothing more than a subtle form of reciprocity-based selfishness, asserting that our **'Morality has no other demonstrable ultimate function'** other than to ensure **'human genetic material…will be kept intact'** (p.167 of 260). It took a decade or so after *On Human Nature* was published for this soul-destroying (literally and metaphorically) application of kin selection to fully catch on, but by the 1990s it had—so much so, in fact, that biologists gave this misinterpretation of selfless social behaviour, particularly the misinterpretation of *human's* unconditionally selfless, moral, social behaviour, its very own title: '<u>Evolutionary Psychology</u>'. Yes, it was being claimed that biology could now explain the *psychology* of our human situation, our human condition no less! After all, they put the word 'psychology' into the name!

So how does kin selection-based Evolutionary Psychology claim to explain the psychology of the human condition? It might initially be thought that asserting that humans' born-with, instinctive moral sense is nothing more than a subtle form of kin selection-based selfishness was legitimising selfish behaviour, but as Dawkins explained in *The Selfish Gene*, **'My own feeling is that a human society based simply on the gene's law of universal ruthless selfishness**

would be a very nasty society in which to live. But unfortunately, however much we may deplore something, it does not stop it being true…if you would extract a moral from it [from his book *The Selfish Gene*, it would be to]**…Let us try to *teach* generosity and altruism, because we are born selfish'** (p.3). In terms of avoiding the agony of the human condition, the value of dismissing our moral instincts as a subtle form of kin selection-based selfishness and, by so doing, maintaining the argument that selfishness is the **'universal'** characteristic of nature, is that it said that it wasn't our fault that we are selfish; it said that we can't help it if we are selfish because it's just the natural state **'we are born'** with. It said we are excused, but that doesn't mean we shouldn't try to do something to rectify that state—**'Let us try to *teach* generosity and altruism'**, as Dawkins advised. So, <u>according to Sociobiology, now called Evolutionary Psychology, **'we are born selfish'**, an attitude we then have to try to control or overcome. We are born 'bad' but have to try to be 'good', and since the dilemma of 'good and bad' in the human make-up is what the human condition is, Sociobiology and its elaboration, Evolutionary Psychology, was supposedly explaining the human condition!</u> The fundamental <u>psychological</u> predicament of humans had supposedly been explained using biological/<u>evolutionary</u> reasoning—hence the supposed justification for re-badging Sociobiology as <u>Evolutionary Psychology</u>: evolutionary biology was supposedly now explaining the psychology of the human condition!

In 1994 the science writer Robert Wright presented an introduction to Evolutionary Psychology with his brazenly titled book, *The Moral Animal—Why we are the way we are: The new science of evolutionary psychology*. In it he wrote that **'What is in our genes' interests is what seems "right"—morally right, objectively right, whatever sort of rightness is in order'**, **'In short: "<u>moral guidance" is a euphemism</u>'** (pp.325, 216 of 467)! Yes, here is the full-scale attack on our soul that I foreshadowed—Evolutionary Psychology's dismissal of our wonderful moral soul as nothing more than **'a euphemism'**! So, 'We can forget our soul, forget the whole idea of our moral sense of right and wrong having any real basis, that's rubbish, it's just our genes being subtly selfish, it's just a form of kin selection-based reciprocity—in fact, the whole idea that there is a cooperatively orientated, loving, *unconditionally*-selfless, other-people-must-be-considered, ideal-behaviour-demanding moral conscience in us humans has no foundation. The sense of guilt we humans have been enduring from our moral conscience has no biological basis'!! With regard to the specific issue of the human condition, Wright then wrote that **'Evolutionary psychology professes to be <u>the surest path to a complete explanation of human behaviour, good and bad</u>, and of the underlying psychological states: love, hate, greed, and so on. <u>And to know all is to forgive all</u>. Once you see the forces that govern behavior, it's harder to blame the behaver'** (ibid. pp.347-348). So, here we see it being directly stated that **'Evolutionary psychology'** is presenting **'the surest path to a complete explanation'** of the human condition, the **'good and bad'** aspect **'of human behaviour'**! Not only that, it was being stated that this explanation will bring about the psychological amelioration and rehabilitation of the human race—that **'to know all is to forgive all. Once you see the forces that govern behavior, it's harder to blame the behaver'**!!

There was no holding back now, but the truth is this kin selection-based theory of Evolutionary Psychology doesn't go anywhere near addressing the issue of the human condition, let alone solving it and by so doing bringing about the amelioration of that condition. Rather, as has been carefully explained and evidenced throughout this Part 4:12, the whole kin selection argument is completely dedicated to *avoiding* the whole issue of the

human condition. To claim that the human condition had been explained and could now be ameliorated, when, in fact, the human condition was being determinedly avoided with the effect that the psychosis and neurosis in humans was actually being greatly added to, *not* diminished, was an extremely sophisticated form of delusion and deception.

I would now like to more fully spell-out how Evolutionary Psychology claimed to be able to 'explain' the human condition. As just mentioned, the value of kin selection's dismissal of our moral instincts as being selfish is that it said that 'It isn't our fault that we are selfish because it's just the natural state **'we are born'** with. We are excused, but that doesn't mean we shouldn't have to try to do something about it'—**'Let us try to *teach* generosity and altruism'** (as Dawkins urged). So, according to Sociobiology and Evolutionary Psychology, **'we are born selfish'** which we then have to try to control. We are born **'bad'** but have to try to be **'good'**, and since the dilemma of **'good and bad'** in the human make-up is the human condition, Evolutionary Psychology was supposedly explaining the human condition.

This trick of making our instincts appear to be what makes us capable of **'universal ruthless selfishness'**, as Dawkins said, and our conscious mind the noble force that has to control this supposed barbaric instinctive part of ourselves, that has to **'try to *teach* generosity and altruism'**, was explained earlier in Part 4:9, when, under the heading 'Fourth Category of Thinker: The great majority of the human race who avoided the whole issue of a psychosis in our human situation by simply blaming our selfish and aggressive behaviour on supposed brutish and savage animal instincts within us that our intellect supposedly has to control', the following was stated: 'So instead of our conscious intellect being the guilty party, in the sense of being that part of ourselves that caused us to 'fall from grace' and have to be banished from the Garden of Eden of our original innocent, cooperatively orientated, all-loving, moral instinctive state (as Moses, Plato and all our mythologies have so honestly admitted), our conscious intellect was made out to be the faultless, good part of ourselves—a manipulation of the truth that condemned our instincts as the villain: 'Wonderful, we *are* good, our conscious self is good and our instincts are awful, what a relief, I, my conscious thinking self, feels terrific.' Never mind that this was all an outrageous, reverse-of-the-truth lie. What a trick! Instead of our instinctive past being a **'paradise'**, **'Golden Age'** of **'togetherness'** before **'the dawning of individual consciousness'** brought about a world of highly intelligent people living an immensely insecure, **'shrill, brittle, self-important life'**, which in truth is **'a graveyard where the living are dead'**, our instincts were deemed bad while our intellect was viewed as wonderful! What a complete and terrible assault on the truth, but what a relief for our upset, corrupting intellect! We, our conscious thinking self, had finally made ourselves out to be the hero that we have always intuitively believed we were, and in fact are, but it was a hollow 'achievement' based on an absolute lie! We had lifted the burden of guilt, the psychological insecurity of the issue of our less-than-ideally-behaved human condition, but we had done so fraudulently. The elements involved in the human condition of moral instincts and a corrupting intellect weren't being looked at honestly, rather, the complete opposite was occurring—those elements were being totally misrepresented. The human condition wasn't being confronted—it was being hidden behind an absolutely incredible mountain of lies!' (Note, the sources of the few quotes within this text can be found in Part 4:9.)

So, our instincts are the villains while our conscious thinking self is the blameless mediating 'hero' that had to try to control those supposed vicious instincts within us—what a reverse-of-the-truth lie, but what blessed relief it offered from the agony of the human condition.

In 1998, only a few years after Wright's book was published, the lying continued with Wilson's release of another book, *Consilience: The Unity of Knowledge*, in which he took the art of denial to yet another level, suggesting Evolutionary Psychology's alleged ability to explain the moral aspects of humans meant biology and philosophy, the sciences and the humanities, indeed science and religion, basically reality and ideality (ideality in the form of our moral instincts, which had now been dismissed as a mere **'euphemism'**), the dilemma of the human condition no less, could at last be solved. In it he spoke of **'the attempted linkage of the sciences and humanities…of consilience, literally a "jumping together" of knowledge…to create a common groundwork of explanation'** (p.6 of 374), and went so far as to not just use the words 'good' and 'bad' as Wright had done, but actually use the words 'human condition', claiming that **'The strongest appeal of consilience is…the value of understanding the human condition with a higher degree of certainty'** (p.7). An extract from *Consilience*, published in the prestigious journal *The Atlantic Monthly* (Apr. 1998), in an article boldly titled 'The Biological Basis of Morality', featured this introduction: **'Philosophers and theologians have almost always conceived of moral instincts as being transcendent or God-given. Is it possible, though, that ethical reasoning derives not from outside but from our very nature as evolving material creatures?'** Just how bold Wilson was in his claim to have made sense of the philosophical, spiritual and religious aspect of human life using kin selection is also apparent in one of the headings used in the extract, **'The Origins of Religion'**. Religions have been the custodians—albeit using abstract, metaphysical terms—of Integrative Meaning (represented as it is by the concept of 'God'), of the existence of our 'Garden of Eden', innocent, integrated past and its representation in us of our moral 'soul', and of our species' present corrupted, 'fallen', human-condition-afflicted, 'sinful', psychologically upset state. These truths certainly can be explained biologically without invoking a **'transcendent'**, interventionist, 'creationist', 'intelligently-designing' God, as has been done in this presentation. Similarly, the deeper issue of **'the human condition'**, the dilemma of the existence of 'good and evil' in the human make-up, can be explained biologically, as has also been done in this presentation. But to use biological lies to 'explain' these subjects and, by so doing, fraudulently 'produce' the reconciliation or **'consilience'** of science and religion was an act of diabolical dishonesty, an outrageous assault on truth. Of course, in terms of needing to avoid the scientific demystification of God and of what our soul actually is and of the true nature of our moral sense, the essential 'achievement' of Wilson's work was that he had seemingly provided a way to deny these truths. Indeed, he made his overall point unequivocally when he wrote in *Consilience* that '[Jean-Jacques] **Rousseau claimed** [that humanity] **was originally a race of noble savages in a peaceful state of nature, who were later corrupted…**[but <u>what]</u> **<u>Rousseau invented</u>** <u>[was]</u> **<u>a stunningly inaccurate form of anthropology</u>'** (p.37). It has been said that the most forceful and thus effective lie is the lie that puts forward the complete opposite of the truth—well, this statement by Wilson is yet another example of an all-out, no-holds-barred, unrestrained, outrageous reverse-of-the-truth lie.

At this point we need to comprehend the enormity of what has occurred: Wilson has said that his kin selection-based biology explained the human condition and made possible

the psychological rehabilitation of the human race, and explained the origins of religion and brought about the consilience of all knowledge—and yet he has now dismissed and disowned all of these amazing claims as being entirely wrong. That is some incredible manoeuvring: 'I have scientifically argued that I have saved the world, but no, it wasn't science at all and I haven't achieved anything of the kind.' But Wilson's capacity for what is clearly outrageously reckless hubris is, as we are going to see, not a one-off feat, for it is about to happen all over again. Yes, Wilson has gone on to invent another grand synthesis that he claims solves everything, when in truth it solves nothing and actually buries the human race deeper in the mire of alienated sickness. It is a track record of out-of-control delusion, madness no less; but that is, in fact, the reality of the situation that the human race as a whole has arrived at—a state of out-of-control madness that Wilson is really only a reflection of. So while all this lying has become absolutely extreme and it would seem that it couldn't possibly get any worse, we are going to see that it's actually going to get a whole lot worse—to the extent that if anyone were to be watching what is happening on Earth from outer space they would be glued to their Earth-watching channel in absolute astonishment at the level of lying taking place in this corner of the universe.

Part 4:12F A backlash of revulsion develops towards Sociobiology/Evolutionary Psychology's denial of our moral instincts

Not surprisingly, a backlash of revulsion developed towards the lord of lying, duke of denial, bishop of bullshit, king of 'krap', Wilson-led selfishness-justifying, right-wing dismissal and denigration of our moral instincts—a revulsion that was articulated by Randolph Nesse, an American Professor of Psychiatry and Psychology, when, in 1996, he stated that **'The discovery that tendencies to altruism are shaped by benefits to genes is one of the most disturbing in the history of science. When I first grasped it, I slept badly for many nights, trying to find some alternative that did not so roughly challenge my sense of good and evil. Understanding this discovery can undermine commitment to morality—it seems silly to restrain oneself if moral behavior is just another strategy for advancing the interests of one's genes'** (*The Origins of Virtue*, Matt Ridley, 1996, p.126 of 295). In the 2001 documentary series *Testing God*, in the part titled 'Darwin and the Divine' that focused upon Evolutionary Psychology's claimed biological explanation of humans' moral sense, Reverend Martha Overall (from the South Bronx in the USA) deplored the immense deficiency of such accounts, calling them **'very superficial…the real truth lies in the goodness in the hearts of people, especially the hearts of…children** [and those]**…who will go out and save somebody who is homeless and drunk and addicted…that kind of relationship to another human being on the basis of nothing more than their humanity and their basic goodness, one to another, is far more truthful than a bunch of numbers'**.

A **'bunch of numbers'**, scientific evaluation, *is* fine—but they had to relate to the issue and equate with the overall evidence to be true and Evolutionary Psychology's 'subtle form of selfishness' explanation doesn't begin to explain our **'awe'**-inspiring, unconditionally selfless, genuinely altruistic, truly loving moral sense, or relate one little bit to our soul's memory and awareness of a completely cooperative, fully integrated, 'Garden of Eden', 'Golden Age' in our species' past and potential for the future.

Everywhere we look we are surrounded by examples of humans behaving unconditionally selflessly, such as those who sacrifice their lives for moral or ethical principles, or rescue unrelated individuals and even animals, or show charity to the less fortunate by donating to aid organisations and giving blood. And, in truth, these are only superficial examples of our species' extraordinary capacity for unconditional selflessness. As has been explained, since the human condition became fully developed some two million years ago—and even prior to that when consciousness first began to emerge some five million years ago—*every* human who has ever lived has selflessly dedicated his or her life to the hope that a future humanity will be free of the human condition. Every human who has ever lived during all those millions of years has dedicated his or her life to the tasks of accumulating knowledge and heroically defying the insinuation that we humans are fundamentally bad, in the belief that one day, which has now finally arrived, liberating understanding of the human condition would be found. *That* is the greater truth about the extent of the selflessness of humans. We didn't have to struggle to find knowledge and prove our worth, at any stage we could have stopped struggling and given in to the seemingly impossible task before us, *but we didn't*. The members of each generation selflessly dedicated their lives to the hope, one day, of achieving our species' freedom from the binds of the human condition. And in the process of doing so, each generation selflessly resigned itself to the limitations imposed upon it by the times in which it was forced to live. While the psychologically reconciling understanding of the human condition was still to be found, hunter-foragers *had* to be hunter-foragers; when we developed centres for living, city dwellers *had* to accept living in unnatural, alienating cities; egomaniacs *had* to endure being egomaniacs; women *had* to endure a world of intolerably egocentric men—and the list goes on and on. Yes, the true extent of the selflessness of humans is a story that can now finally be told—and it is the most incredible, most fabulous, most wonderful story of sacrifice ever told!

Above all, it is a story about the ever-changing and developing *psychology* of our human situation—how our original innocent, fully cooperative instinctive psyche or soul condemned our intellect, leaving it no choice but to retaliate and repress that wonderfully integratively orientated part of ourselves, with the result that we became upset; that is, psychotic (soul-repressed) and neurotic (mind-distressed) psychological sufferers of the human condition. But, unable to face and deal with this real and main psychological description of our behaviour, we ended up with completely artificial and superficial and deeply dishonest accounts of ourselves—accounts that claimed to be presenting an account of the 'evolutionary psychology' of our situation but were, in fact, not engaging in the psychology of our situation at all; in complete contrast, they were adding *more* layers of psychosis and neurosis to our lives by burying us deeper into Plato's cave of dark alienating denial.

For instance, using kin selection theory, Evolutionary Psychologists claim that **'Women's desire to look like Barbie—young with small waist, large breasts, long blond hair, and blue eyes—is a direct, realistic, and sensible response to the desire of men to mate with women who look like her'**, and that men prefer to **'mate with women who look like her'** because **'they are healthier and more fertile than other women'** ('Ten Politically Incorrect Truths About Human Nature', Alan Miller & Satoshi Kanazawa, *Psychology Today*, 1 Jul. 2007). The true, *psychological* explanation (which is presented in Part 7:1) is that sex, as psychologically upset humans practice it, has been all about attacking innocence (innocence being a psychological state where an individual has had relatively little exposure

to the psychologically upset state of the human condition and thus lacks familiarity with and awareness of that upset state) for its unwitting criticism of upset. Men, in particular, sexually violated the innocence of women because of their relative lack of appreciation of the upset men were enduring from having taken on the responsibility of championing the conscious thinking self or ego over the ignorance of our instinctive self. The more innocent a woman was and/or looked, which basically means the younger a woman was and/or looked, the more 'attractive' they were to men for sexual destruction.

The kin selection theory for male homosexuality, which is ostensibly a behaviour that can't reproduce itself, includes the claim that **'research has demonstrated that Samoan male androphiles** [homosexuals] **(known locally as *fa'afafine*) exhibit significantly higher altruistic tendencies toward nieces and nephews than do Samoan women and gynephilic** [heterosexual] **men…and altruistic tendencies toward nonkin children was significantly weaker among *fa'afafine* than among Samoan women and gynephilic men…These findings are consistent with the *kin selection hypothesis*, which suggests that androphilic males have been selected over evolutionary time to act as "helpers-in-the-nest", caring for nieces and nephews and thereby increasing their own indirect fitness'** (Paul Vasey & Doug VanderLaan, 'An Adaptive Cognitive Dissociation Between Willingness to Help Kin and Nonkin in Samoan *Fa'afafine*', *Psychological Science*, Jan. 2010). But, as even the Evolutionary Psychologist Robert Wright pointed out in *The Moral Animal* in response to similar kin selection theories for homosexuality: **'First of all, how many homosexuals spend an inordinate amount of time helping siblings, nephews, and nieces? Second, look at what many of them do spend their time doing: pursuing homosexual union about as ardently as heterosexuals seek heterosexual union. What's the evolutionary logic in that? Sterile ants don't spend lots of time caressing other sterile ants, and if they did it would constitute a puzzle'** (p.384). The human-condition-confronting rather than human-condition-avoiding, real, *psychological* explanation for male homosexuality (a more comprehensive account of which is presented in *A Species In Denial* in the chapter titled 'Bringing peace to the war between the sexes' at <www.humancondition.com/asid-men-and-women>) is that young men are the last bastion of psychological innocence that can be found for sexual destruction because men, being the main perpetrators of the sexual destruction of innocence, aren't normally exposed to having their own innocence destroyed through sex like women have been, and so when men become overly psychologically upset and, as a result, lose their naivety and are able to actually realise that women are no longer truly innocent but merely the *image* of innocence, it is the enduring innocence in young men that they become attracted to.

So, the attractiveness of women depends on how little psychological upset/hurt/soul-damage they have, and/or have *appeared* to have, experienced in infancy and childhood, while male homosexuality is a sexual orientation that results from being overly psychologically upset/hurt/soul-damaged in infancy and childhood. But these are extremely confronting truths to have to face, and as emphasised, kin selection-based Evolutionary Psychology is all about finding ways to *avoid* the real psychological issue of the human condition—no matter how absurd the form of evasion. It maintains that the attractiveness of younger women has nothing to do with them being less psychologically corrupted, or at least the appearance of that state, rather it's due to a genetic reproductive strategy; and, similarly, that male homosexuality is not due to a psychosis, but is also due to a genetic reproductive strategy. And the 'blame-it-on-savage-instincts-rather-than-a-psychosis' excuse

goes on: 'Humans don't kill each other in wars because they are psychologically upset, they kill each other in order to reproduce their genes in the same way bulls fight and kill other bulls to ensure they win the mating opportunities.' But such 'explanations' are absurd because our human condition involves our fully conscious mind; humans suffer from a psychological *human condition*, not a non-psychological genetic-opportunism-based, *animal condition*. Arthur Koestler summarised mechanistic, reductionist science's deliberate blindness to the issue of the **'mental disorder'** of our **'unique'** human condition when he wrote that **'symptoms of the mental disorder which appears to be endemic in our species…are specifically and uniquely human, and not found in any other species. Thus it seems only logical that our search for explanations** [of human behaviour] **should also concentrate primarily on those attributes of *homo sapiens* which are exclusively human and not shared by the rest of the animal kingdom. But however obvious this conclusion may seem, it runs counter to the prevailing reductionist trend. "Reductionism" is the philosophical belief that all human activities can be "reduced" to – i.e., explained by – the behavioural responses of lower animals – Pavlov's dogs, Skinner's rats and pigeons, Lorenz's greylag geese, Morris's hairless apes…That is why the scientific establishment has so pitifully failed to define the predicament of man'** (*Janus: A Summing Up*, 1978, p.19 of 354).

It should be apparent by now that kin selection-based Evolutionary Psychology is a contrivance that enables the upset human race to avoid having to face the unbearable agony of the devastating truth of the psychosis and neurosis of its condition. It is a way of pretending that the 'psychology' of the human condition is being faced and dealt with when, in fact, the absolute opposite is occurring; it is effectively advocating 'running from the truth of the psychology of the human condition as fast as your legs can carry you'! Apart from in the term Evolutionary Psychology itself, Wilson doesn't, in any of his books, even refer to human psychology or psychosis or neurosis or alienation or insecurity of self or depression or self-confrontation. Contrast this with my books that *do* address the psychology of the human condition head-on, and *do* mention these terms thousands of times—because, as R.D. Laing recognised, **'Our alienation goes to the roots. The realization of this is the essential springboard for any serious reflection on any aspect of present inter-human life'** (*The Politics of Experience* and *The Bird of Paradise*, 1967, p.12 of 156). The actual psychology of the human condition is the very last thing Wilson wants to think about. All of his work on kin selection/Sociobiology/Evolutionary Psychology has been entirely concerned with finding a way to 'deal with' (actually 'to dismiss') the human condition so that he *doesn't* have to think about, or **'realiz**[e]**'**, his/humans' psychosis. Evolutionary Psychology is not evolutionary psychology, it is evolutionary anything-but-psychology! To term it 'Evolutionary Psychology' is another ultimate lie, another reverse-of-the-truth lie; it is all about mimicking the truth because its proponents are, in fact, totally unable to face the truth—they are, in effect, saying, 'I can't go near the truth, even though I know I should, so what I will do is pretend I am going near it, which at least will make me feel good, and to hell with the consequences, which are that I am horribly abusing the truth and threatening to make it permanently inaccessible'! This is in reality the meanest, most angry and vengeful state imaginable—but that is the level of upset that has developed in much of the human race now—'I don't care about the human race anymore, I only care about finding some relief from *my* upset condition.'

So, how did humans maintain this tragic game of pretending to 'deal with' the truth without actually going anywhere near it? How did this incredibly dangerous game of pretence and delusion progress? In terms of this explanation of the development of the great denials in biology, we are now up to the point where Evolutionary Psychology's right-wing emphasis on selfishness had become insufferable, to the extent that a backlash movement emerged to try to present a more selflessness-emphasising interpretation of biology. Again, however, it has to be stressed that since no one was prepared to go anywhere near the *actual* psychological issue of the human condition, what we are talking about is merely a shift from a *selfish*-emphasising form of biological lying to a *selfless*-emphasising form of biological lying. As explained in Parts 3:4, 4:1 and 4:4B, science—and this applies to both right-wing selfish-emphasising and left-wing selfless-emphasising science—has been mechanistic and reductionist, not holistic and teleological. It has avoided the critically important truths of Integrative Meaning, the nurturing, love-indoctrination origins of our moral soul, and the psychologically upsetting consciousness versus moral instincts origins of our human condition. Its intention was only to *pretend* to confront the issue of the human condition—to create the illusion that the human condition was being confronted so that we could delude ourselves that we were being responsible when we were, in fact, being the total opposite.

Part 4:12G The by-products of natural selection explanation for our unconditionally selfless moral instincts

As will be described in Part 4:12H, the main theory that developed to counter the right-wing, selfishness-emphasising biology of the Wilson-led Sociobiology/Evolutionary Psychology camp was the extremely dishonest Multilevel Selection 'explanation' for our unconditionally selfless, moral instincts. However, while this account, which was put forward by left-wing, selflessness-emphasising biologists, was (as will be discussed in Part 4:12H) extremely dishonest, its proponents *did* start out on the truthful, right track by recognising that an extra element, or 'step', must have been involved for the fundamentally selfish natural selection process to produce our unconditionally selfless moral instincts.

If I very briefly restate how the love-indoctrination process was able to produce our unconditionally selfless moral instincts, the existence of this 'step' becomes clear.

As briefly described in Part 4:4D, and as will be fully explained in Part 8:4B, the love-indoctrination process accounts for one of the three great mysteries in biology of how the fundamentally selfish natural selection process could have produced our unconditionally selfless, genuinely altruistic, moral instincts. (The other two great mysteries, which have now also been truthfully explained in this presentation, in Parts 3:2 and 8:4C respectively, are what caused the human condition, and how did our fully conscious mind emerge.) The process of love-indoctrination is made possible by the fact that genetic traits for nurturing are selfish (which genetic traits normally have to be if they are to carry on and become established in a species), for through the nurturing and fostering of offspring who carry her genes the mother's genetic traits for nurturing are selfishly ensuring their reproduction into the next generation. However, while nurturing *is* a genetically selfish trait, from an observer's point of view it *appears* to be unconditionally selfless behaviour—the mother is giving her offspring food,

warmth, shelter, support and protection for *apparently* nothing in return. This point is most significant because it means from the infant's perspective, its mother is treating it with real, unconditionally selfless love. The infant's brain is therefore being trained or conditioned or indoctrinated with unconditional selflessness and so, with enough training in unconditional selflessness, that infant will grow into an adult who behaves unconditionally selflessly. Apply this training across all the members of that infant's group and the result is a fully integrated society. The 'trick' in this 'love-indoctrination' process lies in the fact that the traits for nurturing are encouraged, or selected for genetically, because the better infants are cared for, the greater are their, and the nurturing traits', chances of survival. This process does, however, have an integrative side effect in that the more infants are nurtured, the more their brains are trained in unconditional selflessness.

So, the selfish natural selection process fostered maternalism, which had the by-product-effect, or side-effect—which is the aforementioned 'step'—of training an infant's brain in unconditional selflessness. When I came up with the idea of love-indoctrination in the 1970s, my mind had abandoned trying to work out how the selfish natural selection process could have created our unconditionally selfless, moral instincts and had started searching for some by-product of natural selection that might have enabled such instincts to develop. It was when I started carrying out this search and recognised the potential significance of a mother's maternal care appearing to her infant as *real* love, or unconditional selflessness, that the idea of love-indoctrination occurred to me. So looking for a secondary, by-product of natural selection *was* the right path to take in cracking the riddle of how the selfish natural selection process could have created unconditional selflessness, and it was this path for a by-product of natural selection that the left-wing biologists who were trying to contest the 'nature is all about selfishness' account also first started down, but their thinking soon diverged into a cul-de-sac of dishonesty. The following is a description of what transpired.

In a series of articles and papers that were released between the late 1970s and the late 1990s, the prominent selflessness-emphasising, left-wing American biologist Stephen Jay Gould railed against the selfishness-emphasising right-wing biology of Sociobiology and Evolutionary Psychology. In 1986 he labelled Sociobiology **'Cardboard Darwinism'** ('Cardboard Darwinism', *The New York Review of Books*, 25 Sept. 1986), and, eleven years later, referred to its successor, Evolutionary Psychology, as **'Darwinian fundamentalism'** and **'ultra-Darwinism'** ('Darwin Fundamentalism', *The New York Review of Books*, 12 Jun. 1997). In the 1997 article, Gould accurately recognised the fallacy of kin selection's 'there-is-no-group-significance-involved-rather-it's-entirely-about-the-individual-ensuring-it-reproduces-its-genes' interpretation, writing that **'genes struggling for reproductive success within passive bodies (organisms) under the control of genes'** is **'a hyper-Darwinian idea that I regard as a logically flawed and basically foolish caricature of Darwin's… intent'** (ibid). However, when it came to actually countering the 'selfishness-is-a-universal-biological-truth, get-used-to-it, we-humans-don't-have-an-unconditionally-selfless-instinctive-moral-instincts-rather-we-have-selfish-ones', all Gould could do (like me) was basically give up and accept that natural selection *is* a fundamentally selfish process, writing that **'The answers to moral questions cannot be found in nature's factuality in any case, so why not take the "cold bath" of recognizing nature as nonmoral, and not constructed to match our hopes? After all, life existed on earth for 3.5 billion years before we arrived; why should life's causal ways match our prescriptions for**

human meaning or decency?' (ibid). But, in giving up on the ability of natural selection (**'nature's factuality'**, as he described it) alone to **'answer'** the **'moral questions'** and fulfil **'our hopes'** of explaining the origin of humans' extraordinary unconditionally selfless, genuinely altruistic, truly moral instincts—**'our prescriptions for human meaning or decency'**—what Gould did (like I did) was start searching for secondary, by-products (or side-effects) of natural selection that might have enabled our moral instincts to develop.

The main argument given by Gould in his 1986 and 1997 publications to counter the 'selfishness-is-all-that-is-occurring-in-nature' account was actually first presented in 1979 by Gould and another prominent selflessness-not-selfishness emphasising, left-wing American biologist, Richard Lewontin. In a famous joint paper, Gould and Lewontin argued for the importance of the by-products (what they referred to as 'spandrels') of natural selection in explaining some biological outcomes. They complained of **'natural selection…**[being regarded] **as so powerful…it…becomes the primary cause of nearly all organic form, function and behavior…**[such that other influences] **are usually dismissed as unimportant'**, and called for a **'pluralistic approach'** that involves both natural selection and **'alternatives to the adaptationist** [natural-selection-only] **programme'** ('The Spandrels of San Marco and the Panglossian Paradigm: A Critique of the Adaptationist Programme', 1979, *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London*, Series B, Vol.205, No.1161, pp.581-598). To support their case for a **'pluralistic approach'**—one involving both natural selection *and* by-products of natural selection—they referred to Darwin, who, having acknowledged in his Introduction to *The Origin of Species* that there is **'much remaining as yet unexplained in regard to the origin of species'**, concluded that same Introduction with the sentence: **'I am convinced that natural selection has been the main but not exclusive means of modification.'** Yes, being such a truthful and thus effective thinker, Darwin would have also been coming down this road of realising some by-product of natural selection must have been involved in creating our extraordinary unconditionally selfless, moral instincts.

In developing the **'pluralistic'** idea—which, again, involved natural selection *and* by-products of natural selection—Gould suggested in his aforementioned 1997 **'Darwinian fundamentalism'** article **'that the platform of evolutionary explanation houses an assortment of basic cranes, all helping to build the edifice of life's history in its full grandeur…Natural selection may be the biggest crane** [but]**…you need a lot of cranes to build something so splendid and variegated** [as **life's history in its full grandeur**]**'**. Gould's inference here was that the **'grande**[st]**'**, most amazing creation of all in **'life's history'**, which is humans' unconditionally selfless, genuinely altruistic, truly moral instinctive self or soul, must have been developed by a matrix of by-products of natural selection; **'a lot of cranes'**, not only **'natural selection'**.

So, it was being recognised that by-products of natural selection must play a significant part in explaining some biological outcomes, particularly our unconditionally selfless, **'moral'** instincts. The question then being, *which* by-products? It was at this point that the truthful thinking that had been going on became derailed. Examples of biological outcomes that required more than adaptations from natural selection to explain them were certainly provided by Gould and Lewontin—even the example of the extinction of dinosaurs being caused by a meteorite, a scenario entirely outside the scope of natural selection, was referred to—but no accountable by-product of natural selection explanation was put forward to explain our unconditionally selfless, moral instincts. It was simply argued that the *involvement* of

by-products of natural selection was possible, which is true, but the actual origin of our unconditionally selfless, moral instincts remained unanswered.

All that had happened was that the *idea* of pluralism to explain our unconditionally selfless moral instincts had been developed in a way that created the *illusion* that the origin of our moral instincts had been explained. You can see the illusion emerging in Gould's comment that **'you need a lot of cranes to build something so splendid and variegated'** as **'life's history in its full grandeur'**. Since the **'grande**[st]**'** creation of all in **'life's history'** is humans' unconditionally selfless, moral instincts, what Gould was implying was that obviously a matrix of by-products of natural selection, **'a lot of cranes'**, created our moral soul and that's all we need to know. The thinking was to the effect that 'Our unconditionally selfless, moral instincts exist and they had to have emerged somehow, and natural selection on its own can't explain how, so clearly they must have been created by a matrix of by-products of natural selection, so that's all we need to know; our moral instincts exist and they were created by a matrix of by-products of natural selection!'

This simplistic and duplicitous **'pluralistic'** argument employed by left-wing, selflessness-emphasising, kin-selection-defying biologists of an **'assortment of basic cranes, all helping to build the edifice of'** our **'moral' 'decency'** or nature has continued. In the Preface to the 2011 book *Origins of Altruism and Cooperation* (an assemblage of presentations given at a 2009 conference held at Washington University on 'Man the Hunted and the Origin and Nature of Human Sociality, Altruism and Well-Being'), the anthropologist Robert Sussman and the psychiatrist and geneticist Robert Cloninger wrote that **'Social scientists and biologists are learning that there is more to cooperation and generosity in both human and nonhuman group-living animals than an investment in one's own nepotistic patch of DNA. Research in a great diversity of scientific disciplines is revealing that there are many biological and behavioral mechanisms that humans and nonhuman primates use to reinforce pro-social or cooperative behavior. For example, there are specific neurobiological and hormonal mechanisms that support social behavior. There are also psychological, psychiatric, and cultural mechanisms.'** So, it was being alleged that a matrix of **'many biological and behavioral mechanisms'** created **'pro-social or cooperative behavior'**, but how exactly? Certainly **'hormonal'** and **'neurobiological' 'psychological'** and **'psychiatric'**, along with **'cultural'**, influences are involved in the **'support'** of **'social behavior'**, but that doesn't explain our social behaviour at all! Yes, a by-product of natural selection, namely the love-indoctrination process, did create our **'pro-social or cooperative behavior'**, and then those love-indoctrinated moral instincts did clash with our emerging conscious mind to create the psychologically upset state of our human condition—at which point all our **'neurobiological' 'psychological'** and **'psychiatric'** behaviours emerged and then different **'cultur**[es]**'** were created to try to manage that upset. Our hormonal system was also obviously affected by, and became involved in, the development of this upset state. Yes, all the **'hormonal'**, **'neurobiological'**, **'psychological'**, **'psychiatric'** and **'cultural'** aspects of our make-up *are* by-products of natural selection and they *are* all involved in human behaviour—but that doesn't explain the **'origins of altruism and cooperation'** at all. The illusion is that that our moral instincts have been explained when they haven't—but in the desperation to counter the right-wing doctrine that **'cooperation and generosity in both human and nonhuman group-living animals'** is nothing more **'than an investment in one's own nepotistic patch of DNA'** such extreme

illusion was deemed necessary. It was all just more 'smoke and mirrors', but this time from the left-wing camp. (More will be said about the 2011 book *Origins of Altruism and Cooperation* in Part 4:12J.)

The reason why, at the point of recognising that by-products of natural selection must have been involved in creating our unconditionally selfless moral instincts, the honest, effective thinking diverged into a cul-de-sac of dishonesty is because this next step depended on recognising that the particular by-product involved in creating our moral instincts was that of nurturing. And, as was explained in Part 4:4F, the problem with acknowledging the importance of nurturing in human life was that it was an unbearably confronting truth for upset, human-condition-afflicted humans to have to face.

As described in Part 3:11H, while those in the left-wing typically sided with selflessness-emphasising forms of idealism to relieve themselves of the agony of the human condition because they had become too upset to continue fighting against idealism (a responsibility that was left to those in the right-wing), because of that extreme upset they have actually been *more* afraid of encountering the ideals and confronting the human condition than those in the right-wing; in short, those in the left-wing needed a form of idealism to support but have typically been the most afraid of any ideals or truths that brought the issue of the human condition into focus. Their strategy was to *mimic* selfless idealism, to *appear* ideal without actually being ideal and thus able to truthfully acknowledge and face the real issue of their own and the human race's upset human condition. Part 3:11H charts the development of ever more guilt-relieving but dishonest forms of idealism that the left-wing took up to support, but in the case here, while supporting the ideals of selflessness was fine, when it came to actually confronting the agony of the human condition itself, which the truth of the importance of nurturing required, they stopped dead in their tracks and wouldn't go any further. The difference between the right-wing and the left-wing is that, unlike the right-wing, the left-wing were promoting themselves as supporters of the real truth (in this case, the truth of our unconditionally selfless, genuinely altruistic moral instincts), but when that support actually required confronting the truth of the human condition (which the truth of nurturing raised), they suddenly stopped being supporters of the real truth! This fundamental difference between the right-wing and the left-wing is the reason why the left has posed a far more dangerous threat to the human journey than the right. To be pretending to let the truth out when you actually weren't and, moreover, couldn't, was a far more dishonest, subversion-of-the-truth and irresponsible practice than the outright lying being perpetrated by the right-wing. Masquerading lies as the truth is so much more sinister than lying itself.

I should reiterate that even Darwin, who was remarkably secure in self and thus not someone needing to join the ranks of the pseudo idealistic left, found himself unable to go the next step of recognising the importance of nurturing. While at one point in *The Descent of Man* he did actually touch on the idea of nurturing being the origin of our social instincts, writing that **'The feeling of pleasure from society is probably an extension of the parental or filial affections, since the social instinct seems to be developed by the young remaining for a long time with their parents; and this extension may be attributed in part to habit, but chiefly to natural selection'** (1871,

ch.4), he didn't develop the idea into a full account of the origins and consequences of humans' moral nature. As discussed in Part 4:11, he baulked at that step, presumably because he didn't feel secure enough to engage in ideas that involved fully confronting the human condition.

The overall problem, therefore, for biologists from both the left-wing and the right-wing is that they have been operating in a mechanistic, reductionist paradigm that determinedly resisted any encounter with the human condition, which meant they couldn't hope to explain such fundamental questions as the human condition and how we acquired our unconditionally selfless moral instincts—which is the fundamental point being made about this 'Fourth Category of Thinker: The great majority of the human race who avoided the whole issue of a psychosis in our human situation (…etc).' If you're avoiding 'the whole issue of a psychosis in our human situation' you are in absolutely no position to explain it. Again, as R.D. Laing pointed out, **'Our alienation goes to the roots. The realization of this is the essential springboard for any serious reflection on any aspect of present inter-human life.'**

The great questions in biology, indeed the three holy grails of biology, have been to truthfully explain the human condition, which is done in Part 3:2; to truthfully explain the origins of humans' unconditionally selfless moral instinctive self or soul, which is what the love-indoctrination explanation given in Part 8:4B does; and to truthfully explain how we developed full consciousness when other species haven't been able to, which is explained in Part 8:4C. What we are particularly concerned with here, however, is the second of these holy grails in biology of the origin of our unconditionally selfless moral instincts. How could a fundamentally selfish process have produced unconditionally selfless instincts in a species, namely the human species? The immense frustration of mechanistic, reductionist biology is its inability to solve *any* of the three holy grails of biology, including this question of the origin of our moral instincts. Unarguably, mechanistic, reductionist biology has made progress in many areas of inquiry into the nature of our world but biologists now realise that any further advancement depends on solving these three questions, and their inability to do so means mechanistic, reductionist biology is now stalled, piled up and festering at this gateway that it can't seem to get through no matter how hard it perseveres. And the reality is it will never get through because, in the case of our moral instincts, the ability to solve the riddle of how a fundamentally selfish process could have produced unconditionally selfless instincts depends on *not* living in denial of Integrative Meaning, or the fundamental psychosis/alienation of our human situation, or, most particularly, the importance of nurturing both in the maturation of our species and in our own lives. The extent of Stephen Jay Gould's insecurity of self and thus inability to complete the honest path he set out on and find the particular by-product of natural selection that explains the origins of our moral soul, namely nurturing, is reflected in how determinedly he resisted the idea of reconciling science and religion, maintaining that they are **'nonoverlapping magisteria'** ('Nonoverlapping Magisteria', *Natural History* 106, Mar. 1997). Of course, as will be emphasised in Part 8:1, religion and science must ultimately be reconciled for, as the Nobel Prize-winning physicist Charles H. Townes has observed, **'they** [religion and science] **both represent man's efforts to understand his universe and must ultimately be dealing with the same substance. As we understand more in each realm, the two must grow together…converge they must'** (*The Convergence of Science and Religion*, *Zygon*, Vol.1 No.3, 1966). For the exceptionally insecure, however, recognising the science-and-religion-reconciling truth of Integrative Meaning has been an

anathema—in his 'Darwinian Fundamentalism' article that was mentioned earlier Gould actually asserted that **'natural selection'** is **'directionless, nonteleological'**. Gould was someone who was only prepared to imitate the truth, not confront it.

Proof of how mechanistic, reductionist science has been both unwilling and unable to face the truth of the significance of nurturing in explaining the origins of our unconditionally selfless moral nature, is that I, and the supporters of the ideas contained in this presentation, have tried many times to have not only this nurturing explanation for our moral nature recognised by the scientific establishment, but also all the other critically important explanations, such the origin of the human condition and how we humans became conscious—and yet every time these efforts have been rebuffed. These attempts are documented in Part 8:6, however, to present just one example, in 2005 I submitted an abstract of a paper titled 'Nurturing as the Prime Mover in Primate Development and Human Origins' for the International Primatological Society's 2006 Congress in Uganda, but was rejected on the grounds that **'Both reviewers felt this abstract presents no data nor a testable hypothesis and is therefore inappropriate for this congress.'** Despite arguing that my nurturing, love-indoctrination explanation for humans' moral instincts **'contains a great deal of supportive evidence in the form of many summaries of data-supported studies of bonobos and other primates by leading primatologists'**, and **'is an entirely testable, validatable hypothesis, as the evidence just described about bonobos shows'**, and submitting this protest to the President and 38 members of the IPS Congress Committee (including the primatologist Richard Wrangham in his capacity as President of the IPS), the rejection was upheld! (My full correspondence with the IPS can be read at <www.humancondition.com/ips-2006-congress>). Of course, science has a long history of deriding new ideas as 'untestable'. For instance, Bishop Wilberforce, the opponent of natural selection in the great debate about Darwin's theory at Oxford in 1860, said it was a **'theory which cannot be demonstrated to be actually impossible'** (Wilberforce's review of *Origin of Species* in *Quarterly Review*, 1860, p.249); while the geologist and bishop Adam Sedgwick said it was **'not a proposition evolved out of the facts'** ('Objections to Mr Darwin's Theory of the Origin of Species', *The Spectator*, 7 Apr. 1860) and that it was **'based upon assumptions which can neither be proved nor disproved'** (Sedgwick in a letter to Darwin, 24 Nov. 1859). The palaeontologist Louis Agassiz similarly complained that **'absolutely no facts…can be referred to as proving evolution'** (William Penman Lyon, *Homo versus Darwin: A judicial examination of statements recently published by Mr Darwin regarding 'The Descent of Man'*, 1872, p.140); while more recently—and revealingly, I would say, in terms of an apparent prejudice—the philosopher Karl Popper commented, before later changing his mind, that **'Darwinism is not a testable scientific theory'** (*Unended Quest*, 1976, p.168).

Further powerful evidence that it is the human-condition-confronting nature of the nurturing explanation for our moral soul that was the cause of the rejection is the fact that the rejection (of the nurturing explanation) has a significant precedent. As documented in Part 8:5B, the American philosopher John Fiske first put forward the essence of the nurturing explanation for our moral instincts only 15 years after Darwin published his idea of natural selection in *The Origin of Species* in 1859. But despite some very eminent scientists of that era describing Fiske's hypothesis of **'altruistic Love'** having **'developed in the course of evolution from the necessities of maternity'**, as a **'far more important' 'principle'** than Darwin's selfish, **'natural selection by means of the struggle for survival'**, in fact, as **'one of the most beautiful contributions ever made to the Evolution of Man'**, it was eventually totally ignored and left to die!

The fundamental issue here is that until the human condition was explained humans couldn't cope with the truth of the importance of nurturing in human life, and while I am finally presenting the compassionate framework that makes it psychologically safe to admit the importance of nurturing, the explanation is still being rejected because although humans are now defended the problem remains of having to confront so much denied truth about our human condition. As pointed out in Part 3:10, truth day is also exposure day; it is, in fact, the long anticipated **'judgment day'**—so while it is ultimately a 'day' of compassionate understanding, not condemning 'judgment', there is still a great deal of denied truth to have to suddenly encounter and accept. In terms of the progress of new ideas in science, especially ideas that challenge established paradigms, their reception invariably follows a pattern whereby the old paradigm doesn't want to move to the new one, not only because it's confronting but because scientists are attached to the paradigm they have either created (or contributed to) or become accustomed to. The philosopher Arthur Schopenhauer summarised the stages of resistance new ideas in science have historically had to undergo when he **'said that the reception of any successful new scientific hypothesis goes through predictable phases before being accepted'**. First, **'it is ridiculed'** and **'violently opposed'**. Second, after support begins to accumulate **'it is stated that it may be true but it's not particularly relevant'**. Third, **'after it has clearly influenced the field** [including members of the establishment quickly remodelling/plagiarising the ideas as their own discoveries, which unfortunately is something I have experienced] **it is admitted to be true and relevant but the same critics assert that the idea is not original'**. Finally, **'it is accepted as being self-evident'** (compiled from two references to Schopenhauer's quote—*New Scientist*, 15 Nov. 1984 and *PlanetHood*, Ferencz & Keyes, 1988). The physicist Max Planck succinctly described the historical reality of scientific progress when he said that **'science progresses funeral by funeral'** (see his *Scientific Autobiography*, 1948), while the famous playwright George Bernard Shaw warned of the true nature of progress when he wrote that **'All great truths begin as blasphemies'** (from his play *Annajanska*, 1919).

Part 4:12H The Multilevel Selection theory

Part 4:12H-i Introduction

In Part 4:12E it was described how humans' wonderful moral instinctive self or soul has been dismissed by Evolutionary Psychologists as *not* the unconditionally selfless, genuinely altruistic, truly loving entity it really is, but as a form of *reciprocal selflessness*—basically as nothing more than a subtle form of *selfishness*. Among those making this assertion were Richard Dawkins, who said, **'Much as we might wish to believe otherwise, universal love and the welfare of the species as a whole are concepts that simply do not make evolutionary sense…we are born selfish'**, and Robert Wright, who said, **'"moral guidance" is a euphemism'**, and E.O. Wilson, who summarised that **'Rousseau claimed** [that humanity] **was originally a race of noble savages in a peaceful state of nature, who were later corrupted…**[but what] **Rousseau invented** [was] **a stunningly inaccurate form of anthropology.'**

In Part 4:12F I described how a backlash of revulsion developed towards this denigration of our wonderful moral instinctive self as nothing more than a subtle form of selfishness. I recounted how Stephen Jay Gould attacked the right-wing, selfishness-justifying biological

thinking as **'Cardboard Darwinism'**, **'Darwinian fundamentalism'**, **'ultra-Darwinism'** and **'hyper-Darwinian'**, and how, in 1979, Gould and Richard Lewontin attempted to present a left-wing, selflessness-emphasising counter theory based on a by-products-of-natural-selection explanation to argue for the existence of our unconditionally selfless, genuinely altruistic moral instincts. In summarising his argument in 1997, Gould stated that **'Natural selection may be the biggest crane** [but]**…you need a lot of cranes to build something so splendid and variegated** [as **life's history in its full grandeur**]**'**. He was arguing that the **'grande**[st]**'**, most amazing creation of all in **'life's history'**, which is humans' unconditionally selfless, genuinely altruistic, truly loving, moral instinctive self or soul, was developed by a matrix of by-products of natural selection—**'a lot of cranes'** acting in conjunction with **'natural selection'**. As pointed out in Part 4:12G, our unconditionally selfless, moral instincts *did* come about as a result of a by-product of natural selection, namely the nurturing, love-indoctrination process, but, unable to admit this unbearably confronting truth of the importance of nurturing, Gould and Lewontin's *unspecified* by-products-of-natural-selection explanation couldn't and ultimately didn't succeed in *actually* explaining the origins of our unconditionally selfless moral instincts—they only created the *illusion* that it had been explained.

Basically, this matrix, unspecified by-products of natural selection attempt by the left-wing to counter Evolutionary Psychology's abhorrent dismissal of our moral soul as nothing more than a subtle form of selfishness had failed, leaving the left-wing scrambling to find *some* way to defend their pseudo idealistic, selflessness-justifying philosophy for living with the agony of the human condition. A human-condition-avoiding, yet unconditionally-selfless-moral-instincts-admitting counter to the right-wing's selfishness-justifying denigration of our moral instincts still had to be found.

But what could left-wing biologists come up with? The biological reality they faced is that genes *are* necessarily selfish; genetic traits *do* have to reproduce if they are to become established in a species, and an unconditionally selfless trait doesn't tend to reproduce—that being the definition of unconditional selflessness: doing something for others without incurring any personal benefit, such as ensuring your genes reproduce. A very powerful reason why unconditionally selfless traits don't tend to reproduce is because extreme competition exists amongst sexually reproducing individuals to ensure their genes reproduce, so if an unconditionally selfless trait *were* to emerge it would be exploited by all those who were being selfish—if someone in a group says, in effect, 'I'm going to help others', the others are going to, in effect, reply, 'By all means, go right ahead because it can only help me reproduce my genes—but don't expect me to help you.' Selflessness is going to be subverted, undermined by opportunist cheaters or free riders. So the reality seemingly is that an unconditionally selfless, genuinely altruistic, truly loving, completely concerned-with-the-larger-whole-not-yourself, moral instinctive orientation to life cannot, outside the love-indoctrination opportunity, become established within a species.

Certainly, self-sacrificing genetic traits that *do* reproduce and therefore aren't *unconditionally* selfless *can* be developed by natural selection, but an *unconditionally* self-sacrificing moral instinctive orientation to life, such as we humans have, seemingly cannot be developed by natural selection outside the love-indoctrination situation. As described in my brief denial-free description of the development of order of matter on Earth in Part 4:12B,

self-sacrificing genetic traits that do reproduce and therefore aren't *unconditionally* selfless can be developed *within* a sexually reproducing individual—such as leaves sacrificing their lives when they are dropped by a tree in winter; or our body's skin cells giving their lives so that our body can carry on; or, in the elaborated sexually reproducing individual situation, when worker bees give their lives to protect their colony; or, in the temporarily elaborated sexually reproducing individual situation, when hunting dogs delay their own reproduction to selflessly help raise their parents' subsequent offspring—because the reproductive part of the sexually reproducing individual, namely the tree's or our body's reproductive parts, or the queen bee, or the queen dog, reproduces them. The genes for the leaves/skin cells/worker bees/helper dogs do reproduce, which means their self-sacrifice is not *unconditionally* selfless, truly altruistic.

So how could the left-wing find a human-condition-avoiding argument for the development of unconditionally selfless, moral instincts among sexually reproducing individual humans? There was only one situation that had ever been envisaged that offered a way for human-condition-avoiding left-wing biologists to argue the case for unconditionally selfless moral instincts, and that was group selection, or, more accurately, 'between-group selection'. The argument for between-group selection, which was very briefly described in Part 4:12D, runs like this, while *within* a group of sexually reproducing individuals selflessness is always going to be subverted, if there are two groups in competition against each other and one has members who are more able to behave selflessly and help each other then that group will have an advantage over the other group that *doesn't* have such selfless, cooperative members, which means that unconditionally selfless cooperation supposedly could be able to be selected for. While within groups the selfish are more likely to succeed, in competition *between* groups, those that are able to behave selflessly, consider the welfare of the group above their own welfare, and thus be more cooperative, are more likely to succeed. Put simply, within groups the selfish are likely to succeed, but in competition between groups, groups of altruists are more likely to succeed; theoretically, groups of cooperators can out-compete groups of non-cooperators, thereby ensuring their genes, including the ones that predispose them to cooperation, are handed down to future generations.

In *The Descent of Man*, Charles Darwin canvassed this possibility of between-group selection developing unconditional selflessness, writing that **'It must not be forgotten that although a high standard of morality gives but a slight or no advantage to each individual man and his children over the other men of the same tribe, yet that an increase in the number of well-endowed men and advancement in the standard of morality will certainly give an immense advantage to one tribe over another. A tribe including many members who, from possessing in a high degree the spirit of patriotism, fidelity, obedience, courage, and sympathy, were always ready to aid one another, and to sacrifice themselves for the common good, would be victorious over most other tribes; and this would be natural selection'** (1871, ch.5). But while Darwin did think about the theoretical possibility of between-group selection developing unconditional selfless instincts in humans, he never pursued the idea—presumably because when, as mentioned earlier, Darwin said that our **'moral sense affords the best and highest distinction between man and the lower animals'** (ibid, ch.4) he was recognising just how extraordinary and wonderful humans' moral instincts are; he was sound enough to acknowledge that our moral instincts are *truly* altruistic, that they want to be

unconditionally selfless towards *all* of life, that they are *universally* loving. As is going to be emphasised, the very idea that our moral instinctive self or soul is derived from aggressively attacking and warring against other groups of humans does not ring at all true, just as it would not have rung true for Darwin. It does not equate at all with what we all intuitively know about what our born-with, instinctive moral conscience wants us to feel and how it wants us to behave towards *all* humans, and even towards all creatures—indeed towards all of life—which is to feel and behave lovingly towards *all* things. Our instinctive orientation is to love, not be at war with other people, and to argue otherwise is, in truth, as abhorrent as the right-wing's denigration of the nature of our moral soul as nothing more than a subtle form of selfishness.

And so, in his soundness and integrity of thought, Darwin would have felt uncomfortable with the idea that our moral instincts could possibly be derived from strategic warring between groups, and that discomfort would have led to his resistance to developing it into a full-blown theory to explain our moral instincts. As has been described already, Darwin dabbled with the idea of by-products of natural selection being involved in the creation of our moral instincts, and he also canvassed the notion of nurturing playing a role, but he chose not to develop even these ideas that do resonate as being honest into an explanation for the origin of our moral instincts—because, as has been mentioned, he presumably didn't feel secure enough to engage in ideas that involved fully confronting the human condition. Being a biologist of great integrity, Darwin was cautious in all his thinking about the biology of human behaviour, as evidenced by the fact that he avoided that all-important issue in his main book, *The Origin of Species*. So while Darwin *did* canvas the merits of between-group selection in *The Descent of Man*, he didn't pursue it. As William Hamilton recognised, while in the early, 'naive' 1900s, **'almost the whole field of biology stampeded in the direction** [of accepting the idea of group-emphasising selection]**...Darwin had gone** [there] **circumspectly or not at all'** ('Innate Social Aptitudes of Man: An Approach from Evolutionary Genetics', *Biosocial Anthropology*, ed. R. Fox, 1975, p.331).

However, while Darwin chose not to develop the idea of between-group selection being able to produce unconditionally selfless instincts into a theory, other biologists haven't been so scrupulous. And so, when the left-wing needed to counter the right-wing's abhorrent selfishness-justifying dismissal of our moral instincts as nothing more than a subtle form of selfishness, it was the between-group selection for unconditionally selfless instincts argument that they resorted to.

But to do so was not easy, because for left-wing biologists to take up the between-group selection argument for unconditional selflessness they not only had to overlook what, in truth, we all know about our born-with, instinctive moral conscience, which is that it doesn't want us to war with other humans, they *also* had to find a way to counter a particular problem that all thoughtful biologists could see lay with the idea of between-group selection of unconditional selflessness. Obviously within a group of sexually reproducing individuals selflessness is always going to be exploited and subverted by opportunistic cheaters or mercenary free-riders, however, even in the situation where a group with altruists *were* to succeed in competition with other groups, the winning altruistic group would still likely be subverted by cheaters within the group. Even if altruism is advantageous in the between-group situation, within *any* group at all, one successfully competing with another group

or not, altruists are liable to be exploited by selfish free-riders who refrain from behaving altruistically. In a group of altruists there will almost certainly be a dissenting minority who refuse to make any sacrifice, and if there is just one selfish rebel prepared to exploit the altruism of the rest, then that individual will be more likely to survive and have children who will tend to inherit his selfish traits and so, after several generations, this altruistic group will be over-run by selfish individuals. Further, even if by chance a purely altruistic group without any opportunistic rebels occurs it is very difficult to see how it would not eventually be contaminated by the migration of selfish individuals from neighbouring groups. As mentioned in Part 4:12D, in his devastating critique of group-emphasising biological thinking that appears in his book *Adaptation and Natural Selection*, George Williams emphasised that while **'between-group selection'** of unconditional selflessness is theoretically possible, he concluded that in reality it is **'not strong enough'** to overcome genetic selfishness. As he emphasised in his Preface to the 1996 reprint of *Adaptation and Natural Selection*: **'I concluded** [in *Adaptation and Natural Selection*]**…that group selection was not strong enough to produce…**[an] **adaptation… characterized by organisms' playing roles that would subordinate their individual interests for some higher value, as in the often proposed benefit to the species'** (p.xii).

Further, the evidence for the improbability, indeed *impossibility*, of between-group selection actually being able to develop a completely concerned-with-the-larger-whole-not-yourself, moral instinctive orientation to life, such as we have, is that it has never been able to be achieved—or, if it was, then sustained over the long-term so as to be in existence today. As emphasised, our species was able to develop such a state but *we* achieved it through love-indoctrination, *not* through between-group selection.

Further, as was also explained and emphasised in Part 4:12B, the reality amongst sexually reproducing individuals that haven't been able to develop love-indoctrination is that the more cooperative integration they develop, the more intense becomes the selfish competition to reproduce until eventually the competition becomes so fierce that only dominance hierarchy can contain it. The apparent universality of dominance hierarchy amongst non-human social (relatively integrated) species is evidence that the selfishness of the gene-based natural selection learning or refinement system can't, outside of love-indoctrination, develop a completely unconditionally selfless, moral instinctive orientation to life like we have.

The reality is that if that most effective form of cooperation of all, namely unconditional selflessness, could have been developed into a complete moral instinctive orientation to life in sexually reproducing individuals then we can expect that it would have been developed many times over in the history of life on Earth—but it hasn't, except in our situation, and almost amongst bonobos who, as described in Part 8:4, are in the final stages of the love-indoctrination process. (Again, it has to be remembered that self-sacrificing traits can be developed within the sexually reproductive individual, but such traits are not *unconditionally* selfless like ours are because the reproducing parts of the individual, such as the tree/body/queen ant/queen dog in the examples mentioned earlier, do reproduce the genes for the trait.)

As described in Part 4:12D, as a result of what Williams and many other biologists pointed out about the limitations of between-group selection, the whole between-group selection idea was virtually eliminated from biological thinking from the mid to late 1900s—as Richard Lewontin wrote in 1998, **'group selection has been regarded as an anathema by nearly**

all evolutionary biologists' ('Survival of the Nicest?', *The New York Review of Books*, 22 Oct. 1998). Certainly, as described in Part 4:12D, the right-wing were particularly concerned with eliminating the concept of group selection because it meant recognising integration, which involved recognising Integrative Meaning, nevertheless, the points they made about the unlikelihood of between-group selection being able to develop an unconditionally selfless moral instinctive orientation to life seem very true.

BUT, despite all these factors—despite between-group selection being an affront to the truth that we have morals that are all-loving; and despite all the arguments made against it by Williams and many others (in particular that it was difficult to imagine how even winning groups of altruists would not become subverted by selfish opportunists); and despite the left-wing having just as much need as the right-wing to avoid emphasising group selection because of its Integrative Meaning implications—at the end of the day between-group selection remained the one possible theory that left-wing biologists could use to argue that our moral instincts are not a subtle form of selfishness but actually unconditionally selfless; and it was the one possible theory that the left-wing *had to* resort to using if they were to preserve their pseudo idealistic, selflessness-not-selfishness-emphasising, feel-good-and-thus-relieved-of-the-agony-of-the-human-condition strategy for living.

As I often say, when the need for denial is critical any excuse will do—the trick is to have just some excuse, one excuse, any excuse, and then stick to it. And so despite having fallen into near total disrepute amongst biologists, group selection was resurrected by selflessness-emphasising left-wing biologists. The leading advocate and architect of its resurrection, and its staunchest defender, is the American biologist David Sloan (D.S.) Wilson. In 1994 he and the American science philosopher Elliot Sober published a paper titled 'Re-introducing Group Selection to the Human Behavioral Sciences' in a bid to, as they said, **'re-introduce group selection to human sociobiology as well as to the more traditional branches of the human sciences'** (*Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 17 (4): pp.585-654). In the paper they mentioned that **'Group-selection models are the favored turf of biologists and others who feel that people are genuinely altruistic'**, and said that **'We have emphasized group-level functional organization in humans as an antidote to the rampant individualism we see in the human behavioral sciences.'** Four years later, in 1998, D.S. Wilson and Sober published an expanded description of their between-group theory in a book titled *Unto Others: The Evolution and Psychology of Unselfish Behavior*.

To differentiate it from the early 1900s 'naive', 'good-of-the-species' type group selection, this selflessness-emphasising left-wing account of the origin of unconditional selflessness was originally called 'new group selection theory', but eventually became known as Multilevel Selection theory (MLS) because it encompasses the influence of natural selection at both the individual and group levels, as well as the involvement of cultural and psychological influences. In *Unto Others*, D.S. Wilson and Sober wrote of **'Replacing kin selection theory with multilevel selection theory'** (p.332 of 394), and said they were presenting an argument for a **'plurality of causes of evolutionary change, which can and do occur in different combinations'** (p.331). Referring to natural selection as '**functionalism'**, they wrote that **'We think that multilevel selection theory provides the beginning of a unified framework within which the legitimate claims of individual level functionalism, group-level functionalism, and antifunctionalism can each be given their due'** (p.331). In addition to having selfish instincts, which they claimed arose from competition between

individuals (from **'individual level functionalism'**), and unconditionally selfless instincts, which they claimed arose from between-group competition (**'group-level functionalism'**), D.S. Wilson and Sober argued that there were other **'antifunctional'** influences involved in the evolution of animal behaviour. They explained that by **'antifunctionalism'** they mean **'traits** [that] **have evolved for reasons having nothing much to do with natural selection'**, that **'there is more to evolution than natural selection. In the case of human beings and perhaps of other species, it emphasizes the importance of culture in addition to genes and shows how behaviors can evolve that make sense only through the context of cultural systems that support them'** (p.331). They spoke of **'variations in customs that exist across cultures'** (p.336), and argued that **'Natural selection based on cultural variation has produced adaptions that have nothing to do with genes'** (p.337), and referred to **'the process of some groups replacing other groups'** (p.193) through this claimed **'cultural group selection'**, giving the example of how **'the Nuer** [tribe's] **social system replaced the Dinka** [tribe's] **social system because it was better organized at the level of large groups'** (p.189).

What D.S. Wilson and Sober were, in effect, arguing was that animal behaviour, including human behaviour, resulted from natural selection operating not only at the level of the sexually reproducing individual, but also at the level of the group of sexually reproducing individuals, and specifically in the between-group situation. They were also arguing that influences *outside* the gene-driven natural selection process, in particular cultural influences—so-called **'antifunctional'** forces—also played a part in the development of behaviours, including the development of unconditionally selfless behaviour in humans.

These multilevel influences will be looked at next, after which I will conclude their analysis with an overall evaluation of its truthfulness or otherwise.

Part 4:12H-ii The individual and group level influence

In launching their defence of group selection in their 1994 paper titled 'Re-introducing Group Selection to the Human Behavioral Sciences', D.S. Wilson and Sober referred to Darwin's recognition of between-group selection, which, to their credit, they admitted Darwin hadn't pursued, writing in the expanded version of their paper, their 1998 book *Unto Others: The Evolution and Psychology of Unselfish Behavior*, that Darwin's **'practice was to appeal to this process only rarely'** (p.4). From that point on in their 1994 paper, the main focus of D.S. Wilson and Sober's argument was on convincing their readers that Evolutionary Psychology's denial of the importance of the group, basically denial of the integrative theme of existence, the **'nested hierarchy of units'** as they refer to it (such as Williams asserting **'group-related adaptations don't exist'**, and Dawkins saying **'there was no such thing as superorganisms'**), **'was just plain wrong'**. They pointed out that **'According to Williams and Dawkins…even sexually reproducing organisms do not qualify as units of selection'**, they are only what **'Dawkins…called "vehicles of selection"'**, **'environments'** for the **'selfish genes'** to achieve their goal of reproduction. They wondered **'why genes are suitable candidates for units of selection whereas organisms, groups and so on are not'** and complained that **'Gene-centered theorists frame-shift downward with enthusiasm but they are much more reluctant to frame-shift upward'** in **'the biological hierarchy…**[of] **nested series of units'**. They railed against **'gene-centered theorists…who claimed to explain the social insects without invoking group selection'**. This whole criticism of right-wing **'gene-centered theorists'** was

an obvious and easy criticism to make because of course ant and bee superorganisms exist, and of course there is an integrating **'nested hierarchy'** of order of matter on Earth, but that overlooks the strategy employed when denying an unbearable truth: right-wing Evolutionary Psychologists weren't worried about the truth, only about finding a *possible* way of denying Integrative Meaning, which they sought to achieve through promoting their kin selection theory. Again, when the need for denial is critical any excuse will do—it only has to be a reasonably accountable argument and then you simply stick to it like glue. You can see this principle at work in a football match where it doesn't matter that your team wins only by a point in a very close and long fought game, which in fact indicates that there is virtually no difference in the quality of the two teams—a win is a win, your team's the best and you have 'won' some much-needed relief for your embattled ego and that's all that matters, unreal or unwarranted as that may be! Players are, very often, not even from the country or region they are representing, so the truth is the win doesn't at all prove your country or region is the best, *but, again, that doesn't matter*, just make sure you come out on top any way you can! So yes, pointing out what is obviously false about Evolutionary Psychology was a good starting point for D.S. Wilson and Sloan's attack on the right-wing, but, of course, what they were doing by acknowledging group selection was admitting Integrative Meaning and, by so doing, exposing humanity to fearful self-confrontation—but such was the desperation of the left to resist the right that they were prepared to pay that price. I might mention that it appears that the way the left-wing coped with their acknowledgment of Integrative Meaning was by deluding themselves that since they weren't advocating the involvement of a divine being, a cosmic-magician-type God, there was no problem with recognising Integrative Meaning/teleology/holism; as D.S. Wilson and Sloan put it in *Unto Others*, **'Thinking of groups of organic units subject to their own laws of behavior smacked of mysticism, and once holism was purged of mysticism'** (p.329)—with the unsaid words following this phrase seeming to be that 'there was no problem with holism'. And indeed, in *Unto Others* Integrative Meaning is *fully* recognised: **'Some evolutionary biologists have proposed that the history of life on earth has been marked by a number of major transitions in which previously autonomous units became integrated into higher-level units (J. Maynard Smith & E. Szathmary, 1995)** (*The Major Transitions of Life*)**. Molecules became organized into "hypercycles" during the origin of life itself (M. Eigen & P. Schuster, 1977, 1978a-b)** (3 papers: 'The Hypercycle: A Principle of Natural Self-Organization': 'A: Emergence of the Hypercycle', *Naturwissenschaften* 64, 1977; 'B: The Abstract Hypercycle' and 'C: The Realistic Hypercycle', *Naturwissenschaften* 65, 1978) [and] **(R. Michod 1983)** ('Population Biology of the First Replicators', *American Zoologist* 23)**, genetic elements became neatly arranged into chromosomes, prokaryotic (bacterial) cells formed into elaborate communities that we call eukaryotic cells (L. Margulis 1970)** (*Origin of the Eukaryotic Cells*)**, and single-celled organisms built themselves into multi-celled organisms (L. Buss 1987)** (*The Evolution of Individuality*) [and] **(R. Michod 1996, 1997a-b)** ('Cooperation and Conflict in the Evolution of Individuality II', *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London* B, 263, 1996; and 'Cooperation and Conflict in the Evolution of Individuality I', *American Naturalist* 149, 1997; and 'Evolution of the Individual', *American Naturalist* 150, 1997)**. The social insects are a more recent example of lower-level units coalescing into higher-level units (T. Seeley 1996)** (*The Wisdom of the Hive*)**. The transition is never complete and every unit, no matter how tightly integrated, has rogue elements that succeed at the expense of the unit. In addition, for every major coalescing event there must be thousands of other events in which the coalescence is only partial, with higher-level organization struggling to emerge from lower-level organization'** (pp.97-98).

The other part of D.S. Wilson and Sober's attack on selfishness-justifying, right-wing Evolutionary Psychologists was to argue that there is a way in which, in the between-group selection situation, the winning group of altruists *don't* end up becoming subverted by selfish opportunists. This point raises the keystone in their strategy because, remember, the subversion from within even a group of winning altruists was the big problem the left were going to have to disprove in order to successfully resurrect the between-group selection theory.

And so, in *Unto Others*, D.S. Wilson and Sober put forward an explanation involving between-group selection for how unconditional selflessness/altruism could be developed despite such behaviour being constantly undermined by selfish opportunism. I find it difficult following formulaic, game-theory type arguments, that 'If you have three apples in the cupboard and you take one out from under the sink then they'll all pop up in the back shed!', but we need to consider their thesis, which does have a surprising logic. Using the figures in the theoretical model presented on p.25 of *Unto Others*, if we imagine there are two groups that both have 100 members and Group S ('S' for more Selfish) has 20 percent altruists and Group A ('A' for more Altruists) has 80 percent altruists, then the percentage of altruists in the global population would be 50 percent ([0.2x100 + 0.8x100]/200). In the offspring generation, the altruists would have, as predicted, declined in frequency within each group because of the emergence of selfish opportunism, such that Group S now has 18.4 percent altruists and Group A 78.7 percent; *however*, because altruists are more cooperative and thus more successful in between-group competition, the group with more altruists grows larger than the group with fewer altruists, such that Group S now has 1080 members compared to Group A's 1320 members—so while the proportion of altruists has declined *within* each group, altruists have actually *increased* in frequency across the global population from 50 percent to 51.6 percent ([0.184x1080 + 0.787x2400]/2400)!! The success of altruism in this model is an example of a statistical phenomenon known as Simpson's Paradox (see *Unto Others*, p.23)—meaning, in this instance, that although altruists are *diminishing within each group* (because of the 'subversion from within' problem), they are *increasing overall* because the group with a greater proportion of altruists are more successful in competing and reproducing offspring than those in the other group. So, according to this D.S. Wilson and Sober-formulated two-group model, altruists *can* increase in frequency in the global population, despite the fact that they decrease in frequency *within* each group. In summarising **'what is required to produce this interesting (and for many people counterintuitive) result'**, D.S. Wilson and Sober wrote that **'To be sufficient, the differential fitness of groups…must be strong enough to counter the differential fitness of individuals within groups…**[Thus] **Altruism can evolve if the process of group selection is sufficiently strong'** (ibid. pp.26-27). In other words, the degree to which the more altruistic group outperforms the more selfish group (in terms of the number of progeny they leave) must be great enough to counter the degree to which the selfish are outperforming the altruists within the groups.

As D.S. Wilson and Sober pointed out, for this model to work, **'the progeny of both groups disperse and then physically come together before forming new groups of their own'**, but if this can occur, and **'the process be repeated over many generations, altruists will gradually replace the selfish types, just as the selfish types replace the altruists in the one group example'** (ibid. p.25-26). D.S. Wilson and Sober added that **'Of course, we must still explain how, generation after generation, altruists tend to find themselves living with altruists, and selfish individuals tend to associate with other selfish**

individuals' (p.26). Conceding that these **'assumptions of our two-group model…may have seemed unlikely'** (p.29), D.S. Wilson and Sober then presented an example from nature where they say this two-group model for the development of altruism is **'biologically plausible'** (p.29), which is in the life cycle of the *Dicrocoelium dendriticum*, a trematode parasite that spends the adult stage of its life cycle in the livers of cows and sheep, then two generations within land snails, and then yet another stage in ants, where the parasite migrates to the ant's brain and forms what is known as the brain worm. Without going into detail of the brain worm's entire cycle, in terms of the requirement for **'altruistic and selfish types to become concentrated into different groups'**, D.S. Wilson and Sober wrote that in the case of the brain worm, **'This is accomplished biologically by reproduction within the snails, which concentrates the progeny of the mutant altruist into a single group'** (p.29). They then addressed other issues and concluded that **'The brain worm remains a fascinating *prima facie* example of altruism from the field of natural history, but the conceptually relevant details have only been guessed'** (p.30).

In a review of D.S. Wilson and Sober's theory, Richard Lewontin summarised their argument thus: **'If** [as a result of between-group selection] **some group has, by chance, a higher frequency of altruistic individuals, and if the consequence is a larger number of offspring for the group as a whole, then even though there is some selection against the altruists within each group, altruism may come to characterize the species'** ('Survival of the Nicest?', *New York Review of Books*, 22 Oct. 1998).

To further support their belief that between-group selection *can* develop unconditionally selfless traits, D.S. Wilson and Sober described how evidence suggests that between-group selection can explain both the occurrence of female-biased sex ratios that some small invertebrate species have (*Unto Others*, pp.35-43), and the evolution of reduced virulence in some disease organisms (ibid. pp.43-50). They concluded that **'We have reviewed the examples of sex ratio and disease virulence in detail** [because]**…they show that group selection is more than "just a theory" and has been documented as well as any theory in evolutionary biology'** (p.50).

In describing the history of the idea of how between-group selection might be able to explain the development of unconditionally selfless traits, D.S. Wilson and Sober referred to William Hamilton, one of the architects behind the demise of group selection theory in the 1960s, reconsidering his position and agreeing that group selection may play a role in evolution. They also referred to that other architect of the demise of group selection, George Williams and his own revised views on group selection, writing that '[the reader] **may be surprised to learn that even G. C. Williams, the icon of the individual selection movement, has accepted the evidence for group selection as the best explanation of important biological adaptations such as female-biased sex ratios and reduced virulence in disease organisms'** (ibid. p.7). It should be explained that while Williams did change his mind about group selection in regard to some very specific traits, namely instances of female biased sex ratios and reduced virulence in disease organisms, he remained unconvinced about group selection's wider applicability, as D.S. Wilson admitted in a later publication **'In general, however, George retained his worldview and I didn't convince him about group selection'** ('Rest in Peace George C. Williams, *ScienceBlogs*, 10. Sep. 2010).

They also discussed John Maynard Smith's influential 1964 'haystack model' (thus termed because it involved a species of mouse that lived in haystacks) which greatly helped to establish the view **'that group selection models were too implausible to be taken seriously'** (ibid. p.71). Without going into detail, D.S. Wilson and Sober referred to D.S. Wilson's 1986 re-

analysis of the model in which he ascribed what he regards as more realistic values to the benefits to selfish mice and the costs to altruistic mice. D.S. Wilson has, elsewhere, summarised this modified 'haystack model' by saying that **'It turns out that altruism can evolve by group selection, using reasonable values of b** [benefit to recipient] **and c** [cost to altruist]**, even when the altruistic gene is initially rare in the total population. The model that led to the rejection of group selection is favorable for group selection after all'** (Blog titled *Truth and Reconciliation for Group Selection IX: Anatomy of a Model (continued)*, 17 Apr. 2009).

So, D.S. Wilson and Sober maintained that **'altruism can evolve'** by between-group selection **'after all'**, and that group-level natural selection *should* therefore be included with individual-level natural selection in explaining the evolution of behaviour, especially human behaviour. As mentioned, the validity or otherwise of this argument that we humans have selfish instincts derived from competition between individuals, and selfless instincts arising from competition between groups, will be examined at the conclusion of this analysis of Multilevel Selection, in Part 4:12H-vi. However, I might say here that these situations where between-group selection of unconditionally selfless traits is said to have occurred, namely in the occurrence of female-biased sex ratios that some small invertebrate species have, and the evolution of reduced virulence in some disease organisms, seem so improbable as to be impossible for large mammals who don't have complex life cycles.

Part 4:12H-iii The influence of culture

In this review of D.S. Wilson and Sober's Multilevel Selection theory involving the **'plurality of causes of evolutionary change'** of **'individual level functionalism, group-level functionalism, and antifunctionalism'**, we have, at this stage, looked at their arguments relating to **'individual level functionalism, group-level functionalism'**. What remains to consider are their views on **'antifunctionalism'**, which are **'traits** [that] **have evolved for reasons having nothing much to do with natural selection'**—specifically, **'In the case of human beings…the importance of culture'** (*Unto Others*, p.331). In short, they argued that **'Natural selection based on cultural variation has produced adaptions that have nothing to do with genes'** (p.337).

The following is an expanded description of D.S. Wilson and Sober's human cultural evolution argument, in their own words (the italics are as they appear in the text, the underlinings, however, have been added for emphasis): **'we will make a specific claim about human cultural evolution: *In most human social groups, cultural transmission is guided by a set of norms that identify what counts as acceptable behavior*. People who violate the norms are subject to punishment or exclusion from the group'** (*Unto Others*, p.150). **'Consider two imaginary cultures, the squibs and the squabs. The squibs follow the social norm "Be altruistic to fellow squibs, punish those who don't, and punish those who fail to punish." The squabs have the norm "Solve your own problems." They freely exploit fellow squabs… The altruistic squibs will outperform the quarrelsome squabs in all situations that involve between-group processes…The problem of cheaters and freeloaders within groups, which is so often used to argue against the evolution of altruism, is not a problem for the squibs because cheaters and freeloaders are severely punished'** (p.151). **'Our imaginary example of the squibs and squabs informally describes a theory of cultural group selection that has been developed by Boyd and Richerson'** (p.152). D.S. Wilson and Sober argue that **'virtually all cultures possess strong social norms that appear designed**

to promote the well-being of the group' (p.183) and that **'Seeing rewards and punishments as products of group selection goes a long way toward explaining how human social groups can be organismic** [integrated] **even though they do not have the same population structure as clonal organisms or social insect colonies'** (p.149). They claim that **'mechanisms that substitute for genealogical relatedness probably operate in many species, but they do so especially in human populations, because they <u>require sophisticated cognitive abilities and (in some cases) the cultural transmission of behavior</u>. Thus, multilevel selection theory has the potential to explain not only why humans are ultrasocial, but why they have experienced a unique variety of group selection'** (p.158). To illustrate **'the process of some groups replacing other groups'** (p.193) through this claimed **'cultural group selection'**, D.S. Wilson and Sober offer the example of how **'the Nuer** [tribe's] **social system replaced the Dinka** [tribe's] **social system because it was better organized at the level of large groups'** (p.189).

So, D.S. Wilson and Sober are arguing that because of humans' **'sophisticated cognitive abilities'**—namely our fully conscious mind—we are able to put in place **'strong social norms'** or controls to ward against selfish behaviour. This is certainly true, but the questions remain as to how and why humans became fully conscious and divisively behaved in the first place; *why* did we fully conscious humans become competitive, selfish and aggressive when our instinctive moral conscience's ideals are to be cooperative, selfless and loving? What is the origin of the human condition, the origin of our less-than-ideal behaviour? Why have we needed both self discipline and imposed discipline? Why did we need to develop such cultural laws of constraint as the Ten Commandments? Certainly, the 'fallen', corrupted, psychologically upset state of the human condition emerged and we then had to find ways to control it until we could find the clarifying, reconciling, exonerating, dignifying, uplifting, redeeming, relieving, healing, ameliorating understanding of that 'fallen', corrupted, psychologically upset state, but where is the description of that bigger picture that imposed discipline is only a part of? Where is the deeper analysis? The true story about our human condition that biologists are charged with having to scientifically explain is that which appears in the Bible: **'God created man in his own image'** (Gen. 1:27) (we did once live in that *completely* integrated, unconditionally selflessly behaved, cooperative, loving ideal state), and then we took the **'fruit' 'from the tree of…knowledge'** (Gen. 3:3, 2:17) (became conscious), and then we **'fell from grace'** (derived from the title of Gen. 3, **'The Fall of Man'**) (became corrupted, psychologically upset, angry, egocentric and alienated), and, as a result, were **'banished… from the Garden of Eden'** (Gen. 3:23) state of our original innocence (became insecure/guilt-ridden about our fundamental goodness and worth) and became **'a restless wanderer on the earth'** (Gen. 4:14) (became psychotic and neurotic) until we could find the reconciling, healing understanding of the **'good and evil'** (Gen. 3:5) in our make-up and, by so doing, become **'like God, knowing** [understanding] **good and evil'** (ibid). From being **'in the image of God'** (Gen. 1:27)—that is, instinctively orientated to the integrative, Godly ideals of being cooperative, selfless and loving—we then had to search for the understanding of our psychologically upset, corrupted, **'fall**[en]**'** state that would enable us to become **'knowing'**—that is, cognisant of the integrative, Godly ideals and why we departed from them.

Yes, *that* is the story we biologists are charged with having to explain—and which now *has* been explained here in *Freedom Expanded: Book 1*, but which D.S. Wilson and Sober don't deal with at all, let alone explain! To argue that **'norms'** or forms of cultural restraint

were important completely misses the bigger issue of the whole journey that the human race has been involved in of seeking ameliorating understanding of our psychologically upset condition. In fact, as will be pointed out shortly in Part 4:12H-vi when the question of 'What is the truth about Multilevel Selection theory?' is addressed, D.S. Wilson and Sober's theory about altruism is just a contorted, bewildered, dishonest—alienated—interpretation of the nature of our human condition.

Part 4:12H-iv Psychological influence

A parallel movement to the right-wing, selfishness-emphasising biological account of the origin of altruism has occurred within the social sciences, with some of those working in the fields of psychology, philosophy, economics and political theory seeking to avoid the agony of the human condition by contriving a defence for selfishness that suggests that when we humans do behave selflessly towards others we are only doing so to selfishly derive a future benefit—or at least the warm inner **'glow of satisfaction'** (*Unto Others*, p.243) that comes from 'doing good'. Towards the end of *Unto Others*, D.S. Wilson and Sober explore this concept of so-called psychological altruism; as they explain it, while **'evolutionary biologists define altruism entirely in terms of survival and reproduction…Philosophical and psychological discussions of altruism often concentrate…heavily on motives'** (p.17). According to the latter, **'The act of helping others does not count as (psychologically) altruistic unless the actor thinks of the welfare of others as an ultimate goal'** (p.6). By way of illustration, D.S. Wilson and Sober refer to the view that **'Even saints could be regarded as selfish if they perceived their lives of sacrifice as tickets to heaven'** (p.17).

As a result of this abhorrent argument put forward by some in the social sciences that all selfless acts undertaken by humans are actually acts of **'psychological egoism'** (p.251), or, as it is sometimes termed, 'competitive altruism', the truth that humans have an unconditionally selfless, genuinely altruistic, truly loving moral nature fell out of favour amongst psychologists, philosophers, economists and political theorists—just as the truth about our unconditionally selfless moral nature fell out of favour amongst biologists. As D.S. Wilson and Sober put it, just as belief in the existence of **'Genuinely altruistic traits…became an endangered species in evolutionary biology'** (because **'such apparently altruistic traits…as human morality…are said to be only apparently altruistic because individuals who help others receive benefits in return** [reciprocity] **or promote their "genetic self-interest" by helping copies of their own genes that are found in the bodies of others** [kin selection]**'**), so the existence of **'genuine psychological altruism…** [became] **an endangered species in the social sciences'** (ibid. p.6). So, D.S. Wilson and Sober were now keenly attempting to counter *both* the selfishness-justifying, right-wing arguments being put forward by Evolutionary Psychologists *and* this dismissal in the social sciences of our unconditionally selfless, genuinely altruistic, truly loving moral nature.

Given how desperate humans have been to contrive a way of escaping the agony of the human condition it is not at all surprising that the upset human race actually developed an argument that suggested that when humans were being selfless and caring they were actually being motivated by self-interest—that, for example, people only do charitable acts to earn the praise and respect of others—BUT, such a defence is a disgraceful denigration of the *true* nature of our wonderful unconditionally selfless, genuinely altruistic, truly loving, fully empathetic

moral nature. Apart from it being a complete denial of what we all, in truth, do intuitively know about the nature of our wonderful moral instincts, which is that they *are* unconditionally selfless, trying to separate biological/evolutionary altruism from psychological altruism, when the latter has to be derived from the former, doesn't make sense. We have moral instincts—our conscience—that makes our conscious mind aware that to think and behave selfishly is wrong and that to think and behave selflessly is right; we have moral instincts that criticise our conscious mind's decisions (just as we have instincts that tell our conscious mind to abate our thirst with water; to have a drink), and this criticism from our moral instincts of our mind's thoughts is central to the creation of our psychologically upset state of the human condition. Our psychological condition is derived from, and related to, our biological condition.

We, the whole of our beings, are biologically derived. All the elements involved in our psychologically upset human condition, namely our instincts and conscious mind, are biologically derived, which makes biology the key to understanding human behaviour. Our psychologically upset state does overlay our moral instinctive soul, but, nevertheless, our soul remains—we are still capable of real love, namely unconditional selflessness, of helping others without any regard for self. Certainly, after we developed our unconditionally selfless moral soul and became conscious, the insecure state of the human condition emerged and we became angry, egocentric and alienated, and, as a result, do often have ulterior motives, such as wanting **'tickets to heaven'**, to derive a warm inner **'glow of satisfaction'** from being idealistic, and to want to earn the praise and respect of others, but that doesn't eliminate our ability to think and behave unconditionally selflessly. The existence of our moral soul wasn't destroyed by the advent of the human condition; indeed, as pointed out, its continued presence in the form of our conscience is why we have suffered so acutely from the insecure state of the human condition—it has made us feel guilty when we behave selfishly. Our capacity to be unconditionally selfless *is* real, even though we are also capable of being duplicitous and having ulterior motives as a result of suffering from the upset state of the human condition. When Joe Delaney, a professional footballer, acknowledged that **'I can't swim good, but I've got to save those kids'**, just moments before plunging into a Louisiana pond and drowning in an attempt to rescue three boys ('Sometimes The Good Die Young', *Sports Illustrated*, 7 Nov. 1983), it *was* possible, indeed highly probable, that he was being unconditionally selfless. So, while, as I will shortly explain, I don't agree that D.S. Wilson and Sober's between-group selection theory explains how we acquired our unconditionally selfless moral instincts, I do agree with their assertion about psychological altruism, that **'We will not suggest that everyone has a thoroughgoing and saintly dedication to helping others—that people always treat the well-being of others as an end in itself and never think of their own welfare. Rather, our objective will be to show that concern for others is *one* of the ultimate motives that people *sometimes* have'** (*Unto Others*, p.9).

The central question we need to keep asking ourselves is are our moral instincts unconditionally selfless or not, because if they are—and indeed they are—then we *do* have a conscious awareness that it is right to treat others with *unconditional* selflessness, and therefore we *do* have the ability to consciously decide to behave unconditionally selflessly towards others. As D.S. Wilson and Sober put it, **'If evolutionary altruism is absent in nature, why should psychological altruism be present in human nature?'** (ibid. p.6). Yes, why is it present? *That* is the *real* question.

Part 4:12H-v Summary of the Multilevel Selection theory

D.S. Wilson and Sober summarise their theory as follows: **'Altruism can be removed from the endangered species list in both biology and the social sciences. Groups can qualify as organismic units. Culture can play a vital role in the evolutionary process. And the study of psychological mechanisms can be as evolutionary as the study of behavior. It is heartening to contemplate the emergence of a legitimate pluralism—for evolutionary theories of social behavior, for theories of psychological motivation, and for the larger intellectual traditions that influence how we think about ourselves and the world around us'** (*Unto Others*, p.337).

Part 4:12H-vi What is the truth about the Multilevel Selection theory?

So, what is the truth about D.S. Wilson and Sober's Multilevel Selection theory; in particular, what is the truth regarding their argument that unconditional selflessness can be developed through between-group selection? Having now considered D.S. Wilson and Sober's two-group model, it may be possible for between-group selection to develop unconditionally selfless traits in a few situations (such as in the brain worm, female-biased sex ratios and virulence situations perhaps), however, I maintain that the virtual universality of dominance hierarchy amongst social animals evidences just how strong natural selection at the individual level is and therefore that, even in a between-group situation, unconditional selflessness cannot be developed amongst sexually reproducing individual animals. As D.S. Wilson and Sober admitted themselves, the process does **'seem' 'unlikely'**. Yes, this between-group selection model where **'the progeny of both groups disperse and then physically come together before forming new groups of their own'**, and where, if this can occur, and **'the process be repeated over many generations'**, and where **'generation after generation, altruists** [somehow] **tend to find themselves living with altruists, and selfish individuals** [somehow] **tend to associate with other selfish individuals'**, then **'altruists will gradually replace the selfish types'**, does **'seem' 'unlikely'** even though it is, supposedly, **'biologically plausible'** and is theorised to have occurred in the brain worm situation. The only biological models that have been presented that appear to overcome this problem of genetic selfishness always prevailing are so complex and convoluted they seem highly implausible, in that they involve the disbanding of a population into new, separate colonies, formed by solitary fertilised females, some of whom only have selfish genes and some of whom have altruistic genes, with those altruistic colonies outcompeting those with just selfish genes to build larger, more altruistic populations. Then, before the colonies with altruistic genes **'quickly lose…**[their] **altruism through natural selection favoring cheaters'**, the colonies peacefully merge back into one population, after which fertilised females separate out again to breed new, isolated groups (and so on). Essentially the model requires a process of constant merging and disbanding in order to 'outrun' the genetic imperative in nature to exploit altruism or selflessness. The situations where this between-group selection of unconditionally selfless traits is said to have taken place are in the occurrence of female-biased sex ratios in some small invertebrate species, and in the evolution of reduced virulence in some disease organisms (see David Sloan Wilson & Elliot Sober, *Unto Others: The Evolution and Psychology of Unselfish Behavior*, 1998, pp.35-50 of 394). However, for large mammals especially, who don't have complex life cycles, the mechanism is so implausible it has to be considered impossible.

Richard Dawkins has been extremely critical of the between-group selection argument for the development of unconditionally selfless instincts, saying it is **'poorly defined and incoherent'** and that **'Convincing examples are vanishingly hard to find'** ('The descent of Edward Wilson', *Prospect* mag. 24 May 2012). I think these comments do capture the sense that between-group selection is such a complex and devious mechanism—involving individuals repeatedly dispersing and then coming together to form groups in which, somehow, altruists associate with altruists and the selfish associate with the selfish—that it is an extremely unlikely mechanism for developing unconditionally selfless instincts in animals. While another comment by Dawkins that **'biologists with non-analytic minds warm to multilevel selection'** (ibid) is untrue in that supporters of Multilevel Selection are no more **'non-analytic**[al]**'**, human-condition-avoiding-and-thus-unable-to-think-truthfully-and-thus-effectively—or, as R.D. Laing said, **'alienated'**, **'asleep'**, **'unconscious'**, **'dead'** and **'blind'**—than Evolutionary Psychologists, the comment *does* recognise and reveal that supporters of between-group selection are being prejudicially driven by a left-wing, dogmatic, don't-question-or-think-about-our-imperfect-human-condition-just-*be*-ideally-behaved agenda to derive a feel-good, **'warm'** inner glow from supporting the idealistic, selflessness-emphasising between-group selection explanation that says we humans do have unconditionally selfless moral instincts.

In 2011 another prominent right-wing biologist, Jerry Coyne, presented this summary of the perceived limitations of between-group selection's ability to develop unconditional selflessness, which, aside from the last sentence, I agree with (as usual, the underlinings are my emphasis): **'Group selection isn't widely accepted by evolutionists for several reasons. First, it's not an efficient way to select for traits, like altruistic behavior, that are supposed to be detrimental to the individual but good for the group. Groups divide to form other groups much less often than organisms reproduce to form other organisms, so group selection for altruism would be unlikely to override the tendency of each group to quickly lose its altruists through natural selection favoring cheaters. Further, we simply have little evidence that selection on groups has promoted the evolution of any trait. Finally, other, more plausible evolutionary forces, like direct selection on individuals for reciprocal support, could have made us prosocial'** ('Can Darwinism improve Binghamton?', *The New York Times*, 9 Sep. 2011). It wasn't **'reciprocal support'** that **'made us prosocial'**, it *was* another **'more plausible evolutionary force'**—love-indoctrination. Similarly, the right-wing psychologist Stephen Pinker said in his essay 'The False Allure of Group Selection' that **'group selection sounds like a reasonable extension of evolutionary theory and a plausible explanation of the social nature of humans…this reasonableness is an illusion. The more carefully you think about group selection, the less sense it makes, and the more poorly it fits the facts of human psychology and history'** (18 Jun. 2012, accessed Feb. 2013 at: <https://www.edge.org/conversation/the-false-allure-of-group-selection>).

The point should also be made that being unaware of the love-indoctrination explanation for our unconditionally selfless moral instincts meant that both right-wing and left-wing biologists were prone to be *seduced* by their respective Evolutionary Psychology and between-group selection 'explanations' for our moral instincts. They couldn't help but think, 'Humans' moral instincts do exist, so there *must* be a biological explanation for them and, since there are no other possible explanations for them that aren't prejudiced [because, of course, they are unable to recognise their *own* prejudice], it simply *has* to be due to the theory that I'm putting forward.' Comments such as **'If altruism manages to evolve, this indicates that the group-selection process has been strong enough to overwhelm the force pushing in the opposite direction'**

(*Unto Others*, p.33) smack of this 'It-exists-and-since-there-is-no-other-valid-explanation-it-has-to-be-this-explanation' seduction and delusion.

So, I don't at all agree with D.S. Wilson and Sober's view that **'group selection** [is]**…a significant evolutionary force'** (ibid. p.51), and, as I will explain, I don't at all agree that between-group selection could have created our completely concerned-with-larger-whole-not-yourself, moral instinctive orientation to life.

I should mention that I do get the impression that D.S. Wilson and Sober are aware that their between-group selection explanation for our unconditionally selfless moral instincts is flimsy and that to bolster its 'credibility' they have resorted to using the same 'matrix of mechanisms' device that, as I described in Part 4:12G, other left-wing biologists, like Gould, Lewontin and Sussman, clung to. Yes, D.S. Wilson and Sober's 'Multilevel' account is another 'matrix of mechanisms'-type explanation where, as they say in their conclusion, along with individual-level selection, **'Groups can qualify as organismic units. Culture can play a vital role in the evolutionary process. And the study of psychological mechanisms can be as evolutionary as the study of behavior.'** For example, when they said that culture **'goes a long way toward explaining how human social groups can be organismic'**, it was as if they recognised that their between-group selection explanation needed significant help. The truth is that rather than being a factor involved in **'explaining how human social groups can be organismic'** (can become integrated), cultural restraints actually developed *after* we became integrated, and *after* the **'sophisticated cognitive abilities'** of our conscious mind developed, and, as a result of the conflict that occurred between those two forces, the human condition emerged, at which point all our upset behaviour had to be contained by such cultural restraints as self discipline and then imposed discipline (as explained in Parts 3:11D and 3:11G). Also, the only **'psychological'** aspect of the human condition referred to by D.S. Wilson and Sober was the issue of the **'motivation'** or intent behind selfless acts. There was no analysis of the psychology of the human condition at all. So, for them to assert that **'It is heartening to contemplate the emergence of a legitimate pluralism—for evolutionary theories of social behavior, for theories of psychological motivation, and for the larger intellectual traditions that influence how we think about ourselves and the world around us'** is a complete bluff. Basically, D.S. Wilson and Sober were desperately throwing everything into the melting pot of possibilities to try to create a **'heartening'**, 'matrix of mechanisms'-type *illusion* that they had provided a **'legitimate'** selflessness-emphasising counter to the right-wing's selfishness-emphasising Evolutionary Psychology!

I will now explain why D.S. Wilson and Sober's explanations for how we acquired our selfless moral instincts and for why we are selfish are both completely wrong.

Firstly, with regard to how we acquired our selfless moral instincts, even if there are a few complex situations where between-group selection has contributed to the development of unconditionally selfless instincts, it could not possibly have developed our species' completely concerned-with-the-larger-whole-not-yourself, moral instinctive orientation to life.

As I have stressed, the idea that our moral instinctive self or soul is derived from group vs group conflict does not equate at all with what we all know about what our born-with, instinctive moral conscience wants us to feel and how it wants us to behave towards *all*

humans, and even towards all creatures—indeed towards all of life—which is to feel and behave lovingly towards *all* things. Our instinctive orientation is to love, not to be at war with other people, and to argue otherwise *is* in truth as abhorrent as the right-wing's advocacy of Evolutionary Psychology's denigration of our moral soul as nothing more than a subtle form of selfishness. No human who is prepared to be truthful (which I appreciate that under the duress of the human condition almost no humans have been prepared to be) would accept that our species' completely concerned-with-the-larger-whole-not-yourself, moral instinctive orientation to life is driven by an extremely selfish, competitive and divisive cause, namely to give warring groups a competitive advantage. The truth that we all do know about our born-with, instinctive moral conscience *is* that it doesn't want us to be at war with other humans—*that* is the very last thing our moral instincts desire. No, our moral instincts are *not* derived from competition between groups of humans, they are *universally* loving.

Further, for our moral instinctive orientation to be as deeply, completely and truly loving as it is requires nurturing in an *environment* of love—not, as suggested by the between-group selection model, an environment that is firstly one where everyone is basically selfish, and secondly where any selflessness that does occur is continually undermined and under siege from selfish cheaters. Unlike the between-group selection situation, *love-indoctrination both develops from and creates a whole environment of love*. We are born with an instinctive expectation of being unconditionally loved that comes from a time when our species lived in a nurturing, all-loving situation—but there is no recognition of this in D.S. Wilson and Sober's Multilevel theory.

Further, the complex, devious, subtle mechanism of repeatedly dispersing and then coming together in groups in which altruists somehow associate with altruists, and the selfish associate with the selfish, isn't at all consistent with how our universally and always loving, unsophisticated, unsubtle, straightforward, uncomplicated, moral instinctive orientation to life operates.

And further still, instead of creating just a few unconditionally selfless/loving traits, love-indoctrination has given us a *complete* orientation to love in the sense that while between-group selection may have enabled a rare few unconditionally selfless traits to emerge, its ability to develop unconditional selflessness en masse—many, many unconditionally selfless instincts together—indeed, to develop an entire genetic ethos of unconditional selflessness, a not-occasional-but-in-all-situations, universal, completely concerned-with-the-larger-whole-not-yourself, moral instinctive orientation to life, such as we have, has to be impossible.

In stark contrast, D.S. Wilson and Sober actually concede that their between-group selection theory has *not* given us a universal, not-occasional-but-in-all-situations, *completely* unconditionally selfless, concerned-with-the-larger-whole-not-yourself, all-loving, moral instinctive orientation to life. As they say, they are putting forward a *multilevel* account of human behaviour that involves both selfish instincts derived from individual-level selection *and* unconditionally selfless instincts that they claim have resulted from between-group conflict at the group level—and even from **'antifunctional'** influences such as culture. Indeed, they say that **'our goal in this book is not to paint a rosy picture of universal benevolence. Group selection does provide a setting in which helping behavior directed at members of one's own group can evolve; however, it equally provides a context in which hurting individuals in other groups can be selectively advantageous. Group selection favors within-group niceness *and* between-group nastiness'** (*Unto Others*, p.9).

So, according to D.S. Wilson and Sober, our original instinctive state was *not* one of **'universal benevolence'**, but one with instincts for both **'niceness'** and **'nastiness'**—but that is absolutely untrue. So much of the great literature of the world (especially the work of our greatest thinkers), and all our mythologies, and all our great religious teachings, and even the observations of honest scientists, have recognised that we humans did once live in a *completely* concerned-with-the-larger-whole-not-yourself, *fully* cooperative, *all*-loving, *utterly* harmonious, *totally* empathetic, *absolutely* innocent, **'Garden of Eden'**-like (Gen. 3:23), 'Golden Age'—the instinctive memory of which is our moral soul. To summarise these many references to our species' all-loving instinctive past it is worth recalling the following passage from Richard Heinberg's 1990 book, *Memories & Visions of Paradise*, which was included earlier in Part 4:6: **'Every religion begins with the recognition that human consciousness has been separated from the divine** [Integrative Meaning orientated] **Source, that a former sense of oneness…has been lost…everywhere in religion and myth there is an acknowledgment that we have departed from an original…innocence…the cause of the Fall is described variously as disobedience, as the eating of a forbidden fruit, and as spiritual amnesia** [alienation]**'** (pp.81-82 of 282). For instance, in the Bible, a passage in Ecclesiastics states that **'God made mankind upright** [uncorrupted]**, but men have gone in search of many schemes** [understandings]**'** (7:29). Similarly, Christ spoke of a time when God **'loved** [us] **before the creation of the** [upset, human-condition-afflicted] **world'** (John 17:24), and a time of **'the glory…before the** [upset] **world began'** (John 17:5). The eighth century BC Greek poet Hesiod similarly recognised the pre-human-condition-afflicted, upset-free, completely innocent 'Golden Age' in our species' past in his poem *Works and Days*: **'When gods alike and mortals rose to birth / A golden race the immortals formed on earth…Like gods** [Integrative-Meaning-orientated beings] **they lived, with calm untroubled mind / Free from the toils and anguish of our kind / Nor e'er decrepit age misshaped their frame…Strangers to ill, their lives in feasts flowed by…Dying they sank in sleep, nor seemed to die / Theirs was each good; the life-sustaining soil / Yielded its copious fruits, unbribed by toil / They with abundant goods 'midst quiet lands / All willing shared the gathering of their hands.'**

In a more recent literary work, the poet William Wordsworth referred to the instinctive memory that we are born with of a *fully* cooperative, *all*-loving, *completely* Integrative-Meaning-orientated past existence when he wrote that **'The Soul that rises with us, our life's Star…cometh from afar…trailing clouds of glory do we come / From God, who is our home'** (*Intimations of Immortality*, 1807). In his 1931 book *The Destiny of Man*, the philosopher Nikolai Berdyaev wrote that **'The memory of a lost paradise, of a Golden Age, is very deep in man'** (tr. N. Duddington, 1960, p.36 of 310). The philosopher Bruce Chatwin was another who recognised the harmony that originally existed between our own instinct and still not fully developed conscious mind when he wrote that '[the third century theologian Origen argued that] **at the beginning of human history, men were under supernatural protection, so there was no division between their divine and human natures: or, to rephrase the passage, there was no contradiction between a man's instinctual life and his reason'** (*The Songlines*, 1987, p.227 of 325). Chatwin also recognised mythology's acknowledgement that our species did once live in a state of innocence, writing that **'Every mythology remembers the innocence of the first state: Adam in the Garden, the peaceful Hyperboreans, the Uttarakurus or "the Men of Perfect Virtue" of the Taoists. Pessimists often interpret the story of the Golden Age as a tendency to turn our backs on the ills of the present, and sigh for the happiness of youth. But nothing in Hesiod's**

text exceeds the bounds of probability. The real or half-real tribes which hover on the fringe of ancient geographies—Atavantes, Fenni, Parrossits or the dancing Spermatophagi—have their modern equivalents in the Bushman, the Shoshonean, the Eskimo and the Aboriginal' (ibid. p.227). The philosopher Sir Laurens van der Post also acknowledged that **'before the dawning of individual consciousness'** humans lived in a state of **'togetherness'** when he wrote that **'This shrill, brittle, self-important life of today is by comparison a graveyard where the living are dead and the dead are alive and talking** [through our soul] **in the still, small, clear voice of a love and trust in life that we have for the moment lost…**[there was a time when] **All on earth and in the universe were still members and family of the early race seeking comfort and warmth through the long, cold night before the dawning of individual consciousness in a togetherness which still gnaws like an unappeasable homesickness at the base of the human heart'** (*Testament to the Bushmen*, 1984, pp.127-128 of 176). He had also previously written that **'I spoke to you earlier on of this dark child of nature, this other primitive man within each one of us with whom we are at war in our spirit'** (*The Dark Eye in Africa*, 1955, p.154 of 159), and that **'There was indeed a cruelly denied and neglected first child of life, a Bushman in each of us'** (*The Heart of The Hunter*, 1961, p.126 of 233), describing the relative innocence and empathy of this **'first child of life'** in us as follows: **'He** [the Bushman] **and his needs were committed to the nature of Africa and the swing of its wide seasons as a fish to the sea. He and they all participated so deeply of one another's being that the experience could almost be called mystical. For instance, he seemed to *know* what it actually felt like to be an elephant, a lion, an antelope, a steenbuck, a lizard, a striped mouse, mantis, baobab tree, yellow-crested cobra, or starry-eyed amaryllis, to mention only a few of the brilliant multitudes through which he so nimbly moved. Even as a child it seemed to me that his world was one without secrets between one form of being and another'** (*The Lost World of the Kalahari*, 1958, p.21 of 253). The poet D.H. Lawrence was another who recognised our species' lost state of sensitive innocence when he wrote that **'In the dust, where we have buried / The silent races and their abominations** [their confronting innocence] **/ We have buried so much of the delicate magic of life'** (*Son of Woman: The Story of D.H. Lawrence,* D.H. Lawrence, 1931, p.227 of 402). The philosopher Jean-Jacques Rousseau also acknowledged the innocence of our original instinctive state and our present corrupted state when he wrote that **'nothing is more gentle than man in his primitive state'** (*The Social Contract and Discourses*, 1755; tr. G.D.H. Cole, pub. 1913, Book IV, *The Origin of Inequality*, p.198 of 269) and **'Man is born free but is everywhere in chains'** (*Le Contrat Social*, 1762 [published in English as *The Social Contract*, 1791]). (Science's denial of the relative innocence of so-called 'primitive' races will be discussed in Part 5:2.)

As has been mentioned, the philosopher Immanuel Kant was so impressed by our all-loving, fully altruistic moral instincts that he had inscribed on his tomb the words, **'Two things fill the mind with ever new and increasing admiration and awe: the starry heavens above me and the moral law within me'** (*Critique of Practical Reason*, 1788). The philosopher John Fiske wrote that **'in the study of the moral sense we contemplate the last and noblest product of evolution…the existence of a moral sense and moral intuitions…We approve of certain actions and disapprove of certain actions quite instinctively. We shrink from stealing or lying as we shrink from burning our fingers…In short, there is in our psychical structure a moral sense which is…quickly and directly hurt by wrong-doing or the idea of wrong-doing'** (*Outlines of Cosmic Philosophy*, 1874, Vol.IV, Part II, pp.104, 106, 126). A few years earlier, Charles Darwin had recognised this truth of our species' *fully* integrated orientation to behaving unconditionally selflessly when he wrote that **'the moral sense affords the best and highest distinction between man and the lower animals'** (*The Descent of Man*, 1871, p.495). And we cannot

discuss the truth of the existence within us all of an unconditionally selfless, all-loving, innocent, pure, aligned-with-the-ideals, original instinctive self or soul without citing the words of history's greatest philosopher, Plato, who, long ago, in around 360 BC, wrote that humans have **'knowledge, both before and at the moment of birth…of all absolute standards…**[of] **beauty, goodness, uprightness, holiness…our souls exist before our birth'**. He continued, **'the soul is in every possible way more like the invariable'**, which he described as **'the pure and everlasting and immortal and changeless…realm of the absolute…**[our] **soul resembles the divine'** (*Phaedo*, tr. H. Tredennick).

A less effusive yet still accurate acknowledgement of humans' instinctively cooperative state appears in the summary of an assemblage of presentations given by leading thinkers at a 2009 conference on the 'Man the Hunted and the Origin and Nature of Human Sociality, Altruism and Well-Being', compiled by the anthropologist Robert Sussman and the psychiatrist and geneticist Robert Cloninger, in which they wrote that **'We suggest that human beings are naturally cooperative when healthy and only revert to violence under abnormal conditions, as when stressed, abused, neglected or mentally ill'** (*Origins of Altruism and Cooperation*, 2011, p.ix of 439).

Indeed, even the meaning behind the words used in psychology recognise the truth that humans once lived in an Integrative-Meaning-orientated, fully cooperative, sound soulful state and that it is our behaviour *today* that is **'abnormal'**. For a start, the word 'psychology' literally means the **'study of the soul'**, derived as it is, according to the *Online Etymology Dictionary*, from *psyche*, which comes from the Greek word *psykhe*, meaning **'breath, life, soul'**, and the Greek word *logia*, meaning **'study of'**. Yes, 'psyche' is another word for soul, as the *Penguin Dictionary of Psychology* confirms: **'psyche: The oldest and most general use of this term is by the early Greeks, who envisioned the psyche as the soul or the very essence of life'** (1985). Tellingly, the word 'psychiatry' literally means **'soul-healing'**, derived as it is from the term *psyche* (which again means soul) and the Greek word *iatreia*, which, according to *The Encyclopedic World Dictionary*, means **'healing'**. Similarly revealing of what the study of psychology is really all about is the word 'psychosis', which literally means **'soul-illness'**, coming as it does from *psyche* (which again means soul) and *osis*, which, according to *Dictionary.com*, is also of Greek origin and means **'abnormal state or condition'**. While dictionary definitions of 'soul' are somewhat evasive they still manage to reveal the real significance of the word. For instance, the *Concise Oxford Dictionary* defines 'soul' as **'the immaterial…moral and emotional part of man'**, and as the **'animating or essential part'** of us, while *The Macquarie Dictionary* describes 'soul' as the **'principle of life, feeling, thought, and action in humans'**, and as being **'the spiritual part of humans regarded in its moral aspect…the seat of the feelings or sentiments'**.

Yes, the truth is that we do **'come from God, who is our home'**—our instinctive self or **'soul resembles the divine'**, **'the very essence of life'**, its **'breath'**. And since integrativeness is the theme of existence and thus universal and eternal, our soul is *fully* representative of the **'eternal'**, **'pure and everlasting and immortal and changeless…absolute'**. D.S. Wilson and Sober's claim that our original instinctive state is *not* one of **'universal benevolence'** but one with instincts for both **'niceness'** and **'nastiness'** *is* absolutely untrue; it's completely inconsistent with all we know about the nature of our wonderful original instinctive self or soul—which *is* a state of **'universal benevolence'**!!

Secondly, with regard to why we are selfish, D.S. Wilson and Sober maintain that our selfish behaviour comes from selfish instincts derived from individual-level selection—from sexually reproducing individuals competing with each other for food, shelter, territory and a mate. The truth, as has now been biologically explained, is that through the love-indoctrination process humans were able to overcome the selfish, competitive 'animal condition' and develop a completely unconditionally selfless, concerned-with-the-larger-whole-not-yourself, all-loving, moral instinctive orientation to life, which all the quotes above bear witness to the existence of and which we all know is true if we are prepared to be honest. So the question is, having become completely selflessly behaved, *why* did we become capable of selfishness, and not just selfishness but extreme anger, brutality and hatred towards our fellow humans? *That* is the real issue about our less-than-ideally behaved 'human condition' that biology had to explain. And the answer to that question is that when our fully conscious mind emerged after the instinctive blocks that exist in all other species' minds against thinking selflessly and thus truthfully and thus effectively had been breached by the love-indoctrination process (this explanation for how we became conscious was briefly provided at the beginning of Part 3:11 and will be fully presented in Part 8:7B), an upsetting battle broke out between our conscious mind and our already established perfect instinctive orientation to behaving cooperatively and lovingly (this upsetting battle was explained in Parts 3:2 and 3:4). It was this psychological upset, this anger, egocentricity and alienation, that made us capable of selfishness. Until we could explain this reason for why we defied our perfectly loving instincts, we were condemned to a state of insecurity, or what was historically referred to as 'guilt', about our fundamental worth and goodness, and, as a result, were forever trying to prove and demonstrate our goodness and worth, and forever trying to relieve ourselves of that insecurity through material reinforcement—and it was this relentless self-preoccupation with trying to prove and demonstrate that we were good and not bad, and to find relief from our insecurity, that explains our selfish behaviour. We became selfish as a result of being psychologically upset.

Again, our human condition is *not* a result of having developed instincts for being selfish and instincts for being selfless, the conflicting influences of which we then had to consciously try to manage—no, the psychologically upset state of the human condition emerged *after* we became completely instinctively orientated to a fully integrative, utterly cooperative, unconditionally selfless, all-loving way of living, and *after* we became fully conscious. Our human condition is a result of a deep insecurity about our meaning and worth as humans, a guilty conscience—the result of which is immense psychosis and neurosis.

That is the fully accountable and thus true explanation of all that we know about our human condition. To again present that perfect description (for it is not an *explanation—that* had to wait for science to find understanding of the different ways genes and nerves process information) of what we all know about the nature of our human condition from that most voted-for-for-its-truth document in human history, the Bible: **'God created man in his own image'** (Gen. 1:27) (we did once live in that *completely* integrated, unconditionally selflessly behaved, cooperative, loving ideal state), and then we took the **'fruit' from the tree of…knowledge'** (Gen. 3:3, 2:17) (became conscious), and then we **'fell from grace'** (derived from the title of Gen. 3, **'The Fall of Man'**) (became corrupted, psychologically upset, angry, egocentric and alienated), and, as a result, were **'banished…from the Garden of Eden'** (Gen. 3:23) state of our original innocence

(became insecure/guilt-ridden about our fundamental goodness and worth) and became **'a restless wanderer on the earth'** (Gen. 4:14) (became psychotic and neurotic) until we could find the reconciling, healing understanding of the **'good and evil'** (Gen. 3:5) in our make-up and, by so doing, *become* **'like God, knowing** [understanding] **good and evil'** (ibid). From being **'in the image of God'** (Gen. 1:27)—that is, instinctively orientated to the integrative, Godly ideals of being cooperative, selfless and loving—we would search for the understanding of our consciousness-derived-and-induced psychologically upset, corrupted, **'fall**[en]**'** state that would finally enable us to become **'knowing'** (Gen. 3:5)—that is, cognisant of the integrative, Godly ideals and why we departed from them.

So, claiming that the reason we are selfish is because we have selfish instincts derived from having to compete for food, shelter, territory and a mate doesn't even begin to explain all that we know about the nature of our human condition. It overlooks the fact that our human behaviour involves our unique fully conscious thinking mind. Descriptions of our behaviour, such as arrogant, deluded, optimistic, pessimistic, artificial, superficial, guilty, depressed, inspired, psychotic, alienated, all imply a consciousness-derived *psychological* dimension to *our* behaviour. We humans suffer from a consciousness-derived, psychological HUMAN CONDITION, *not* an instinct-controlled ANIMAL CONDITION—<u>it is unique to us fully conscious humans</u>.

Yes, our selfish condition is *psychologically* derived, and further, our selfishness is but *one* expression of our psychologically upset, divisive condition—for beyond selfishness there is *the entirety* of our psychosis, in particular our egocentricity, anger, depression and alienation, to consider and account for. The truth is there is an *immense* amount of consciousness-involved psychosis and neurosis in our human condition, not just the psychological ulterior motives that D.S. Wilson and Sober superficially focused on. And as emphasised, culture *has* played a big part in the human journey, but *not* in creating the human condition, as D.S. Wilson and Sober assert, but in trying to manage it.

The fact is, D.S. Wilson and Sober's account of human behaviour contains no acknowledgement of the whole consciousness-involved psychology of our human condition. As such, it's a completely superficial and artificial interpretation. <u>Any *real* description and explanation of human nature would deal with the absolute agony of our condition, and the consciousness-derived-and-induced, upset, psychological sickness of alienation, anger and selfish egocentricity that it has produced in us, but none of this real analysis, description and accountable explanation of our human condition is present in D.S. Wilson and Sober's Multilevel Selection, instincts-for-**'niceness'**-and-**'nastiness'**-but-not-for-**'universal benevolence'** 'explanation'. It offers no real confrontation with the issue of the human condition, with our psychosis and neurosis, with our soul and mind sickness, at all, and because it doesn't, it has not really contributed to or furthered our understanding of human nature</u>. Again, as R.D. Laing said, **'Our alienation goes to the roots. The realization of this is the essential springboard for any serious reflection on any aspect of present inter-human life.'** Realising/addressing the issue of our psychological and neurological alienation *is* **'the essential springboard for any serious reflection on any aspect of present inter-human life'**.

In summary, our original instinctive state *wasn't* composed of selfish instincts derived from individual-level selection and selfless instincts derived from group-level selection as D.S. Wilson and Sober maintain, rather our original instinctive orientation was to behaving in a completely unconditionally selfless, concerned-with-the-larger-whole-not-yourself, all-loving, moral way, an orientation that resulted from the love-indoctrination process. We *then* became conscious and *then* psychologically upset and *then* selfishly self-preoccupied. So, to say that our original instinctive state entailed both selfish and selfless instincts, with the selfless instincts resulting from aggressive warring with other humans, is completely and entirely inconsistent with what we have always known about the nature of our human condition. It is just a contorted, bewildered, dishonest—alienated—interpretation of the nature of our human condition. It is just the sort of rubbish people conjure up when they have lost all access to what it is that we need to explain about ourselves—namely how our original innocent, **'Garden of Eden'**-like state of **'universal benevolence'** became corrupted, and our **'fall**[en]**'**, immensely alienated, psychotic and neurotic selfish, self-preoccupied state that we live in today emerged.

Basically, this left-wing, Multilevel Selection account of the origin of our selfish behaviour and of our unconditionally selfless, moral instinctive orientation to life is just as desperate, superficial and 'smoke-and-mirrors'-dishonest as the kin-selection-based, Evolutionary Psychology, right-wing account that dismissively asserted that **'"moral guidance" is a euphemism'** and that **'Rousseau claimed** [that humanity] **was originally a race of noble savages in a peaceful state of nature, who were later corrupted…**[but what] **Rousseau invented** [was] **a stunningly inaccurate form of anthropology'**. What D.S. Wilson and Sober have put forward is essentially the old Social Darwinist, 'The reason we are selfish is because we have instincts derived from having to compete for food, shelter, territory and a mate'-account, with some selfless instincts that were supposedly derived from warring with other groups thrown into the mix. There is no acknowledgement whatsoever of the involvement of that **'essential springboard for any serious reflection on any aspect of present inter-human life'** of our consciousness-involved, derived and induced *psychologically* upset, **'alienation'** that in truth **'goes to the roots'** of our condition.

Part 4:12I The Theory of Eusociality—the most dangerous lie in human history

Introduction

The question that may arise from what has just been explained about how completely untrue and dishonest D.S. Wilson and Sober's Multilevel Selection theory is, is why give it all this attention? The answer is because it has been parlayed into the most dangerous lie in human history—*so* dangerous because the lie is so seductive that it has the potential to keep humanity living in the darkness of alienated denial forever; or at least until the human race becomes extinct from terminal levels of alienation. The Multilevel Selection theory has become the basis of a whole new, supposedly biology-based excuse for humans to use to avoid any confrontation with their psychologically upset human condition—and this latest incarnation is by far the trickiest of all the excuses we have seen.

What has happened is that someone was watching the emergence of the between-group selection argument and saw that it had the potential to be developed into the equivalent of nothing less than a new Bible for the human race, a new description and contexting of the whole issue of our troubled human condition—but, in this instance, it's a completely *dishonest* interpretation. It is not hard to guess who that perpetrator is: yes, it is none other than that lord of lying, duke of denial, bishop of bullshit, king of 'krap'; that master of keeping humanity *away* from any truth; indeed, the quintessential anti-Christ—Edward O. Wilson himself.

As mentioned in Part 4:12D when his development of Sociobiology was being presented, E.O. Wilson has an *extremely* astute radar for ideas in biology that have the potential to artificially relieve humans of the unbearable agony of the human condition. Indeed, his antenna for ways to evade the human condition is as astute as St Paul's was in seeing the potential of Christianity to save the human race from self-destruction while it was waiting to find self-understanding—the *big* difference being that E.O Wilson's antenna was for spotting ideas that, while immensely influential, actually have the potential to destroy the human race, not save it.

Paradoxically, D.S. Wilson's intention when developing the Multilevel Selection theory was to provide a way to *counter* the right-wing's selfishness-emphasising theory of Sociobiology/Evolutionary Psychology, but what E.O. Wilson could see was that the theory could be used to justify selflessness *and* selfishness, thereby supposedly satisfying *both* the left-wing and right-wing camps; moreover, it could be used to provide a completely fake, human-condition-*avoiding*-not-human-condition-*confronting* biological explanation for our 'good and evil'-afflicted human condition!! While D.S. Wilson and Sober were recognising a 'good vs evil', **'niceness'** vs **'nastiness'**, human-condition-like duality when they wrote that **'our goal in this book is not to paint a rosy picture of universal benevolence. Group selection does provide a setting in which helping behavior directed at members of one's own group can evolve; however, it equally provides a context in which hurting individuals in other groups can be selectively advantageous. Group selection favors within-group niceness *and* between-group nastiness'**, they were seemingly so intent on countering the selfishness-emphasising theory of Sociobiology/Evolutionary Psychology that they failed to recognise how their Multilevel Selection theory could be used as a way to supposedly explain the human condition. In fact, the term 'human condition' is only mentioned four times in *Unto Others*, once in reference to George Price's personal philosophy, and three times in reference to the ancestral hunter-forager way of living, but never in reference to the theory's potential to provide an explanation for the human condition—and this omission was not because they knew it would be dishonest to use it to explain the human condition; it was simply a failure to apply their concept to the issue. D.S. Wilson, for example, has written that **'what he** [E.O. Wilson] **says about group selection deserves our attention'** ('Richard Dawkins, Edward O. Wilson, and the Consensus of the Many', <https://www.prosocial.world/posts/richard-dawkins-edward-o-wilson-and-the-consensus-of-the-many>, May 2012).

E.O. Wilson was not so distracted; he could see that a Multilevel Selection theory that put forward the idea that we have both selfish instincts derived from individual-level selection and selfless instincts derived from between-group selection could present an 'explanation' of that most perplexing of all issues of our human condition. He saw that it could be argued that we have to live with instinctive potentials for both **'niceness'** and **'nastiness'** that we are

forever having to consciously try to manage—in other words, that we suffer from the dilemma of 'the human condition'. As was fully explained in the previous Part 4:12H-vi, D.S. Wilson and Sober's instincts for **'niceness'** and instincts for **'nastiness'** explanation is a completely and utterly superficial, artificial, unaccountable, insincere and dishonest description of human nature, but once again, when the need for denial is critical any excuse will do, and what is so extremely seductive—and sinister—about this Multilevel 'explanation' of the human condition is that it presents a way of 'explaining' the human condition *without having to actually confront the human condition!!*

At the end of the previous Part 4:12H-vi, it was emphasised that the Multilevel account of human nature fails to recognise, acknowledge and address the underlying consciousness-derived-and-induced psychologically upset state involved in the human condition. To briefly recap the criticisms that were made of D.S. Wilson and Sober's Multilevel account of human nature, it was emphasised that the idea that our moral instinctive self or soul is derived from aggressively warring with other groups of humans does not equate at all with what we all know about what our born-with, instinctive moral conscience wants us to feel and behave towards *all* humans, which is to be loving. And it was emphasised that no human who is prepared to be truthful would accept that our species' completely concerned-with-the-larger-whole-not-yourself, moral instinctive orientation to life is driven by an extremely selfish, competitive and divisive cause, namely to give warring groups a competitive advantage. Further, it was pointed out that to be as deeply, completely and truly loving as our moral instinctive orientation is, you have to be nurtured in an *environment of love*—not, as occurs in the between-group selection model, in an environment where everyone is basically selfish, and where any selflessness that *does* occur is continually under siege from selfish cheaters. We are born with an instinctive expectation of being unconditionally loved which comes from a time when our species lived in a nurturing, all-loving situation, but there is no recognition of this in this Multilevel theory.

It was also stated that a complex, devious, subtle mechanism of repeatedly dispersing and then coming together in groups where somehow altruists associate with altruists and the selfish associate with the selfish, isn't at all consistent with how our universally and always loving, unsophisticated, unsubtle, straightforward, uncomplicated, moral instinctive orientation to life operates. It was *also* emphasised that instead of creating just a few unconditionally selfless/loving traits, love-indoctrination has given us a *complete* orientation to love in the sense that while between-group selection may have enabled a rare few unconditionally selfless traits to emerge, its ability to develop unconditional selflessness en masse—many, many unconditionally selfless instincts together—indeed, to develop an entire genetic ethos of unconditional selflessness, a not-occasional-but-in-all-situations, universal, concerned-with-the-completely larger-whole-not-yourself, moral instinctive orientation to life, such as we have, has to be impossible.

Further, it was pointed out that claiming that our original instinctive state was not one of **'universal benevolence'** but one where we have instincts for both **'niceness'** and **'nastiness'** was completely inconsistent with what all the great literature of the world, and all our mythologies, and all our great religious teachings, and even honest scientists, have recognised, which is that we humans *did* once live in a *completely* concerned-with-the-larger-whole-

not-yourself, *fully* cooperative, *all*-loving, *utterly* harmonious, *totally* empathetic, *absolutely* innocent, **'Garden of Eden'**-like, 'Golden Age', the instinctive memory of which is our moral soul. Many quotes that resonate with this truth were included to evidence this, starting with Richard Heinberg's observation that **'Every religion begins with the recognition that human consciousness has been separated from the divine** [Integrative Meaning orientated] **Source, that a former sense of oneness…has been lost…everywhere in religion and myth there is an acknowledgment that we have departed from an original…innocence…the cause of the Fall is described variously as disobedience, as the eating of a forbidden fruit, and as spiritual amnesia** [alienation]**.'**

And, lastly, it was pointed out that D.S. Wilson and Sober's assertion that our selfish behaviour comes from selfish instincts derived from individual-level selection—from sexually reproducing individuals competing with each other for food, shelter, territory and a mate—is completely inconsistent with what we all know about the nature of our human condition. *Again*, it overlooks the fact that our human behaviour involves our unique fully conscious thinking mind. After all, the terms used to describe our behaviour—such as arrogant, deluded, optimistic, pessimistic, artificial, superficial, guilty, depressed, inspired, psychotic, alienated—all imply a consciousness-derived *psychological* dimension to *our* behaviour. We humans suffer from a consciousness-derived, psychological HUMAN CONDITION, *not* an instinct-controlled ANIMAL CONDITION; our condition is unique to us fully conscious humans. Yes, D.S. Wilson and Sober's account completely failed to recognise that our selfish behaviour results from a consciousness-derived-and-induced *psychosis* and *neurosis*—a psychologically and neurologically upset and insecure state in which we are selfishly having to try to prove our goodness and worth, and selfishly seek relief through material reinforcement.

Basically, the Multilevel theory failed to acknowledge, let alone account for, all the fundamental aspects that we know are involved in the human condition, which, as was pointed out, are summarised in that most voted-for-for-its-truth document in human history, the Bible—that **'God created man in his own image'** (we did once live in that *completely* integrated, unconditionally selflessly behaved, cooperative, loving ideal state), and then we took the **'fruit' 'from the tree of…knowledge'** (became conscious), and then we **'fell from grace'** (became corrupted, psychologically upset, selfishly preoccupied with anger, egocentricity and alienation), and, as a result, were **'banished…from the Garden of Eden'** state of our original innocence (became insecure/guilt-ridden about our fundamental goodness and worth) and became **'a restless wanderer on the earth'** (became psychotic—our instinctive self or soul became repressed because it condemned our intellect; and neurotic—our conscious mind became distressed because it couldn't explain itself) until we could find the reconciling, healing understanding of the **'good and evil'** in our make-up and, by so doing, *become* **'like God, knowing** [understanding of our] **good and evil** [afflicted lives]**'**. Yes, any *truthful* account of the human condition would acknowledge and explain that we humans did once live in an innocent Garden-of-Eden-like state, and that we *then* became conscious, and *then* became psychologically upset and corrupted, at which point we had to find the reconciling understanding of why we had become psychologically upset and corrupted. And it should be added that finding that true reconciling understanding of our human condition leads to both our liberation from the human condition and, unavoidably at the same time, confronting exposure of the extent of our corrupted condition; it couldn't be any other way—the truth

about the human condition necessarily exposes the extent of our *own* corrupted condition. Again, this arrival of understanding of the human condition that leads to the liberation from, and also the exposure of, that condition is acknowledged in all the great religious texts. For example, the Bible refers to a time when **'Another book** [will be]**…opened which is the book of life** [the human-condition-explaining and thus humanity-liberating book]**…**[and] **a new heaven and a new earth** [will appear] **for the first heaven and the first earth** [will have]**…passed away…**[and the dignifying full truth about our condition] **will wipe every tear from…**[our] **eyes. There will be no more death or mourning or crying or pain, for the old order of things has passed away'** (Rev. 20:12, 21:1,4). Buddhist scripture contains exactly the same anticipation of this fabulous time when humans **'will with a perfect voice preach the true Dharma** [present the supreme wisdom, namely reconciling, healing understanding of the human condition]**, which is auspicious and removes all ill'**, saying, **'Human beings are then without any blemishes, moral offences are unknown among them, and they are full of zest and joy. Their bodies are very large and their skin has a fine hue. Their strength is quite extraordinary'** (Maitreyavyakarana, tr. Edward Conze, *Buddhist Scriptures*, 1959, pp.238-242). Yes, the end result of the arrival of understanding of the human condition *is* the emergence of a human race that is free of the human condition, but obviously there has to be a period of transition when we each have to face the aforementioned exposure of the extent of our own corrupted condition, and this great honesty day, truth day, exposure day, come-clean day—in fact, judgment day—is recognised in the Bible as the **'day of judgment'** (Matt. 10:15, 11:22, 24, 12:36; Mark 6:11; 2 Pet. 2:9, 3:7; 1 John 4:17) and **'the day when God will judge men's secrets'** (Rom. 2:16). It is also described by the prophet Isaiah, who said that the liberation that **'gives you relief from suffering and turmoil and cruel bondage…will come with vengeance; with divine retribution…to save you. Then will the eyes of the blind be opened and the ears of the deaf unstopped…Your nakedness will be exposed'** (14:3; 35:4, 5; 47:3). The prophet Muhammad also referred to **'the Day of Reckoning'** (*The Koran*, ch.56) and **'the Last Judgement'** (ibid. ch.69), providing this similar description of it: **'when the Trumpet is blown with a single blast and the earth and the mountains are lifted up and crushed with a single blow, Then, on that day, the Terror shall come to pass, and heaven shall be split…On that day you shall be exposed, not one secret of yours concealed'** (ibid. ch.69).

Of course, it is not only in religious texts that we find accounts of the true story of humans' journey from innocence to the emergence of consciousness and, with it, the corruption of our original innocent instinctive state, to the eventual finding of the reconciling, ameliorating human-race-transforming, soundness-resurrecting understanding of the human condition. The following description from more recent times, which was referred to in Part 4:7, comes from the Russian philosopher Nikolai Berdyaev's 1931 book, *The Destiny of Man*, from a chapter actually titled 'The Origin of Good and Evil': **'The memory of a lost paradise, of a Golden Age, is very deep in man, together with a sense of guilt and sin and a dream of regaining the Kingdom of Heaven which sometimes assumes the form of a Utopia or an earthly paradise…We are faced with a profound enigma: how could man have renounced paradise which he recalls so longingly in our world-aeon? How could he have fallen away from it?…The exile of man from paradise means that man fell away from God…Not everything was revealed to man in paradise, and ignorance was the condition of the life in it. It was the realm of the unconscious…Man rejected the bliss and wholeness of Eden and chose the pain and tragedy of cosmic life in order to explore his destiny to its inmost depths. This was the birth of consciousness with its painful dividedness. In falling away from the harmony of**

paradise and from unity with God, man began to make distinctions and valuations, tasted the fruit of the tree of knowledge and found himself on this side of good and evil' (tr. N. Duddington, 1960, p.36 & 38 of 310). Further on, he wrote that **'man is an irrational, paradoxical, essentially tragic being…Philosophers and scientists have done very little to elucidate the problem of man'** (p.49), and, **'psychologists were wrong in assuming that man was a healthy creature, mainly conscious and intellectual, and should be studied from that point of view. Man is a sick being…the distinction between the conscious and the subconscious mind is fundamental for the new psychology'** (pp.67-68). Earlier in *The Destiny of Man*, Berdyaev also described very clearly why **'Philosophers and scientists have done very little to elucidate the problem of man'** and, by so doing, bring about **'the new psychology'**—the reason, of course, being humans' great **'fear'**, in fact, **'primeval terror'**, of confronting the truth of our psychologically **'sick'** condition; as he wrote, **'Knowledge requires great daring. It means victory over ancient, primeval terror. Fear makes the search for truth and the knowledge of it impossible. Knowledge implies fearlessness…it must also be said of knowledge that it is bitter…Particularly bitter is moral knowledge, the knowledge of good and evil** [which is the issue of the human condition]**. But the bitterness is due to the fallen state of the world…it must be said that the very distinction between good and evil is a bitter distinction, the bitterest thing in the world…There is a deadly pain in the very distinction of good and evil, of the valuable and the worthless. We cannot rest in the thought that that distinction is ultimate. The longing for God in the human heart springs from the fact that we cannot bear to be faced for ever with the distinction between good and evil** (pp.14-15). Yes, to not be **'faced for ever with the distinction between good and evil'** we HAD TO face the **'deadly pain in the very distinction of good and evil'**—BUT while the great *flaw* in the Multilevel account of our human condition *is* that it doesn't deal with this real, **'painful'**, **'ancient, primeval terror'** of the *psychological* issue of our human condition, E.O. Wilson was astute enough to see that that flaw was precisely its greatest *asset*, for it offered a way to supposedly explain the human condition *without* having to acknowledge and engage the agonising, real, true, alienated, core, **'deadly pain'** of the psychological condition within ourselves! The truth is, the Multilevel account of the human condition is a completely fake, deliberately trivialising account of the human condition. And in advocating such a dishonest account, its proponents were effectively condemning humanity to be **'faced for ever with the distinction between good and evil'**—because, as Berdyaev said, such **'fear'** of the real human condition **'makes the search for truth and the knowledge of it impossible'**. *Only* the **'fearless' 'search for truth'** could deliver the actual, human-race-liberating explanation of the human condition, which has now been carried out with this, the fully accountable, ameliorating **'truth and the knowledge'** about our condition, the product.

Yes, the Multilevel theory provided a 'get out of jail free' card for humans, a way to avoid having to confront the issue of the immense psychosis and neurosis of our real human condition while arguing that the human condition had been addressed and explained—'What guilt? What insecurity of self? What psychosis and neurosis? What 'sickness of the soul' that we are supposed to experience? What 'deadly distinction between good and evil'? What 'inner depression from our fallen condition'? What 'deeply troubled state'? What 'alienation'? What **'deadly pain in the very distinction of good and evil, of the valuable and the worthless'**? What **'fallen state of the world'**? What '[p]**articularly bitter' 'moral knowledge'**? What **'primal terror'** that, in order to understand and ameliorate, requires a **'new psychology'**? What 'redemption' is it that I need? What 'horror and agony of the human condition'? What 'Resignation' that I'm

supposed to have gone through? What 'Golden Age, soulful innocent past'? What great truth of a Godly Integrative Meaning to existence? What great hunger for a human-condition-healed world? What great dream of the arrival of 'peace on Earth as it is in heaven'? What great psychological scourge of the human race that philosophers have written about? What great day of self-confrontation is coming? What **'day of judgment'**? What **'day'** when **'not one secret'** of mine will be **'concealed'**, which religious teachings have predicted? What **'auspicious'** reconciling understanding that **'removes all ill'**? I don't know what the hell you are talking about—the human condition is nothing more than the manifestation of selfish instincts that are virtually universal in nature and some additional selfless instincts that we acquired as a result of groups of humans fighting against other groups of humans; so fuck off with all your psychological crap, I have no idea what you are talking about. On a good day I *might* try to be nice to people just so they will like me, but on most days I honestly couldn't give a flying fuck about anyone else!' (Yes, this is where humanity is at! Please God [the truth of the existence of universal love and meaning], help me to stop all this madness, this horrific sickness of denial that is destroying humanity.)

But given how horrifically agonising the issue of the human condition actually is, this way of pretending to address the issue of the human condition without actually addressing it was an *extremely* seductive concept for overly upset humans. Sure it meant burying humanity deeper into the cave of denial, and by so doing leading it to the brink of terminal alienation and the extinction of the human race, but as I said earlier, humans have become so upset, embattled and embittered by the human condition that many no longer care about the future of the human race, they only care about finding some way to relieve themselves of their human condition. So rather than being the solution to all our problems, this Multilevel fake explanation of the human condition is the ultimate expression of the end play, end game situation that the human race is now in. Either this great lie, the most seductive and thus sinister lie to have ever been invented, is resisted and exposed, or humanity dies! That is how dangerous this Multilevel account of the human condition is. And, again, it's made so much more seductive and thus sinister by appearing to satisfy both the left-wing and right-wing camps—for while it acknowledges that we have unconditionally selfless moral instincts, it *also* supposedly explains and, in effect, justifies our selfish behaviour as a natural part of our make-up. In fact, since selfishness still supposedly has a powerful presence in our instinctive make-up, it could be viewed as more of a selfishness-justifying, right-wing-supporting theory than an idealistic selflessness-emphasising, left-wing-supporting theory, which must have been somewhat of a shock to D.S. Wilson and Sober whose whole intention in putting forward the Multilevel theory was, as they said, **'as an antidote to the rampant individualism'**.

The great fake explanation of the human condition had arrived! That greatest mystery of all of the human condition has supposedly finally been solved! Explanation of the 'good' and 'evil' aspects of the human condition has supposedly been found! Our great quest for self-knowledge is supposedly finally over! The breakthrough of breakthroughs in the human journey has supposedly finally occurred and we can now understand ourselves! What a terrible, unconscionable lie, but what a relief for denial-committed, 'avoid-the-human-condition-by-any-means-you-can-and-don't-worry-about-the-future-of-the-human-race' humans!

E.O. Wilson could see all this potential and, being the psychologically embattled enemy of truth that he is (he actually epitomises the time predicted by Christ in the Bible when **'the love of most will grow cold'** (Matt. 24:12), which I talk about in Part 3:11H) he grasped it with both hands, even commandeering the idea as largely his own discovery, even re-branding it the 'New Theory of Eusociality'. In fact, D.S. Wilson, the recognised developer of Multilevel Selection theory, isn't even mentioned in E.O. Wilson's 2012 book *The Social Conquest of Earth* (to be introduced shortly) that launched his 'new theory' on the world—apart from in the References at the back of the book where he writes that **'Sequenced multilevel theory owes its origins to many sources, but the main thrust of its development occurred through the following articles, in which the present author played a role'**, citing a 2007 paper and a 2008 paper that E.O. Wilson managed to co-author with D.S. Wilson, *ten years after* D.S. Wilson and Sober's *Unto Others* was published—a book that E.O. Wilson doesn't even mention in *The Social Conquest of Earth*! This is all a re-run of what occurred with kin selection where E.O. Wilson attached himself to William Hamilton and then virtually usurped the concept as his own, re-branding it as 'Sociobiology'. At 83 years of age at the time of the publication of *The Social Conquest of Earth* in 2012, E.O. Wilson has had plenty of time to hone his techniques.

To context E.O. Wilson's complete change of allegiance from being the main architect and promoter of the kin-selection-based, selfishness-emphasising, Sociobiology/Evolutionary Psychology theory, to completely disowning kin selection and instead advocating the multilevel 'New Theory of Eusociality', what E.O. Wilson had realised from all the hateful resistance to Evolutionary Psychology's dismissal of our moral instincts as nothing more than a subtle form of selfishness was that that excuse for our divisive condition had run its course—it had become too abhorrent and patently dishonest to continue to be used. And so a new excuse *had* to be found, and the absolute miracle from E.O. Wilson's perspective is that the Multilevel, between-group-selection-emphasising theory not only justified right-wing selfishness, it could *also* satisfy the selflessness-emphasising left-wing that wanted to admit we have unconditionally selfless moral instincts. As pointed out in a 2011 article reporting on this New Theory of Eusociality alternative explanation to kin selection's dismissal of our moral instincts as nothing more than a subtle form of selfishness, **'Those who bristle at the notion that all altruistic behavior can be recast, via kin selection, as being indirectly self-interested—those who would like to think there's room in nature for a more genuine form of altruism—may find it appealing'** (Leon Neyfakh, 'Where does good come from?', *Boston Globe*, 17 Apr. 2011). E.O. Wilson could see that both the right and the left could supposedly be satisfied by this Multilevel theory—indeed, he could see that they could now join forces in preventing the issue of the human condition from ever being truthfully confronted, acknowledged, understood, reconciled and healed!

Many Sociobiologists/Evolutionary Psychologists were caught on the hop by their leading advocate's shift from supporting their kin-selection-based theory to supporting the new Multilevel Selection theory, but if E.O. Wilson could talk to them truthfully about his change of position, he would argue: 'Can't you see what I'm doing? We have to admit altruism exists—the subtle form of selfishness dismissal of our moral instincts is a spent tactic, everyone is sick of it, so what I have done is find an even trickier way for humans to evade the agony of the human condition, one that doesn't deny that we have genuinely altruistic moral instincts but still excuses our selfish behaviour—and not only that, what is

even more wonderful is that it provides an explanation of the human condition that doesn't require that we have to actually *confront* the psychosis of our human condition.'

And people have begun to 'get it', to catch on, as E.O. Wilson acknowledged in 2012 when writing about the reception he received after he and the mathematicians Martin Nowak and Corina Tarnita introduced the Eusociality explanation in a 2010 paper titled 'The evolution of eusociality' that was published in *Nature* magazine (Vol.466, 26 Aug. 2010): **'A strong reaction from supporters of kin selection not surprisingly ensued, and soon afterward more than 130 of them** [in a letter published in *Nature* magazine, Vol.471, 24 Mar. 2011] **famously signed on to protest our replacement of kin selection by multilevel selection, and most emphatically the key role given to group selection…Since that protest, the number of supporters of the multilevel selection approach has grown, to the extent that a similarly long list of signatories could be obtained'** ('Evolution and Our Inner Conflict', *The New York Times*, *Opinionator*, 24 Jun. 2012). In the article, E.O. Wilson justified this growing support by saying that **'at no time have our mathematical and empirical arguments been refuted or even seriously challenged'**, but, as I say, he can't talk truthfully about the *real* reason people would want to adopt an evasive Multilevel theory.

So, E.O. Wilson abandoned Sociobiology/Evolutionary Psychology and became the ringleader for Multilevel Selection theory as a way to explain (but, in truth, avoid) the human condition. Naming it the **'New Theory of Eusociality'** (*The Social Conquest of Earth*, 2012, p.183 of 331), E.O. Wilson presented his account of it to the general public in 2012 in his book *The Social Conquest of Earth*, in which he explained that **'eusociality'** (which is derived from the Greek *eu* meaning **'good/real'**, and the word **'social'**) is **'the condition of multiple generations organized into groups by means of an altruistic division of labor'** (p.133). Yes, the fully integrated state is the **'good/real social'** state, but E.O. Wilson's Eusociality explanation of its origins is completely *unreal*.

The book's promotion—E.O. Wilson pitches himself as 'Darwin's heir'!!

As has been explained, E.O. Wilson's *The Social Conquest of Earth* is the biggest, most dangerous con job the world has ever seen. It represents the height of sophistication in the art of denial, and the scam begins with the book's presentation. Unlike the voluminous tome of his earlier, supposedly human-race-explaining book *Sociobiology: The New Synthesis*, which he now completely disowns, **'E.O. Wilson's Theory of Everything'** (*The Atlantic* mag. Nov. 2011) is usefully hand-sized—like a Bible is designed to be! With its short, digestible chapters and uncomplicated illustrations it is clear that a lot of thought has gone into its production. But just how outrageous this book is ('outrageous' because of how patently dishonest E.O. Wilson's **'Theory of Everything'** is) can be gauged from the promotional blurb attached to it. The book's dust jacket cites a commendation that effectively serves as a subtitle to the book (the underlinings are my emphasis)—**'A monumental exploration of the <u>biological origins of the human condition</u>.'** The promotional blurb on the leaves of the jacket continues in the same fashion: **'From the <u>most celebrated</u> living <u>heir to Darwin</u> comes this groundbreaking book on evolution, the summa work of Edward O. Wilson's <u>legendary</u> career…In refashioning the story of human evolution, he… present**[s] **us with the <u>clearest explanation ever produced as to the origins of the human condition</u>. In doing so, Wilson also <u>brilliantly</u> reveals how <u>"group selection" can be the only model for explaining man's origins</u> and domination…**[The book] **is <u>the single most important new history of animal and human</u>**

evolution in a generation…Wilson is regarded as one of the world's preeminent biologists'. Further commendations on the back of the jacket refer to Wilson's **'urgent reflections on the human condition. At the core of *The Social Conquest of Earth* is the unresolved, unresolvable tension in our species between selfishness and altruism'**, while others state that **'Once again, Edward O. Wilson has written a book combining the qualities that have brought his previous books Pulitzer Prizes and millions of readers: a big but simple question, powerful explanations, magisterial knowledge'**, and '[this book] **could transform our understanding of human nature…advancing human self-understanding'**. (Note that even though Sociobiology and its progeny Evolutionary Psychology were said to explain the human condition—for example, in *Consilience* E.O. Wilson wrote that **'The strongest appeal of consilience is…the value of understanding the human condition with a higher degree of certainty'** (1998, p.7)—Sociobiology/Evolutionary Psychology were never strongly promoted as providing explanation of the human condition. However, with the theory of Eusociality, Wilson's claim that it has solved the human condition is front and centre in its publicity—the inference being that what he is presenting now is the definitive explanation of the human condition.)

E.O. Wilson certainly has been **'celebrated'** and is considered a **'legendary' 'preeminent biologist'**. To mention just a few of his accolades, he has been awarded two Pulitzer Prizes, the U.S. National Medal of Science and in 1995 was named one of *TIME* magazine's 25 Most Influential People in America. He has as many medals, ribbons and gongs on his chest as an African dictator, and the truth is they are about as justified and meaningful. He is the complete fake, the very *opposite* of the **'heir to Darwin'**. Whereas Darwin was an honest thinker, a contributor of light to the world, E.O. Wilson is the prince of darkness, the archetypal baddie with the black hat, *the* Lord of Lying—and what we have in this, his latest book, *The Social Conquest of Earth*, is the devil's Bible. While Christ and his words represent the very essence of truth (as evidenced by my constant reference to his words to illustrate the truthful biological explanation of the human condition), E.O. Wilson and *his* words represent the very opposite of truth. Yes, E.O. Wilson *is* the quintessential anti-Christ. That is the reality: E.O. Wilson's **'summa work'** represents the grand finale in the two million year long story of the development of denial on Earth—it is the final great push to have the world of lies with all its sickness, darkness and ugliness swamp the world. If I'm being harsh it is because I need to be: this lying has to be stopped. Make no mistake, E.O. Wilson is trying to kill the human race, prevent it from ever reaching liberating understanding. The long anticipated last great battle on Earth, the fabled battle of Armageddon, is actually the battle between the entrenched dark world of denial and the emerging new enlightened, true world of denial-free understanding—which basically boils down to a battle between E.O. Wilson's fake, superficial, not-genuinely-biological, human-condition-trivialising account of the human condition, and the true, human-condition-confronting-and-penetrating biological explanation of the human condition being presented here in *Freedom Expanded: Book 1*. Choose your side.

So, *The Social Conquest of Earth* alleges that it is going to explain **'the biological origins of the human condition'**, and that this will have the effect of **'advancing human self-understanding'**. As has been explained, it does absolutely nothing of the sort. It is the great fake explanation of the human condition that doesn't advance our understanding of ourselves, not one iota—let alone bring about the long anticipated and needed reconciling, ameliorating, healing of our human condition. As the just mentioned publicity attached to the book claims, E.O. Wilson's

version of the human condition sees the condition as **'unresolvable'**, we simply have to live with and try to consciously manage the **'unresolvable tension in our species between selfishness and altruism'**. Again, the true description of our consciousness-induced-and-derived *psychological* human-condition-afflicted journey is that we were **'created…in the image of God'** (we once lived in that *completely* integrated, unconditionally selflessly behaved state), then we took the **'fruit' 'from the tree of…knowledge'** (became conscious), then we **'fell from grace'** (became corrupted, psychologically upset), and, as a result, were **'banished…from the Garden of Eden'** state of our original innocence (became insecure/guilt-ridden) and became **'a restless wanderer on the earth'** (became psychotic and neurotic) until we could find the reconciling, healing understanding of the **'good and evil'** in our make-up and by so doing become **'like God, knowing** [understanding of our] **good and evil** [afflicted lives]**'**, at which point **'Another book** [would be]**…opened which is the book of life** [the human-condition-explaining and humanity-liberating book]**…**[and] **a new heaven and a new earth** [will appear] **for the first heaven and the first earth** [will have]**…passed away…**[and the reconciling and healing full truth about our condition] **will wipe every tear from…**[our] **eyes. There will be no more death or mourning or crying or pain, for the old order of things has passed away'**, but during the transition stage to this time of **'relief from suffering and turmoil and cruel bondage'** we will unavoidably go through a period when **'the eyes of the blind** [will] **be opened and the ears of the deaf unstopped'** and our **'nakedness will be exposed'** and **not one secret of'** ours will be **'concealed'**. So, far, far, far from our human condition being **'unresolvable'**, it *is* resolvable, and resolving it, healing it, ameliorating it was the fundamental expectation of what would happen when we found understanding of the human condition. So E.O. Wilson's account of the human condition, which states that we just have to live with instincts for **'niceness'** and **'nastiness'** in perpetuity, is *completely* inconsistent with all our expectations of what happens when we *truly* solve the human condition. (All the anticipations of the arrival of a truly reconciling, completely human-race-transforming understanding documented in Part 3:12 provide overwhelming evidence of this expectation.)

Ironically, E.O. Wilson's *The Social Conquest of Earth* does actually begin with an accurate statement about the importance of solving the human condition: **'There is no grail more elusive or precious in the life of the mind than the key to understanding the human condition'** (p.1)—a statement that echoes another of his earlier references to this critical search: **'The human condition is the most important frontier of the natural sciences'** (*Consilience*, 1998, p.298 of 374). So he is fully aware of how critically important solving the human condition is to the human race, which means he must also be fully aware of how deeply criminal it is to be presenting such a completely false explanation for it. But unlike Charles Darwin, who had sufficient integrity *not* to pursue or develop ideas that weren't consistent with what we all do know about the true psychological nature of our human condition, E.O. Wilson obviously has no such scruples—quite the opposite in fact, for at every stage in the thought journey about the human condition that his mind has gone on he has been fully committed to finding a way to *avoid* the true psychological nature of our condition. And not only is it the very opposite of being **'the only model for explaining man's origins and domination'**, E.O. Wilson's model is also patently dishonest, whereas the other model being presented here in *Freedom Expanded: Book 1* is patently honest and fully accountable of all that we know about the real **'tension in our species between selfishness and altruism'**.

In a further demonstration of his duplicity, E.O. Wilson is even prepared to begin his book with a fake display of empathy with the depth of our species' troubled psychotic state, writing that **'Humanity today is like a waking dreamer, caught between the fantasies of sleep and the chaos of the real world. The mind seeks but cannot find the precise place and hour. We have created a Star Wars civilization, with Stone Age emotions, medieval institutions, and god-like technology. We thrash about. We are terribly confused by the mere fact of our existence, and a danger to ourselves and to the rest of life'** (p.7). Yes, as R.D. Laing truthfully wrote, **'The condition of alienation, of being asleep, of being unconscious, of being out of one's mind, is the condition of the normal man** [p.24 of 156] **…between *us* and It** [our true self or soul] **there is a veil which is more like fifty feet of solid concrete. *Deus absconditus*. Or we have absconded** [p.118] **…The outer divorced from any illumination from the inner is in a state of darkness. We are in an age of darkness. The state of outer darkness is a state of sin—i.e. alienation or estrangement from the inner light** [p.116] **…We are all murderers and prostitutes—no matter to what culture, society, class, nation one belongs…We are bemused and crazed creatures, strangers to our true selves, to one another, and to the spiritual and material world** [pp.11-12]**'** (*The Politics of Experience* and *The Bird of Paradise*, 1967). **'We are dead, but think we are alive. We are asleep, but think we are awake. We are dreaming, but take our dreams to be reality. We are the halt, lame, blind, deaf, the sick. But we are doubly unconscious. We are *so* ill that we no longer feel ill, as in many terminal illnesses. We are mad, but have no insight** [into the fact of our madness]**'** (*Self and Others*, 1961, p.38 of 192). Of course, the great difference between what E.O. Wilson wrote and what Laing wrote is that the latter explicitly stated that in order to solve our sleeping, thrashing about, confused, lost, estranged state we have to *reflect* upon that immensely alienated condition, *not* go all out to *avoid* such reflection as E.O. Wilson has done throughout his career; again, as R.D. Laing said, **'Our alienation goes to the roots. The realization of this is the essential springboard for any serious reflection on any aspect of present inter-human life** (*The Politics of Experience* and *The Bird of Paradise*, p.12); or as Berdyaev said, in order to achieve **'victory over ancient, primeval terror'** of **'the fallen state of the world'** and by so doing not be **'faced for ever with the distinction between good and evil'** we HAD TO face the **'deadly pain in the very distinction of good and evil'**, which is the truth of our immensely alienated condition.

The question is, how did E.O. Wilson go about explaining the human condition while denying the essential psychosis involved in that condition; how did he construct his great lie?

E.O. Wilson's first step in formulating this latest greatest lie was to somehow dismiss the recognitions given by all the great religious teachers, such as Abraham, Moses, Christ, Muhammad and Buddha, and all the great philosophers, such as Plato, of the essential characteristics of our psychologically upset, fallen, integrative/Godly-ideal-state-corrupted, alienated condition. The outrageously dishonest and astonishingly brazen way he did so was by claiming **'the mythic foundations of religion'**, such as the idea of **'a divine, all-powerful'** God, and the **'creation stories'**, were nothing more than adaptive devices to ensure groups stayed together, **'a Darwinian device for survival'**; and, in the case of philosophers, by asserting that **'consciousness' 'was not designed for self-examination'** and that the thoughts of philosophers amounted to nothing more than **'failed models of the mind'**! In *The Social Conquest of Earth*, E.O. Wilson wrote: **'Religion will never solve this great riddle** [of the human condition]**…In the desert-**

dwelling patriarchies of Judaism, Christianity, and Islam, prophets conceived, not surprisingly, a divine, all-powerful patriarch who speaks to his people through sacred scripture. The creation stories gave the members of each tribe an explanation for their existence. It made them feel loved and protected…The creation myth is a Darwinian device for survival. Tribal conflict, where believers on the inside were pitted against infidels on the outside, was a principal driving force that shaped biological human nature…Can these two worldviews [of religion and science] **ever be reconciled? The answer, to put the matter honestly and simply, is no. They cannot be reconciled…If the great riddle of the human condition cannot be solved by recourse to the mythic foundations of religion, neither will it be solved by introspection** [pp.7-8] **… Consciousness…was not designed for self-examination. It was designed for survival and reproduction… Moreover, we look in vain to philosophy for the answer to the great riddle…Most of the history of philosophy consists of failed models of the mind…the solution of the riddle has been left to science…I will propose that scientific advances…are now sufficient for us to address…the identity of the driving forces that brought it** [**advanced social life**] **into existence** [pp.9-10]**.'** So, as for the prospect of the great insights and truths enshrined in religion ever being reconciled with scientific understandings, E.O. Wilson simply asserts that it is not possible—that **'They cannot be reconciled.'** In May 2006, *National Geographic* magazine featured an interview with E.O. Wilson in which he said that he had **'another book in progress…called *The Creation*** [published in 2006]**, and its subtitle is *A Meeting of Science and Religion*** [in which] **I take a very strong stance against the mingling of religion and science.'** Yes, many scientists like E.O. Wilson and Richard Dawkins have coped with the great truths contained in religion of Integrative Meaning represented by the concept of 'God', of the existence of our 'Garden of Eden' innocent soulful past, and of our corrupted 'fallen', human-condition-afflicted, 'sinful' present state, by simply maintaining that religion and science are completely unrelated. Contrast this view with the common sense exhibited by the Nobel Prize-winning physicist Charles H. Townes when he said, **'they** [religion and science] **both represent man's efforts to understand his universe and must ultimately be dealing with the same substance. As we understand more in each realm, the two must grow together…converge they must'** ('The Convergence of Science and Religion', *Zygon*, Vol.1 No.3, 1966).

We have already established how much E.O. Wilson loathes religion and in *The Social Conquest of Earth* his determination to undermine the substance and value of religions continues apace with his assertion that they have no contribution to make to **'the search for truth'**! He writes that **'conflict among religions is often…an accelerant, if not a direct cause, of war. Devout believers value their faith above all else and are quick to anger if it is challenged. The power of organized religions is based upon their contribution to social order and personal security, not to the search for truth. The goal of religions is submission to the will and common good of the tribe. The illogic of religions is not a weakness in them, but their essential strength. Acceptance of the bizarre creation myths binds the members together… Such an intensely tribal instinct could, in the real world, arise in evolution only by group selection, tribe competing against tribe'** (p.259). The immensely sound and logical—not **'illogic**[al]**'** or **'bizarre'**—truths elevated by the great religious teachers (such as the great truths mentioned above and many others such as that 'God is love', which we can now understand as meaning that the theme of the integrative process *is* unconditional selflessness) are the core reason their teachings have attracted the support of billions of humans throughout history. Similarly, the reason why philosophers like Plato have been regarded with awe through the ages is precisely because of how much truth they were able to contribute to humanity's search

for knowledge. This comment captures the *true* significance of two of the great religious and philosophical texts: **'It has been said that after the Bible, Plato's dialogues are the most influential books in Western culture'** (from the front flap of Plato's *Symposium and Phaedrus*, published by Everyman's Library in 2001). Earlier, I stated that Moses, Plato and Christ *made the most important contributions to humanity's great journey to enlightenment*: that Moses' Ten Commandments gave humanity the most effective form of Imposed Discipline for containing the ever increasing levels of psychological upset in the human race; that Christ gave humanity the soundest and thus most effective corruption-and-denial-countering Religion; and that Plato gave philosophy (the actual business of studying **'the truths underlying all reality'** (*Macquarie Dict*. 3rd edn, 1998), in particular studying and finding the all-important understanding of the human condition) the best possible orientation and assistance. But instead of honouring their immensely important contribution to humanity's great journey to enlightenment, E.O. Wilson dismisses their work as selfish, self-preservation-derived, essentially meaningless rubbish!!

Claiming **'consciousness'** is not capable of **'self-examination'** is basically a projection of E.O. Wilson's own great fear and inability to look into or examine himself—in fact, to look into the human condition per se—and yet he claims to have explained what he is incapable of looking into! One way to disarm an opponent is to articulate their position so clearly that you give the impression that you couldn't and wouldn't be able to do so unless you had an effective counter to their position. In *The Social Conquest of Earth*, E.O. Wilson is disarmingly honest about the true nature of the human condition, writing that human nature's **'true identity has remained elusive. There may be an emotional, very human reason for this persistent ambiguity. If raw, untransformed human nature were to be revealed…what would it be? What would it look like? Would we love it? A better question may be: Do we really want to know? Perhaps most people, including many scholars, would like to keep human nature at least partly in the dark. It is the monster in the fever swamp of public discourse'** (p.191). Yes, the human condition *is* **'the monster in the fever swamp of public discourse'**, *the* great unconfrontable and unmentionable 'elephant in the living rooms' of the lives of humans, but, immediately after writing so truthfully and eloquently about the deep, dark, unbearable *real* psychological issue of the human condition, E.O. Wilson reverted to his default position—a completely *superficial*, trivialised, non-psychological, non-**'monster in the fever swamp of public discourse'**-confronting account of it. Claiming that science can now give us **'a clear definition of human nature'** (p.192), he put forward his outrageously superficial, non-penetrating multilevel **'gene-culture coevolution'** (p.195) explanation of human nature. Clearly it is not the **'consciousness'** of *all* humans that is incapable of **'self-examination'**, but *E.O. Wilson's* conscious mind.

Indeed, what E.O. Wilson has done with his fake, trivialised, extraordinarily superficial 'explanation' of the human condition is diminish what the human condition actually is. He has made it seem like it's nothing special at all, merely the existence of two different instincts within us that are sometimes at odds. But if we read what has been written about the extreme agony that children endure through their interactions with the silent, adult world or, more specifically, what adolescents go through during Resignation we are swiftly reconnected with the true horror and fear of the *real* human condition—but E.O. Wilson's version of the human condition contains no such horror, which of course is its great appeal, but the risk is that from the time of the publication of *The Social Conquest of Earth* onwards the human condition

may never be talked about truthfully again. When adolescents going through Resignation are given E.O. Wilson's account of the human condition they are going to find it laughable it's so patently dishonest in its superficiality. The subject of the human condition used to be an almost sacred subject, one that was only referred to in moments of deep profundity, but now it can be talked about as if it's nothing extraordinary at all. What E.O. Wilson has done is not explain the human condition but nullify it, render it benign, virtually inconsequential. When the core issue about what it is to be human is finally completely trivialised, as it now is, we have the ultimate example of how denial is taking humanity to the very brink of terminal dishonesty/alienation/superficiality/darkness/death.

To support his human-psychosis-avoiding, fake account of the human condition, E.O. Wilson had to find a way to argue that the fundamentally weak mechanism of between-group selection could develop our unconditionally selfless moral instincts.

In order to support the between-group selection argument for the origin of unconditionally selfless instincts, E.O. Wilson most heavily relied on the superficially persuasive logic that within groups the selfish are more likely to succeed but that in competition *between* groups, it's the groups of altruists that are most likely to succeed. For example, the 2007 paper that he co-authored with D.S. Wilson concluded with this **'summary'** of the **'new'** between-group selection theory: **'Selfishness beats altruism within groups. Altruistic groups beat selfish groups. Everything else is commentary'** ('Rethinking the Theoretical Foundation of Sociobiology', *The Quarterly Review of Biology*, Vol.82, No.4, Dec. 2007). Similarly, in *The Social Conquest of Earth* E.O. Wilson stated that **'an iron rule exists in genetic social evolution. It is that selfish individuals beat altruistic individuals, while groups of altruists beat groups of selfish individuals'** (p.243). While anyone unfamiliar with biology will likely find this logic very persuasive in explaining how altruism might be selected for, for a biologist it simply doesn't hold water because, as they know, selfishness is such a dominant force in natural selection that even a winning group of altruists will, in all likelihood, become subverted by selfish opportunists. Certainly, it is perfectly obvious—so obvious that **'Everything else is commentary'**, that it *is* **'an iron rule'**—that a group with members who are selflessly considerate and supportive of each other will be more successful in competition with groups that aren't, but that is not the issue at hand, *the issue here is can such selflessness become established in a group? Is between-group selection a strong enough force to overcome genetic selfishness?*

On that key issue, it was explained in Part 4:12B that while it is certainly true that selfless cooperation is the best way to develop and maintain integrative order—it is why ant and bee colonies work so extremely well—the biological reality is that under the limitations imposed by the fact that genetic traits have to reproduce if they are to carry on, selfless cooperation is normally (that is, outside of the love-indoctrination process) impossible to develop while each member of a species retains its ability to sexually reproduce. Evidence of this 'agony of the animal condition' is the universality of dominance hierarchy in social species, where the more members of the species become integrated, the more intense becomes the selfish competition for food, shelter, territory and a mate—until only the establishment of dominance hierarchy, a 'pecking order', can bring some peace between the competing individuals. Yes, if that most

effective form of cooperation, unconditional selflessness, could have been developed among sexually reproducing individuals we can expect that it would have appeared many times over in the history of life on Earth, but it hasn't—except in *our* human situation, and to a degree in bonobos, through love-indoctrination. As Jerry Coyne stated about the between-group selection argument, **'altruism would be unlikely to override the tendency of each group to quickly lose its altruists through natural selection favoring cheaters'**.

As explained in Part 4:12B, ants and bees and the few other completely social colonial species have achieved full integration by elaborating the reproductive individual, but large animals such as humans couldn't employ this device because it meant too great a loss of genetic variability. Each human has had to remain sexual.

So, as superficially persuasive as the **'iron rule'** is that groups of altruists will defeat groups of selfish individuals and that, as a result, genes for altruism will be handed down to future generations, the key biological question is can between-group selection be strong enough to overcome **'the tendency of each group to quickly lose its altruists through natural selection favoring cheaters'**? In *The Social Conquest of Earth* E.O. Wilson did raise this key biological question that has to be answered about between-group selection, but only briefly and very superficially—and, dismissively, not until a third of the way into the book. On page 72 he wrote: **'The key question remaining in the dynamics of human genetic evolution is whether natural selection at the group level has been strong enough to overcome the powerful force of natural selection at the level of the individual. Put another way, have the forces favoring instinctive altruistic behavior to other members of the group been strong enough to disfavor individual selfish behavior? Mathematical models constructed in the 1970s showed that group selection can prevail if the relative rate of group extinction or diminishment in groups without altruistic genes is very high. As one class of such models suggests, when the rate of increase of group multiplication with altruistic members exceeds the rate of increase of selfish individuals within the groups, gene-based altruism can spread through the population of groups. More recently, in 2009, the theoretical biologist Samuel Bowles has produced a more realistic model that fits the empirical data well. His approach answers the following question: if cooperative groups were more likely to prevail in conflicts with other groups, has the level of intergroup violence been sufficient to influence the evolution of human social behavior? The estimates of adult mortality in hunter-gatherer groups from the beginning of Neolithic times to the present, shown in the accompanying table, support that proposition.'**

But as seductive as the obvious **'iron rule'** argument is that an altruistic group will beat a selfish group, the fact is it actually holds no weight. What is needed to support the between-group selection argument is an explanation of how between-group selection can be strong enough to overcome the powerful forces of genetic selfishness, and on this key issue all that is provided in *The Social Conquest of Earth* is this one brief and unconvincing paragraph of explanation. While it is not one of the **'Mathematical models constructed in the 1970s'**, and while he doesn't acknowledge it as D.S. Wilson's mathematical model (presumably, as suggested earlier, because he doesn't want to credit D.S. Wilson as the developer of Multilevel Selection theory), the mathematical model referred to where, **'when the rate of increase of group multiplication with altruistic members exceeds the rate of increase of selfish individuals within the groups, gene-based altruism can spread through the population of groups'** *does* describe D.S. Wilson's mathematical model that was presented in Part 4:12H. That was the model where for between-group selection to work, **'the progeny of both groups disperse and then physically come together before**

forming new groups of their own', and where, if this can occur, and **'the process be repeated over many generations'**, and where **'generation after generation, altruists** [somehow] **tend to find themselves living with altruists, and selfish individuals** [somehow] **tend to associate with other selfish individuals'**, then **'altruists will gradually replace the selfish types'**, which all **'seemed unlikely'** even though it was supposedly **'biologically plausible'** and has apparently occurred in the brain worm situation. Had E.O. Wilson presented these details about this complex and improbable model then the reader would have very likely *not* been persuaded that in such **'Mathematical models…group selection can prevail'** in explaining the origin of unconditionally selfless instincts such as our moral nature. So in truth, up to this point in that critical paragraph, no convincing argument had been presented. E.O. Wilson then stated that **'More recently, in 2009, the theoretical biologist Samuel Bowles has produced a more realistic model that fits the empirical data well.'** So, while E.O. Wilson has acknowledged here that there is some doubt about how realistic the mathematical models are, he still maintains that Bowles' more recent and **'more realistic model…fits the empirical data well'**. He then indicated that the particular **'data'** that has **'been sufficient to influence the evolution of human social behavior'** is **'the level of intergroup violence'** that has occurred in human prehistory, referring at that point to a chart documenting the **'Fraction of adult mortality due to warfare'** (p.70) over the last 14,000 years.

Basically, E.O. Wilson has argued that it is violent warfare between groups that caused natural selection of selfless cooperation to be strong enough to overcome selfish opportunism. Yes, a group with cooperative altruists will defeat a group without such altruists, but, unless Bowles' model can persuade us otherwise, we are entitled to believe that a group with altruists will **'quickly lose its altruists through natural selection favoring cheaters'**. So E.O. Wilson's whole theory depends on knowledge of Bowles' supposedly **'more realistic model'**, but he provides no details of that model! This key paragraph in the book is, like the whole book, scant on substance and full of bluff. Clearly E.O. Wilson is depending on the superficially persuasive but not actually persuasive **'iron rule'** that an altruistic group will beat a selfish group to carry the day in persuading the reader of the soundness of his theory. Aside from this paragraph, the rest of *The Social Conquest of Earth* focuses on building evidence for how being forced together around campfires, food shortages and other influences led to the extreme warfare that he has supposedly, but not actually, established, is needed to develop unconditionally selfless instincts. His whole theory is based on bluff.

So, by sleight of hand, E.O. Wilson has supposedly brought the reader to the situation where all they need to be shown is how extreme warfare developed in order to be persuaded that unconditionally selfless instincts were able to be developed by our ancestors, even though the evidence is that if a completely moral instinctive orientation to life in sexually reproducing individuals could have been developed it would have been developed many times over in the history of life on Earth, but again it hasn't—except in *our* human situation (and to a degree in bonobos) where it was achieved through love-indoctrination.

Since E.O. Wilson hasn't established the fundamental biological reasoning for his argument that extreme warfare gave us our moral instincts, it's not really necessary to present his arguments for how being forced together around campfires, food shortages and other influences led to extreme warfare, nevertheless, for the sake of completeness I'll briefly address those arguments. But before doing so, I should point out that despite admitting that

while we humans are **'eusocial'** like ants **'there are major differences…even aside from our unique possession of culture, language, and high intelligence. The most fundamental among them is that all normal members of human societies are capable of reproducing'** (*The Social Conquest of Earth*, p.16), E.O. Wilson has continually and inappropriately misused the situation of colonial insects such as ants as a model for how we humans became eusocial. For example, in the May 2006 edition of *National Geographic* magazine, where I first saw E.O. Wilson adopting the group selection argument, he said, **'The** [ant] **colony, by group selection, has developed traits that could not be possible otherwise—communication, the caste system, cooperative behavior. It's a unit of activity and of evolution. One colony against another is what's being selected…ants are constantly at war. Well, so are we!…It may turn out that highly evolved societies with this level of altruism tend strongly to divide into groups that then fight against each other. We humans are constantly at war and have been since prehistory.'** Upon reading this I warned, in a publication that I was working on at the time, that 'So, according to Wilson, we now must accept that we humans are biologically capable of being cooperative and even altruistic, but that such behaviour is driven by an extremely selfish, competitive and divisive cause: to give warring groups a competitive advantage!' (*The Great Exodus*, 2006). Yes, E.O. Wilson is right, unlike ants we humans are in **'unique possession'** of a conscious mind and have managed to become integrated as sexually reproducing individuals, BUT what this means is that our eusociality is completely different from that of the colonial insects; *we* suffer from a consciousness-derived, psychosis-and-neurosis-afflicted *human* condition, and our ancestors couldn't have and didn't develop full integration by elaborating the reproductive individual as ants did.

To look further at the basic argument in E.O. Wilson's grand **'Theory of Everything'**, on pages 54 and 55 of *The Social Conquest of Earth* he acknowledges the fundamental problem that altruistic/unconditionally selflessly behaved, fully integrated, **'eusocial'** societies have **'been rare in the history of life because group selection must be exceptionally powerful to relax the grip of individual selection'**, but asserts altruistic **'Group-selected traits typically take the fiercest degree of resolve during conflicts between rival groups'**, and that it is from these **'fiercest'** of **'conflicts'** that altruism in groups could have been forged to such a degree **'to relax the grip of individual selection'** and become established. This is E.O. Wilson's basic bluff, that fierce conflict between groups could have been a strong enough force to overcome **'the grip of individual selection'**. The biological reality is that fierce conflict between groups of highly social sexually reproducing individuals has been present throughout the history of life on Earth, and all it has ever produced is dominance hierarchy, never complete altruism-dependent integration. But E.O. Wilson was certainly not going to be put off by that reality; humans have moral instincts and there must be a basis for them, so, as far as he is concerned, they must have been acquired through between-group selection—and, coupled with the Multilevel Selection theory that says we have instincts for both selfishness and selflessness, he is clearly extremely happy to have devised a psychosis-avoiding, fake explanation for our human condition.

Fighting against biological reality, E.O. Wilson acknowledged that **'the human condition is a singularity'**, then, to the fundamental question of **'why the likes of it has occurred only once and took so long in coming'**, he answered that, **'The reason is simply the extreme improbability of the preadaptations necessary for it to occur at all'** (ibid. p.45). He then describes these preadaptations as **'a large body size'** to carry a large **'brain'** capable of **'advanced reasoning and culture'**, then **'grasping**

hands', **'free…from locomotion in order to manipulate objects easily'** (p.46). The next preadaptation, he claimed, **'was a shift in diet to include a substantial amount of meat'** which **'yields higher energy… than does vegetation'** (p.46). He then asserted that **'The advantages of cooperation in the harvesting of meat led to the formation of highly organized groups'**, and that **'An expanded population was an advantage in the conflicts inevitably arising among different groups'** (p.47). Then **'About a million years ago the controlled use of fire followed'** and **'With the sharing of cooked meals came a universal means of social bonding'** (p.47). **'With meat, fire, and cooking, campsites lasting for more than a few days at a time, and thus persistent enough to be guarded as a refuge, marked the next vital step. Such a nest, as it can also be called, has been the precursor to the attainment of eusociality by all other known animals. There is evidence of fossil campsites and their accouterments as far back as *Homo erectus*'** (p.47). **'Along with fireside campsites came division of labor'** (p.47). He then claimed that **'The stage was now set for the biggest-brained of African primates to make the truly defining leap to their ultimate potential'** (p.48). **'What genetic evolutionary forces pushed our ancestors to the eusociality threshold, then across it?'** (p.139). **'The cohesion forced by the concentration of groups to protected sites was more than just a step through the evolutionary maze. It was…the event that launched the final drive to modern *Homo sapiens*'** (p.44). **'The precursors of *Homo sapiens*, if archaeological evidence and the behavior of modern hunter-gatherers are accepted as guides, formed well-organized groups that competed with one another for territory and other scarce resources'** (p.53), and it was these **'fiercest'** of **'conflicts'** that were **'powerful** [enough] **to relax the grip of individual selection'** and allow altruism to become established in humans. **'War…**[is] **Humanity's Hereditary Curse. History is a bath of blood…Our bloody nature… is ingrained because group-versus-group was a principal driving force that made us what we are'** (p.62). **'From April to June in 1994, killers from the Hutu majority in Rwanda set out to exterminate the Tutsi minority…In a hundred days…800,000 people died…Russia's Great Terror under Stalin resulted in the deliberate starvation to death of more than three million Soviet Ukrainians during the winter of 1932–33'** (p.63). **'<u>Wars and genocide have been universal and eternal, respecting no particular time or culture</u>'** (p.65). **'Tools from the earliest Neolithic period include instruments clearly designed for fighting'** (p.67). **'Bushmen of South Africa…also engaged in tribal wars'** (p.68). **'Tribal aggressiveness thus goes well back beyond Neolithic times, but no one as yet can say exactly how far. It could have begun at the time of *Homo habilis*'** (p.72). **'Jane Goodall…documented the murders within chimpanzee groups and lethal raids conducted between groups'** (p.73). **'Chimpanzees and bonobos occupy and defend territories…Chimps and bonobos alternatively break into subgroups and re-aggregate. They advertise the discovery of fruit-laden trees by calling back and forth but do not share the fruit they pick. They occasionally hunt in small packs. Successful members of the pack share the meat among their fellow hunters, but charity mostly comes to an end there. Of greatest importance, the apes have no campfire around which to gather'** (p.42).

Thus E.O. Wilson claims that **'The dilemma of good and evil was created by multilevel selection…Individual selection is responsible for much of what we call sin, while group selection is responsible for the greater part of virtue. Together they have created the conflict between the poorer and the better angels of our nature'** (p.241). **'Human beings are prone to be moral—do the right thing, hold back, give aid to others, sometimes even at personal risk—because natural selection has favored those interactions of group members benefitting the group as a whole'** (p.247). **'Selection at the individual level tends to create competitiveness and selfish behavior among group members—in status, mating, and the securing of resources. In opposition, selection between groups tends to create selfless behavior, expressed in greater generosity and altruism, which in turn promote stronger cohesion and strength of the group as a**

whole. An inevitable result of the mutually offsetting forces of multilevel selection is permanent ambiguity in the individual human mind, leading to countless scenarios among people in the way they bond, love, affiliate, betray, share, sacrifice, steal, deceive, redeem, punish, appeal, and adjudicate. The struggle endemic to each person's brain' (p.274). **'Multilevel selection (group and individual selection combined) also explains the conflicted nature of motivations. Every normal person feels the pull of conscience, of heroism against cowardice, of truth against deception, of commitment against withdrawal. It is our fate to be tormented…We, all of us, live out our lives in conflict and contention'** (p.290).

We see that E.O. Wilson's basic assumption is that human prehistory has been characterised by warfare—he says that **'Wars and genocide have been universal and eternal, respecting no particular time or culture'**—but is that true? Wilson writes that **'Early humans had the innate equipment—and likely the tendency also—to use projectiles in capturing prey and repelling enemies. The advantages gained were surely decisive. Spear points and arrowheads are among the earliest artifacts found in archaeological sites'** (ibid. p.29), but as the archaeologist Steven Mithen says about this: **'No, the earliest artifacts are from around 2.5 million years ago, but spear points are not made until a mere 250,000 years ago and arrowheads might have first been manufactured no longer ago than 20,000 years'** ('How Fit Is E.O. Wilson's Evolution?', *The New York Review of Books,* 21 Jun. 2012). And in response to Wilson's claim that **'Archaeologists have found burials of massacred people to be a commonplace'** and **'archaeological sites are strewn with the evidence of mass conflict'**, Mithen argues that **'No, both are quite rare, especially in pre-state societies, and those that are known are difficult to interpret'** (ibid).

As to the possibility of our distant ape ancestors being cooperative and not warlike, we have the evidence of the extraordinarily cooperative and peaceful nature of bonobos, a species whose behaviour Wilson lumps together with chimpanzees. For instance, on page 40 he cites a single instance of bonobos hunting in a group and uses that 'evidence' to draw erroneous comparisons with the more aggressive common chimpanzees; 'That's one more problem out of the way', he seems to be saying, but, as many primatologists will attest, bonobo behaviour is *very* different to common chimpanzees—consider this from Barbara Fruth: **'up to 100 bonobos at a time from several groups spend their night together. That would not be possible with chimpanzees because there would be brutal fighting between rival groups'** (Paul Raffaele, 'Bonobos: The apes who make love, not war', 2003, Last Tribes on Earth.como). Yes, the truth, as will be described in detail later in Part 8:4, is that, unlike chimpanzees, bonobos are extraordinarily cooperative, loving and gentle—behaviour that they, like us, achieved through love-indoctrination.

As I have explained in Part 3:11, where all the stages of ever-increasing upset in our human-condition-afflicted journey are presented, the psychologically upset state of the human condition emerged some two million years ago when our conscious mind became sufficiently confident in understanding the relationship of events that occur through time to take over management of our lives from our original, all-loving instincts. Thus, upset in humans has been increasing for two million years, which means that while humans living a mere 14,000 years ago in the Neolithic period will be somewhat less upset or more innocent than humans living today, they will still be far from free of upset. So yes, tribal warfare has been occurring for a long time, but that doesn't mean that competitive and aggressive warfare characterised the lives of our earliest ancestors, as E.O. Wilson would have us believe; it does not mean that our species' *original* instinctive orientation wasn't to living in an unconditionally selfless, all-loving, fully cooperative and harmonious integrative

state—and it doesn't mean that the relative innocence of hunter-forager tribes still living, like the Bushmen of South Africa and the Yanomamö of South America, don't reveal a great deal about how extremely upset the great majority of the human race has become. (Much more will be said in Part 5:2 about science's denial of the relative innocence of so-called 'primitive' races.) As all the quotes from the great thinkers included earlier in Part 4:12H-vi indicate, our distant ancestors *did* once live in a 'Garden of Eden'-like, 'Golden Age' of upset-free, all-loving innocence. Children *are* born innocent and happy, not bedevilled by two conflicting instinctive states; and the human race emerged innocent and happy, not bedevilled by selfish and selfless conflicting instinctive states. We individually start out, and as a species started out, innocent and *then* our conscious mind develops/developed and *then* we become/became sufferers of the human condition. Where is the acknowledgement of the innocence of children and of the innocence of original humans in this Multilevel explanation? Who is being honest, E.O. Wilson or the following? The founders of the great religions whose works, as Richard Heinberg said, all **'begin with the recognition…that a former sense of oneness…has been lost'**; and Bruce Chatwin when he wrote that **'Every mythology remembers the innocence of the first state'**; and Nikolai Berdyaev when he wrote that **'The memory of a lost paradise, of a Golden Age, is very deep in man'**; and Plato when he wrote that humans have **'knowledge, both before and at the moment of birth…of all absolute standards…**[of] **beauty, goodness, uprightness, holiness…our souls exist before our birth'**, and **'the soul'** he described as **'the pure and everlasting and immortal and changeless…realm of the absolute…**[our] **soul resembles the divine'**; and William Wordsworth when he wrote that **'The Soul that rises with us, our life's Star…cometh from afar…trailing clouds of glory do we come / From God** [the fully integrated state]**, who is our home'**; and Jean-Jacques Rousseau when he wrote that **'nothing is more gentle than man in his primitive state'** and **'Man is born free but is everywhere in chains'**; and, finally, Laurens van der Post when he wrote that **'This shrill, brittle, self-important life of today is by comparison a graveyard where the living are dead and the dead are alive and talking** [through our soul] **in the still, small, clear voice of a love and trust in life that we have for the moment lost…**[there was a time when] **All on earth and in the universe were still members and family of the early race seeking comfort and warmth through the long, cold night before the dawning of individual consciousness in a togetherness which still gnaws like an unappeasable homesickness at the base of the human heart'**, and **'He** [the Bushman] **and his needs were committed to the nature of Africa and the swing of its wide seasons as a fish to the sea. He and they all participated so deeply of one another's being that the experience could almost be called mystical. For instance, he seemed to *know* what it actually felt like to be an elephant, a lion, an antelope, a steenbuck, a lizard, a striped mouse, mantis, baobab tree, yellow-crested cobra, or starry-eyed amaryllis, to mention only a few of the brilliant multitudes through which he so nimbly moved. Even as a child it seemed to me that his world was one without secrets between one form of being and another.'** Today, when I am writing this Part, which happens to be 28 July 2012, there is a front-page pictorial in *The Weekend Australian* newspaper about a 63-year-old retired school teacher named Russell Bathard who, for 30 years now, has been riding his bicycle literally all over outback Australia, camping every night in a swag beside his bike under the stars. He described how **'A couple of weeks ago I saw a whole flock of parrots turning at the same time, and their colours glinted in the sun'**, and of how **'I can smell rain well before I can see it or feel it when I'm out here.'** Basically all Bathard's cycling through the endless outback had disconnected

him from **'This shrill, brittle, self-important life of today'** that van der Post so honestly spoke of, and allowed the **'still, small, clear voice of a love and trust in life that we have for the moment lost'** of his/our soul to re-surface and connect him to all the sensitivities and beauty of our world. It is a vicious lie that we humans don't have a *completely* concerned-with-the-larger-whole-not-yourself, *fully* cooperative, *all*-loving, *utterly* harmonious, *totally* empathetic, *absolutely* innocent original instinctive self or soul—but then again, the psychological agony of our human condition has been so great that while we humans couldn't truthfully explain our condition all we had to protect ourselves from the vicious, unbearable self-confrontation was such matching, equally vicious, retaliatory lies.

In contrast to the descriptions provided above from some of history's most honest thinkers, the following quotes from *The Social Conquest of Earth* indicate E.O. Wilson's own views on human nature: **'Are people innately good, but corruptible by the forces of evil? Or, are they instead innately wicked, and redeemable only by the forces of good? People are both. And so it will forever be unless we change our genes, because the human dilemma was foreordained in the way our species evolved, and therefore an unchangeable part of human nature. Human beings and their social orders are intrinsically imperfectible'** (p.241). **'In summary, the human condition is an endemic turmoil rooted in the evolution processes that created us. The worst in our nature coexists with the best, and so it will ever be'** (p.56). As has already been emphasised, E.O. Wilson's view that the conflict within humans of the human condition is **'forever' 'unchangeable'**, **'intrinsically imperfectible'**—that **'The worst in our nature coexists with the best, and so it will ever be'**—flies in the face of all we humans have ever known about the real nature of **'the human condition'** and its eventual amelioration, which is that one day a true-not-fake, psychosis-reconciling and redeeming/healing understanding of our human condition would be found (which it now has been with the explanation being presented here in *Freedom Expanded: Book 1*) and that, as a result, humans would be permanently liberated and transformed from the duress of that condition (a TRANSFORMATION that is further explained, described and evidenced in *Freedom Expanded: Book 2*). Again, all the anticipations of the arrival of a reconciling, completely human-race-transforming understanding of ourselves that are documented in Part 3:12 provide overwhelming evidence of this expectation.

To quickly look at a few remaining issues that E.O. Wilson raises in *The Social Conquest of Earth*. With regard to the important question of why we humans became so intelligent (developed full consciousness), E.O. Wilson wrote of **'The necessity for fine-graded evaluation by alliance members…The strategies of this game were written as a complicated mix of closely calibrated altruism, cooperation, competition, domination, reciprocity, defection, and deceit. To play the game the human way, it was necessary for the evolving populations to acquire an ever higher degree of intelligence. They had to feel empathy for others, to measure the emotions of friend and enemy alike, to judge the intentions of all of them, and to plan a strategy for personal social interactions. As a result, the human brain became simultaneously highly intelligent and intensely social'** (ibid. p.17). We humans certainly have become a devious, cunning, calculating species, but, as was pointed out in Part 4:12H-v, *not* as a result of a conflict of instincts for selfishness and instincts for selflessness, but as a result of a *psychological* upset state. We didn't become a fully conscious, highly intelligent species as a result of having to manage the human condition, rather our human condition resulted from *becoming* fully conscious. We took the fruit from the tree of knowledge, became

conscious, and *then* we fell from grace, became corrupted, became sufferers of the human condition. The real reason we humans became conscious while other animals haven't is briefly explained in Part 8:4C, and fully explained in Part 8:7B.

Like D.S. Wilson and Sober, E.O. Wilson also uses culture to bolster his between-group selection explanation for how we became socially intelligent beings. For example, he wrote that **'meat and campfire are not enough by themselves to explain the rapid increase in size of the brain that occurred** [in humans]**. For the missing piece we can turn, I believe with some confidence, to the cultural intelligence hypothesis'** (ibid. p.226). **'Gene-culture coevolution, the impact of genes on culture and, reciprocally, culture on genes, is a process of equal importance to the natural sciences, the social sciences, and the humanities. Its study provides a way to connect these three great branches** (p.236). **'The intricacies of gene-culture coevolution are fundamental to understanding the human condition'** (p.240). As was explained in Part 4:12H-vi, culture *has* played a big part in the human journey, but not in creating the human condition, but in trying to manage it.

'E.O. Wilson's Theory of Everything' even has a completely dishonest psychosis-denying explanation for our ego, which claims that **'To form groups, drawing visceral comfort and pride from familiar fellowship, and to defend the group enthusiastically against rival groups—these are among the absolute universals of human nature…People must have a tribe. It gives them a name in addition to their own and social meaning in a chaotic world. It makes the environment less disorienting and dangerous…People savor the company of like-minded friends, and they yearn to be in one of the best—a combat marine regiment, perhaps, an elite college, the executive committee of a company, a religious sect, a fraternity, a garden club—any collectivity that can be compared favorably with other, competing groups of the same category'** (ibid. p.57). As the Adam Stork story describes in Part 3:2, the real *psychological* reason for humans' extremely egocentric state of mind is because we suffer from, and have been perpetually trying to disprove, an immense insecurity about our sense of goodness and worth.

E.O. Wilson also has a psychosis-denying explanation for why humans have **'continuous sexual activity'**, which is that it **'promotes female-male bonding and biparental care'** (ibid. p.79). And on the issue of homosexuality, he says, **'a low dose of homosexual-tending genes may give competitive advantages to a practicing heterosexual. Or, homosexuality may give advantages to the group by special talents'** (p.254). The *psychological* reason for humans' continual sexual activity and homosexuality was briefly explained in Part 4:12F, and is more fully explained in my book *A Species in Denial* in the chapter titled 'Bringing peace to the war between the sexes' at <www.humancondition.com/asid-men-and-women>. E.O. Wilson also claims that **'Prolonged childhood'** was for **'allowing extended learning periods under the guidance of adults'**, when the real reason for it was to allow for the maternal, nurturing, love-indoctrination of infants.

E.O. Wilson concludes *The Social Conquest of Earth* by saying that his hope is that **'out of an ethic of simple decency to one another, the unrelenting application of reason, and acceptance of what we truly are, our dreams will finally come home to stay'** (p.297). Yes, a future for the human race depends on **'the unrelenting application of reason, and acceptance of what we truly are'**, but if we were to find **'what we truly are'** and, by so doing, permanently ameliorate that condition and finally be capable of **'decency to one another'** it had to be as a result of HONEST reasoning, NOT E.O. Wilson's extremely DISHONEST reasoning! Lying was never going to get us to the liberating truth about our condition.

Summary assessment of the theory of Eusociality

In Part 4:9, which marks the beginning of this analysis of the development of dishonest, denial-complying mechanistic/reductionist biology, it was pointed out that virtually all scientists since Darwin have totally avoided the *real* issue involved in the human condition of a psychologically upset state by simply blaming that upset competitive, selfish and aggressive behaviour on supposed brutish and savage animal instincts within us that our intellect has to somehow control or overcome. While the recent theory of Eusociality added supposed group selection-derived selfless instincts to these supposed selfish animal instincts in us, there has, in truth, been *no* change to this basic strategy of avoiding any acknowledgement of the involvement of a consciousness-induced psychologically upset state in our troubled condition.

So, in E.O. Wilson's **'New Theory of Eusociality'** the situation essentially ends at the same place it did with his old theory of Sociobiology/Evolutionary Psychology, with no recognition of a consciousness-involved psychosis in our human condition, despite the word 'psychology' appearing in the description of that theory. In the new theory, apart from an extremely superficial reference to **'personality traits'** (p.101), Wilson still refrains from referring to the psychology of our human condition, to our psychosis or neurosis or alienation or insecurity of self or depression or the problem of self-confrontation. Contrast this with my books that *do* address the psychology of the human condition head-on, and *do* mention these terms and issues thousands of times—because, as R.D. Laing recognised, **'Our alienation goes to the roots. The realization of this is the essential springboard for any serious reflection on any aspect of present inter-human life.'**

The fact is, the real psychologically upset state of the human condition is the very last thing E.O. Wilson wants to think about. His whole career has been entirely dedicated to finding ways to deal with the human condition that *don't* require him to have to confront the issue of **'our alienation'** that, in truth, **'is the essential springboard for any serious reflection on any aspect of present inter-human life'**. Further, the point that was initially made in Part 4:9 about dishonest mechanistic/reductionist science as a whole, and again in Part 4:12E about Evolutionary Psychology, has to be made yet again for the theory of Eusociality—which is that the argument still being dogmatically pursued is that 'Selfish, self-preservation behaviour is only natural because that is what every other species practices and that is what we still have instincts for and the task for us conscious, intelligent humans is to use our marvellous reasoning mind to control these savage and brutish animal instincts within us.' So instead of our conscious intellect being the guilty party, in the sense of being that part of ourselves that caused us to 'fall from grace' and have to be banished from the Garden of Eden of our original innocent, cooperatively orientated, all-loving, moral instinctive state (as Moses, Plato and all our mythologies have so honestly admitted), our conscious intellect is, again, being made out to be the faultless, good part of ourselves—a manipulation of the truth that, again, condemns our instincts as the villain: 'Wonderful, we *are* good, our conscious self is good and our instincts are awful, what a relief, I, my conscious thinking self, feels terrific.' Never mind that this was all an outrageous, reverse-of-the-truth lie. What a trick! Instead of our instinctive past being a **'paradise'**, **'Golden Age'** of **'togetherness'** before **'the dawning of individual consciousness'** brought about a world of highly intelligent people living an immensely insecure, **'shrill, brittle, self-important life'**, which in truth is **'a graveyard where the living are dead'**,

as Sir Laurens van der Post and others recognised, our instincts were deemed bad while our intellect was viewed as wonderful. What a complete and terrible assault on the truth, but what a relief for our upset, corrupting intellect. We, our conscious thinking self, had finally made ourselves out to be the hero that we have always intuitively believed we were, and in fact are, but it was a hollow 'achievement' based on an absolute lie. We had lifted the burden of guilt, the psychological insecurity of the issue of our less-than-ideally-behaved human condition, but we had done so fraudulently. The elements involved in the human condition of moral instincts and a corrupting intellect weren't being looked at honestly, rather, the complete opposite was occurring—those elements were being totally misrepresented. The human condition wasn't being confronted—it was being hidden behind the biggest mountain of lies that could possibly be assembled!

As was emphasised at the end of the Part on Evolutionary Psychology, the truth is that our story is one about the ever-changing and developing *psychology* of our human situation—how our original innocent, fully cooperative instinctive psyche or soul condemned our intellect, leaving it no choice but to retaliate and repress that wonderfully integratively orientated part of ourselves, with the result that we became upset; that is, psychotic (soul-repressed) and neurotic (mind-distressed) psychological sufferers of the human condition. But, unable to face and deal with this real and main psychological description of our behaviour, we ended up with completely artificial and superficial and deeply dishonest accounts of ourselves, like E.O. Wilson's latest theory of Eusociality, which doesn't refer to our species' psychosis *anywhere*; it doesn't admit that we are a fundamentally sick species.

The fact is, a true account of human nature would acknowledge and address the real issue of our alienated, sick, psychotic and neurotic condition. Again, as that most truthful of psychiatrists, R.D. Laing, wrote, **'The condition of alienation, of being asleep, of being unconscious, of being out of one's mind, is the condition of the normal man…between *us* and It** [our true self or soul] **there is a veil which is more like fifty feet of solid concrete. *Deus absconditus*. Or we have absconded… The outer divorced from any illumination from the inner is in a state of darkness. We are in an age of darkness. The state of outer darkness is a state of sin—i.e. alienation or estrangement from the inner light…We are all murderers and prostitutes—no matter to what culture, society, class, nation one belongs…We are bemused and crazed creatures, strangers to our true selves, to one another, and to the spiritual and material world.' 'We are dead, but think we are alive. We are asleep, but think we are awake. We are dreaming, but take our dreams to be reality. We are the halt, lame, blind, deaf, the sick. But we are doubly unconscious. We are *so* ill that we no longer feel ill, as in many terminal illnesses. We are mad, but have no insight** [into the fact of our madness]**.'**

As already mentioned, Arthur Koestler summarised mechanistic, reductionist science's deliberate blindness to the issue of the **'mental disorder'** of our **'unique'** human condition when he wrote that **'symptoms of the mental disorder which appears to be endemic in our species…are specifically and uniquely human, and not found in any other species. Thus it seems only logical that our search for explanations** [of human behaviour] **should also concentrate primarily on those attributes of *homo sapiens* which are exclusively human and not shared by the rest of the animal kingdom. But however obvious this conclusion may seem, it runs counter to the prevailing reductionist trend. "Reductionism" is the philosophical belief that all human activities can be "reduced" to – i.e., explained by – the** [non-psychosis involved] **behavioural responses of lower animals – Pavlov's dogs, Skinner's rats and pigeons,**

Lorenz's greylag geese, Morris's hairless apes…That is why the scientific establishment has so pitifully failed to define the predicament of man.' Koestler complained of **'the sterile deserts of reductionist philosophy'**, asserting that **'a correct diagnosis of the condition of man** [had to be] **based on a new approach to the sciences of life'** (*Janus: A Summing Up*, 1978, pp.19, 20 of 354).

Earlier, in Part 4:7, I also referred to how Nikolai Berdyaev exposed the extreme dishonesty of the reverse-of-the-truth lie that 'our instincts are the villains and our intellect is guiltless, secure, in-control, psychosis-free and healthy' when he observed that **'psychologists were wrong in assuming that man was a healthy creature, mainly conscious and intellectual, and should be studied from that point of view. <u>Man is a sick being, with a strong unconscious life</u>'** (*The Destiny of Man*, 1931, tr. N. Duddington, 1960, pp.67-68 of 310). He also clearly indicated that understanding of the human condition depended on acknowledging, not denying, that **'The human soul is divided, an agonizing conflict between opposing elements is going on in it…<u>the distinction between the conscious and the subconscious mind is fundamental for the new psychology</u>. Mental disorders are due to the conflict between the two'** (ibid). As Berdyaev accurately summarised, **'man is an irrational, paradoxical, essentially tragic being in whom two worlds, two opposite principles, are at war…Philosophers and scientists have done very little to elucidate the problem of man'** (ibid. p.49). Yes, the real description of the conflicting elements in our psychologically upset, **'sick'** human condition involves **'the distinction between the conscious and the** [instinctive] **subconscious mind'**.

Again, the reason **'Philosophers and scientists have done very little to elucidate the problem of man'**, and **'why the scientific establishment has so pitifully failed to define the predicament of man'**, was because the human condition wasn't being truthfully confronted. Instead, as was described in Part 4:9, what we have been fed by **'the scientific establishment'** is a whole world of dishonesty, an immense castle of lies, a great paradigm of madness where everyone in the world swans around, seemingly confident that the mental world they are inhabiting is completely rational and sound, making jokes and slapping each other on the back in happy reassurance that all is well and good, awarding each other Nobel Prizes for being brilliant, etc, etc—basically sinking deeper and deeper into a terrible swamp of delusion!

With specific regard to E.O. Wilson's **'New Theory of Eusociality'**, the points that were made earlier about the nullification of the subject of the human condition also need to be re-stated. While denial *was* necessary while we couldn't truthfully explain the human condition, the great danger of taking the art of denial to such extremes as E.O. Wilson has done with this latest fake, trivialised, extraordinarily superficial 'explanation' of the human condition is to permanently discredit what the human condition actually is. He has made it seem like it is not profoundly distressing at all, just two different instincts within us that are sometimes at odds. The subject of the human condition used to be an almost sacred subject, one that was only referred to in moments of deep profundity, but now it can be talked about as if it is nothing extraordinary at all. The most serious of subjects has been rendered benign, virtually inconsequential! Already, in 2013, a school teacher has written to me saying, **'In support of what you wrote about the term Human Condition not being sacred anymore, on Friday my year 12s were trying to write an introduction to an essay and one of them said "I love the term The Human Condition, I can use it in just about any essay for any subject"'** (WTM records, 15 Feb. 2013). What E.O. Wilson has done is not explain the human condition but nullify it. When the core issue about what it is to be human is finally completely trivialised, as it now is with E.O. Wilson's

account of it, we have the ultimate example of how denial is taking humanity to the very brink of terminal dishonesty/alienation/superficiality/darkness/death. Yes, E.O. Wilson *is* the quintessential anti-Christ, the embodiment of the very opposite of truth. That is the reality: E.O. Wilson's **'summa work'** represents the grand finale in the two million year long story of the development of denial on Earth—it is the final great push to have the world of lies with all its sickness, darkness and ugliness take over the world. Make no mistake, with his seductive but completely dishonest account of the human condition E.O. Wilson is trying to kill the human race, prevent it from ever reaching liberating understanding. The long anticipated last great battle on Earth, the fabled battle of Armageddon, is actually the battle between the entrenched dark world of denial and the emerging new enlightened, true world of denial-free understanding—which basically boils down to a battle between E.O. Wilson's fake, superficial, not-genuinely-biological, trivialising account of the human condition, and the true, human-condition-confronting-and-penetrating biological explanation of the human condition being presented here in *Freedom Expanded: Book 1*. Choose your side.

Part 4:12J Desperationville/End Game/Terminal Alienation

As has now been explained, although the multilevel theory of Eusociality supports the truth that we humans do have unconditionally selfless moral instincts, which is a more honest finding than Evolutionary Psychology's assertion that we don't have such unconditionally selfless moral instincts, its assertion that we *also* have selfish instincts doesn't ring true to what we all know about the nature of our original instinctive self or soul, which is that it is a *completely* concerned-with-the-larger-whole-not-yourself, *fully* cooperative, *all*-loving, *utterly* harmonious, *totally* empathetic, *absolutely* innocent state. Further, the idea that our selfless moral instincts were derived from vicious warring with other groups similarly doesn't ring true to what we all know about the nature of our original instinctive self or soul, which is that it is universally loving. The multilevel theory of Eusociality is also a patently dishonest denial of the fact that the human condition is a *psychologically* upset state. And further still, since Eusociality argues that selfishness has a powerful presence in our instinctive make-up, selfish individualism is, in effect, still being justified as a natural part of our make-up—indeed, as pointed out earlier, the theory of Eusociality could be viewed as more of a selfishness-justifying, right-wing theory than an idealistic selflessness-emphasising, left-wing theory. What all this means for the left-wing, whose essential strategy is to pretend to be supporting truth and ideality (which is how its proponents derive their human-condition-relieving sense of feeling good about themselves) is that while the theory of Eusociality appeared to cater to both the left and right wing as E.O. Wilson hoped (as the heading of an article in *The Atlantic* about this new theory proclaimed, **'The Radical Theory of Evolution That Explains Democrats and Republicans'** (Larrie D. Ferreiro, 11 Jun. 2012)), it didn't *actually* satisfy the left-wing.

This failure of the multilevel between-group selection theory of Eusociality to satisfy the left-wing meant that in the ever-escalating 'cultural war' between the blatant lying of the right-wing and the pseudo idealistic left-wing's need to mimic the truth without actually confronting it, the latter were left in a desperate situation. Unlike the right-wing who could blatantly lie, the left-wing had to *pretend* to be on the side of truth and idealism, and the

situation had now arisen where, in order to continue to pretend to be ideal, a superficially more honest account of human nature had to be found, but how? The reality for the left-wing was that there was no truly accountable explanation available that would enable them to maintain their position, which meant they were basically stranded in Desperationville.

So, all the pseudo idealistic left-wing could do was try to fabricate some sort of selflessness-emphasising argument and, beyond that, revert to the old vague by-products-of-natural-selection, matrix-of-biological-mechanisms, bluff, illusionary, non-explanation for our unconditionally selfless moral soul that was described in Part 4:12G—and that is exactly what left-wing biologists did. In Part 4:12G, reference was made to the 2011 book *Origins of Altruism and Cooperation* as being an example of the 'by-products of natural selection' argument (the book is actually an assemblage of presentations that were given at a 2009 conference, held at Washington University, on 'Man the Hunted and the Origin and Nature of Human Sociality, Altruism and Well-Being'). We can now understand why, having been rejected and replaced by, firstly, the theory of Evolutionary Psychology, and then the Multilevel theory of Eusociality, the old Stephen Jay Gould-led argument—that a vague matrix of biological mechanisms operating either outside or alongside genetics made the development of unconditional selflessness possible—was resurrected in 2011.

As was also mentioned in Part 4:12G, in the Preface to *Origins of Altruism and Cooperation*, the book's editors—the anthropologist Robert Sussman and the psychiatrist and geneticist Robert Cloninger—wrote that **'Social scientists and biologists are learning that there is more to cooperation and generosity in both human and nonhuman group-living animals than an investment in one's own nepotistic patch of DNA. Research in a great diversity of scientific disciplines is revealing that there are many biological and behavioral mechanisms that humans and nonhuman primates use to reinforce pro-social or cooperative behavior. For example, there are specific neurobiological and hormonal mechanisms that support social behavior. There are also psychological, psychiatric, and cultural mechanisms'** (viii of 439). Yes, it was being alleged that a matrix of **'many biological and behavioral mechanisms'** created **'pro-social or cooperative behavior'**, but the question is how exactly did it do that? Certainly, **'hormonal'** and **'neurobiological' 'psychological'** and **'psychiatric'**, along with **'cultural'**, influences are involved in the **'support'** of **'social behavior'**, but that doesn't explain our social behaviour at all. Yes, a by-product of natural selection, namely the love-indoctrination process, did create our **'pro-social or cooperative behavior'**, and then those love-indoctrinated moral instincts did clash with our emerging conscious mind to create the psychologically upset state of our human condition—at which point all our **'neurobiological' 'psychological'** and **'psychiatric'** behaviours emerged and then different **'cultur**[es]**'** were created to try to manage that upset. Our hormonal system was also obviously affected by, and became involved in, the development of this upset state. Yes, all the **'hormonal'**, **'neurobiological'**, **'psychological'**, **'psychiatric'** and **'cultural'** aspects of our make-up *are* by-products of natural selection and they *are* all involved in human behaviour—but that doesn't explain the **'origins of altruism and cooperation'** at all. The *illusion* is that the origin of our moral instincts has been explained when it hasn't—but, again, in the desperation to counter the right-wing's selfishness-emphasising doctrine such extreme illusion was deemed necessary.

In light of what has now been explained about the unsatisfactory nature of D.S. Wilson and E.O. Wilson's Multilevel explanation of human behaviour for the left-wing, further

consideration can be given to what is said in *Origins of Altruism and Cooperation*. One of the book's contributors, the Italian biological philosopher Telmo Pievani, stated in the book that **'Edward O. Wilson…and his colleague David Sloan Wilson proposed a theory where selection acts at "multiple levels" and upon different "units" (Wilson and Wilson, 2007)'** (p.49). Their **'hypotheses concerning the central role of cooperation and altruism in primate and human life are reduced to competition arguments, at different levels of selection'** (p.50). In a further reference to the multilevel theory, Sussman and Cloninger referred to biologists who **'suggest that human beings are "bipolar apes" with conflicting dispositions for waging war (like aggressive chimpanzees) and making love (like sociable bonobos), so that human beings must constantly strive to engage in emotional reconciliation to maintain social harmony'** (p.ix). Presenting their left-wing counter view to this, Sussman and Cloninger then stated that **'We suggest that human beings are naturally cooperative when healthy and only revert to violence under abnormal conditions, as when stressed, abused, neglected, or mentally ill'** (p.ix). This alternative view is then elaborated on, with Sussman and Cloninger writing that **'The traits of altruism and cooperation often are assumed to be among humanity's essential and defining characteristics…Data are presented** [in *Origins of Altruism and Cooperation*] **supporting the idea that the normal pattern for most diurnal primates and for humans is to be social. People who develop the need for psychiatric intervention are those who become alienated and antisocial. It is human nature to want to work together and cooperate'** (p.vii). **'In fact, cooperative sociality is a necessity for well-being in anthropoid primates'** (p.viii).

In a reference to the unconscionable, **'ethically unpleasant'** idea that our moral instincts are derived from competitive warring with other groups of humans, Pievani stated that **'what is interesting in this** [Wilson and Wilson group selection] **model from the point of view of the philosophy of biology is that altruism seems founded on conflict between groups, and the exclusion of outsiders'** (p.49). He pointed out that this **'group selection…could have ethically unpleasant consequences: parochialism inside the group and aggressiveness against others in a competitive system'** (p.57).

Instead of arguing that our moral nature resulted from warring between groups, as D.S. Wilson and E.O. Wilson claimed, the contributors to *Origins of Altruism and Cooperation* put forward a more idealistic, left-wing, non-aggressive-and-competitive argument for the origin of our moral nature—this is the fabricated selflessness-emphasising argument that I said the left-wing had to come up with. So rather than arguing that the cooperation arose from between-group warfare, they argued that it arose from having to defend ourselves against predators. Pievani stated that **'The function of widespread cooperation as defence against predators, instead for the promotion of more coordinated and aggressive hunting, is one of the bridges between the social behaviours seen among living primates and the hypothetical social behaviours in groups of our hominid ancestors** [p.51] **…If we discover that, for the greater part of our evolutionary history, the defence of ourselves and of our families from predators, and not the contrary, has been the main driver of our survival; that sociality and cooperation have had a function connected to avoid predators, and not to the glorious aim of hunting and dominating environments, we will have to change the major paradigm that has dominated our views of our essential selves from the earliest days of paleoanthropology** [p.57] **… The "Man the Hunted" paradigm is "positive", with respect to the opposite "Man the Predator" notion, because it offers much more effective and realistic evolutionary explanations (Hart and Sussman, 2009). Without denying that humans are extremely able in warfare, it removes the idea that egotism is natural and cooperation a cultural epiphenomenon. It also eliminates the concept that cooperation and sociality**

are marginal contingencies that may be explained merely as anomalies tolerated by an alleged "universal Darwinian algorithm". And it does away with the idea of a supposed evolutionary determinism of selfishness, frequently used as a support for conservative and class-conscious ways of putting questions in sociological researches and biased questionnaires of evolutionary psychology (Dupré, 2001)…We are born to cooperate as well as to be human [p.58]**.'** Incidentally, Pievani's reference to **'Man the Hunted'** comes from Robert Sussman's 2005 book, *Man the Hunted: Primates, Predators, and Human Evolution* where he first put forward the argument that cooperation arose from having to defend ourselves from predators. In summarising his theory, Sussman, for example, said in 2006, **'Our intelligence, cooperation and many other features we have as modern humans developed from our attempts to out-smart the predator'** (presentation at the American Association for the Advancement of Science's Annual Meeting, 19 Feb. 2006).

Also, in a further reference to their vague matrix of mechanisms, by-products of natural selection argument that only created the *illusion* that the biological origins of our moral soul had been explained, Pievani wrote that **'it is the logic itself of our evolutionary explanations that needs to be extended: this is not only a matter of "interactors" belonging to genetic pools but also a matter of the economy of survival, immediate physical benefits, responses to contingent conditions in the surrounding ecological systems, the ability to learn new behaviours, phenotypic and behavioural plasticity and the flexibility of social patterns of interactions—all of them macro-evolutionary independent factors in a hierarchy of evolutionary levels (Eldredge, 1985, 1995, 1999; Gould, 2002)** (p.52). He also wrote that **'This debate can take place in the context of an extended and pluralistic, although still Darwinian, theory of evolution. The multifactorial and integrated approach involved brings together, in a viable and testable way, genealogical, ecological and cultural logics that are not reducible to standard arguments based on competition. This allows us to approach the problem of human behavioural origins without having to adopt "universal laws" for evolution (as in the universal strong Darwinian "algorithm"), but instead by seeking at evolutionary law-like "patterns", that are repeated schemes of regular events (Eldredge, 1999)'** (p.56). (I might mention to the reader that if you had trouble following what was said in the above extract, don't worry—I am also hanging in by my mental fingertips and I'm supposed to have some idea of what is being talking about! As I've mentioned before, the more desperate the need to fabricate a persuasive argument, the more intellectual and convoluted the writing becomes.)

In summarising their argument, Sussman and Cloninger wrote that **'The paleontological, behavioral, neurobiological, and psychological evidence provided in this book gives a more optimistic and realistic view of human nature than the more popular, conventional view of humans being naturally and basically aggressive and warlike'** (p.viii).

To respond now to these assertions. Firstly, with regard to the theory that the defence against and avoidance of predators was **'the main driver'** in making us social, certainly the threat of predators encouraged cooperation, but, once again, that was not going to *make* us social. It was not going to overcome the fundamental problem of genetic selfishness, which is that wherever selflessness develops it is going to be subverted by selfish opportunists. The fact is, species have been living with the threat of predators since life first emerged and it has never been able to bring about full integration. What we see instead is the eventual development of dominance hierarchy as a means to try to contain the rampant selfish competition and opportunism. The whole reason E.O. Wilson and D.S. Wilson put forward

the argument that warring *between* groups was the eusociality threshold breaker was because there had to be an *extreme* need for cooperation if selfish opportunism was going to be defeated; there had to be a situation of conflict where groups of cooperators would defeat groups of non-cooperators. Arguing that groups of cooperators survived the threat of predators better than groups of non-cooperators doesn't create anything like the same selection pressure as actual conflict between groups. Indeed, this **'defence against predators'** argument neglects the whole driving force behind the development of the between-group warfare argument. And, as for the credibility of the between-group warfare model itself, even if it does create an extreme need for cooperation, it is not a sound argument—for the reasons that were listed when we looked at the theory of Eusociality. Again, the overall *reality* out there in nature is that efforts to cooperate and integrate have resulted only in the establishment of dominance hierarchy as a means to try to contain the excessive competition that inevitably develops between sexually reproducing individuals—with the exception, of course, of the fully integrated state, which was achieved through love-indoctrination. So, the by-products of natural selection, matrix of mechanisms idea, even when bolstered by the supposed **'main driver'** of the **'defence against predators'** argument, provides no real explanation for the origin of our moral soul.

Basically what the left-wing have done is replace the right-wing **'conventional view of humans being naturally and basically aggressive and warlike'** with a non-aggressive, **'defence against predators'** argument and attached that to the old matrix of mechanisms argument in the hope that the combined effect would be enough to finally get them across the line in terms of arguing that our unconditionally selfless moral soul has been explained in a non-aggressive, non-selfishness-emphasising way. And that is precisely why it could not, and did not succeed, for despite the addition of the supposed **'main driver'** of the **'defence against predators'** thesis, the left-wing selflessness-emphasising, **'conservative and class-conscious'**-defying, **'more optimistic'** biologists were, at the end of the day, *still* relying heavily on the old, discredited matrix of mechanisms argument. On the issue of the matrix of mechanism concept, as was pointed out in Part 4:12G, the basic thinking involved in that simplistic, illusionary, duplicitous and desperate, **'multifactorial'**, **'pluralistic'** approach was along the lines of, 'Our unconditionally selfless, moral instincts exist and they had to have emerged somehow, and natural selection on its own can't explain how (the need for defence against predators isn't a sufficient explanation), so clearly our moral instincts must have been created by a matrix of by-products of natural selection, so that's all we need to know!' And, having supposedly (but not actually) 'succeeded' in explaining the origin of our moral instincts, and in the process having supposedly (but again not actually) 'explained' the origin of our psychotic, **'alienated and antisocial'** human condition, these left-wing biologists felt they were justified in raising all manner of human-condition-confronting, psychosis-exposing truths. But since the origin of our moral instincts had not actually been explained, and since, unlike the Wilson and Wilson model, no specific arguable explanation had been given for our conflicted **'psychological'** and **'psychiatric'** human condition, this 'Damn it, I'm just going to let the truth out anyway because the situation for humans in the world has become so dire that us left-wing biologists have to start getting some truth up' attitude was *extremely reckless*. Upset humans were being confronted with the truth of their corrupted condition without it having first been explained and defended.

This desperate, reckless, 'just-let-the-truth-out' attitude in *Origins of Altruism and Cooperation* is apparent from the very first page of the book, where the dedication reads (the emphasises are as they appear): ***'We dedicate this book to Walter Goldschmidt who reminded us at the conference that: "You talk about cooperation and altruism, but what you really mean is LOVE. We shouldn't be afraid to use the word LOVE. That is what makes us truly human."'*** As has been explained before, love actually means 'unconditional selflessness' and the problem with admitting this truth is that it confronts upset humans with the question of why don't they behave unconditionally selflessly—so, without understanding of the human condition, it was better to leave the concept of love abstract and undefined. As has been mentioned, the linguist Robin Allott summarised denial-complying, human-condition-psychosis-avoiding mechanistic/reductionist science's **'afraid'** attitude to the concept of love when he wrote, **'Love has been described as a taboo subject, not serious, not appropriate for scientific study.'**

Looking at the content of the book, it is completely true and honest to say that **'The traits of altruism and cooperation often are assumed to be among humanity's essential and defining characteristics'**, and that **'human beings are naturally cooperative when healthy and only revert to violence under abnormal conditions, as when stressed, abused, neglected, or mentally ill'**, and that **'People who develop the need for psychiatric intervention are those who become alienated and antisocial. It is human nature to want to work together and cooperate'**, and that **'cooperative sociality is a necessity for well-being in anthropoid primates'**, but to confront humans with the truth about their corrupted condition like this while pretending to have provided them with the safe, relieving understanding of that corrupted condition, was to simply add to, not alleviate, the deluded, alienated, psychotic state of humanity. Certainly, R.D. Laing was being even more honest than the contributors to *Origins of Altruism and Cooperation* about the extent of our alienated condition, but, unlike the contributors to that book, he wasn't pretending to be presenting an explanation of human nature. R.D. Laing was saying that we *needed* to look into the human condition, he wasn't pretending to have looked into it or solved it himself. He wasn't being delusional. What the contributors to *Origins of Altruism and Cooperation* are doing is basically just letting out schizophrenic fragments of honesty amongst an intellectual maelstrom of biological dishonesty. It's desperate, mad, irresponsible behaviour, not truthful, honest, deeply thoughtful, sound behaviour.

These truth-imitating-but-not-genuinely-truth-confronting, pseudo idealistic left-wing biologists weren't really interested in confronting the human condition at all—far from it. As has been explained before, the whole strategy of the left-wing was to support idealistic causes in order to make yourself feel as though you were free of the human condition so you wouldn't have to actually confront the human condition. A stark example of the extent to which these left-wing biologists have been committed to avoiding thinking truthfully about the human condition and the origin of our moral soul is how an observation made by Charles Darwin is treated in *Origins of Altruism and Cooperation*. In *The Descent of Man*, Darwin wrote that **'The feeling of pleasure from society is probably an extension of the parental or filial affections, since the social instinct seems to be developed by the young remaining for a long time with their parents; and this extension may be attributed in part to habit, but chiefly to natural selection'** (1871, ch.4). Darwin was an exceptionally sound, human-condition-confronting-not-avoiding, genuinely honest and thus effective thinker, and he was on the right track with what he said here

because, as has been explained, it *was* the nurturing, love-indoctrination process that gave us our moral instincts. However, while on pages 2 and 5 of *Origins of Altruism and Cooperation* the contributors to that book *did* cite this quote from Darwin about the role of nurturing in developing our **'social instincts'**, they failed to follow through on the idea he was raising to arrive at the nurturing, love-indoctrination explanation for our moral soul, opting instead to limit their focus to the **'pleasure'** aspect of the quote. The answer to the great question they were seeking of the origin of our moral soul was in front of them but they couldn't—in fact, wouldn't allow themselves to—see it. It is true that **'cooperative sociality is a necessity for well-being in anthropoid primates'**, but that **'cooperative sociality'** didn't arise from having to cooperate to protect ourselves from predators. It arose from the nurturing, love-indoctrination process that, as explained in Part 8:4, primates have been variously able to practice and develop.

In summary, the resurrection of the pluralistic, matrix of mechanisms 'explanation' for the origins of our moral soul, bolstered as it supposedly was by the 'need to cooperate to avoid predation' argument, is still no more accountable than it was when the matrix of mechanisms concept was first put forward by Stephen Jay Gould and others.

(Another recent (2012) left-wing, cooperation-emphasising hypothesis that has been put forward to explain our moral nature is the Self-Domestication Hypothesis (SDH), by primatologists Brian Hare, Victoria Wobber and Richard Wrangham. However since the SDH is addressed in detail in Part 8:5H where its dishonesty and dangers are exposed, it is sufficient to just make mention of it here.)

A response to such reckless and dangerous truth-admitting-but-not-explaining dogma of the left-wing, as has just been described, has been for right-wing biologists to desperately try to at least point out the danger of such truth-admitting-but-not-explaining dogma. An example of this is the book *Pathological Altruism* (published in December 2011), in which the bioengineer Barbara Oakley argues that altruism and empathy can lead to **'codependency'**, **'burnout'**, **'suicide bombing'**, **'self-righteous political partisanship'** and **'ineffective social programs'**. Yes, to admit but not explain the truth that we humans have an innocent, uncorrupted, ideal, soul-infused moral nature while not providing a bridging understanding of our present extremely corrupted, non-ideal human-condition-afflicted reality, *can* lead to more innocent people being so bewildered by reality and thus unable to defy it that they do become **'codependen**[t]**'** to it, seduced by its lies—which *can* lead to **'burn**[ing]**' 'out'** in an effort to idealistically try to reform the corrupt world—or, in the case of the pseudo idealistic, excessively soul-corrupted situation, *can* lead to brazenly imitating moral idealism to feel good, which very often *has* led to **'self-righteous political partisanship'** and **'ineffective social programs'**—and in the case of **'suicide bombing'**, *can* lead to fanatical insistence on a rigidly ideal world. What's needed to solve all these problems is the reconciling and ameliorating understanding of the real origin of our moral nature and the reason why we departed from it. Dogma, **'Pathological Altruism'**—the expectation of, even insistence on, idealism without any reconciling explanation for the reality of our corrupted condition—has been the essential problem of the human condition. We humans needed mind-full understanding not more mind-less dogma.

Desperate, reckless, dogmatic assertions that our human world is not ideal but should be got us nowhere. The whole purpose of science is to demystify and, by so doing, end dogma, not add to it. Equally, for right-wing scientists to put forward patently dishonest accounts of human nature was also improper science. To solve the desperate situation that humanity now finds itself in we needed real insights into the human condition, not more dishonest right-wing biological lies such as the theory of Eusociality, or, alternatively, more artificial and superficial pseudo idealistic, dogmatic expressions of idealism, such as the left-wing pluralistic explanation for our moral nature.

Part 4:12K Science became a farce

For a summary of just how devastatingly corrupted by the human condition we humans are now, and how farcically hopeless science has become in its efforts to do anything about it, we need look no further than the acclaimed 2010 documentary *Secrets of the Tribe* on the Yanomamö Indians of the Amazon—a *relatively* innocent, happy, soulful tribe who lived in total isolation from the outside world until cultural anthropologists descended upon them in the 1960s to study their behaviour. In addition to describing 30 or so years of sordid and appalling mistreatment by some of these anthropologists, including the sexual abuse of a whole generation or more of young Yanomami, the program also documented the ferocious conflict that emerged between the right-wing and left-wing anthropologists who were studying the tribe. Briefly, the right-wing tried to highlight the infighting and intertribal wars of the Yanomami, with a book that even described them (in the title no less) as **'The Fierce People'**, and a theory that the hostilities arose because they were competing for the chance to reproduce their genes—that war is a result of aggressive instincts in humans. The left-wing anthropologists attempted to counter the right-wing's aggression-and-selfishness-is-only-natural argument with their own equally dishonest **'cultural materialism'** argument that claimed the fighting was a cultural development that arose from fighting for strategic material resources, such as the steel tools the anthropologists were providing them with and high protein game. The right-wing sociobiologists blamed our supposed selfish genes, while the left-wing socialists blamed the development of a materialistic culture. As already mentioned, the human-condition-confronting-rather-than-human-condition-avoiding *true* explanation for the aggression apparent in the Yanomami is that while they are undoubtedly more innocent than the majority of humans in the world today, they are still nowhere near as innocent as humans were some two million years ago when the battle of the human condition first emerged. The Yanomami are a *relatively* innocent, happy, well-adjusted, peaceful race—as virtually all those outsiders who spent time with them felt very keenly.

For the scientific establishment to support the misrepresentation of these obviously relatively innocent people as **'The Fierce People'**, which is an outrageous reverse-of-the-truth-lie, and allow one of their own to sexually destroy the innocence of an entire generation of this pristine tribe, shows just how festered science had become by its practice of denial of the human condition—as Barbara Rose Johnston, one of the anthropologists who briefly appears

in the documentary wrote, **'*Secrets of the Tribe* exposes the secrets of my tribe, of anthropologists'** (*Secrets of the Tribe*, pub. in political newspaper *Counterpunch*, accessed 9 Jan. 2012 at <https://www.counterpunch.org/2010/03/19/secrets-of-the-tribe/>). Basically, the Yanomami's innocence was felt to be so confronting and exposing that it had to be annihilated with an atomic-bomb-sized attack that was sanctioned at the highest levels in our society! This behaviour is extremely revealing of where humanity has arrived at; it provides the starkest evidence of just how psychologically upset and insecure we humans have become—and, it should also be said, that pseudo idealists' human-condition-avoiding, superficial focus on materialism was so pathetic and cowardly it was even more sickening than those attacking innocence/truth head on. It is all deeply, deeply shocking, but again, that is the end play state that the world has arrived at. The human-race-transforming, reconciling understanding of the human condition has come at the absolute eleventh hour for our species and our planet. (Much more will be said in Part 5:2 about science's denial of the relative innocence of so-called 'primitive' races.)

The point should be made that in terms of the so-called 'discipline of science', it's obvious that the left-wing and the right-wing explanations of human behaviour couldn't *both* be correct—and in fact, *neither* of them are—and yet they both cited acres of research papers that allegedly supported what they were putting forward, which is simply more evidence of just how lacking in any objective impartiality science has been. The song played at the end of the *Secrets of the Tribe* documentary, with its lyrics, **'Things have come to a pretty pass… It looks as if we two will never be one…You like potato and I like potahto…Let's call the whole thing off'**, perfectly captures the whole farcical, 'no-one-cares-about-the-pursuit-of-understanding-anymore-only-about-imposing-their-own-twisted-philosophy-on-the-world' joke that science has been reduced to. The truth is, while there has been much emphasis placed on scientific research, the *real* need was for some honest, penetrating scientific thought. It wasn't a lack of research papers holding science back, but a lack of mental integrity. The answers were there to find, the problem was no one was prepared to think truthfully enough to find them. As has now been described, since Darwin presented his idea of natural selection in 1859 and revealed that instincts are only orientations not understandings, there has been sufficient base information to explain the human condition and all the other crucial biological questions facing the human race—the problem was that no one was prepared to think truthfully enough to arrive at those explanations. The need was not for the mental cleverness that all university entrance exams basically select for, but mental soundness. The impasse was alienation, not lack of information. The bottom line truth is that while ever scientists are committed to living in denial of the real psychological issue of the human condition they are going to be incapable of honesty—a point that was made in an amazingly frank comment that was posted on a Christian website in 2009: **'if there really is hope beyond the human condition, then the Truth that leads to it has to have been established by someone beyond the human condition. Us** [denial-complying] **humans are way too good at rationalizing truth into any shape that pleases us'** (Jonathan Wise, *The Emerging Church*, 29 Mar. 2009, accessed 4 Jul. 2009 at: <https://www.jonandnic.com/topics/faith-ministry/the-emerging-church>). It's only now that understanding of the human condition has finally been found that we are going to see the emergence of a world of trustworthy science.

With regard to **'humans'** being **'way too good at rationalizing truth into any shape that pleases'**, the great burden for denial-complying mechanistic scientists has been to somehow present or **'rationaliz**[e]**'**, and supposedly support with scientific research, lies. Lying—practicing denial—is hard work. The end result has been that scientific papers are now so incredibly intellectualised, especially in their wording and in the weight of supposed evidence in terms of the references that are supplied, that all scientists now complain of how taxing it is on their mental powers trying to actually decipher the flood of these sophisticated dissertations, even in their own field of work. While lying requires great intellectual dexterity because you essentially have to bluff, pretend to be in possession of the truth when you really are not, 'truthing' doesn't. The paradigm that I operate in where the truth is confronted and not denied is a much simpler paradigm in which to operate. I don't need to intellectualise, indulge in convoluted arguments and create acres of scientific citations. However, although my work *is* most rigorously grounded in logic and evidence, it is so different in its simplicity and content to the work coming from the intellectualised mechanistic world that the latter has never been able to cope with it. As will be described shortly in Part 4:14, I have never ceased trying to have my work considered, debated and published in the scientific community, but despite such efforts it has, in almost every instance, been rejected—even though I have truthfully explained the psychologically upset state of the human condition and, by so doing, made the truths that I am presenting safe to confront. The intellectualised world of denial is like a different universe to the one I operate in, which is why I had to create my own institution to fund, support and promote my work.

From these efforts, however, I have managed to extract some positive feedback—for instance, Scott Churchill, the Professor and Chair of the Psychology Department at the University of Dallas, has written the following about my analysis of the biological theories that have emerged since Darwin: **'I have recommended his** [Griffith's] **more recent work to my students precisely for his razor-sharp clarifications of positions of contemporary authors like Edward O. Wilson, Richard Dawkins, and Robert Wright. Griffith manages to summarise book-length expositions of these oftentimes obtuse and varying perspectives on human evolution with clarity and brilliance'** (Expert Report tendered in the 2007 NSW Supreme Court trial regarding the scientific standard of Griffith's work—see the *Persecution of the WTM* section on our website <www.humancondition.com/persecution>). What is astonishing to *me*, however, is how all the **'book-length expositions'** on all the theories of biology that have emerged since Darwin's time that I **'summarise'** have managed to complexify the core concept they were putting forward to the extent of creating what are often very large and intellectually imposing books. But that is the very point I am making—having to practice denial was a tricky business, you essentially had to bluff, pretend to be in possession of the truth when you really weren't—and persuade others in the process. It was all about 'smoke and mirrors', **'obtuse'** intellectualised deception and pretension. In the end, the artificiality of it all, and also the delusion and arrogance involved, was ridiculous and appalling. Yes, it really was a case of **'Things have come to a pretty pass…It looks as if we two will never be one…You like potato and I like potahto…Let's call the whole thing off'**! Again, however, this development was only another indication of the end play state of terminal alienation that was happening everywhere in the world, no matter where we chose to look.

Part 4:13 Summary of why biology had not made any real advance since Darwin

This analysis of dishonest, denial-complying, human-condition-avoiding mechanistic, reductionist biology began at Part 4:9 under the heading, the 'Fourth Category of Thinker: The great majority of the human race who avoided the whole issue of a psychosis in our human situation by simply blaming our selfish and aggressive behaviour on supposed brutish and savage animal instincts within us that our intellect supposedly has to control'. There it was stated that 'What we are going to see now is how almost everyone…in the world, including virtually all scientists, totally avoided the whole issue of the real dilemma and psychosis of our human condition by simply blaming our selfish and aggressive behaviour on supposed brutish and savage animal instincts within us that our intellect has to control.' It was explained that 'Most people, in fact virtually all adults, have avoided anything to do with the issue of the psychological dilemma and resulting psychosis and neurosis of our human condition. Even beginning to vaguely contemplate the nature of our human situation has been too psychologically dangerous for upset humans—as described in Part 4:4C, even asking the obvious initial question of 'What makes humans unique?' has been a 'no-go zone'. Clearly what is so unique about us humans is that we are conscious, but thinking about that was a slippery slope as it quickly raised the depressing question: 'Well, if we are fully conscious, reasoning, intelligent, extremely clever animals, what is so intelligent, clever and smart about being so aggressive and selfish that we have nearly destroyed our own planet?' Similarly, to start thinking truthfully about the other element that must play a significant role in our situation, namely that of our instinctive heritage, was even more treacherous as it very quickly led to the unbearably confronting memory, that all humans carry, of an upset-free, cooperatively orientated, innocent time in our species' instinctive past, a time before the fabled 'fall' that all our mythologies recognise took place when we became fully conscious.

What we have now seen is how true that prediction was, for apart from some recent desperation-motivated exceptions that were just described in Part 4:12J, the journey that biology has undergone since Darwin has been one of completely avoiding any encounter with the truth that we humans once lived in an innocent, upset-free, completely unconditionally selflessly orientated instinctive state, and that we then we became conscious, after which we became sufferers of a psychologically upset human condition. Basically, Social Darwinism, Sociobiology, Evolutionary Psychology, the by-products of natural selection account, the Multilevel theory and the Theory of Eusociality all avoided acknowledging that the human condition is, in fact, a *psychologically* derived condition, a psychosis. If we are honest even for a moment, the descriptions that we give of our human behaviour, such as egocentric, arrogant, evil, shameful, guilty, contemptuous, alienated, psychotic, depressed, deluded, artificial, fake, pretentious, superficial, escapist, defensive, dishonest, hateful, mean, etc, etc, all imply a *psychological* dimension to our human behaviour. Not one of these theories leads to the fulfilment of Carl Jung's requirement that **'wholeness for humans depends on the ability to own their own shadow'**. Ours is a *psychologically* derived condition, we have a **'shadow'** to understand and ameliorate. It really is absurd to try to relate our species' mind-controlled, psychologically-troubled *human condition* to other animals' gene-controlled *animal condition*.

As already pointed out in Part 4:12G when talking about the by-products of natural selection explanation for our moral soul, the overall problem for biologists from both the left-wing and the right-wing is that they have been operating in a mechanistic, reductionist paradigm that determinedly resisted any encounter with the psychological agony of the human condition, which meant they couldn't hope to truthfully explain such fundamental questions as the human condition, how we acquired our unconditionally selfless moral instincts or how we humans became fully conscious. If you're avoiding the whole issue of a psychosis in our human situation you are in no position to explain it—as R.D. Laing pointed out, **'Our alienation goes to the roots. The realization of this is the essential springboard for any serious reflection on any aspect of present inter-human life.'**

Again, the great questions in biology, indeed the three holy grails of biology, have been to truthfully explain the human condition, which is done in Part 3:2; to truthfully explain the origins of humans' unconditionally selfless moral instinctive self or soul, which is what the love-indoctrination explanation given in Part 8:4 does; and to truthfully explain how we developed full consciousness when other species haven't been able to, which is explained in Part 8:4B. The immense frustration of mechanistic, reductionist biology has been its inability to solve *any* of these fundamentally important biological questions, which is why biology became stalled, piled up and festering at this gateway that it couldn't seem to get through no matter how determinedly it tried. And the reality is it could never get through because, in the case of our moral instincts for example, the ability to solve the riddle of how a fundamentally selfish process could have produced unconditionally selfless instincts depends on *not* living in denial of Integrative Meaning, or of the fundamental psychosis/alienation of our human situation, or, most particularly, of the importance of nurturing both in the maturation of our species and in our own lives.

In summary, the interpretations of human behaviour put forward by the proponents of Social Darwinism, Sociobiology, Evolutionary Psychology, the by-products of natural selection account, the Multilevel theory and the Theory of Eusociality were *not* advances in sound biological thinking where human behaviour was concerned, rather, they were increasingly sophisticated ways for upset humans to *avoid* the issue of our human condition. As my professor of biology at Sydney University, Charles Birch, so truthfully said, **'Biology has not made any real advance since Darwin'** (In recorded conversation with this author, 20 Mar. 1987). Indeed, Birch went further in speaking the truth when he said, **'Science can't deal with subjectivity… what we were all taught in universities is pretty much a dead end'** (From recording of Birch's 1993 FHA/WTM Open Day address). He later said that **'the traditional framework of thinking in science is not adequate for solving the really hard problems'** (ABC Radio National, *Ockham's Razor*, 16 Apr. 1997), and we know that the **'hard**[est] **problem'** of all for humans to confront and solve was the **'subjective'** issue of our psychologically upset human condition.

As R.D. Laing wrote about both the importance and difficulty of investigating our consciousness-derived-and-induced human condition: **'The requirement of the present, the failure of the past, is the same: to provide a thoroughly self-conscious and self-critical human account of man… Our alienation goes to the roots. The realization of this is the essential springboard for any serious reflection on any aspect of present inter-human life** [pp.11-12 of 156] **…We respect the voyager, the explorer,**

the climber, the space man. It makes far more sense to me as a valid project—indeed, as a desperately urgently required project for our time—to explore the inner space and time of consciousness [the issue of the human condition]**. Perhaps this is one of the few things that still make sense in our historical context. We are so out of touch with this realm** [so in denial of the issue of the human condition] **that many people can now argue seriously that it does not exist. It is very small wonder that it is perilous indeed to explore such a lost realm** [p.105]**'** (*The Politics of Experience* and *The Bird of Paradise*, 1967). (It should be mentioned in passing here that with E.O. Wilson's trivialisation of the subject of the human condition **'many people'** will **'now argue'** that the subject of the human condition *does* exist, but they won't be thinking **'seriously'** about what the human condition *actually* is—which means the subject has, in truth, become ever more of **'a lost realm'**!)

So Darwin advanced biology as far as it could go if you weren't prepared to lie and if you weren't prepared to truthfully confront the issue of the human condition—and that is where biology, and science as a whole, has been stalled, because almost every biologist since Darwin failed to take up the path that led to the truthful explanation of the human condition that is being presented here in *Freedom Expanded: Book 1*, and which Darwin's understanding of natural selection made possible. They failed to admit that we humans have unconditionally selfless moral instincts that are at odds with our conscious mind, and from there realise that these two learning systems, the gene-based and the nerve-based, differ in the way they process information, and from there realise the nature of the difference, which is that the gene-based learning system can give species orientations, but orientations are not the understandings that the nerve-based learning system requires, hence the battle between the two learning systems that produced the psychologically upset state of the human condition. But with understanding of the human condition now found, by taking that human-condition-confronting, denial-free path through to its conclusion, the consilience of all information (which E.O. Wilson at one stage deceitfully claimed to be achieving) can finally occur. In the future, instead of children being taught unrelated subjects like spelling, mathematics, history, chemistry, biology, physics, religion, etc, all subjects will be associated under the broader subject of what it means to be human. Instead of having to live in a cave of denial all of humanity can finally come out into the sunshine of the truth about ourselves and be forever TRANSFORMED to a state that is free of the upset state of the human condition.

So what I said when summarising the dishonest Multilevel Selection account of human behaviour at the end of Part 4:12H-vi applies to *all* the post-Darwin accounts of human nature: from Social Darwinism to Sociobiology to Evolutionary Psychology to the by-products of natural selection account to the Multilevel theory to the Theory of Eusociality. While these theories certainly made us feel as though we had some excuse for our corrupted, fallen, alienated, split, bipolar, manic depressive, psychotic condition, in truth, all that they were was contorted, bewildered—alienated—interpretations of human behaviour. Yes, just the sort of rubbish people conjure up when they have lost all access to what it is that we have to explain about ourselves, namely our **'fall**[en]**'** from a **Garden of Eden'** state of original innocence, corrupted, immensely alienated, psychotic and neurotic lives. In Part 4:12A I warned that what was going to be presented would be a nightmare of dishonest thinking, and that is what it has been.

The fact is, both the left and the right weren't interested in going anywhere near the real issue of the human condition, only in pretending to—and this pretence has led to literally a mountain of supposedly scholarly papers and books; billions and billions of words about theories supposedly supported by mathematical models, formula, graphs and charts, which, unfortunately, amounted only to a great pile of bullshit/lies/denial/dishonesty/alienation—but, again, it is simply a reflection of what has happened across *all* areas of human life; the human race *has* entered the end play state of terminal alienation. Thank goodness the true understanding of our human condition has arrived to save us from this unthinkably torturous form of death of the human race.

Part 4:14 Understanding of the human condition has had to be independently developed and promoted

Although the human condition has at last been explained and humanity can be free of the horror of its condition, a problem remains. As has now been explained and evidenced, the discipline of biology has coped with the issue of the true, psychologically upset state of our human condition by denying its existence. The problem for biology—in fact, for science as a whole—is how is it going to cope with the true explanation of the human condition now that it has arrived when it is so habituated to living in denial. The answer is that, to date, the scientific establishment hasn't, in the main, been able to cope with it, which is why we have had to create an independent organisation, the WORLD TRANSFORMATION MOVEMENT, to develop and promote the true, human-psychosis explaining understanding of the human condition that is presented in Part 3:2, along with all the other vitally important denial-free, truth-based explanations, in particular of the origin of our species' cooperatively orientated, moral instinctive self or soul that is presented in Part 8:4B, and the origin of our fully conscious mind that is presented in Part 8:4C.

What *should* happen when this full synthesis of explanation is presented to the scientific establishment is that it recognises its accountability and promotes it, but tragically the establishment is so habituated to living in denial that it won't acknowledge and support these all-precious, human-race-liberating understandings, even though that is its mandate. Since **'consciousness'** is the code word often used for the issue of the human condition—because consciousness is what caused the horror of the upset state of the human condition, it lies at the core of the issue—when Charles Birch said that **'Biology right now awaits its Einstein in the realm of consciousness studies'** (ABC Radio National, *Ockham's Razor*, 16 Apr. 1997) he was truthfully recognising that denial-based mechanistic science had failed to produce the insights humanity needed and that an inspired, different approach was necessary, specifically *a denial-free approach*. But when those desperately needed insights are finally found by a denial-free approach, no one wants to know about them! In a sense, all the claims made by our innumerable scientific institutions to want to assist the human race to find knowledge prove to be fraudulent.

In short, the scientific establishment will welcome new ideas and insights as long as they are not too insightful. The quote from Berdyaev that was mentioned in Part 4:10—that **'reality'-'sever**[ed]**'**, **'alienation of man'-'based'**, **'meaning'-'impossible'**, **'philosophy'-'enslav**[ing]**'**,

mechanistic-**'objecti**[vism]**'** is **'scientific terrorism'**—turns out to be all too true. The truth about us humans has been, and continues to be, prohibited by mechanistic science.

And it is not as though we in the WTM haven't tried mightily to interest the scientific establishment in these all-important insights. In December 1983, when the full synthesis of explanation of the human condition—including the explanation of our moral soul and the explanation of the origin of our fully conscious mind—was completed, I travelled to England to personally submit an 8,000 word summary of this all-problems-of-the-human-race-solving breakthrough synthesis to John Maddox (later Sir John Maddox), the then editor of *Nature* magazine, which at the time was considered the world's leading science journal. I responsibly took the answers that save the world to the person in the world in charge of the search for it. I also submitted it to Colin Tudge, the then Features Editor of *New Scientist* magazine. Both declined to publish the article. In fact, it took much insistence by me of the importance of my submission for Maddox to even agree to see me. However, when I began the meeting by trying to convince him of the foundation truth of Integrative Meaning he became quite animated in his denial of it, saying to me twice that the concept of Integrative Meaning arising from Negative Entropy is **'wrong'** (from audio recording of the 15 Dec. 1983 meeting). Soon after he terminated the meeting. My 1983 submission to *Nature* and to *New Scientist* can be read at <www.humancondition.com/nature>. In March 1989 over 800 review copies of my first book *Free: The End Of The Human Condition*, which contains a concise presentation of the synthesis, were sent to nearly all the scientific journals in the world. Other review copies were sent to leading scientists. There was virtually no response. There have been many other unsuccessful attempts since 1989 to interest scientific institutions in these ideas, including the American Association for the Advancement of Science, the International Primatological Society and the John Templeton Foundation. While some significant support for the synthesis was generated among eminent holistic scientists for my 1991 book *Beyond The Human Condition* (see <www.humancondition.com/ReviewsScientific>), and also in 2004 when I presented the synthesis as part of a proposed documentary about the issue of the human condition (commendations for the documentary proposal, such as from world-leading physicist Professor Stephen Hawking and Nobel Laureate Professor Charles Townes, can be viewed at <www.humancondition.com/doco-responses>), that support never led to wider interest in the synthesis in the scientific community.

While some of the interest generated as a result of the documentary proposal continues to this day, the overall situation remains that since there is no institution or structure or funding body that we can go to for support of these truthful insights into the human condition, it remains entirely up to the few people who comprise the WTM to develop and promote these world-saving insights.

That is a 2012 snapshot of what has happened—or 'not happened'—on the science front in terms of the acceptance of these humanity-saving, fully accountable truthful insights into the human condition. A summary of the 30 years' worth of submissions to the scientific establishment of these world-saving insights into the human condition, into the origins of our moral nature and conscious mind, and into the integrative meaning of existence is described in Part 8:6, and the full presentation can be read at <www.humancondition.com/full-

history-of-rejection>. In terms of what acceptance or otherwise these insights have received from the general public, the story is even more dire because the overall response so far has not merely been the rejection of these concepts, but outright vilification and opposition. As is documented on our website at <www.humancondition.com/persecution>, over 20 years ago now a vicious campaign began against myself, those of us involved in supporting these ideas, and the WORLD TRANSFORMATION MOVEMENT itself. In 1995 this campaign of persecution, vilification and misrepresentation went public with the publication of a defamatory Australian Broadcasting Corporation television program and *Sydney Morning Herald* newspaper feature article. Produced by a minister of the Uniting Church, both these publications sought to stigmatise our organisation as a dangerous anti-social organisation and me as a deluded megalomanic leader. Ultimately, both publications were completely discredited by a series of official rulings and public apologies culminating in a 2010 court judgment that found my work was real science rather than the mindless dogma that characterises mind-controlling sects, which was how the defamatory publications sought to portray my work. As the full-page advertisement we ran in *The Australian* newspaper after our major court victory (see <www.humancondition.com/vindication>) explains, it was an incredibly hard-won and an incalculably precious victory against those who wanted to destroy us for daring to address the historically forbidden issue of the human condition—the one issue that had to be addressed and solved for there to be a future for the human race. Dealing as it does with the subject of self, the subjective dimension to life, and being the realm of enquiry where religion and science, faith and reason finally overlap, the issue of the human condition is naturally contentious. But that doesn't justify throwing out the rule book on democratic, fair behaviour.

People are sometimes tempted to think that a good idea will withstand whatever resistance it encounters, but that is not true. In the English political philosopher John Stuart Mill's 1859 essay *On Liberty*—a document considered a philosophical pillar of western civilisation—Mill emphasised this point when he said, **'the dictum that truth always triumphs over persecution is one of those pleasant falsehoods which men repeat after one another till they pass into commonplaces, but which all experience refutes. History teems with instances of truth put down by persecution. If not suppressed for ever, it may be thrown back for centuries'** (*American state papers; On liberty; Representative government; Utilitarianism*, 1952, p.280 of 476). The science historian Thomas Kuhn similarly argued that there is no guarantee truth will survive prejudice when he wrote, **'In science…ideas do not change simply because new facts win out over outmoded ones…Since the facts can't speak for themselves, it is their human advocates who win or lose the day'** (Shirley C. Strum, *Almost Human*, 1987—Strum's references are to Thomas Kuhn's *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, second edn, 1970, p.164 of 294). Interestingly, Kuhn also recognised **'that revolutions in science are often initiated by an outsider—someone not locked into the current model, which hampers vision almost as much as blinders would'** (ibid). Even Charles Darwin was **'a lone genius, working from his country home without any official academic position'** (Geoffrey Miller, *The Mating Mind*, 2000, p.33 of 538). While there are certainly advantages to not being **'hamper**[ed]**'** by **'the current model'**, the inherent danger of not being part of the establishment is that the **'outsider'** is an easy, undefended target for those in the establishment who feel threatened by the outsider's new ideas.

As mentioned in Part 4:12G, the philosopher Arthur Schopenhauer summarised the baptism of fire new ideas in science have historically had to undergo when he **'said that the reception of any successful new scientific hypothesis goes through predictable phases before being accepted'**. First, **'it is ridiculed'** and **'violently opposed'**. Second, after support begins to accumulate **'it is stated that it may be true but it's not particularly relevant'**. Third, **'after it has clearly influenced the field** [including members of the establishment quickly remodelling/plagiarising the ideas as their own discoveries, which unfortunately is something I have experienced] **it is admitted to be true and relevant but the same critics assert that the idea is not original'**. Finally, **'it is accepted as being self-evident'** (compiled from two references to Schopenhauer's quote—*New Scientist*, 15 Nov. 1984 and *PlanetHood*, Ferencz & Keyes, 1988). Note that each stage of recognition is achieved in a way that protects the ego of the onlookers. The extent of the insecurity caused by the human condition is very apparent. Because the ego or sense of self worth of each generation becomes attached to its view of the world, paradigm shifts typically have to be introduced by new generations. The physicist Max Planck succinctly described the historical reality of scientific progress when he said that **'science progresses funeral by funeral'** (see his *Scientific Autobiography*, 1948). Kuhn similarly recognised that **'the old scientists who became established within the dominant paradigm have to die off first: they will virtually never accept the new paradigm. Only the younger generation of scientists, who don't have the emotional attachment to the old paradigm, will be willing to change their minds'** (a reference to the work of Kuhn by Marilyn Ferguson, *New Age* mag. Aug. 1982). The playwright George Bernard Shaw was another who warned of the true nature of progress when he said that **'All great truths begin as blasphemies'** (from his play *Annajanska*, 1919).

But most importantly, in *this*, the greatest paradigm shift of all for the human race, from living in denial of the human condition to not living in denial of it, the TRANSFORMED LIFEFORCE STATE solves all the problems of the unbearably confronting exposure of our corrupted human condition that the arrival of the true understanding of our human condition unavoidably brings. The reason I said Max Planck was describing the 'historical' reality when he said that **'science progresses funeral by funeral'** is because the TRANSFORMED STATE allows everyone to *immediately* leave behind the old paradigm and participate in the new human-condition-acknowledged-and-free paradigm.

BLANK PAGE

Part 5
Our Denials Exposed

Part 5:1 How understanding of the human condition was found

The Adam Stork story reveals that we humans became upset when we became conscious. Our pre-conscious, instinct-controlled ancestors weren't the 'savage', 'barbaric', 'primitive' (in the sense of being divisively behaved), 'wild-animal', 'beast-like' 'brutes' they have been portrayed as in every documentary and movie about early humans—rather, *we* immensely upset modern humans are all of those things. But without the explanation of the human condition the upset human race had to defend itself somehow, and so the contrived excuse we came up with was to blame our present-day angry, egocentric and aggressive behaviour on supposed savage competitive and aggressive animal instincts from our pre-conscious past. This contrivance didn't admit that there is a psychosis involved in our human behaviour, even though so many of the words we use to describe our behaviour acknowledge this underlying influence, such as 'alienated', 'psychotic', 'depressed', 'deluded' and 'artificial'. Nor did this 'genes are selfish and that is why we are' defence recognise the obvious influence consciousness—a uniquely human feature—has on our behaviour. It also ignored what all our mythologies recognised—that our ancient ancestors lived in a Garden-of-Eden-like state of gentle and cooperative innocence, the instinctive 'voice' of which is our moral conscience. But despite the fact that blaming our upset on our instincts is such a flawed and transparently false excuse, upset humans *had* to believe in it because it was all that was holding at bay the suicidal depression that thinking about their immensely corrupted state caused. Facing the issue of the human condition has been *impossible* for the upset human race.

The quote that the pre-eminent philosopher of the twentieth century, Sir Laurens van der Post (1906-1996), most frequently cited in his writing is one I mentioned earlier, by the esteemed English poet Gerard Manley Hopkins: **'O the mind, mind has mountains; cliffs of fall / Frightful, sheer, no-man-fathomed'** (from the sonnet *No Worst, There Is None*, 1885). As his writings reveal, Sir Laurens' great interest was the human condition and this passage obviously summarised for him the essence of the problem of the suicidal depression—the **'cliffs of fall'**—that was preventing upset humans from confronting the human condition and thus enabling it to be understood or **'fathomed'**.

Unless you were exceptionally well-nurtured in your infancy and childhood and therefore free of upset, the issue of the human condition was an impossible subject to go near. Having looked into and found the understanding of the human condition, I necessarily had to have been exceptionally well-nurtured. Within the spectrum of upset that has naturally existed across the human race since upset first emerged, with its degrees of denial and alienation, there have always been some denial-free, alienation-free, unresigned, truthful thinkers. While in earlier, pre-scientific times, religions were sometimes formed around the sound, truthful lives and words of these rare unresigned, denial-free thinkers or prophets, in contemporary times they simply represent another variety of thinker. Once mechanistic science found

sufficient insights into the mechanisms and workings of our world for the truth about the human condition to finally be able to be assembled, these denial-free thinkers were needed to undertake that task. All that I have done to find the understanding of the human condition is assemble the relevant clues about the mechanisms and workings of our world that mechanistic science found through centuries of painstaking enquiry. It follows that to have done this—and I was assisted in the assemblage of that truth by the work of other denial-free thinkers—I had to be an unevasive, denial-free thinker.

Most importantly, the fundamental truth that emerges from the biological understanding of the human condition is that *all* humans are equally good, just differently upset from their various encounters with the heroic battle that the human race has been engaged in. In a nutshell, all humans are variously embattled but we are all equally good. We no longer have to rely on a dogmatic assertion that **'all men are created equal'**, purely on the basis that it is a **'self-evident'** truth, as the United States' Declaration of Independence proclaims—because we can now *explain*, *understand* and *know* that that is a fundamental truth. Human upset is a result of humans' unavoidable and necessary *heroic* struggle against ignorance. Understanding the cause of the upset state of the human condition eliminates the possibility of the prejudicial views of some people being good and therefore superior and others being bad, evil, ungodly and therefore inferior and unworthy. Now that we have understanding of the great and necessary battle that humanity has been waging, the whole concept of 'good' and 'evil', of superior and inferior, disappears from our conceptualisation of ourselves. So, those who have been lucky enough to not have been caught up in the most intense part of the battle that humanity has been waging, and who are thus relatively free of upset or innocent, are no better or superior or more worthy than anyone else—they simply represent just one of the innumerable, different states of upset that humanity can and had to draw on to complete its heroic journey to find the liberating understanding of the human condition. <u>All humans can now talk freely about all the different states of upset without there being any implication of either superiority or inferiority, worthiness or unworthiness; more to the point, we *need* to talk about those different states now in order to make sense of the world in which we have all been living</u>. Alienation is the subject that makes sense of human behaviour, so to understand human behaviour, which is what we have to do to understand ourselves, alienation has to be acknowledged. As mentioned earlier, the great Scottish psychiatrist R.D. Laing acknowledged this when he wrote that **'Our alienation goes to the roots. The realization of this is the essential springboard for any serious reflection on any aspect of present inter-human life.'**

The simple truth is that to have been able to look into and explain the human condition I had to have been exceptionally sheltered from all the upset in the world—and I was. I grew up in this historically extremely isolated country of Australia, probably the last place of innocence in the world, and I grew up in the Australian countryside or bush, which is even further removed from all the upset that concentrates in towns and cities. I also benefited very greatly from being born immediately after the Second World War, on 1 December 1945, seven months after Germany surrendered on 8 May 1945 and four months after the atomic bombs were dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki on 6 and 9 August 1945 respectively—acts that brought the Second World War to an end. As previously mentioned, after such terrible bloodletting as occurred in the Second World War, which amount to a valving off

of upset, there is always a period of enormous relief and freshness, especially among those on the side of victory against such tyranny. In fact, there can't have been any other period in modern history where there was as much innocent idealism and optimism as the 'flower power', 'Age of Aquarius' era of the 1960s when the post-war 'baby boom' generation was growing up. Science, the organised and systemised pursuit of knowledge, was sufficiently developed for the biological explanation of the human condition to be found, and there also seemed to be—and, as it turned out, was—enough sound innocence in the population for that explanation to be truthfully and thus effectively assembled by someone exceptionally innocent and thus exceptionally free of denial.

I was also fortunate to have attended two of the best schools in the world, both of which were also situated in rural Australia: Tudor House school at Moss Vale in New South Wales for my junior schooling, and Geelong Grammar School (GGS) in Victoria for my senior education. The ethos of GGS, which was established by Australia's greatest ever educator, Sir James Darling, focused on fostering the souls of students, rather than their intellect (virtually all schools focus on academic achievement and egocentric competition in sport). For example, as part of GGS' curriculum students spend a year in the Victorian mountains at a campus called 'Timbertop', where everyone goes bushwalking every weekend. I absolutely thrived at Timbertop, winning the Natural History Prize and being judged runner-up for Best Boy of The Year even though I performed very poorly in my academic studies. I had all kinds of collections, even of all the different animal droppings. I will talk more about Sir James Darling and GGS shortly. Of course, the most important factor by far in my ability to confront the issue of the human condition was the nurturing I received from my mother. As I will describe shortly, it was her soul strength that cultivated and strengthened my soul sufficiently to be able to defy the false world of denial.

I might include this comment about the significance of being conceived towards the very end of the Second World War. I have been involved with a number of adults undergoing primal therapy who, bit by bit, are helped by supportive, encouraging and delving questioning to go back into their memories to therapeutically relive their childhood traumas and to hear the extreme anguish that many of them express from their time in the womb there can be no denying how acutely aware the foetus is of its environment. Unlike most denial-complying mechanistic scientists, practitioners of primal therapy, such as the American Arthur Janov (1924-) (see his many books), know all too well the sensitivity of the foetus to the human-condition-afflicted state of mothers today. An article in *TIME* magazine (4 Oct. 2010) titled 'How the first nine months shape the rest of your life: The new science of fetal origins' recorded this evidence of the sensitivity of the foetus: **'a study of the health records of more than 88,000 people born in Jerusalem between 1964 and 1976 found that the offspring of women who were in their second month of pregnancy in June 1967—the time of the Arab-Israeli Six-Day War—were significantly more likely to develop schizophrenia as young adults.'** With the upset state of the human condition now explained/understood/defended we can at last safely admit that our ape ancestors lived in an utterly cooperative, harmonious, loving state, and that as a result of that heritage human infants still expect to encounter such an ideal state. In light of this expectation, we can admit therefore how utterly devastating it must be for the foetus to encounter the extreme opposite of that happy, secure, nurturing, loving state—as it was for those developing in the womb of

mothers traumatised by the Arab-Israeli Six-Day War. Conversely, it follows that if someone is conceived and raised at a time when there is extraordinary relief and happiness in their society, as I was at the conclusion of the Second World War, that their instinctive self or soul will be exceptionally content, secure and well-adjusted. As I say, the whole post-war 1960s generation was relatively extraordinarily secure and happy and, as a result, idealistic and sound in its thinking and thus visionary—anticipating, as the 1967 'Summer of Love' song *Aquarius* described, a time of **'Harmony and understanding, sympathy and trust abounding. No more falsehoods or derisions, golden living dreams of visions…And the mind's true liberation …We dance unto the dawn of day'** (from the rock musical *Hair* that premiered in 1967, lyrics by James Rado & Gerome Ragni).

I had an idyllic upbringing that enabled me to look at this subject of the human condition when no one else would. My great fascination and interest is with wildlife, what all the birds and the other animals are doing. As Tim Macartney-Snape mentioned in his Introduction, prior to and after finishing university I spent six years looking for the Thylacine, or Tasmanian Tiger, in the wilds of Tasmania—you can read more about my search at <www.humancondition.com/tasmanian-tiger-search>. I never wanted to be a biologist who sat writing at a desk all day; actually, I don't at all enjoy writing all day, but I kept finding I could make sense of biological questions. The problem, however, was that the issues that seemed so obvious and important to me—in particular, that there is something extremely wrong with the way humans behave—didn't seem to bother anyone else. In fact, everyone was carrying on as if the way humans behaved was the way they have always behaved and should behave. As I *now* understand, adults have lived in a resigned state of denial of the truth of the extreme imperfection of human behaviour today.

Throughout not only my adolescent years but my entire life, I have been consumed with all the issues that denial-free, pre-resigned adolescents struggled with about the apparent wrongness of human behaviour. As I described in Part 3:8, when adolescents started thinking about the issue of the human condition, which is the imperfection of human behaviour today, they almost invariably found they had to resign themselves to living in denial of the subject because their thinking about it eventually brought them into contact with the issue of their *own* imperfections that arose from their encounters with the upset world during their own infancy and childhood. In my case, while I was consumed with the issue of the human condition like all pre-resigned adolescents have been, unlike other adolescents I didn't encounter the depressing issue of the human condition within myself and so never had to resign to a life of living in denial of it. Unlike virtually everyone else, I have confronted the issue of the human condition and sought to understand it *all* my life—the result being the explanation of it that I have presented.

Not having resigned to living in denial of the issue of the human condition, the thoughts that have consumed my mind throughout my life have been vastly different to those of resigned humans who have been practicing all manner of denial, to which they never admit. I was continually running into views that seemed totally wrong to me, and yet everyone except me was upholding those views as true and right. As I have mentioned before, for all those living in denial it is self-evident why denial is such a universal practice but for the relatively innocent who are not yet resigned it is a total mystery—an extremely bewildering situation that, in my case, was only relieved when in my late teenage years my mother gave

me a copy of a book by the exceptionally innocent and sound, denial-free thinker, Sir Laurens van der Post (I think it was his 1952 book *Venture to the Interior*). It was this book, and then Sir Laurens' two main books about the relatively innocent Bushmen, *The Lost World of the Kalahari* (1958) and *Heart of the Hunter* (1961), which I sought out soon after reading the first book, that saved my life—well, saved my soul's life. These books saved my soul's life because through Sir Laurens' depiction of the relatively innocent Bushmen they told me the truth that humans were once, before the emergence of the human condition, totally innocent and free of upset and that the way humans behave now *is* extremely distorted or corrupted. Sir Laurens' writings gave me the confirmation I needed to know that my very different unresigned, denial-free way of thinking wasn't some form of madness. He gave my unresigned, denial-free, innocent instinctive self or soul the strength to carry on and defy the world of denial. When your soul is full of enthusiasm for another true world—a number of my report cards from Tudor House school, which I still have, said I was **'filled with a great zest for life'**—you don't need a lot of help in life but at some stage you do need someone to reassure you that your view of the world isn't wrong.

As Tim described in his Introduction, my idealistic, quixotic (labels I was often given as a young man), truthful view of the world first expressed itself in my desire to save the Tasmanian Tiger from extinction. I then switched my focus from the effects of humans' mad behaviour, such as our destruction of the natural world, to the issue of human behaviour itself. I thought that what was needed was to create a world for humans that was free of extravagant artificiality, so I went off into the bush and built a massive pole-framed workshop and then designed and built a range of furniture that was devoid of that artificiality and ornamentation. In time, however, I realised that there was a deeper issue behind humans' extravagant way of living and that was the issue of the human condition. Thus in 1975 I began to think and write about that issue, a practice I have carried out every day since then. Typically I write in the early hours of the morning when everyone else is asleep and the air is free of angst and my soul can run free and tell me all the truths and give me all the guidance I need to plumb the depths of the human condition. From the beginning I have trusted my soul and not the world around me; it is the only thing that has never disappointed me.

Hopkins wrote, **'O the mind, mind has mountains; cliffs of fall / Frightful, sheer.'** We can now understand exactly what he meant—if you try to plumb the depths of the human condition you are going to face suicidal depression, unless you go in a state of innocence. Sir Laurens emphasised this fact that only those free of upset can safely investigate the human condition when he wrote that **'He who tries to go down into the labyrinthine pit of himself, to travel the swirling, misty netherlands below sea-level through which the harsh road to heaven and wholeness runs, is doomed to fail and never see the light where night joins day <u>unless he goes out of love in search of love</u>'** (*The Face Beside the Fire*, 1953, p.290 of 311). The need to live in denial of truth obviously stops access to truth, that being its purpose—as this amazingly honest posting on a Christian website that was included in Part 4:12J recognised: **'if there really is hope beyond the human condition, then the Truth that leads to it has to have been established by someone beyond the human condition. Us** [denial-complying] **humans are way too good at rationalizing truth into any shape that pleases us'** (Jonathan Wise, *The Emerging Church*, 29 Mar. 2009, accessed 4 Jul. 2009 at: <https://www.jonandnic.com/2009/03/29/the-emerging-church/>). You can't look into the human condition if you suffer from the human condition.

As described in Section 4:1 of *Freedom Expanded: Book 2*, Australia's most celebrated poem is Banjo Paterson's 1895 *The Man From Snowy River*. While Australia has an ancient mythology that is grounded in the Dreamtime stories of the Aborigines, it also has a powerful contemporary mythology and *The Man From Snowy River* is at the centre of them. In fact, Australia's $10 note (see following image) features Paterson's image and, in microprint, all the words to *The Man From Snowy River*.

Mythologies only develop and endure if they contain a resonating deep truth and *The Man From Snowy River* certainly does. Ostensibly the poem is about a great and potentially dangerous ride undertaken by mountain horsemen to recapture an escaped thoroughbred that joined the brumbies (wild horses) in the mountain ranges, but what the poem is really recognising is that Australia is where the answers about the human condition would finally be found. In the poem the character Clancy of the Overflow persuades the station owner Harrison to let a **'stripling' 'lad'**—a boy—on his hardy mountain pony join their expedition to retrieve the escaped thoroughbred; he argues, **'I warrant he'll be with us when he's wanted at the end.'** A boy is the embodiment of the innocence that is needed by mechanistic science **'at the end'** of its search for understanding of the mechanisms and workings of our world to assemble, from those hard-won but evasively presented insights, the liberating explanation

of the human condition. So in the poem that **'stripling' 'lad'** goes beyond where the rest of the horsemen (the alienated adults) dare to go, following the brumbies down the **'terrible descent'** of a steep mountainside (note the same imagery as Hopkins' **'O the mind, mind has mountains; cliffs of fall / Frightful, sheer'**), where (if you weren't sufficiently innocent and thus sound enough) **'any slip was death'** (to confront the unconfrontable issue of the human condition), to recapture the thoroughbred from the impenetrable mountain ranges (retrieves the all-precious escaped truth from the depths of denial/alienation). The poem describes how the boy **'ran** [the brumbies]**…till their sides were white with foam / He followed like a bloodhound on their track / Till they halted, cowed and beaten—then he turned their heads for home'** and **'brought them back'** (he fought all the denial and its alienation that has been enslaving the world to a standstill until it finally gave up the truth).

Whilst innocence was unbearably confronting during the search for understanding and was therefore often persecuted, it was needed **'at the end'** to synthesise the denial-free explanation of the human condition from mechanistic science's hard-won but evasively presented insights.

The Biblical story of David and Goliath contains the same recognition of innocence eventually slaying the giant, which is our species' alienated state of denial.

In the great European legend of King Arthur, the wounded (alienated) Fisher King whose realm was devastated (humans unavoidably made their world an expression of their own madnesses) could only have his wound healed, and his realm restored, by the arrival in his kingdom of a simple, naive boy. The boy's name is Parsifal, which, according to the legend, means **'guileless fool'**. To the alienated only a naive, **'guileless fool'** would dare approach and grapple with the confronting truths about our divisive condition. The American Jungian analyst Robert A. Johnson gave an interpretation of this legend in his 1974 book *He, Understanding Masculine Psychology*. Johnson said firstly that **'Alienation is the current term for it** [the state of humans today]**. We are an alienated people, an existentially lonely people; we have the Fisher King wound'** (p.12 of 97). He then described how **'The court fool had prophesied that the Fisher King would be healed when a wholly innocent fool arrives in the court. In an isolated country a boy lives with his widowed mother** [as I will explain later it is the male ego that can be especially oppressive of the souls of children—fortunately my father was saint-like in the degree to which he avoided imposing his ego on others]**…His mother had taken him to this faraway country and raised him in primitive** [innocent] **circumstances. He wears homespun clothes, has no schooling, asks no questions. He is a simple, naive youth'** (p.90). Johnson went on to recount that in the myth it is this boy, Parsifal, who, when he becomes an adult, is able to heal the Fisher King's wound of alienation, so that **'the land and all its people can live in peace and joy'** (p.94).

The Danish author and poet Hans Christian Andersen's 1837 fable *The Emperor's New Clothes* contains the same resonating truth that it would take a small boy to break the spell of the denial that has enslaved the human race.

Drawing by Jeremy Griffith © 1988 Fedmex Pty Ltd

While these and other mythologies have recognised the truth about innocence leading humanity home from its lost state of alienation, they were not the central mythology of their civilisations that *The Man From Snowy River* has been for Australia. I think that deep in their bones all humans know that Australia is the last place in the world where there is sufficient innocence to explain the human condition, and, not only that, I think they know that this great breakthrough would occur here. As I mention in Section 1:14 of *Freedom Expanded: Book 2*, in an interview with the Australian television presenter Andrew Denton, Bono, the prophetic lead singer of the rock band U2, said, **'You do get the feeling in Australia that there's…something going on down here, a new society being dreamt up…**[that in Australia there is] **the opportunity to lead the world…to actually just take some moral high ground'**, to which Denton joked, **'You say this to every country you visit.'** Bono responded, **'The only other country I think has the chance in leadership in terms of creating a new model as Australia would be Canada'** (*Enough Rope*, ABC-TV, episode 97, 13 Mar. 2006).

Another relevant factor has to be my ancestry. As will be explained in Part 7:4, just as innocence is eroded in individuals through exposure to the upset state of the human condition, so races of humans have had their innocence eroded through exposure to the

upset state of the human condition. This means that those races that have been most isolated from all the upset in the world will be the most innocent. Thus the Celts who have lived on the fringes of Europe in Ireland, Scotland, Scandinavia and England (where the Angles and Saxons from Denmark in southern Scandinavia, and the Normans originally from Norway, settled) have to be amongst the most innocent of European races. It makes sense, therefore, that the fact that my father's great, great, great grandfather was a protestant from County Cavan in Ireland, and presumably his ancestors originally came from Wales where Griffith was originally called Gruffydd, while my mother's ancestors came from England and Scotland, must have played a part in my ability to look into the human condition. (You can read more about the Celts in my 2003 book *A Species In Denial* in the section titled 'The denial-free history of the human race', which you can go directly to at <www.humancondition.com/asid-the-denial-free-history-of-the-human-race>.)

In truth, you could sit down and work out exactly where these understandings of the human condition were going to come from—you would ask 'What is a relatively innocent race, what is the most innocent country now, what is the most innocent region of that country, what was the most fortunate period in that country's recent history, what are the most innocence-cultivating-and-preserving schools in that country?', and you would come up with the answer. (*A Species In Denial* contains a section titled 'Australia's role in the world' that talks about this awareness, which you can go directly to at <www.humancondition.com/asid-australias-role>.)

Sir Laurens van der Post, whose deeply influential work I refer to throughout this presentation, grew up in Africa before the human situation there descended into such turmoil—when it was still a place where innocence could survive. Not only that, since Africa was our species' instinctive self or soul's original home, it was a place that was exceptionally nourishing of our soul. Interestingly, Sir Laurens was struck by the physical similarity between Africa and the Australian outback or bush, where I grew up, observing: **'When I first went to Australia…my senses told me at once that here, beyond rational explanation, was a land physically akin to Africa'** (*The Dark Eye in Africa*, 1955, p.35 of 159). Australia is physically similar to Africa, but without its teeming megafauna. Sir Laurens came out of the innocent realm of natural Africa and that is partly why his soul was still alive and he could write with so much honesty about the human condition.

In his books about the relatively innocent Bushmen race, Sir Laurens acknowledged that we humans do have an innocent, loving soul within us and that we weren't once brutal savages. I have mentioned how valuable Sir Laurens' honest writing about the innocence of original humans has been for me—as some indication of just how precious his writing has been to me, my original copies of *The Lost World of the Kalahari* and *Heart of the Hunter* are now so tattered from use they are held together by lots of tape and some string.

As I mentioned earlier, Geelong Grammar School was another soul-fostering influence in my life. GGS played down competition in all activities and especially so in sport. It encouraged any talent or interest a boy might have and kept students close to nature by sending them to its wilderness campus, Timbertop, for a whole year of their education, where everyone, including the masters, went on long bushwalks every weekend. Basically GGS was like a supportive, loving, functional parent rather than an indifferent, stand-offish, brutal, tough dysfunctional one. Astonishing as it may sound, Sir James Darling (1899-1995), whose vision made GGS into such a special school, came out to Australia from England at the age of 30 specifically to foster the soundness needed to solve the human condition. Part 10:5, titled 'Sir James Darling's Vision of Fostering the Ability to Undertake the 'Paramount' Task of Solving the Human Condition in Order to 'Save the World', documents in some detail Sir James' absolutely extraordinary vision, and there is also a longer essay about Darling's vision available at <www.humancondition.com/darling-longer-essay>. The longer essay describes how Sir James was influenced by the attitude of Kurt Hahn who created Gordonstoun school in Scotland. Kurt Hahn, in turn, was influenced by Plato who, in his great work *The Republic*, said that the object of education should be to cultivate **'philosopher guardians'** or **'philosopher rulers'**, who he described as **'the true philosophers, those whose passion is to see the truth'** (*Plato The Republic*, tr. H.D.P. Lee, 1955, p.238 of 405). Plato explained: **'But suppose…that such natures were cut loose, when they were still children, from the dead weight of worldliness, fastened on them by sensual indulgences like gluttony, which distorts their minds' vision to lower things, and suppose that when so freed** [during their upbringing] **they were turned towards the truth** [during their education]**, then the same faculty in them would have as keen a vision of truth as it has of the objects on which it is at present turned'** (p.284). He argued, **'isn't it obvious whether it's better for a blind man** [an alienated person] **or a clear-sighted one** [a relatively innocent, ego-unembattled, denial-free person] **to keep an eye on anything'** (p.244), adding that **'If you get, in public affairs, men who are so morally impoverished that they have nothing they can contribute themselves, but who hope to snatch some compensation for their own inadequacy from a political career, there can never be good government. They start fighting for power…**[whereas those who pursue a life] **of true philosophy which looks down on political power…**[should be] **the only men to get power…men who do not love it** [who are well-nurtured with unconditional love in their upbringing and encouraged during their education to be enterprising and who are thus not insecure and egocentric, excessively in need of reinforcement]**…rulers** [who] **come to their duties with least enthusiasm'** (p.286). It was this Platonic attitude of preserving and fostering the sound, loving, cooperatively orientated, original instinctive self or soul in students that Sir James followed at GGS.

I have been told that the despair Sir James felt after losing so many gifted contemporaries in the First World War, in which he served as an artillery officer, led him to decide that the only way that he could live with the fact that he survived while they did not was to try to live the life of 10 men. So he came here at the age of 30, knowing that Australia was a last refuge for innocence, to take up the headmastership of this small school that drew most of its boys from the rich farming countryside of Victoria and over 30 years he built it up to be one of the most esteemed schools in the world—HRH The Prince of Wales was sent there from the other side of the world for part of his education, which, incidentally, also included Hahn's Gordonstoun.

© 2010 Fedmex Pty Ltd

Jeremy's Egg Collection Box

I mentioned how I thrived at Timbertop where I kept all kinds of collections. On the wall of this theatre we have put up an old glass case of mine that holds, amongst other personal treasures, what is left of my egg collection from when I was a boy. These mementos help preserve my soul that still has to fight against a world that is so habituated to living in denial that it is afraid of the truth when it arrives and determinedly resists it.

As emphasised, above all else it was my mother's strength of character and nurturing that made these understandings of the human condition possible, which is why her photograph and that of her mother and grandmother hang on our theatre wall. My mother's family tree comprises a line of extraordinarily strong women and the following photographs pay tribute to their strength. In the WTM we call such remarkable strength 'Matata strength' (after an exceptionally secure, centred and brilliant-at-nurturing-infants female bonobo named Matata, who I will introduce in a moment and whose photo appears alongside the three matriarchs) because, as will be explained in Part 8:4, it dates from when humanity's female ape ancestors had to have sufficient force of character to bring male aggression from competing for mating opportunities under control.

© 1900's-1963 Fedmex Pty Ltd; and photograph of Matata by Manny Rubio

Clockwise from top left – Norman and Jill Griffith in 1959;
Enid Rush in 1963; Mackie McPherson in the early 1900s; and Matata and Kanzi

The top left photograph is of my mother and father, Jill and Norman Griffith. The photo was taken in 1959 at our sheep station, 'Totnes', near the town of Mumbil in the Central West of New South Wales. I would have been 14 years old when this photo was taken. The top right photograph is of my maternal grandmother, Enid Pountney (later Rush), and on the bottom right is my maternal great grandmother, Emily 'Mackie' McPherson. You can see in their bearing an indication of their strength of character. As I have said before, the only reason I am able to think about this issue of the human condition is because of my mother's strength of character. She was so defiant and dismissive of the corrupt ways of our human-condition-afflicted world that she taught me not to believe in it either and instead to believe in another true world, the world of our soul. People would come to our house when I was a boy and my mother was so centred and secure and believing in another true world that they could sense that their alienated state was being dismissed as inconsequential, even irrelevant, even though my mother was never ever rude in her treatment of people. She simply had no time for the frailties of the alienated world. She lived in another true world in which the alienated world had no relevance; it had no meaning for her, as it hasn't had for me, except for the mystery of it. As I said, you can see in the photographs of my mother and her mother and grandmother the same core strength, the same uprightness, the same defiance and dismissal of all the falseness of this upset, alienated, human-condition-afflicted world. Tim Macartney-Snape's mother had the same core strength.

The bottom left photograph is of the bonobo Matata with her adopted infant Kanzi. The importance of nurturing and of strong-willed matriarchs in developing a cooperative, integrative society will be explained in Part 8:4, however, to touch upon it briefly now, in matriarchal bonobo society we have living evidence of how important secure and centred females have been in the nurturing of offspring and how strong-willed females have brought the male's aggressive competition for mating opportunities under control. In common chimpanzee societies there is not the same focus on nurturing, males still dominate and their societies are patriarchal. Matata's picture is included here in recognition of this strength in women that can be traced right back to our ape ancestors and which Matata, who is an exceptionally centred and secure individual, exemplifies. Those who have studied primates will typically tell you of an extraordinarily secure and strong-willed female in their study group. All primates are trying to develop the nurturing of integrativeness but it is only our ancestors and the bonobos who had the right conditions to achieve it.

The American primatologist Dian Fossey studied gorillas in the mountain forests of Rwanda in Africa for some 18 years. In her 1983 book *Gorillas in the Mist*, Fossey wrote about a remarkable female gorilla named **'Old Goat'** who was such **'an exemplary parent'** (p.174 of 282) that her son **'Tiger' 'was a contented and well-adjusted individual whose zest for living was almost contagious'** (p.186). Fossey is eulogised as a gorilla conservationist but that label presents completely the wrong emphasis. People can't deal with the true significance of her work, which was that she recognised how social and cooperative gorillas are. Fossey is buried in a grave alongside Digit, a male gorilla who gave his life defending his group against poachers.

© 2010 Fedmex Pty Ltd

Plaster cast of a stone axe Jeremy found in Africa

In 1992 my partner Annie Williams and I went to Africa and while there the primatologist Dr Shirley Strum invited us to visit the Pumphouse Gang, a group of baboons she was studying in northern Kenya and about which *National Geographic* magazine had been writing regular features. (Incidentally, in my egg box on the theatre wall there is a plaster cast of a stone axe, the original of which I found when I was walking across the savannah with the Pumphouse Gang to their night time roost on a huge boulder. As an actual item from the lives of our African ancestors, the original axe head was my most treasured possession and, as such, I sent it to Sir Laurens van der Post as a gift in recognition of how important his life's work had been to me—he later thanked me, mentioning that he had put it amongst his collection of hundreds of stone axes from Africa!) During our visit I noticed that Strum had on her desk the skull of a baboon named Peggy. Keeping a skull is a bit macabre but she did so in memory of Peggy because she was such an extraordinarily self-assured, strong-willed, authoritative, charismatic individual who led the Pumphouse Gang successfully for many years. In Strum's words: **'She** [Peggy] **was the highest-ranking female in the troop, and her presence often turned the tide in favor of the animal she sponsored. While every adult male outranked her by sheer size and physical strength, she exerted considerable social pressure on each member of the troop. Her family also outranked all the others…another reason for the contentment in this particular family was Peggy's personality. She was a strong, calm, social animal, self-assured yet not pushy, forceful yet not tyrannical'** (*Almost Human: a journey into the world of baboons*, Shirley C. Strum, 1987, pp.38-39 of 294). As will be explained in Part 7:1, this ancient strength that was developed in females has sadly had to be oppressed by men for two million years because of its ignorant defiance of men's corrupt state, and, as a result, is rare amongst women today—but the fact that it is still present in some is a measure of just how strong it must have originally been to have survived this long. It is this exceptional strength in some women, which is so defiant of the upset, false, alienated world, that they can encourage a male child to so believe in another true world that when that boy grows up he is so imbued with awareness of how the world should and could be that he can defy the false world of upset

humans. As I say, the importance of my mother's strength of character and sound, loving, nurturing influence in my life has been so great that this breakthrough understanding of the human condition that I have found has to be almost entirely attributed to her.

The woman who saved the world

In summary, I owe my ability to look into, find and assemble the explanation of the human condition to the relative innocence of my Celtic ancestors and relative innocence of Australia, together with the relative innocence of the 1960s for the presence of a strong soul in the first place; to my mother for nurturing that soul; to Sir James Darling for fostering it; and finally to Sir Laurens van der Post for giving it the confirmation it needed to take on and finally overthrow the alienated world of denial and bring out the truth about the human condition.

Part 5:2 Descriptions of our lost state of innocence and the extent of our denial of it

I would like now to read some passages from Sir Laurens van der Post's books that illustrate how important his writing about our species' lost state of innocence has been in confirming the truths my instinctive self or soul was telling me. As has been mentioned, the Adam Stork analogy presents a very exposing and confronting truth because it says that humans started out innocent and *then* became upset. Even though what we were taught in school was that humans' aggressive nature comes from our animal instincts, the truth is we are *now* in our most upset, brutal, savage, barbaric state. *Our* animal instincts were just heavenly, for if heaven is the cooperative, gentle, harmonious, unconditionally selfless, loving ideal state then we have been there once already. In a world that is practicing so much denial of this past state of innocence, you can imagine how Sir Laurens' writings about it helped me—and how they would help someone like Ken here in the audience, an adolescent boy who still plays all day with his pet ferrets and other animals. I know that when I questioned his father Tony about the suitability of Ken coming to this talk when his final school exam is in a fortnight's time, Tony said, 'Don't worry, when there is an exam coming Ken goes down to the dam and catches yabbies (small crayfish).' This made so much sense to me because exams were truly terrifying for me; I am almost 64 (as at 2009) and yet I still have nightmares about them. I had no idea what the relevance was of the subjects we were being taught at school—they certainly weren't talking about the issues my mind was thinking about and interested in. I'd love to be able to talk to children about the upset-free, true world and why it became corrupted, and in time we will make videos here in this theatre about exactly that. I will present to children the compassionate truth about this world which will enable them to stay alive inside themselves—boys, like Ken, and young girls will stay alive inside themselves, their souls will never have to die again in a sea of silent denial.

Sir Laurens wrote about the Bushmen or San people of southern Africa, the most ancient race of humans living in the world today according to recent DNA studies, using them to resurrect the truth that humans once did live in an upset-free, innocent state before the emergence of the human condition some two million years ago. For example, he wrote that **'He** [the Bushman] **and his needs were committed to the nature of Africa and the swing of its wide seasons as a fish to the sea. He and they all participated so deeply of one another's being that the experience could almost be called mystical. For instance, he seemed to *know* what it actually felt like to be an elephant, a lion, an antelope, a steenbuck, a lizard, a striped mouse, mantis, baobab tree, yellow-crested cobra, or starry-eyed amaryllis, to mention only a few of the brilliant multitudes through which he so nimbly moved'** (*The Lost World of the Kalahari*, 1958, p.21 of 253). The Bushmen were so free of preoccupation with upset that they could sense what it felt like to be a baobab tree or an antelope. Members of the WTM know that this is what I can do; I can walk a mile in people's shoes as it were, I can put myself in their situation and empathise with where they are living, because I'm not preoccupied with pain. The Bushmen had the freedom within themselves to empathise with each other's situations and with the lives of the birds, animals and plants in their world. Humans were a mystery to me until through empathising with them (because they wouldn't tell me what was going on inside them) I finally worked them out, but I never found the behaviour of animals and birds strange. I can tell you all about the birds out there, what they

are doing. I can whistle their calls. What the animals and birds are doing, and why, is what interests me, as it did the Bushmen.

Sir Laurens wrote, **'Even as a child it seemed to me that his** [the Bushman's] **world was one without secrets between one form of being and another'** (*The Lost World of the Kalahari*, 1958, p.21 of 253). Reading Sir Laurens' books it becomes clear that it was the Bushmen who kept his truthful soul alive. As a boy growing up in South Africa he listened to his parents talk about the Bushmen, who by then had been eradicated from their area. Sir Laurens wrote, **'He** [the Bushman] **built no home of any durable kind, did not cultivate the land, and did not even keep cattle or other domestic chattel'** (ibid. p.25). **'You know I once saw a little Bushman imprisoned in one of our gaols because he killed a giant bustard which according to the police, was a crime…He was dying because he couldn't bear being shut up and having his freedom of movement stopped…Physically the doctor couldn't find anything wrong with him but he died none the less!'** (ibid. p.236). The Bushman died of a broken heart, because he wasn't sufficiently toughened to the human condition to cope with the wrongness of the world in which he found himself (which, incidentally, is why, while a Bushman would be innocent enough and thus sound enough to look into the human condition, he wouldn't be toughened enough to stand up to all the denial and dishonesty in the world and by so doing find understanding of the human condition). Children spiritually die today for the same reason. The Bushmen are just like we all were when we were young and vulnerable, as Sir Laurens recognised: **'There was indeed a cruelly denied and neglected first child of life, a Bushman in each of us'** (*The Heart of the Hunter*, 1961, p.126 of 233).

As mentioned before, Sir Laurens also wrote these extraordinarily honest words: **'This shrill, brittle, self-important life of today is by comparison a graveyard where the living are dead and the dead are alive and talking** [through our soul] **in the still, small, clear voice of a love and trust in life that we have for the moment lost…**[there was a time when] **All on earth and in the universe were still members and family of the early race seeking comfort and warmth through the long, cold night before the dawning of individual consciousness in a togetherness which still gnaws like an unappeasable homesickness at the base of the human heart'** (*Testament to the Bushmen*, 1984, pp.127-128 of 176). And: **'Perhaps this life of ours, which begins as a quest of the child for the man, and ends as a journey by the man to rediscover the child, needs a clear image of some child-man, like the Bushman, wherein the two are firmly and lovingly joined in order that our confused hearts may stay at the centre of their brief round of departure and return'** (*The Lost World of the Kalahari*, 1958, p.13 of 253). Yes, to find the liberating understanding of the human condition the truth of the innocent, soulful state had to be resurrected from its denied state, which was precisely Sir Laurens' contribution to the world.

To write so honestly about humanity's collective loss of innocence was Sir Laurens' great inspiration and vision. It was an incalculably important contribution to the world because it brought light to an area of denial that was crippling the human race. I can't write very well, it has taken me years to learn to write with some degree of competence (and that is even with the help of WTM founding member Fiona Cullen-Ward's editing skills—Fiona is actually related to Banjo Paterson whose writing skills we have already encountered), but Sir Laurens was a most beautiful writer, and what he did was a great trick. He wrote these wonderful books about the Bushmen and even made a documentary about them that, at the time, attracted the biggest television audience next to the Coronation of Queen Elizabeth II (see *The Heart of the Hunter*, p.117). People were fascinated by the beautifully written descriptions of

his ventures into the Kalahari Desert to find the remnants of the lost Bushmen, but through his books Sir Laurens also managed to thread in the truth about the relative innocence of the Bushmen and for someone like me those truths were pure gold. However, not everyone failed to see the truth that Sir Laurens discreetly weaved through his books. For some people, hearing about the magic world of our soul was unbearable, and just as determined deniers of truth tried to destroy me for my honesty, so they tried to crucify Sir Laurens. After Sir Laurens' death, the British journalist J.D.F. Jones (1939-2009) wrote a book that set out to denigrate Sir Laurens as a charlatan—which is a ridiculous accusation when it could not be more clear from his writings how sound and secure he was. Nevertheless, the attack was so incredibly vicious and completely unrestrained in its dishonesty and bias (as attacks on innocents have always been because upset people have feared exposure of their alienated state almost more than they feared death itself) that some people were persuaded by it. For example, a review of Jones' book in Australia, titled 'Charming Charlatan', concluded with the assumption that **'you might…be inclined to offer a wheelbarrow of his books to the nearest second-hand shop, or to junk them all'** (Luke Slattery, *The Weekend Australian*, 19-20 Jan. 2002). Jones' deep allegiance to the world of denial is apparent in this emotionally charged comment he made in an interview: **'the academic experts on the Kalahari** [Bushmen] **are absolutely berserk with rage about the things he** [Sir Laurens] **said, because, if you read *The Lost World of the Kalahari*, you must not believe that this is the truth about the Bushmen; it's not'** (ABC Radio, *Late Night Live*, 25 Feb. 2002). In his book, Jones said that academics accused Sir Laurens of **'a romantic and no doubt inaccurate portrait of this dying social group'** (J.D.F. Jones, *Teller of Many Tales*, 2002, p.230 of 528). What it was that Sir Laurens was saying about the Bushmen that made academic experts—and Jones—**'berserk with rage'** was that the Bushmen were a relatively innocent race. This was heresy for two reasons: firstly, what Sir Laurens was saying destroyed the contrived excuse that our ancestors were brutal savages; secondly, it defied one of the main strategies of denial of not acknowledging the absolutely obvious truth of there being differences in alienation between individuals, genders, generations, races, civilisations and even cultures.

The academic experts in universities were the custodians of denial—we were not going to get any truth from them. In fact, Sir Laurens once complained about the refusal by **'academic experts'** to study the life of the Bushmen: **'It seemed a strange paradox that everywhere men and women were busy digging up old ruins and buried cities in order to discover more about ancient man, when all the time the ignored Bushman was living with this early spirit still intact. I found men willing enough to come with me to measure his head, or his behind, or his sexual organs, or his teeth. But when I pleaded with the head of a university in my own country to send a qualified young man to live with the Bushman for two or three years, to learn about him and his ancient way he exclaimed, surprised: "But what would be the use of that?"'** (*The Lost World of the Kalahari*, p.67). Mechanistic science has not been able to deal with the subjective, human condition dimension to life, as Professor Charles Birch acknowledged when he said, **'Science can't deal with subjectivity…what we were all taught in universities is pretty much a dead end'** (From recording of Birch's 1993 FHA/WTM Open Day address).

Not only did mechanistic scientists seek to escape the unbearably confronting implications of the Bushmen's innocence by reducing the focus of their studies to **'measur**[ing] **his head'** etc, they also went further and sought to denigrate them as 'savages' by highlighting their violence and aggression. For example, in his 1978 book *On Human Nature*, E.O. Wilson

wrote that **'their homicide rate per capita equalled that of Detroit and Houston'** (p.100 of 260). In contrast, Lorna Marshall, regarded as **'the doyenne of American anthropology'** (Sandy Gall, *The Bushmen of Southern Africa*, 2001, ch.10) and one of the only Westerners to live with the Bushmen before they became contaminated through contact with more modern races, described honestly, like Sir Laurens, **'their** [the Bushmen's] **predominantly peaceful, well-adjusted human relations'** (*The !Kung of Nyae Nyae*, 1976, p.286 of 433). Her daughter, Elizabeth Marshall Thomas, who accompanied her on her expeditions in the 1950s, was the author of the classic 1959 book about the Bushmen, *The Harmless People*. In direct response to E.O. Wilson, Marshall Thomas wrote (in a 1989 addition to her book), **'To my knowledge Wilson has never visited the Ju/wasi** [Bushmen]**. His book** [*On Human Nature*] **never mentions how important it was to them to keep their social balance, how carefully they treated this balance, and how successful they were. That he discusses them at all is perhaps due to the fact that in the 1970s they were selected by academics as a sort of living laboratory in which studies could be made on attributes of human nature, the most intriguing of which at the time seemed to be aggression'** (p.283 of 303). Indeed, summarising both her and her mother's observations about the Bushmen, Marshall Thomas wrote that **'we both emphasized the absence of violence and competition. Indeed, we were struck by it…The relatively few outbreaks of violence seemed isolated and were discussed over and over, since they caused such distress'** (*The Harmless People*, 1989. p.286 of 303).

As was explained in Part 4:4E, the acknowledgement of the existence of relative innocence in one race would unfairly condemn the more upset, less innocent races as 'bad', unworthy and inferior, so such reports of the relative innocence of the Bushmen could not be tolerated. And just as Sir Laurens pointed out the superficial, mechanistic studies anthropologists were making of the Bushmen, Marshall Thomas pointed out the urgent attempts to misportray the Bushmen as violent: **'In the ten to twenty years after we started our work, many academics developed an enormous interest in the Bushmen. Many of them went to Botswana to visit groups of Kung Bushmen, and for a time in Botswana, the anthropologist/Bushman ratio seemed almost one to one. Yet although the investigators were numerous, the range of some of their investigations seemed narrowed to an emphasis on questions of violence and aggression'** (ibid p.284). Yes, to escape the agony of the human condition, some excuse *had to be* found—*some* evidence of aggression had to be identified and then gone all out to stress! As has been repeatedly pointed out, when the need for denial is critical any excuse will do, and the art of denial is to then stick like glue to that excuse because doing so saves you from suicidal depression; just keep banging on about it, no matter how transparently false it really is!

One of the more prominent anthropologists whose **'investigations** [into the Bushmen] **seemed narrowed to an emphasis on questions of violence and aggression'** was Melvin Konner, who stressed **'findings that seemed to confirm what might be called the darker side of !Kung life'** (Melvin Konner & Marjorie Shostak, 'Ethnographic Romanticism and the Idea of Human Nature', *The Past and Future of !Kung Ethnography*, eds. Megan Biesele with Robert Gordon & Richard Lee, 1986, p.73 of 423). When Konner wrote a clearly biased review of Marshall Thomas's 2007 book *The Old Way: A Story of the First People*, Marshall Thomas felt compelled to respond, writing that **'the moment I saw Konner as the reviewer, I knew we were back where we started. I measured the length of his review—141 inches or 11¾ feet in all—and saw he was averaging four attacks per foot of column. And in the barrage, I'd say only one criticism had substance. Even then he distorted what I'd said'** ('Response to Dim Beginnings', *The New York Review of Books*, 29 Mar. 2007). Another who **'attack**[ed]**'** Marshall Thomas was the primatologist Richard Wrangham

(who as described in Part 8:5E put forward the Chimpanzee Violence Hypothesis), who accused Marshall Thomas as having **'conjured'** the idea of **'Peaceful primitives'** (*Demonic Males*, 1997, p.76 of 350). So Marshall Thomas' reports of the relative innocence of the Bushmen were attacked, as were Sir Laurens'.

Again, as has been explained throughout this book, while there *is* violence in primitive peoples, the true explanation for the aggression apparent in their societies is that while they are undoubtedly more innocent than the majority of humans in the world today, they are, as mentioned above, still members of the extremely upset stage of humanity, *H. sapiens sapiens*, and are, therefore, *nowhere near* as innocent as humans were some two million years ago when the battle of the human condition first emerged. Moreover, while basic levels of restraint are instinctive in primitive hunter-forager people such as the Bushmen, as was explained in Part 3:11G, they do not possess the more sophisticated levels of self-discipline that more upset races adopted following the advent of agriculture and herding some 11,000 years ago, and which has subsequently become, to a degree, instinctive. As a result, to draw upon data on homicide rates, as academics such as E.O. Wilson do, and use that comparison to argue that more primitive peoples are not more innocent than more modern races, is to totally ignore the effect increasing levels of restraint have on upset behaviour. As any mother will attest, a nine-year-old child is more innocent than an adult, and yet during the 'naughty nines' phase, as was described earlier (in Part 3:11A), they will lash out at the world in a way that a more restrained or 'civilised' adult would not.

The effect of restraining violence was well demonstrated by the successful 'Iroquois Confederacy' of the North American Indians. As was described in Part 3:11G, by the time Europeans arrived in North America, a grand league of American Indian tribes had been established to prevent, through adherence to certain restraining rules that were enforceable through punishment, the endless rounds of payback warfare that had been occurring between and within the tribes. The absurdity of evaluating a peoples' level of innocence through their display of violence is apparent if we were to imagine anthropologists measuring homicide levels the month before and after the Confederacy was established. While homicide rates would have dropped dramatically, the only difference or reason for that change would be that the levels of restraint had increased dramatically, not the degree of innocence, which would have, of course, remained unchanged. The fear of punishment was simply preventing each member from expressing or living out their upset.

The whole story of the human journey during the last two million years that was described in Part 3:11, has really the story of the emergence of ever-increasing levels of upset, and the development of ever more sophisticated ways to restrain and contain those new levels of upset. The recognition in all our mythologies and in the work of our most profound thinkers of a wonderful, all-loving, innocent past for the human race wasn't some romantic, fanciful dream of some impossible, unrealistic, idyllic, utopian existence, as mechanistic science has tried to dismiss it as, but a *completely real* time in our species' distant past that recently discovered fossil evidence is now confirming, and that bonobos provide ample living evidence of. The *true* story of human life over the last two million years *is* that of the loss of

innocence—our 'fall from grace', our departure from the 'Garden of Eden', the corruption of our soul, our ever-increasing levels of anger, egocentricity and alienation! Everyone does, in truth, know that under the duress of the human condition we each, and our species as a whole, started life in an innocent state and ended up in a variously psychologically upset, embattled, soul-corrupted state. Innocence is associated with youth, not old age.

So yes, tribal warfare and outbreaks of individual violence have been occurring for a long time, but that doesn't mean that the relative innocence of hunter-forager tribes still living, like the Bushmen of South Africa, the Australian Aborigines and the Yanomamö of South America, don't reveal a great deal about how extremely upset the great majority of the human race has become, and how much civility, and other pseudo idealistic means of restraint, humans now rely upon to mask and contain that extreme upset. But again, the psychological agony of our human condition has been so great that while we humans couldn't truthfully explain our condition all we had to protect ourselves from the vicious, unbearable self-confrontation of such relative innocence were equally vicious, retaliatory, denial-based lies.

So the **'academic experts'** were **'berserk with rage'** with what Sir Laurens revealed about the Bushmen. The truth is Sir Laurens was persecuted because he was an extraordinarily honest, denial-free thinker or prophet—indeed, as was mentioned in Part 3:11H, in his full-page obituary in the London's *The Times* he was described as **'a prophet out of Africa'** (20 Dec. 1996) (view Sir Laurens' obituary that was reproduced in *The Australian* at <www.humancondition.com/vanderpost-obituary>). The former Prime Minister of Britain, Baroness Margaret Thatcher, recognised Sir Laurens' extraordinary soundness when she described him as **'the most perfect man I have ever met'** (mentioned in the J.D.F. Jones interview on *Late Night Live*, ABC Radio, 25 Feb. 2002). Throughout history denial-free thinkers like John the Baptist and his protégé Christ were often brutally persecuted, or, as in these instances, even *killed* for telling the truth. The great danger of such persecution was that while it protected upset humans from unbearable condemnation it also thwarted the expression of truths needed to explain the human condition. In fact, as was made very clear in Part 3:11H about the danger of pseudo idealism, and in Part 4 about the danger of excessive dishonesty in science, the *real* threat facing the human race was terminal levels of denial/alienation—a world where humans were walking around in such terrible truthless and meaningless darkness that they could never hope to find their way back to a world of liberating and relieving light/knowledge.

With the human condition now explained and defended the truth about our species' immensely angry, egocentric and alienated upset state can and must, if we are to heal our species' world-destroying psychoses and neuroses, be revealed. We can and now need to admit what our mythologies have long recognised, the truth of our species' original innocence—again, as Richard Heinberg summarised in his book *Memories & Visions of Paradise*: **'Every religion begins with the recognition that human consciousness has been separated from the divine Source, that a former sense of oneness…has been lost…everywhere in religion and myth there is an acknowledgment that we have departed from an original…innocence'** (*Memories & Visions of Paradise*, 1990, pp.81-82 of 282).

Africa: Our soul's home – the Garden of Eden

Seeking permission to reproduce this photograph of natural Africa in my 1991 book *Beyond The Human Condition*, I corresponded with Mary Smith, who was then Senior Editor Assistant of *National Geographic* magazine. The photograph was taken by Gilbert M. Grosvenor, who at the time of my correspondence with Smith was President of *National Geographic*. Smith said that despite an official policy to never permit the use of Grosvenor's photographs outside of *National Geographic* they were so moved by my letter that they made the first ever exception and allowed me to use the image. In that letter I told *National Geographic* that the photograph was so important to me because it evoked the memory of our species' original instinctive self or soul's time in Africa. In the 1950s, when I was a young boy at Tudor House boarding school, I saw a film called *Where No Vultures Fly* that had an amazing impact on me, as evidenced by the fact that I still remember the film's name. It was a simple story filmed in Africa with people running around shooting each other, but the background was teeming with all the wonderful wildlife of Africa. Africa is in our psyche, it is in our ancient memory: it is our soul's home. We once lived in the scene in this photograph. Our *Homo sapiens sapiens* ancestors only left Africa some 60,000 years ago so the great majority of our instinctive memory is of living in this landscape where all the animals were our companions. Our species grew up in Africa—we *know* this place. If you go to natural Africa it is like a time warp, you feel like you have been hit with a stick, it is mind-exploding. Tim Macartney-Snape grew up in Tanzania, and Annie and I have been there, and I want the founding members of the WTM to visit natural Africa next year if possible so they can personally experience how moving it is.

In her 1967 book, the appropriately titled *A Glimpse of Eden*, Evelyn Ames, a poet and novelist, recorded the experiences of a month-long safari undertaken in East Africa: **'We thought we knew what to expect. Several friends had been there and told us about it; some, even, had made the same trip we were…going to make, but we discovered that nothing, really, prepares you for life on the East African Highlands. It is life (I want to say), making our usual existences seem oddly unreal and other landscapes dead; that country in the sky is another world…It is a world, and a life, from which one comes back changed. Long afterwards, gazelles still galloped through my dreams or stood gazing at me out of their soft and watchful eyes, and as I returned each daybreak, unbelieving, to my familiar room, I realized increasingly that this world would never again be the same for having visited that one. Nor does it leave you when you go away. Knowing its landscapes and sounds (even more in silence), how it feels and smells—just knowing it is there—sets it forever, in its own special light, somewhere in the mind's sky'** (pp.1-2 of 224). **'Each day in Africa my heart had almost burst with Walt Whitman's outcry: "As to me, I know of nothing else but miracles"'** (p.204). In *Henry IV*, William Shakespeare wrote of **'A foutra for the world and worldlings base! I speak of Africa and golden joys'** (Part 2, Act V, Scene iii, c.1597). A sign at the entrance to the Serengeti National Park reads: **'This is the world as it was in the beginning.'** Sir Laurens wrote that **'We need primitive nature, the First Man in ourselves, it seems, as the lungs need air and the body food and water…I thought finally that of all the nostalgias that haunt the human heart the greatest of them all, for me, is an everlasting longing to bring what is youngest home to what is oldest, in us all'** (*The Lost World of the Kalahari*, 1958, p 151 of 253). Natural Africa is the 'cradle of the human race', it is our species' spiritual home; it is the most sacred place on Earth.

Edward Hicks' *Peaceable Kingdom with Seated Lion* (detail) 1833-1834

This painting by the American folk painter Edward Hicks represents a bubbling up from our subconscious psyche or soul of this memory of our innocent time in Africa, a time when we lived harmoniously with all animals, even lions. Did you know that the relatively innocent Bushmen talk to the lions? They say, 'Don't, no, hey, woo, no' and the lions obey them. Lions have learnt instinctively to respect the Bushmen because they have poison arrows, but the Bushmen do know lions so well that they can communicate with them. As Sir Laurens said, the Bushmen actually know all the creatures' personalities. They walk around asking, 'How are you going mate? What are you doing? I know what you do, you're always scampering around there aren't you?' That is their world. They are fascinated with nature and can relate to it and so they do have these serious out-loud talks with lions, in which they can get very stern but the lions do actually back off. Bushmen can, like our ancient forebears could, talk lions out of a kill.

I want to include again this marvellous description of our original innocent state by the eighth century BC Greek poet Hesiod, from his poem *Works and Days*: **'When gods alike and mortals rose to birth / A golden race the immortals formed on earth…Like gods they lived, with calm untroubled mind / Free from the toils and anguish of our kind / Nor e'er decrepit age misshaped their frame…Strangers to ill, their lives in feasts flowed by…Dying they sank in sleep, nor seemed to die / Theirs was each good; the life-sustaining soil / Yielded its copious fruits, unbribed by toil / They with abundant goods 'midst quiet lands / All willing shared the gathering of their hands.'** We once lived in this idyllic state.

In his 1989 book *What Am I Doing Here*, Bruce Chatwin acknowledged that Christ was the innocent, uncorrupted expression of our species' integratively-orientated, original instinctive self when he wrote that **'There is no contradiction between the Theory of Evolution and belief in God and His Son on earth. If Christ were the perfect instinctual specimen—and we have every reason to believe He was—He must be the Son of God. By the same token, the First Man was also Christ'** (p.65 of 367). This reference to **'the First Man'** being **'also Christ'** makes sense of this comment by Sir Laurens about a missionary who sought to convert the Bushmen to Christianity: **'The pastor, Dominee Ferdie Weich, though much loved by the Bushmen, could report no permanent conversion to Christ in 21 years'** (*Testament to the Bushmen*, 1984, text accompanying photograph 91). The Bushmen, being Christ-like themselves in their relative innocence, weren't in need of Christianity. They didn't need a sound person to defer to, to live through, to be 'born-again' through, to be 'resurrected' from their upset state through, because they were not so upset themselves that they could no longer afford to trust in and live through themselves. In his 1985 book *Black Robe*, the Northern Irish novelist Brian Moore recorded this revealing comment made by an American Indian to Jesuit missionaries in Canada about the comparative innocence of native people: **'It is because you Normans are deaf and blind that you think this world is a world of darkness and the world of the dead is a world of light'** (p.184 of 256). I should mention that as a member of the Jewish race, Christ would have benefited from the genetic toughness of that race because it would have allowed his exceptionally well nurtured innocence to survive contact with the upset world where someone less genetically toughened may have not. As my headmaster at Geelong Grammar School, Sir James Darling (who in his full-page obituary in *The Australian* newspaper was described as **'a prophet in the true biblical sense'** (3 Nov. 1995)), said in one of his famous speeches about sensitive, innocent soundness not being enough for someone to be able to defy the alienated, dishonest world of denial and find the explanation

of the human condition, **'he must be sensitive *and* tough'** (*The Education of a Civilized Man*, 1962, p.34 of 223)—which is why a member of the Bushman race, which is a genetically relatively innocent race, could not have found the explanation of the human condition. (Note, later in Part 10:5 I cite more of Sir James Darling's speech, in which he spoke about needing to **'be sensitive *and* tough'**—and much more can be read there about his incredibly visionary education program at Geelong Grammar School, where he deliberately set out to cultivate the innocence needed to solve the human condition.) Sir Laurens van der Post also recognised that the Bushmen, although relatively innocent, did not have sufficient instinctive toughness to withstand the upset world when he described how **'mere contact with twentieth-century life seemed lethal to the Bushman. He was essentially so innocent and natural a person that he had only to come near us for a sort of radioactive fall-out from our unnatural world to produce a fatal leukaemia in his spirit'** (*The Heart of the Hunter*, 1961, p.111 of 233). A further difference between Christ and the more innocent so-called 'primitive' races such as the Bushman is the greater level of self restraint that accompanies toughness, which Christ, being a member of the more upset adapted Jewish race, would have possessed. The story of how restraint has accompanied the rise in upset during the human journey was described throughout Part 3:11.

So while they are still bouncing around, relatively secure and happy inside themselves, even the Bushmen are to a degree upset, and that upset can be expressed in physical violence. You have to go back a lot further in time to get truly innocent humans. Even so, the Bushmen are the most innocent variety of humans living today. What upset that does develop in the Bushmen is able to be exorcised or valved off by performing trance dances in which the individual uses exhaustion to shut down their troubled conscious mind and let their soul rise to the surface of their awareness and by so doing become realigned to the true world. I mean the Bushmen just wander around with nature all day, talking to the lions, talking to lizards and mucking around here and getting a bit of food there, that's just all they do and that's what we always did—and yet when the Bushmen make, for example, a good arrow, they quickly give it to another to avoid jealousy, because there is still some upset in them.

Indeed, to find what original innocent man was like you have to go back two million years. If an original innocent person walked in this room, honestly we'd all die, because we wouldn't be able to cope with their purity—they would be so free of any sign of corruption; they would be so unaware of anything to do with upset. You would see in their eyes such pure innocence and complete trust, such freedom, such joy and happiness, it would be unbearable.

The French philosopher Jean-Jacques Rousseau (1712-1778) acknowledged the innocence of our original instinctive state when he wrote that **'nothing is more gentle than man in his primitive state'** (*The Social Contract and Discourses*, 1755; tr. G.D.H. Cole, pub. 1913, Book IV, *The Origin of Inequality*, p.198 of 269) and **'Man is born free but is everywhere in chains'** (*Le Contrat Social*, 1762 [published in English as *The Social Contract*, 1791]).

Recall in Part 4:12, how E.O. Wilson, the Harvard professor of biology developed the extremely dishonest theory of Sociobiology/Evolutionary Psychology to dismiss our moral nature as nothing more than reciprocity, a subtle form of selfishness—and then, when that proved too unsavoury, put forward the extremely dishonest theory of Eusociality to misrepresent our moral soul as being derived from warring between groups of humans. With the theory of Eusociality, Wilson even sought to trivialise the human condition as nothing

more than a conflict between selfish and selfless instincts within us! Wilson has been the leading biologist at Harvard University, one of the leading universities in the world. He has been frequently described as one **'of the 20th century's greatest biologists'** and is **'among the most decorated and celebrated biologists of…**[his] **generation'** ('Wilson, Watson reflect on past trials, future directions', *Harvard Gazette*, 10 Sept. 2009). He has been awarded two Pulitzer Prizes, the U.S. National Medal of Science and in 1995 was named one of *TIME* magazine's 25 Most Influential People in America. The key question that had to be answered for there to be a future for the human race was the issue of the human condition, and that is a question for biologists, and Wilson is, by all these accounts, the leader of the world in the field of biology, so in his lap lay the greatest of all responsibilities and yet, instead of seeking an honest answer to the issue of the human condition, he was intent on trivialising the issue, basically subverting humanity from finding the desperately needed, real explanation of our psychologically troubled condition! The captain of the world, as it were, was leading humanity to destruction! I once described Wilson as the 'Antichrist' because if Christ was the most innocent, denial-free, honest thinker in recorded history, which he was, then Wilson was the opposite. While Christ was the Lord of Truth, Wilson was the Lord of Lying, the Archdeacon of Denial! Biology has been spreading some diabolical lies around the world. Darwin tried to avoid lying but Wilson had no compunction about doing so. That this has happened is an expression of how upset the human race has become and thus how desperate humans have been to contrive an excuse for their extremely upset behaviour, but, as I have emphasised, the great danger of such extreme lying was that it risked burying the truth forever and thus condemning humanity to extinction! The amount of lying that has been going on, and the eulogising of it, has been a very serious matter indeed. The world of humans has become completely mad. Alienation had all but seduced the world.

As was described in Part 4:12, in his 1998 book *Consilience*, which claimed that Evolutionary Psychology's reciprocity-explanation-for-social-behaviour explained humans' moral nature, Wilson, the 'captain of the world', said that **'Rousseau claimed** [that humanity] **was originally a race of noble savages in a peaceful state of nature, who were later corrupted…**[but what] **Rousseau invented** [was] **a stunningly inaccurate form of anthropology'** (p.37). This statement is as outrageously dishonest as J.D.F. Jones' accusation that **'the academic experts on the Kalahari** [Bushmen] **are absolutely berserk with rage about the things he** [Sir Laurens] **said'** about the Bushmen.

You may wonder why the WTM is out here, stuck under a few gum trees, promoting these ideas. As I described in Part 4:14, these human-condition-confronting explanations have not been embraced by the human-condition-denying scientific establishment. I once presented a lecture to the psychology department at Sydney University. Well, they hated and rejected what I had to say—they did go **'berserk with rage'**. There was uproar and people walked out—basically I was spat out the door because I started to put forward all these ideas that are based on such truths as the original innocence of humans. I mean I can keep going on like this, talking the truth about the world of innocence and our corrupted state and from that truthful basis explain all manner of phenomena for hours on end. But those in the psychology department didn't want to know about it, their whole edifice of denial was being dismantled brick by brick and they hated it. I mean how dare they? They are supposedly the masters of a field of study that deals with human psychosis—as was explained in Part 3:8,

'psychosis' literally means **'soul-illness'**, derived as it is from *psyche* meaning **'soul'**, and *osis* which means **'abnormal state or condition'**; thus we can understand that **'psychology'** means the **'study of the soul'**, while the associated field of **'psychiatry'**, as practiced by medical specialists, literally means **'soul-healing'**, derived as it is from *psyche* meaning **'soul'** and *iatreia* which means **'healing'**. Well, let's talk about the **'soul'** and why it became **'ill'** or corrupted from an obviously innocent state and therefore has to be **'healed'**. Why aren't these 'specialists of the soul' talking about that? What was our **'soul'**'s original state and how and why did it become **'abnormal'**, corrupted? They are not even asking those fundamental questions and yet they are the supposed authorities on the subject. Very often people who are the least secure want to become psychiatrists and psychologists, not because they have the greatest need for what it has to offer, but because they either want to find what all the denials are that they can use to hide behind, or because by becoming a psychologist they have somehow disproved the possibility that they suffer from psychosis, in which case denial ends up fostering denial. Such is the end play state of terminal levels of alienation at which the human race has arrived.

As the custodians of denial mechanistic science can't tolerate the ideas I present. It is not about to publish these ideas in its literature or have the ideas debated there, which is why they have had to be promoted by an independent organisation that I and the supporters of these ideas have had to establish, fund and run ourselves.

So Wilson said Rousseau was **'stunningly inaccurate'**, and Jones said the **'academic experts'** were **'berserk with rage'** with Sir Laurens. You ought to hear what the captains of denial tried to do to me, it would make your ears curl—how I'm still on my feet I don't know. This is the first public talk I've given in 15 years because the enemies of all the truth I'm daring to present made a program that was televised throughout Australia by our national broadcaster, the ABC, would you believe, that portrayed me as such a monster that I've had to fight to survive let alone do any work (and Sir James Darling was a former Chairman of the ABC! How they have lost their way, become bankrupt of any relevance to the human journey). In fact I had to fight so hard to survive that I came down with Chronic Fatigue, from which I've only just recovered after my partner Annie Williams nursed me through it for 10 years. I once gave lots of public talks and the last time I did one I was a vital, radiantly excited young man. I'm now an old man but thank God I fought hard enough to survive and I'm still alive to give this presentation. Not only do I need to thank Annie for all her support through the last 20 years of horrible persecution, I also need to thank my brother Simon, the other directors and patrons of the WTM, and all the founding members of the WTM for their unwavering courage.

The English poet laureate William Wordsworth was, like Rousseau, extraordinarily honest. As was described in Part 4:6, he wrote this wonderful poem in 1807, probably the greatest poem ever written, titled *Intimations of Immortality from Recollections of Early Childhood*. Even the title *Intimations of Immortality from Recollections of Early Childhood* contains exceptional honesty. If you bore down into that title, unpack it, dismantle it, Wordsworth is saying that humans were once so innocent that it didn't matter to us if we lived or died—which echoes Hesiod, who said, **'A golden race the immortals formed on earth… Like gods they lived, with calm untroubled mind / Free from the toils and anguish of our kind / Nor e'er decrepit age misshaped their frame…Strangers to ill, their lives in feasts flowed by…Dying they sank in sleep, nor seemed to die.'** When we were innocent we were so in tune with everything around

us and so happy inside and so alive that death was not an issue. Death is only an issue when we live a wretched life, where we become so selfish that it matters if we die or not. Fear of death is a product of selfishness, which in turn is a product of alienation, which in turn is the loss of the generosity and meaning we once had before we became upset. In our **'Early Childhood'** we have **'Intimations of Immortality'**—when we are innocent and free of upset we are not concerned with the issue of mortality. For secure people mortality is not an issue because their love for this world is universal and everything is saturated and full of that love. So how much truth is in that title alone! In this marvellous poem Wordsworth wrote, **'There was a time when meadow, grove, and streams / The earth, and every common sight / To me did seem / Apparelled in celestial light / The glory and the freshness of a dream / It is not now as it hath been of yore / Turn wheresoe'er I may / By night or day / The things which I have seen I now can see no more** [because I've become alienated, I have had to block out all truth of another true world because it has become too condemning] // **The Rainbow comes and goes / And lovely is the Rose / The Moon doth with delight / Look round her when the heavens are bare / Waters on a starry night / Are beautiful and fair / The sunshine is a glorious birth / But yet I know, where'er I go / That there hath past away a glory from the earth…something that is gone / …Whither is fled the visionary gleam? / Where is it now, the glory and the dream?** [Where is my memory of that magic time I lived in?] // **Our birth is but a sleep and a forgetting** [alienation] / **The Soul that rises with us, our life's Star / Hath had elsewhere its setting / And cometh from afar / Not in entire forgetfulness / And not in utter nakedness** [and the following words are the most beautiful I've ever read] / **But trailing clouds of glory do we come / From God, who is our home** [God is the integrative, cooperative, selfless, loving ideals and since we once lived in the cooperative ideal state, **'trailing clouds of glory do we come'**. We come from an uncorrupted, cooperative, innocent, loving state—**'From God, who is our home'**] / **Heaven lies about us in our infancy! / Shades of the prison-house begin to close / Upon the growing Boy / …And by the vision splendid / Is on his way attended / At length the Man perceives it die away / And fade into the light of common day / …Forget the glories he hath known / And that imperial palace whence he came.'**

Wordsworth goes on to say that it is only a denial-free thinker or **'prophet'** who hasn't become resigned to living in denial and had to **'Forget'** the true world who, from that honest basis, can plumb the depths of humanity's estranged state: **'Thou best Philosopher, who yet dost keep / Thy heritage, thou Eye among the blind / That, deaf and silent, read'st the eternal deep / Haunted for ever by the eternal mind / Mighty Prophet! Seer blest! / On whom those truths do rest / Which we are toiling all our lives to find / In darkness lost, the darkness of the grave.'**

So in all these quotes about the innocence of our original instinctive state we can gain an appreciation of how dishonest mechanistic science has been to have denied so many truths related to this magic world of our soul. These quotes and the truth they resurrect of the existence of our lost state of innocence also raise the serious question of how are we supposed to cope with the exposure of having the truth of how corrupted the human race has become revealed? It is this very important question that will be looked at next.

Part 6
The Solution to Exposure

Part 6:1 <u>Although the upset state of the human condition is now explained and defended, how is the human race supposed to cope with having the immense extent of its corrupted condition suddenly revealed?</u>

While acknowledgments like those just given of our species' upset-free, cooperative, harmonious, innocent past helped to preserve my soul and allowed me to go on and assemble the explanation of the human condition, they also raise a very serious issue: while the redeeming and rehabilitating understanding of the human condition *has* at last been found and humans' upset state *is* now properly and compassionately defended, how is the upset human race supposed to cope with having all the truth about its immensely corrupted state suddenly revealed?

In fact, the problem of how are we to cope with the arrival of the all-exposing truth about our corrupted condition is such a serious issue that the answer to it is the most important concept in this whole presentation next to the explanation of the human condition itself. As such, this answer, which is the TRANSFORMED LIFEFORCE WAY OF LIVING, was more fully explained in Part 3:10. A detailed presentation of the TRANSFORMED LIFEFORCE WAY OF LIVING will also be given later in Part 9, while Affirmations from those putting it into practice can either be viewed at <www.humancondition.com/affirmations>, or read in Section 3 of *Freedom Expanded: Book 2*. This chapter, which will provide an overview of the problem and its all-important solution, also introduces a drawing that is designed to starkly depict the predicament facing the human race.

Yes, the arrival of understanding of the human condition unavoidably brings with it truth day, honesty day, transparency day, revelation day—exposure day. Indeed, it is the arrival of the historically feared, so-called 'judgment day'—although that is an unfortunate term because this breakthrough is all about bringing dignifying understanding, *not* condemning 'judgment'. As an anonymous Turkish poet once said, judgment day is **'Not the day of judgment but the day of understanding'** (Merle Severy, 'The World of Süleyman the Magnificent', *National Geographic*, Nov. 1987). Nevertheless, while what has arrived is all about compassionate 'understanding', not condemning 'judgment', this understanding does at first leave upset humans feeling extremely exposed; naked; stripped of all the contrived defences they have been employing to cope with their condition while they couldn't explain it. A focus of religious texts has always been on how all-liberating yet at the same time all-exposing the truth about our species' condition was going to be when at last it arrived. The Bible, for instance, contains

references to the **'day of judgment'** (Matt. 10:15, 11:22, 24, 12:36; Mark 6:11; 2 Pet. 2:9, 3:7; 1 John 4:17) and **'the day when God will judge men's secrets'** (Rom. 2:16), as well as descriptions of it, such as that from the prophet Isaiah, who said that the liberation that **'gives you relief from suffering and turmoil and cruel bondage…will come with vengeance; with divine retribution…to save you. Then will the eyes of the blind be opened and the ears of the deaf unstopped…Your nakedness will be exposed'** (14:3; 35:4, 5; 47:3). The prophet Muhammad also referred to **'the Day of Reckoning'** (*The Koran*, ch.56) and **'the Last Judgement'** (ibid. ch.69), providing this similar description of it: **'when the Trumpet is blown with a single blast and the earth and the mountains are lifted up and crushed with a single blow, Then, on that day, the Terror shall come to pass, and heaven shall be split…On that day you shall be exposed, not one secret of yours concealed'** (ibid. ch.69).

So, the big question is this: having lived for two million years in a deathly dark, cave-like state of extreme denial and thus alienation, how is the upset human race expected to cope with **'the Terror'** of suddenly having the blinds drawn and all the exposing light of truth stream in upon us? These explanations of the human condition are initially fascinating because they make sense of so much of human life, however, when reading on they typically become increasingly confronting and exposing, and ultimately unbearable. For example, reading through all the quotes just given from Sir Laurens, Hesiod, Rousseau, Wordsworth and others about our lost innocence can become overwhelmingly exposing. How are upset humans supposed to cope with learning just how much innocence they have lost? This problem of exposure is part of the difficulty we in the WTM term the 'Mexican Standoff', which is slang for reaching an impasse or deadlock—in this case, the situation where you intellectually know the information is true and that it explains and defends the upset state, but find actually confronting it all excruciating. The American writer and futurist Alvin Toffler coined the term **'future shock'**, which he described as **'the shattering stress and disorientation that we induce in individuals by subjecting them to too much change in too short a time'** (*Future Shock*, 1970, p.4 of 505). When Toffler wrote of this **'future shock'** he was actually intuitively anticipating this time when understanding of the human condition would emerge and humans would suddenly be faced with too much truth to have to adjust to in too short a time.

There is a terrifying abyss of depressing truth to have to face when understanding of the human condition arrives. Carl Jung described in dramatic terms just how **'shattering'** unrestricted self-confrontation has been for upset humans: **'When it** [our **'shadow'**, the negative aspects of ourselves] **appears…it is quite within the bounds of possibility for a man to recognize the relative evil of his nature, but it is a rare and shattering experience for him to gaze into the face of absolute evil'** (*Aion: Researches into the Phenomenology of the Self*, 1959, tr. R.F.C. Hull; in *The Collected Works of C.G. Jung*, Vol. 9/2, p.10). Although we now know that upset is not an **'evil'** state, Jung's quote makes it very clear just how much corruption exists within upset humans, and that an abyss of depression awaits any who delve too deeply into their corrupted condition—which brings us to the following drawing of *Humanity's Situation*, an image almost as important as the Adam Stork picture in terms of what it depicts.

Drawing by Jeremy Griffith © 2008 Fedmex Pty Ltd

Humanity's Situation: the Sunshine Highway to Freedom, the Abyss of Depression, our Cave-like Dead Existence and the Spiralling Pit of Terminal Alienation

At the top of the picture we can see humans revelling in the human-condition-ameliorated freedom of sun-drenched liberating understanding. Beneath them, however, is a terrible abyss with the word **'DEPRESSION'** written prominently across the bottom of it,

representing all the exposing truth about the human race's immensely corrupted condition that is unbearable to confront. You can see that this abyss consumes two-thirds of the whole picture, which is an accurate reflection of just how big the problem of exposure is that unavoidably accompanies the arrival of understanding of the human condition. On the other side of the abyss lies a narrow strip of land that is coloured the grey-green of dead flesh and which features the words **'CAVE-LIKE DEAD EXISTENCE'** and a throng of people walking around like zombies. This is a truthful depiction of the state of extreme alienation that humans currently live in. So, the question is, how are we to cross that terrifying abyss of depression, how are we to cope with unbearable exposure? As Enrico, a reader of my books, put it: **'Diving into a sea of truth where everything is completely transparent one can't but ask, "how will anybody cope with this; how in the world can anybody cross such darkness to reach light?!"'** (WTM records, 24 Feb. 2011). And yet if the human race does not cross that abyss it *will* reach terminal levels of alienation. The bottom corner of the picture contains a big black spiral pit that has written beside it, **'Extinction of the human species from terminal levels of alienation.'** Yes, if understanding of the human condition was never found, or if there was no way for the upset human race to cope with the exposing understanding of the human condition once it was found, as it now has been, then eventually the human race would become extinct from terminal levels of alienation.

So this impasse is where the human race appears to be trapped—between having to face unbearably exposing truths or extinction from terminal levels of alienation. Mercifully, however, there is a way to cope, and in this drawing that solution is depicted by the **'Sunshine Highway'** bridge over the Abyss of Depression.

Stated simply, the way the upset human race copes with the arrival of exposure day or 'judgment day' is by supporting the truth without overly confronting it. When the liberating understanding of the human condition arrives after two million years of living without it, there is necessarily going to be far too much exposing and confronting truth to, all of a sudden, be able to process—but that does not prevent us from supporting the truth. Once you have studied these understandings sufficiently to verify to your own satisfaction that they are the true explanation of the human condition then there is no need to study them further and become overly confronted by them. The generations who grew up in the dark as it were, without understanding of the human condition, can't suddenly expect to be able to cope with the blinding glare of the light of truth. All that the first generations who encounter the liberating but exposing truth about the human condition need to do is support it so that the truth can successfully reach the next generation, who in turn won't have to grow up adopting all the false, alienating denials that the first generations (and all those who came before) had to employ. Confronting the truth naturally has to be a generation-by-generation process. What is so wonderful is that this way of living, where you support the truth without overly confronting it, is so relieving and exciting that it totally TRANSFORMS humans, as those living that way attest to in the Affirmations in Section 3 of *Freedom Expanded: Book 2*.

While the transitional generations who take up the TRANSFORMED LIFEFORCE STATE won't be entirely free of all their insecurities, alienations and psychoses, their ability to live

in support of the understanding of the human condition will be *so fabulously exciting* that all their/our psychoses, all their/our 'baggage' from the old, human-condition-unresolved world, will be rendered immaterial and insignificant. The fact is, having lived in such a dead, alienated, dark, cave-like state of dishonest denial and resulting estrangement from our true soulful self for so long, coming out into the truthful world of liberating sunshine of understanding will be so redeeming and exalting it will be almost more exciting, transfiguring, rapturous and exhilarating than the human body is capable of handling. To finally be FREE from having to—and we did *have to*—live such a world-destroying, selfish, mean and egocentric existence for so long is such a relief. To now be able to live a life of TRANSFORMED FREEDOM from the dark, effectively dead state of denial and be able to participate fully in the true, human-condition-liberated world with all its beauty and sensitivity is something so exciting that appreciating just how exciting it is going to be is almost beyond our present powers of imagination.

There is not simply a way of coping with the truth about humans when it arrives, but the almost *unbearably exciting way of living* it brings about.

Part 6:2 The initial reaction of intolerant resistance to the exposing truth, which Plato anticipated

The arrival of understanding of the human condition *is* an extremely exposing and confronting development for upset humans but thankfully there *is* a way of coping—in fact, coping is too slight a word—the arrival of understanding of the human condition brings about a fabulous new way of living for humans! In truth, the human race would not have had the will and determination to persevere through two million years of the darkness of alienation if it didn't believe deep within itself that there would be a way to live with the truth when it finally arrived.

Unfortunately, however, there was always a danger that we could lose sight of this faith and trust in the eventual liberation of the human race from the human condition and that when understanding of the human condition finally arrived some would be intolerant of the emerging information and try to reinstate the historical denials that have been used to block exposure to the issue of the human condition. As mentioned previously, psychologists and counsellors recognise that **'habitual…patterns** [of denial] **have a life of their own, and their will to live is very strong. They fight back with a vengeance when faced with annihilation'** (*Courage to Heal*, L. Davis & E. Bass, 1988, p.175 of 495). Resistance is the automatic, historical response to the threat of exposure, however, where human-condition-confronting new ideas and movements are concerned tolerance is essential because, as emphasised, it has been humanity's central hope that some day, some where, some how understanding of the human condition would finally emerge and the possibility of that occurring always had to be considered. If there wasn't this tolerance, and instead people immediately attacked and obliterated new confronting information they could be obliterating the one chance humanity had to achieve its freedom—they might, in effect, be killing the goose that laid the golden egg.

Plato gave a very clear warning of this great danger of intolerance threatening to prevent the emergence of understanding of the human condition in his allegory of the cave in his great work *The Republic*. Plato's amazingly insightful analysis of the human condition in his cave allegory has already been described in Part 3:10, however, given how revealing it is of the danger of intolerance to the arrival of understanding of the human condition, a further analysis should now be included.

Plato began his allegory with an actual reference to the human condition, saying, **'I want you to go on to picture the enlightenment or ignorance of our human conditions somewhat as follows. Imagine an underground chamber, like a cave with an entrance open to the daylight and running a long way underground. In this chamber are men who have been prisoners there'** (*The Republic*, tr. H.D.P. Lee, 1955, p.278 of 405). He then described how between the natural, radiant, all-visible, sunlit world and humans' **'cave'** existence stands a **'brightly burning fire'** that prevents humans from leaving the cave: **'the light of the fire in the prison** [cave] **corresponds to the power of the sun'** (ibid. p.282). What the **'sun'** and its Earthly representation, the **'brightly burning fire'**, represent is the condemning cooperative ideals of life, the ideals that bring the depressing issue of the human condition into focus—the question of why, when the ideals are to be cooperative, loving and selfless, are humans competitive, aggressive and selfish? The **'sun'/'fire'** represents the confronting glare of the ideals and the burning heat of the issue of the human condition that those ideals cause and which the upset human race has had to live in denial of—metaphorically speaking, hide from in a dark **'cave'**. Imprisoned in the cave, all that can be seen are **'shadows'** cast by the **'fire'**, which Plato said are only an **'illusion'** of the real world outside the cave. The allegory makes clear that while **'the light of the fire in the cave prison corresponds to the power of the sun'** (ibid. p.282), with **'the sun…making things we see visible'** (ibid. p.273) such that without it humans can only **'see dimly and appear to be almost blind'** (ibid. p.272), having to hide in the **'cave'** of **'illusion'** and endure **'almost blind'** alienation was infinitely preferable to facing the **'painful'** light of the **'fire'/'sun'** that would make **'visible'** the unbearably depressing issue of **'the imperfections of human life'** (ibid. p.282), namely the issue of the human condition. Plato's description of humanity having to live in a cave of blind alienation is clearly a description of humanity having to live in deep denial of the unbearably exposing (the **'sun'**) and confronting or burning (the **'fire'**) issue of the human condition, and of any truths that bring that unbearably depressing issue into focus.

Given Plato's ability to describe humanity's state of denial and resulting alienation so honestly, it is no wonder Alfred North Whitehead, one of the most highly regarded philosophers of the twentieth century, referred to the history of philosophy as merely **'a series of footnotes to Plato'** (*Process and Reality [Gifford Lectures Delivered in the University of Edinburgh During the Session 1927-28]*, 1979, p.39 of 413). Plato's work has rightly drawn comparisons with some of the great religious texts. For example, **'It has been said that after the Bible, Plato's dialogues are the most influential books in Western culture'** (from the front flap of Plato's *Symposium and Phaedrus*, published by Everyman's Library in 2001), and **'Among secular books, Plato only is entitled to Omar's fanatical compliment to the Koran, when he said, "Burn the libraries; for their value is in this book"'** (American philosopher Ralph Waldo Emerson, *The Complete Works, Vol. 4; Representative Men, Riverside Edition reprinted*, ed. J. Elliot Cabot, 1903, p.41). There have only been a few denial-free books in the history of the world—in addition to Plato's dialogues, they include Sir Laurens' books and obviously the great

religious texts. Incidentally, if you would like to read a powerful demystification of some of the religious texts, because with understanding of the human condition such clarifications are now possible, go to Part 10:1, titled 'Moses, Christ and Plato'. This Part demystifies Moses' first five books of the Bible, including what he meant by Abraham being instructed by God to **'sacrifice'** his own **'son'** (Gen. 22:2).

R.D. Laing raised this truth about the rarity of denial-free books when he wrote that **'Few books today are forgivable. Black on the canvas, silence on the screen, an empty white sheet of paper, are perhaps feasible. There is little conjunction of truth and social 'reality'. Around us are pseudo-events, to which we adjust with a false consciousness adapted to see these events as true and real, and even as beautiful. In the society of men the truth resides now less in what things are than in what they are not. Our social realities are so ugly if seen in the light of exiled truth** [the unevasive truth]**, and beauty is almost no longer possible if it is not a lie'** (*The Politics of Experience* and *The Bird of Paradise*, 1967, p.11 of 156).

Having described this state of being imprisoned by denial of the issue of the human condition, Plato went on to describe what would happen when understanding of the human condition was found, which is the issue being addressed in this Part of my presentation. (The following quote comes from a helpful summary of the cave allegory that appears in the 1996 *Encarta Encyclopedia*, under the entry for 'Plato'. The underlinings are my emphasis): **'Breaking free, one of the individuals escapes from the cave into the light of day. With the aid of the sun** [living free of denial of the issue of the human condition and of any truths that bring that issue into focus]**, that person sees for the first time the real world and returns to the cave with the message that the only things they have seen heretofore are shadows and appearances and that the real world awaits them if they are willing to struggle free of their bonds. The shadowy environment of the cave symbolizes for Plato the physical world of appearances. Escape into the sun-filled setting outside the cave symbolizes the <u>transition to the real world</u>, the world of full and perfect being, the world of Forms, <u>which is the proper object of knowledge</u>'** (by Professor Robert M. Baird. Accessed 11 Jul. 2008: see <www.wtmsources.com/101>). To return to Plato's actual words, he warned that **'if he** [the cave prisoner] **were made to look directly at the light of the fire** [again the fire represents the unconfrontable issue of our less-than-ideal human condition]**, it would hurt his eyes and he would turn back and take refuge in the things which he could see** [take refuge in all the denials that he has become accustomed to]**, which he would think really far clearer than the things being shown him. And if he were forcibly dragged up the steep and rocky ascent** [out of the cave of denial by the person who has broken free of the cave] **and not let go till he had been dragged out into the sunlight** [shown the truthful all-liberating—but at the same time all-exposing and confronting—explanation of the human condition]**, the process would be a painful one, to which he would much object, and when he emerged into the light his eyes would be so overwhelmed by the brightness of it that he wouldn't be able to see a single one of the things he was now told were real** [this inability to absorb discussion of the human condition is what we in the WTM refer to as the 'deaf effect']**'**. Plato then said, **'they would say that his** [the person who tries to deliver understanding of the human condition] **visit to the upper world had ruined his sight** [they would treat him as if he was mad, which is how I've been treated]**, and** [they would say] **that the ascent** [out of the cave] **was not worth even attempting. And if anyone tried to release them and lead them up, they would kill him if they could lay hands on him** [my detractors have done everything they can, short of physical attack, to kill me]**'** (*The Republic*, tr. H.D.P. Lee, 1955, p.280, 281).

Reverend David Millikan, who persecuted me and the WTM, then known as the Foundation for Humanity's Adulthood, in two defamatory publications in 1995 (an ABC-TV *Four Corners* program and a feature article in the *Sydney Morning Herald* newspaper) revealed his real motivation and prejudice—and confirmed Plato's prediction that they would say **'that the ascent** [out of the cave of denial] **was not worth even attempting'**—when he said, **'You realise you are attempting the impossible, you will be fighting to have this material accepted right down to the last person on the planet'** (WTM records, 16 Feb. 1995). The other architect of the attack on my work, one of a very few intolerant parents of WTM members, revealed a similar motivation, and a similar confirmation of Plato's prediction, when he said to me, **'You know you are encroaching on the personal unspeakable inside people and you won't succeed'** (WTM records, 12 Feb. 1995). He similarly told his son, **'You are trying to rattle the black box inside people and you just can't do that'** (WTM records, 18 Mar. 1995). These men were right in the sense that these truths I am revealing about the human condition *are* extremely confronting, but they were fundamentally wrong because, as Plato said, the **'proper object of knowledge'** was to find the **'enlightenment… of our human condition'** that would enable the **'transition to the real world'** and they were not allowing for that greatest of all possibilities for the human race, which is the most serious act of oppression of thought possible. The whole principle of democracy was established, and fought and died for by Australian soldiers in France, Gallipoli, and elsewhere, so that we could keep the door to freedom of expression open, most especially in this critical area of enquiry into the issue of the human condition.

Incidentally, I should explain more clearly why these comments by my detractors—about me **'encroaching on the personal unspeakable'**, **'black box' 'inside people'** and that I will be **'fighting to have this material accepted right down to the last person on the planet'**—reveal their real motivation and prejudice. In a campaign akin to J.D.F. Jones' demonisation of Sir Laurens van der Post, Reverend Millikan used selective editing and extreme misrepresentation to cast me as a dangerous anti-social pariah in both his *Four Corners* program and *Sydney Morning Herald* article. The fact of the matter is I simply cannot be sound enough to confront and look into the human condition, as my detractors' comments acknowledge I have done, and at the same time be so unsound as to be a monster in our society. Christ pointed out this obvious truth when, in responding to his truth-hating persecutors' accusation of him being **'possessed by Beelzebub… the prince of demons'** (Mark 3:22), he said, **'How can Satan drive out Satan?'** (Mark 3:23). He was making the same point when he said that **'A good tree cannot bear bad fruit, and a bad tree cannot bear good fruit'** (Matt. 7:18). Sir Laurens also made this same point when, in a comment that was included earlier in Part 5:1, he said, **'He who tries to go down into the labyrinthine pit of himself, to travel the swirling, misty netherlands below sea-level through which the harsh road to heaven and wholeness runs, is doomed to fail and never see the light where night joins day unless he goes out of love in search of love.'** Alienation cannot look into the human condition—one precludes the other. The truth is, the lack of soundness lies within the person who cannot tolerate someone looking into the human condition. The accusation that I am a dangerous pariah in society was a deliberate, fear-inducing, reverse-of-the-truth lie fabricated to try to prevent the emergence of these ideas against which the attackers held monumental prejudices.

The point being made is that if people don't want to study these ideas sufficiently to be able to recognise that they are the all-important, all-liberating full truth about humans, they should at least trust in the democratic principle of freedom of expression to evaluate the potential importance to the human race of the ideas being put forward. They don't have to throw out the rule book on fair behaviour as Reverend Millikan did in his defamatory *Four Corners* program and *Sydney Morning Herald* article—or as J.D.F. Jones did in his attack on Sir Laurens.

Of course, the principle of freedom of expression should be applied in all areas of enquiry. Again, as John Stuart Mill emphasised, **'the dictum that truth always triumphs over persecution is one of those pleasant falsehoods which men repeat after one another till they pass into commonplaces, but which all experience refutes. History teems with instances of truth put down by persecution. If not suppressed for ever, it may be thrown back for centuries.'**

So Plato was right when he warned that when understanding of the human condition was found many people would be deaf to what was being said (**'he wouldn't be able to see a single one of the things he was now told were real'**); that some would say that all human-condition-confronting information should be destroyed on sight (**'that the ascent** [out of the cave] **was not worth even attempting'**); that some would accuse the presenter of the understanding of being mad (**'his visit to the upper world had ruined his sight'**); and that some would even try to destroy the deliverer of the understanding (**'if anyone tried to release them and lead them up** [out of the cave]**, they would kill him if they could lay hands on him'**).

After fighting this intolerant resistance for 20 years now and having finally received complete vindication—a journey that is documented on our website at <www.humancondition.com/persecution>—we in the WTM feel and hope this intolerant stage is now over. We hope that in terms of Schopenhauer's stages that new ideas have to survive before being accepted—from firstly being **'ridiculed'** and **'violently opposed'**, to secondly having it **'stated that it may be true but it's not particularly relevant'**, to thirdly having it **'admitted to be true and relevant but the same critics assert that the idea is not original'** to finally having **'accepted as being self-evident'**—that we have now moved to the second stage. We, our small group of some 50 individuals, are also immensely relieved to have not failed to defend these all-precious understandings against immense and ferocious opposition from not only two of Australia's biggest media institutions in the Australian Broadcasting Corporation and the Fairfax Media group, but many other powerful and influential people and factions in our community—because, as the science historian Thomas Kuhn said, **'In science…ideas do not change simply because new facts win out over outmoded ones…Since the facts can't speak for themselves, it is their human advocates who win or lose the day.'**

So, to recap, the cave depicted in our FREEDOM poster (see the beginning of Part 3:5) is where the upset human race has been imprisoned and, while humanity has finally achieved its glorious freedom, the truth about the upset state is still extremely confronting and exposing and thus painful, which brings us back to the predicament depicted by the *Humanity's Situation* picture, in which the human race is stranded between unbearable exposure and terminal alienation.

As mentioned, the solution to this problem of being stranded is the Sunshine Highway of supporting the truth without confronting it—a path that leads to the TRANSFORMED LIFEFORCE STATE. We *can* now live in support of the reconciling understanding of the human condition rather than allow our habituated reactions of denial and angry resistance prevent the emergence of a human-condition-free world. There is no point in procrastinating and trying to reassert the old denials when the dignifying truth about humans makes such behaviour unnecessary and obsolete. Why stay in the old dead world when we no longer have to? The catch cry now is 'Let's go! Let's get out of here!'—let's leave all that pain and anguish behind and move to the human-condition-understood new world. All humans can now immediately be effectively FREE from the terrible, cave-dwelling, alienated state by supporting and participating in the new, understanding-drenched, truthful, FREE World-In-Sunshine. To live in support of these liberating understandings makes possible the most exciting life we fully conscious humans have ever known. All humans can now come out of the terrible cave where they have had to live for so long and join the FREE in the truth-and-understanding-supporting Sunshine Army on the Sunshine Highway to the World-In-Sunshine. This, finally, is the birth of The Kingdom of Light and The Empire of the Sun in The World of the FREE. After such a terrifyingly long journey and struggle through a cavernous world of darkness into this new world of light, the whole human race is going to have such a big celebration and party now that it will go on for generations. Everywhere we are going to be hoppin' and boppin', rompin' and stompin', hollerin' and howlin', movin' and groovin', rollickin' and rollin', hootin' and tootin', jumping and jiving, jolting and somersaulting, skipping and skating, shaking and shimmering, hugging and laughing, embracing and gyrating, twisting and shouting, dancing and singing, slipping and sliding, jamming and slamming, ripping and roaring, whirling and twirling and reelin' and rockin'. This is it, the great breakthrough and breakout for all humans from our species' ancient prison into a fabulous TRANSFORMED world of FREEDOM for the human race. This is the time that the most esteemed piece of music ever written, Beethoven's 1824 *Ninth Symphony*, anticipates with its full choir of human voices rising to the final height of glorious unison and excitement with the words, **'Joy'**, **'Joyful, as a hero to victory!'**, **'Join in our jubilation!'**, **'We enter, drunk with fire, into your sanctuary…Your magic reunites…All men become brothers…All good, all bad…Be embraced, millions! This kiss for the whole world!'** It is little wonder the piece was adopted by the European Union, the EU, as its anthem in 1985.

Part 6:3 The threat of terminal levels of alienation

The depressingly exposing descriptions of our lost state of innocence given by Sir Laurens, Hesiod, Rousseau, Wordsworth and others provided a powerful illustration of the problem of the Abyss of Depression from unbearable exposure that existed on one side of our species' seemingly stranded position. What now needs to be provided is evidence of the threat of terminal levels of alienation that lay in wait on the other side of that Abyss of Depression.

As explained in Parts 1 and 2 of this book, and in Section 1:6 of *Freedom Expanded: Book 2*, the *real* threat to the world was not from environmental destruction, as devastating as that was—it was from terminal levels of alienation, and that threat to humanity was approaching

extremely rapidly. For instance, in Parts 4:10 to 4:14 it is described how in the world of science lying had become so entrenched that no one was seeing through it and calling its bluff—to the contrary, everyone was lauding it.

What happens when alienation, the practice of denial or lying, becomes extreme is that society becomes so dysfunctional it collapses. We can gain an excellent insight into the approaching terminal levels of dysfunctionality by looking at what happened when excessive egocentricity developed, most especially in men, but also in women.

Part 6:4 The dysfunctional 'Power Addicted' state

When humanity set out in search of understanding some two million years ago, only the finding of that understanding could stop the ever-increasing levels of upset, which means by the end of that two million year period, which is now, the human race was going to be extraordinarily upset. As was explained in Part 3:11D, we learnt to 'civilise' that upset, which simply means to conceal it, but underneath that facade of civility lies immense upset. As will be explained shortly in Part 7:1, it was men's role to take up the task of championing the conscious thinking self or ego over the ignorance of our instinctive self. It follows then that by the end of two million years of ever-increasing upset men in particular were going to become extremely egocentric, punch drunk with the need for validation, desperate for the power, fame, fortune and glory relief from the insecure state of the human condition. Part 3:11F, the final 'Hollowman' stage, described this overly upset punch-drunk state.

By examining how this extreme egocentricity, in men in particular, affected children we can see how quickly alienation produced a dysfunctional generation.

Everywhere now we see expressions of the punch-drunk egocentric state, this end play situation of the development of upset in the world of having to get a win, a victory, success at any cost. We see parents on the sideline of sports fields, watching their children play and projecting their embattled need for a win onto those children, yelling, 'win, win, win'! The effect this pressure has on their children is psychologically devastating because, as I will now explain, it produces a new generation who are either psychologically crippled or turned into 'power addicts', both of which are extremely dysfunctional states.

Only last month (at time of filming, Sept. 2009) the Australian journalist Miranda Devine wrote an honest article on poor parenting and the narcissistic behaviour or power addiction it produces in individuals. Titled 'Face it, we are all narcissists now', the piece reported that **'"Parents are becoming increasingly self absorbed [believing] 'the single most important thing in the world is for me to work like a dog and get the house, the car and the holiday house' and don't realise all their kids want is to be loved and to have one-on-one time with their parents." He** [renowned Australian adolescent psychologist Michael Carr-Gregg] **says an "epidemic of poor parenting" is to blame for a drastic rise in psychological problems in young people. "Generation Y is being ravaged by depression, anxiety disorders and stress disorders"'** (*Sydney Morning Herald*, 3 Sept. 2009). In the article Devine discussed the development of the narcissistic personality disorder where adults develop **'a grandiose sense of self importance; preoccupation with fantasies of unlimited success, power, brilliance…a need for excessive admiration; a sense of entitlement; exploitive personal relationships; a lack of empathy;**

envy and arrogant, haughty behaviour…Everyone's a potential narcissist these days.' The article mentions **'a long-term study of…American college students** [that found]**…the incidence of narcissistic personality traits increased on a scale rivalling obesity'**. The reason, the article reported, for this recent explosion in narcissism is **'poor parenting'**.

Having lived in denial of the truth that our species once lived in a cooperative, unconditionally-selfless, loving, harmonious state, the nurtured origins of which has already been explained and will be more fully explained in Part 8:4B, there has been almost no recognition of the importance of nurturing children with unconditional love. Children come into the world instinctively expecting to receive unconditional love and when they don't get it—receiving *conditional* love instead—they are so innocent, so trusting in a true, all-loving, upset-free world that the only conclusion they can come to for not being unconditionally loved is that for some reason *they* haven't deserved it and are therefore a worthless, unlovable, bad person. Children are *so* naive, they are born *so* instinctively unaware of the existence of the upset state of the human condition, that they can't believe it is the adults' fault that they are not being given unconditional love; they are *so trusting* in the world around them, so codependent to it, they can only presume it's their fault. (Psychologists coined the word 'codependent' to describe someone who is **'reliant on another to the extent that independent action is no longer possible'** (*Macquarie Dict*. 3rd edn, 1998). In this case, children are so trusting of, and thus reliant upon, the adult world they are incapable of thinking independently enough to trust that they are not at fault.) This conclusion by children that they are, in effect, bad either hurts them so deeply that they block all the pain of it out of their mind and become a psychologically detached, extremely alienated, crippled person, or they try desperately to prove they aren't worthless and spend the rest of their lives desperately seeking reinforcement.

To reiterate, if a child is not given unconditional love, but instead is intimidated, frozen out and made to prove themselves all the time by 'my way or the highway', arrogant, tyrannical, authoritarian, tough, extremely egocentric, overly embattled parents, then that child will either be psychologically crippled by the situation, or made into a narcissistic power addict who has to succeed at all times and at all costs—where only success can keep at bay the terrifying conclusion that they are somehow unworthy. Power addicts need to win at all costs. They will say anything, do anything, no matter how immoral, to gain power, the upper hand. Powerpaths or psychopaths, as narcissistic power addicts are also known, are described as **'ruthless'**, **'quick to blame others for their mistakes'**, **'manipulative'**, **'belligerent'**, **'bullying'**, **'totally self-centred'**, **'egocentric'**, **'cold'**, **'obsessed with wielding power over others'**, **'deceitful'**, **'self-important'**, and **'lacking any ability to empathise with others'** ('Are you living with a socialised psychopath?', Robert Matthews, published in *Focus* mag., May 1994 and *Sunday Telegraph* Review, April 1997).

Regarding the power addict's inability **'to empathise with others'**, the truth is, they are *so* preoccupied—in fact, utterly *consumed*—by their own pain that instead of empathising with and being considerate of others, they *impose* their condition on the world around them; they intimidate and frighten everyone with their angry, often silent embattled state; to 'have everyone walking on eggshells' is a common description of how they operate. The psychiatrist Frank Lake articulated this problem of adults who were under attack as infants and children treating everyone and every situation they encounter as if they were *still* under attack when he wrote that such an adult **'complains as if it remembered the bad times it had been through. It reacts**

to the world around it as if it were still in the bad place, still having to "feel its keenest woe". It reacts defensively as if the attack were still going on' (*Supplement to Newsletter* No.39—*Clinical Theology Newsletter No*.39, Dec. 1981, p.4).

Basically, the power addict's life is stranded or arrested in the childhood state of needing reinforcement. You can quickly extrapolate just how absolutely desperate the power addict's mind is for reinforcement—how they aren't able to care about anyone or anything other than getting that reinforcement, how every moment of every day their mind can't afford to be anything other than singularly focused on how they can get that power or glory or attention or any other form of validation—if you imagine a child fighting with all their might to avoid the devastating conclusion that they are an unworthy, bad person. When all the evidence from the way a child is being treated seems to unequivocally indicate to that innocent, trusting, naive, ideal-world-expecting child that they are unworthy and bad, the child naturally fights back with all their being to resist that soul-destroying conclusion. If that evidence is overwhelming, however, the child has no choice but to give in and conclude that they are indeed worthless and bad. Then, to cope with that terrifying, absolutely unbearable conclusion, all the child can do is determine never again to allow their mind to connect with that conclusion that they are an unlovable, bad person ever again, and since that core issue of their worthiness is where their true self is preoccupied, avoiding that issue amounts to separating or dissociating or splitting from their true state and thus true self. This is the split, false, psychologically crippled state. If, on the other hand, the evidence that they are an unworthy, bad person is immense but not quite overwhelming the child will be stuck in a lifelong battle fighting with all their might to not surrender to the psychologically crippling conclusion that they are an unworthy, bad person. And that is where power addicts live, stranded in that state of terrible fear that they are unworthy, fighting with all their might to 'stay on their feet' and defy that implication. Necessarily, after two million years of the development of upset in the world, all adults are stranded somewhere on the spectrum of insecurity of self due to lack of reinforcement/love in their upbringing. The actress Mae West famously articulated this situation of arrested development, within males in particular, when she said, **'If you want to understand men just remember that they are still little boys searching for approval.'** The power addict state and, beyond that, the psychologically crippled state are simply the extreme states of the human condition. Again, it has to be emphasised that it is at last safe to admit this because we have now found the redeeming, dignifying understanding of how all the upset in the world started, and how it can be TRANSFORMED and eventually ameliorated. All the upset in the world is now defended; the basis for our insecurity about being upset has gone.

Just one of the many extremely dysfunctional features of the power addict mind is its extraordinary ability to accumulate grievances. The narcissistic, power addict is so unable to accept any criticism, so desperately preoccupied avoiding any implication that they are unworthy, so extremely insecure, that all day, every day, they seek out only reinforcement, only 'wins', such as power, fame and glory. There is no room to accept any criticism and since most situations in life contain a spectrum of positives and negatives, of reinforcements and criticisms, such minds are simply unable to tolerate *any* of the negative, criticising aspects of a situation. In fact, the power addicted mind will find a way to avoid *all* criticism, no matter how much there is or how legitimate, and instead search for and find some fault or flaw in the

situation, imagined or real, that brings reinforcement to them. Their totally defensive mind locks on to these 'grievances' as being all-significant at the exclusion of all other aspects of the situation. Over time, any interaction with a power addict, no matter how fair or generous, will leave them harbouring a mountain of grievances and totally incapable of recognising the unfairness of their view. The desperation of the power addict mind to avoid any threat to their power base is extremely difficult for the more balanced mind to comprehend. I have watched documentaries showing the former US President Franklin D. Roosevelt being overly cordial to the Russian dictator Joseph Stalin in the futile hope that Stalin would be fair minded during their negotiations over the future of Europe at the end of the Second World War. Stalin always presented a benign, open, balanced and fair minded expression on his face when underneath he was, in fact, a furious monster who, out of paranoia, oversaw the murder of millions and millions of his own people—including *all* of his closest friends who he was terrified might challenge his power. Power addicts learnt to disguise their extraordinarily defensive mindset, but their behaviour could often be absolutely, unbelievably selfish.

The child is turned into either a 'I-won't-back-down', 'must-win', power addict, or a psychologically crippled, broken person as an adult.

Drawing by Jeremy Griffith © Fedmex Pty Ltd 2007-2009

I have drawn this picture of the narcissism-producing and psychologically crippling situation to help children understand the world we live in. Since adults own the world there has been very little focus on the wellbeing of children. They can't fight for themselves.

They can't write books. In fact, in their bewilderment children can't even tell adults what they are going through. If children were able to express themselves and be properly heard—for instance, if they were able to vote, if they had some power—the care and concern for their wellbeing would have been much greater than it has been. As the upsetting search for knowledge progressed, however, parents' ability to adequately nurture their children decreased to the point now where we almost have to choose to either stop participating in humanity's upsetting battle in order to have time for children, or continue participating in the battle and not have children—a choice the contraceptive pill has afforded us.

Children need so much love and among less human-condition-embattled races they generally receive it. In Australian Aboriginal society **'All observers agree upon the extraordinary tenderness which parents display towards their children, and indeed, to all children whether of their own family and race or not'** (*Coming into being among the Australian Aborigines*, Ashley Montagu, 1974, p.345 of 426). In the case of the Bushman of the Kalahari, **'Their love of children, both their own and that of other people, is one of the most noticeable things about the Bushman'** (*Tribes of the Kalahari Desert*; Accessed 13 Jun. 2010 at:see <www.wtmsources.com/103>). The **'Bushmen…mother carries her child with her at all times up to four years of age'** (*Population Pressure and Cultural Adjustment*, Virginia Abernethy, 2005, p.34 of 189). **'Children are breast-fed for up to 3½ years, and among the Bushmen lactation suppresses ovulation'** (*Hunter-gatherer economy in prehistory: a European perspective*, G.N. Bailey, 1983, p.114 of 247). **'!Kung** [Bushmen]**…infants hardly ever cry'** (*Cultures without Colic: Breastfeeding & Other Baby Lessons from the !Kung San*, by Dr Harvey Karp, accessed 2 Apr. 2012: see <www.wtmsources.com/117>). This report on the studies of more natural-living and nurturing societies that was made by the American dentist Dr Weston Price provides a good summary of the physical and mental health of the members of such societies: **'For the next ten years** [during the 1930s]**, he** [Dr Price] **travelled to various isolated parts of the earth, where the inhabitants had no contact with "civilisation" in order to study their health and physical development… Price took photograph after photograph of beautiful smiles, and noted that "healthy primitives" were invariably cheerful and optimistic. Such people were characterized by "splendid physical development". The women gave birth with ease. Their babies rarely cried and their children were energetic and hearty. Many others have reported a virtual absence of degenerative disease, particularly cancer, in isolated, so-called "primitive" groups'** (Sally Fallon Morell, 'Nasty, Brutish and Short?', The Western A. Price Foundation; see <www.wtmsources.com/110>).

Unable to explain why we humans have become so embattled, parents in the so-called 'developed world' haven't been able to cope with any criticism of their inability to adequately nurture their children. As the teacher and best-selling author about children, John Marsden, said, **'The biggest crime you can commit in our society is to be a failure as a parent and people would rather admit to being an axe murderer than being a bad father or mother'** ('A Single Mum's Guide to Raising Boys', *Sunday Life* mag. *Sun-Herald*, 7 July 2002). In Part 4:4F the importance of nurturing in human life was described as one of the six unconfrontable truths. But parents' inability to cope with any criticism of their inability to nurture overlooks, indeed disregards, the fact that children also can't cope with not being loved. Parents have had it all their way. The powerlessness of children has made them victims of the adults' powerfulness. The truth is, we live in an anti-child world today where children are irritants—and yet children are the next generation and to have no regard for them is to have no regard for the future. It is akin to trying to build a house while destroying the raw materials the house is to be built from. It is madness—pure

generational selfishness. Denial of the immense importance of nurturing in the maturation of our lives has been part of the abuse that has stemmed from parents having all the power, but now that we have found the dignifying understanding of the human condition the immense importance of nurturing children can at last be admitted and this denial brought to an end.

The drawing above shows a tyrannical father and the effect his behaviour is having on his child. Professor Charles Birch put it extremely succinctly (if somewhat bluntly) when he and I spoke about the destructive effect power addict fathers have on their children, saying, **'Haven't you heard Jeremy, the best thing that can happen in a man's life is that his father dies when he is born'** (WTM records, 12 Nov. 1998). Some fathers claim it is necessary to toughen their children, kill off their inspired, truth-filled, happy, excited, inspired, nothing-is-too-difficult, world-conquering, loving original instinctive self or soul! Alienation is a tragically lost, dark, effectively dead state that the whole human race has been working desperately hard to escape from, *not* stay in. The week after Miranda Devine's article appeared, a cartoon in the same newspaper depicted this appalling point of view with the following exchange between a father and son: **'Son you're a liar, you're a bully, you're greedy, you're manipulative, you're self serving. You'll go far'** (Alan Moir, *Sydney Morning Herald*, 11 Sept. 2009). When speaking on radio in New Zealand once, a listener rang up to say, 'We're having children and my husband says he wants to toughen the kids up because he wants them to be able to meet reality head on.' I tried my best to explain to her that such an approach is wrong—that you have to try to love children, preserve their soul absolutely as long as possible.

The *real* issue in the situation where parents want to toughen up their children is the extent of the upset anger, egocentricity and alienation in the parents, because it is extreme upset in the parents that causes them to project onto their children the need to be a success at all costs. It is *their* need for glory, not the need to turn their children into 'survivors', that is the real motivation. Parents saying they 'want to toughen up their kids so they can face the real world', as though they are doing their children a favour, is the convenient excuse for **'poor parenting'** because all parents do intuitively know how critically important it is that children receive unconditional love if they are to grow into truly creative, functional and successful adults. As will be explained in Part 8:4B, how to nurture children is one of the most ancient instincts in humans.

Devine wrote that **'an "epidemic of poor parenting" is to blame for a drastic rise in psychological problems'**, citing **'a long-term study of…American college students** [that found]**…the incidence of narcissistic personality traits increased on a scale rivalling obesity'**. What happens as upset anger, egocentricity and alienation increases is that eventually a threshold is reached where there is so much anger, egocentricity and alienation in the population that the great majority of children can no longer cope with the extent of the upset they encounter and a dysfunctional generation appears where there is a predominance of individuals who are either narcissistic power addicts or psychologically crippled. It is this threshold, this terminal level of alienation, that Devine has described as having now been reached in the Western world.

The British-American anthropologist Ashley Montagu (1905-1999) was exceptionally brave in his admission of the critical importance of nurturing in a child's well-being and the horrific consequences that lack of unconditional love has. For example, in his profoundly honest paper titled 'A Scientist Looks at Love', he wrote **'love is, without question, the most**

important experience in the life of a human being…The newborn baby…wants love. He behaves as if he expected to be loved, and when his expectation is thwarted, he reacts in a grievously disappointed manner…not only does a baby want to be loved, but also that it wants to love; all its drives are orientated in the direction of receiving and giving love. If it doesn't receive love it is unable to give it—as a child or as an adult. From the moment of birth the baby needs the reciprocal exchange of love with its mother… It has, I believe, been universally acknowledged that the mother-infant relationship perhaps more than any other defines the very essence of love…The infant can suffer no greater loss than deprivation of the mother's love…Criminal, delinquent, neurotic, psychopathic, asocial, and similar forms of unfortunate behavior can, in the majority of cases, be traced to a childhood history of inadequate love…Show me a murderer, a hardened criminal, a juvenile delinquent, a psychopath, or a "cold fish" and in almost every case I will show you the tragedy that has resulted from not being properly loved during childhood… maternal rejection may be seen as the "causative factor in…every individual case of neurosis or behavior problem in children."…Endowed at birth with the need to develop as a loving, harmonic human being, the child learns to love by being loved…children who have not been adequately loved grow up to be persons who find it extremely difficult to understand the meaning of love…they tend to be thoughtless and inconsiderate. They have little emotional depth…they often seek ways of achieving power… Occasionally, when they attain prodigious political power as in the case of such unloved creatures as Hitler, Mussolini, and Stalin, they commit horrendous atrocities and subject humanity to irreparable damage. It is quite evident that the tragedy these men brought to the world was principally due to their incapacity to love…To love one's neighbor as oneself requires first that one must be able to love oneself, and the only way to learn that art is by having been adequately loved during the first six years of one's life. As Freud pointed out, this is the period during which the foundations of the personality are either well and truly laid—or not. If one doesn't love oneself one cannot love others. To make loving order in the world we must first have had loving order made in ourselves…Nothing in the world can be more important or as significant…love is demonstrable, it is sacrificial, it is self-abnegative [self-denying]**. It puts the other always first. It is not a cold or calculated altruism, but a deep complete involvement with another. Love is unconditional…Love is the principal developer of one's capacity for being human, the chief stimulus for the development of social competence, and the only thing on earth that can produce that sense of belongingness and relatedness to the world of humanity which is the best achievement of the healthy human being…In an age in which a great deal of unloving love masquerades as the genuine article, in which there is a massive lack of love behind the show of love, in which millions have literally been unloved to death, it is very necessary to understand what love really means. We have left the study of love to the last, but now that we can begin to understand its importance for humanity, we can see that this is the area in which the men of religion, the educators, the physicians, and the scientists can join hands in the common endeavor of putting man back upon the road of his evolutionary destiny from which he has gone so far astray—the road which leads to health and happiness for all humanity, peace and goodwill unto all the earth'** (*The Phi Delta Kappan*, 1970, Vol.51, No.9, pp.463-467).

Under the duress of the human condition there has basically been three varieties of alienated humans: those who received unconditional love; those who received conditional love (basically non-love) and are still trying to resist the implication that they are unworthy and bad and as a result have become power addicts; and those who received either no love or so much conditional love that they were unable to resist the implication that they are unworthy and bad and as a result have had to dissociate from that terrifying, unbearable

conclusion and, as a result of that, are psychologically crippled. The first category are those that our society has been recognising as 'functional' and the second and third categories are those that have been described as 'dysfunctional'. Another honest description we have had for these three states was, respectively, 'relatively secure', 'very insecure' and 'extremely insecure'. However, with the world reaching end play states of upset, the proportion of the population that is dysfunctionally alienated is becoming near total.

As a result, finding a secure, well-adjusted, functional 'soft handed' manager in a company now is almost unheard of, for they are nearly all power addicts. Once power addicts gain control of a company it is the beginning of the end for that company—it will become dysfunctional because they are tyrannical. It will also become dysfunctional because, as mentioned, power addicts find anything that resembles criticism unbearable, such as criticism of their own ideas or having their mistakes pointed out. They are simply not effective free thinkers, which good business leaders need to be. And nor do they tolerate any perceived threat to their power base—as the adage goes, "A's employ A's and B's employ C's". 'A's' are those who have been nurtured and are relatively secure and therefore not threatened by talented people and eager to employ other 'A's'. Insecure 'B's', on the other hand, will only employ 'C's' because once in power they don't want anybody usurping them. As a result, the company becomes dysfunctional.

As with individuals and companies, the same process can also be applied in the context of entire countries. What happened when the proportion of power addicts in a country increased to a certain critical point was that 'right' could suddenly no longer win out over 'might'—at which point dysfunctional tyrants would take over the government with terrifying consequences for both their country's population and that of neighbouring countries. The rise of Mussolini's totally ruthless, fascist 'Blackshirts' in Italy prior to the Second World War is a case in point. Tyrants like Napoleon, Hitler, Mussolini and Stalin have only been able to take control when the number of power addicts in a population surpassed a critical point where the remaining soundness was no longer able to stand up to their extreme intensity and defy them. Just as children and wives of tyrannical men in family situations were unable to fight back and were crushed, tyrannical dictators could crush entire populations. The reason England has so often in the history of Europe been able to defeat tyrants there (and elsewhere) can be put down to its island isolation, which meant it was still sheltered enough from all the upset in the world, still sound enough, still free enough of power addicts, to stand against those tyrants who had taken over control of countries on the continent where, by inference, the tipping point of too many power addicts in the population had been surpassed. As I said, what has happened in households and companies is exactly the same as what has occurred in countries, just on a smaller scale.

The existence of sufficient strength of character amongst the English to resist tyrants was clearly demonstrated when they threw out one of their own kings for his tyranny. To quote from the 2010 documentary *Empire of the Seas: How the* [British Royal] *Navy Forged the Modern World*: '[King **Charles** II] **died in 1685…He was succeeded by his brother James. Now he'd had a rather successful career as an Admiral in the Royal Navy—could he be the man who could work together with politicians and financiers and businessmen to build a new kind of constitutional monarchy** [to ensure the Royal Navy stayed strong]**? Well, no. And this extraordinary portrait tells us why.**

James has had himself painted in the garb of a Roman Emperor with a haughty stare, his golden tunic, magnificent purple robe flowing off his shoulders, and decked out in jewels at his throat, sword hilt and sandals. And out at sea his Navy, his play thing, the Royal banner flying from the main top mask. This was not how the English wanted their kings to see themselves…This was not a man to protect the legacy of Drake and Hawkins. He would have to go. In July 1688 a figure dressed as a common sailor arrived in Holland. Beneath the disguise was England's premier naval officer, Admiral Arthur Herbert—or rather ex-Admiral. He had resigned weeks earlier refusing to serve under King James. Herbert was carrying an extraordinary letter. It was signed by seven Englishmen, all grandees in the armed forces, church and state, and it was addressed to the Dutch Prince William of Orange, who…was married to James II's daughter, Mary…It was an appeal for William's help against their tyrannical king. This was high treason but Herbert and his fellow conspirators were the desperate men from an exasperated nation, and in William they found their man…[James II] **was replaced as king** [of England] **by William'** (Part 1 of 4 'Heart of Oak', BBC). Contrast this with the inability of the Romans to stop the rise of the tyrant Julius Caesar—to quote from a blog on the internet: **'In 44BC the tribune Gaius Marcellus tried to prevent Julius Caesar overturning the Roman Republic and becoming a tyrant…he failed'** (Accessed 27 Jan. 2011: see <www.wtmsources.com/124>).

In an essay titled *The English Record*, Sir James Darling—my headmaster at Geelong Grammar School and an exceptionally profound, honest, prophetic thinker—wrote about the relatively sound character of the English: **'The truth seems to be this, that there is a genius of the English character which shows itself in its institutions, in its practical inventiveness, and under stimulus in its fighting quality. There is a stubborn determination to live its own life, and to brook no interference from a foreign power, which has put England five times in history into the position of protagonist against a European power which threatened to dominate the world; but this same determination has been coupled with a recognition that others also have a right to self-government and that the function of Empire is to educate rather than to oppress.'** Sir James even went on to say that England has **'an unbeaten record in the history of civilization'** (*The Education of a Civilized Man*, 1962, pp.134, 136 of 223). Another of the soundest, most innocent, most denial-free, prophetic people in recorded history, Sir Laurens van der Post (who was a South African of Dutch origin), similarly concluded that **'There is not another people in the history of the world which has been less corrupted by great power than the British, in spite of the poor view they themselves take of their own imperial past. They possess a capacity for self-criticism unequalled in any other nation, and a sense of decency so imaginative and searching that less scrupulous opponents in the modern world have frequently used it as a weapon against them'** (*The Heart of the Hunter*, 1961, p.116 of 233). An article in *TIME* magazine recorded that **'A quarter of the world's population speak English…English is increasingly becoming entrenched as the language of choice for business, science and popular culture. Three-quarters of the world's mail, for example, is currently written in English'** (7 July 1997). Amongst Anglo-Saxons and Celts there remains some functionality in the world but, as Miranda Devine acknowledged, this is fast disappearing.

Again, the all-important fundamental truth that understanding of the human condition reveals is that upset is a *heroic* not bad, evil, unworthy state. While all humans are differently upset as a result of their different encounters with humanity's heroic battle to overthrow ignorance, all humans are equally good and worthwhile. Understanding the cause of the upset state of the human condition eliminates the possibility of the prejudicial views of some people, genders, generations, races, countries or civilisations being good and

therefore superior and others being bad, evil, ungodly and therefore inferior and unworthy. Now that we have understanding of the great and necessary battle that humanity has been waging, the whole concept of 'good' and 'evil', of superior and inferior disappears from our conceptualisation of ourselves. The longer and or more intensely a person or a gender or a generation or a race or a country has been engaged in humanity's great battle to overthrow ignorance the more upset and embattled they unavoidably will have become. It is a simple truth. Innocence was not going to survive very long in the red light district of Kings Cross in Sydney, but it would last a long time in a happy family, sheltered somewhere in the remote countryside, removed from all the upset in the world. All humans can now talk freely about all the different states of upset or lack thereof without there being any implication of either superiority or inferiority, and we *need* to talk about those different states now to make sense of the world we have been living in. Upset is the essential feature of our current human condition, and degrees of upset is an essential feature of that upset condition. Again, as R.D. Laing said **'Our alienation goes to the roots. The realization of this is the essential springboard for any serious reflection on any aspect of present inter-human life'**. Shortly in Part 7:4 I describe the differences in upset between races—and even more description and explanation of the differences between races can be read in my book *A Species In Denial* in the section titled 'The denial-free history of the human race' at <www.humancondition.com/asid-the-denial-free-history-of-the-human-race>. Also, the overall increase in upset of the human race as a whole was described in Part 3:11.

Of course, the same process of a threshold of dysfunctionality eventually being reached in individuals, families, genders, generations, companies, races and countries can also be applied to whole civilisations. When history books talk of great civilisations, such as the Greek and Roman Empires, and many others, becoming decadent, the main feature of that decadence was the dysfunctionality that resulted from having a majority of overly egocentric, insecure power addicts: there was simply not enough sound, functional soulful generosity, fairness, honesty, sensitivity, humility and equanimity left in the system for it to remain operational. Once everyone wanted glory at all costs and there was no interest in truth or fairness—basically no interest in others—the system simply collapsed.

As I mentioned, it is this threshold of power-addict-produced, decadent, dysfunctionality that has now been reached in Western civilisation, having, as our history books describe, already been reached in older civilisations around the world. Recall the title of Miranda Devine's article: **'Face it, we are all narcissists now.'** And since communication technology has shrunk the world in the sense of making it one civilisation, the whole world has, in essence, reached the end play state of terminal alienation. This breakthrough understanding of the human condition and the TRANSFORMATION of the human race it makes possible has arrived without a moment to spare.

With regard to the power addict state, it should be emphasised that it is really only the extreme, end play result of the human condition, of humans trying to prove that they are good and not bad. Of course any lack of reinforcement—and it has to be remembered that humans' original instinctive expectations are of receiving *complete* reinforcement during their infancy and childhood—can cripple or egocentrically embattle a person. For example, children who are exposed to extreme ill-treatment, such as sexual abuse, can also become

horrifically psychologically crippled—but one of the biggest crippling influences on children is the oppression from egocentricity, especially the extreme egocentricity of males. The other biggest psychologically crippling influence in society, which will now be talked about, is the effect of the inability of neurotic mothers to love their infants. Again, this is only another result of the end play state of terminal levels of alienation in the world. The upset state of the human condition in both fathers and mothers has had devastating psychological effects on children—mothers during their infancy and fathers during their childhood.

Before looking at how the upset state of the human condition in mothers has affected each new generation, I would like to include another cartoon I have drawn in defence of children, because, as I have said, parents have had it all their own way. They have been protected by society's avoidance of any criticism of their inability to nurture their children, but that system effectively denied children any recognition of the pain that *they* were having to endure as a result. It has been a one-way street in terms of empathy and sympathy. Basically children have been sacrificed to the power of adults. So this cartoon is an attempt to right the balance. Since we give accolades to adults who exhibit great courage, but never to children for the absolutely extraordinary courage they so often have had to exhibit, I have drawn the Queen of England knighting a child 'for exhibiting phenomenal courage'.

Drawing by Jeremy Griffith © 2011 Fedmex Pty Ltd

Apparently I have spelt 'arise' incorrectly, but anyway I got pretty close, and a spare 'r' might come in handy. There should be two r's in it anyway—ar-rise! Spelling hasn't got anything to do with anything anyway. I mean, how did I manage to spell 'phenomenal'—especially the 'p', where did they get that from! Spelling is almost as irrelevant as a warthog is to a good night's sleep or something, I mean it has no relevance at all. In the world where

I live no one is interested in spelling at all because it is so irrelevant when there are questions like 'Why are humans so superficial and artificial and dishonest and brutal and hateful, etc, etc?' to be thought about and answered. Getting 'phenomenal' right should result in a national holiday! I don't know why such a fuss was made over spelling at school, it just terrorised me never being able to spell, so this is another thing I'm squaring the ledger on for children! And don't start me on grammar ('i' before 'e' except after breakfast) or mathematics (Pie are squared and all that)—or chemistry ('put this with that and it goes boom') which also absolutely terrorised me—I'm 65 as I write this and I honestly still regularly have nightmares about exams. In the case of chemistry and mathematics, they were such difficult subjects for my mind to think about and focus on that I had to keep taking first year chemistry and mathematics at university for three years before I finally managed to gain the compulsory pass needed in those subjects for a biology degree—and those passes were only achieved with additional tutoring. I remember once becoming so distressed in a mathematics class in school (because I couldn't understand for the life of me why I was being asked to understand and remember all these seemingly endless weird and, to me, totally irrelevant equations and formulas) that I stood up and demanded to know from the teacher 'Why are we learning mathematics?' Well, the teacher looked at me like I was a fool and angrily berated me for disrupting the class! I should say that incident happened at a public high school that I attended for one year in 1959 when I was 14 years old so my mother could organise special tuition for me at home on our sheep station because I was having so much trouble with my studies at Tudor House—while my school report cards said I had **'a tremendous zest for life'**, I was forever coming second last in the class! Tudor House is an absolutely wonderful private boarding school for boys near Sydney that I attended for four years from 1955 to 1958. It wasn't Tudor House's fault that I was having difficulties with my studies, rather the denial-based, mechanistic education system that has dominated the education system everywhere on Earth, because Tudor House was probably one of the least mechanistic schools in the whole world—which is why my parents made great sacrifices to enable myself and my three brothers to go there because we weren't wealthy and the fees at the two very special private schools that the four of us attended, namely Tudor House for our junior schooling and Geelong Grammar School for our senior schooling, were significant. The extraordinary soul-rather-than-intellect-emphasising, Platonic education system that Sir James Darling established at Geelong Grammar School (which I attended for four years from 1960 to 1963) has already been talked about here in *Freedom Expanded: Book 1*, but just to give the reader some appreciation of how soul-rather-than-intellect emphasising a school Tudor House was and still is, a front page article in *The Sydney Morning Herald* newspaper only a few days ago featured a large photo of a couple of Tudor House schoolboys on their scooters, and the accompanying text: **'John Stewart, the headmaster of Tudor House, a private boys' school at Moss Vale, is adding an extra recess to the day with classroom doors locked…**[He said] **"For boys to be sitting in a classroom, contained behind a desk for hours on end, just skilling and drilling that can help you improve in a test score, is not only archaic, it is cruel. We felt boys needed more time to play and that social and emotional learning is just as important as reading and writing skills." Children at the kindergarten to year 6 school are encouraged to ride bikes, skateboards, fly kites, build bases and climb trees during recess and lunchtime. Electronic games, computers and mobile phones are banned'** (21 Oct. 2011). Schooling is **'cruel'**, **'extra recess'**,

'classroom doors locked', 'encouraged to' 'climb trees', 'computers and mobile phones are banned'—how absolutely incredibly enlightened! God knows the debt I (and now the world) owe my parents. It is more than I can bear to think about—my heart just splits, it just disintegrates into little pieces if I try to think about my parents. To be as innocent as I was in the world was torturous and if it wasn't for the sensitivity towards soul shown by my parents in the first instance and then Tudor House and Geelong Grammar, that innocence could never have survived to go on and stand up to all the false denial in the world and finally overcome it and reach all the way to the liberating full truth about humans. It has been an amazing journey of absolutely extraordinarily good fortune.

Part 6:5 Autism and Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD)

(Note, the codependency of children to the silent, resigned adult world and its affects that were just described in Part 6:4, and the causes and nature of autism and ADHD that are about to be described here, are also described later in Part 8:10 in the presentation on how the nurturing of our infants will now become one of the most important activities of a post-human-condition world. The purpose of the description and analysis of autism and ADHD that is about to be presented here is to evidence how the human race is now approaching terminal levels of alienation. While these two descriptions of autism and ADHD, and also of the codependency of children, do contain similar material, there are significant differences, which means the fullest analysis of autism, ADHD and of the codependency of children will be gained from reading *both* these presentations.)

The epidemic incidence of Autism and Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD), for which the drug Ritalin is being mass prescribed, is a product of children becoming increasingly unable to cope with the extreme levels of upset anger, egocentricity and alienation in the world. While a few cases of autism are caused by physical damage to the brain, most are the result of extreme instances of infants not receiving the love, in particular from their mother, that their instincts expect, and, as a result, the infant has had to dissociate psychologically from its reality to cope with the violation and hurt to its instinctive self or soul. Able to safely admit now that our species' original instinctive orientation was to living in

a harmonious, happy, loving, non-alienated, non-egocentric, non-angry state, and that children come into the world expecting to encounter such a state, we can understand the incredible shock it must be for them to encounter the extreme upset that now exists. Many children can't psychologically bridge the gap and have to adopt all manner of block-out of, and compulsive and obsessive distraction from, the mental anguish to cope, which is why we are seeing epidemic rates of ADHD and autism.

In his 1996 posthumously published book *Thinking About Children*, the former president of the British Psychoanalytical Society, psychiatrist D.W. Winnicott (1896-1971), who is described on the book's cover as being **'increasingly recognized as one of the giants of psychoanalysis'**, gave the following honest description of the cause of autism. Winnicott wrote that in **'a proportion of cases where autism is eventually diagnosed, there has been injury or some degenerative process affecting the child's brain…**[however] **in the majority of cases…the illness is a disturbance of emotional development…autism is not a disease. It might be asked, what did I call these cases before the word autism turned up. The answer is…"infant or childhood schizophrenia"** [Note, the etymology of the word 'schizophrenia' is *schiz* meaning **'split'** or **'broken'**, and *phrenos* meaning **'soul or heart']'** (p.200 of 343). **'There are certain difficulties that arise when primitive things are being experienced by the baby that depend not only on inherited personal tendencies but also on what happens to be provided by the mother. Here failure spells disaster of a particular kind for the baby. At the beginning the baby needs the mother's full attention, and usually gets precisely this; and in this period the basis for mental health is laid down** [p.212]**…the essential feature** [in a baby's development] **is the mother's capacity to adapt to the infant's needs through her healthy ability to identify with the baby. With such a capacity she can, for instance, hold her baby, and without it she cannot hold her baby except in a way that disturbs the baby's personal living process…It seems necessary to add to this the concept of the mother's unconscious (repressed) hate of the child** [p.222]**…it is the quality of early care that counts. It is this aspect of the environmental provision that rates highest in a general review of the disorders of the development of the child, of which autism is one'** (p.212)**. 'Autism is a highly sophisticated defence organization. What we see is *invulnerability*…The child** [develops]**…a complex mental structure insuring against recurrence of…unthinkable anxiety** [that results from the mother's failure to provide her **full attention]'** (pp.220, 221).

The following is a typical case history of an autistic child from one of the many documented by Winnicott: **'When I first saw Ronald at the age of 8, he had very exceptional skill in drawing…Apart from drawing he was, however, a typical autistic child…I will look and see how things** [Ronald's behaviour] **developed. The mother herself was an artist, and she found being a mother exasperating from one point of view in that although she was fond of her children and her marriage was a happy one, she could never completely lose herself in her studio in the way that she must do in order to achieve results as an artist. This was what this boy had to compete with when he was born. He competed successfully but at some cost…At two months the mother remembers smacking the baby in exasperation although not conscious of hating him. From the start he was slow in development…His slowness made him fail to awaken the mother's interest in him, which in any case was a difficult task because of her unwillingness to be diverted from her main concern which is painting'** (pp.201, 202).

As will be explained in Part 8:4, it was 'nurture' not 'nature' (our genetics) that had by far the greatest influence on our own upbringing and make-up, and on the maturation of our species. Children come into the world expecting to be unconditionally loved. As has been

explained before, and as will be fully explained in Part 8:4, unconditional love is what laid the foundations for our species' moral conscience and sense of wellbeing. As a result of this heritage, and because it is fundamentally meaningful regardless, unconditional love is also what lays the foundations for our individual sense of what is right, true and worthwhile, and gives us our sense of relevance, meaning and overall wellbeing.

The problem with this truth of the importance of nurturing unconditional love in the development of our species and in the development of our own lives is that it confronts parents, mothers especially, with their inability to nurture their children as much as their children's instincts expect. The truth of children's deeply sensitive expectation of encountering an all-loving world, and of the immense importance of nurturing children with unconditional love, are terrifying truths for two-million-year-embattled, extremely upset parents of today to have to face. As John Marsden was quoted earlier as saying, **'The biggest crime you can commit in our society is to be a failure as a parent and people would rather admit to being an axe murderer than being a bad father or mother.'** Far better are the 'blame-all-our-ailments-on-genetics-or-disease-or-immunisation' excuses that are flooding the scientific literature today. The child psychologist Oliver James acknowledged that **'Our first six years play a critical role in shaping who we are as adults'**, and then said **'One of our greatest problems is our reluctance to accept a relatively truthful account of ourselves and our childhoods, as the polemicist and psychoanalyst Alice Miller pointed out'**, adding that **'believing in genes** [as the cause of psychoses] **removes any possibility of "blame" falling on parents'** (*They F*** You Up: How to Survive Family Life*, 2002, p.7,9,13 of 370). The American writer Andrew Solomon acknowledged in *The Noonday Demon*, his 2001 book about severe depression, **'Being told you are sick is infinitely more cheering than being told you are worthless.'** How could a mother with an autistic child possibly have been expected to cope with accepting her cold, alienated state caused the autism? How much more bearable was it to blame autism on chemicals in our industrial world, childhood immunisation programs, a genetic predisposition or some contracted disease? Winnicott's truthful account of the cause of autism was a rare and brave admission—and he knew it, cautioning himself and others to **'expect resistance to the idea of an aetiology** [cause] **that points to the innate processes of the emotional development of the individual in the given environment. In other words, there will be those who prefer to find a physical, genetic, biochemical, or endocrine cause, both for autism and for schizophrenia'** (*Thinking About Children*, 1996, p.219 of 343).

It is only now with the ability to understand that there has been a *good* reason why nurturing has been so compromised that the truth of the importance of nurturing becomes at all bearable, but even with that understanding the truth of the importance of nurturing is one of those truths that people won't be able to fully confront for a few generations. The fact is that since the upset battle of the human condition emerged *no* child has been able to be given the amount of love that all children received before the battle imposed itself. While nurturing created an integrated humanity—gave our species its instinctive orientation to behaving unconditionally selflessly—the subsequent emergence of consciousness compelled humanity to enter into a great battle against our instinctive self or soul's ignorance of our conscious self's need to understand the world. That necessary consciousness-centred, 'ego-centric', male-led battle unavoidably intruded upon and compromised women's ability to fully nurture their offspring.

In another rare admission of the importance of nurturing and the effects of mothers' failure to provide it, the great South African author Olive Schreiner (1855-1920) wrote: **'They say women have one great and noble work left them, and they do it ill…*We* bear the world, and *we* make it. The souls of little children are marvellously delicate and tender things, and keep for ever the shadow that first falls on them, and that is the mother's or at best a woman's. There was never a great man who had not a great mother—it is hardly an exaggeration. The first six years of our life make us; all that is added later is veneer…The mightiest and noblest of human work is given to us, and we do it ill'** (*The Story of an African Farm*, 1883, p.193 of 300). The human race is naturally extremely embattled after two million years of its heroic search for knowledge. This means that virtually no mother now can hope to love her infants as much as their instincts expect to be loved. For their part, virtually no father now can hope to restrain their extreme egocentricity to the degree necessary to avoid oppressing their children somewhat—the effect of which, as Miranda Devine conceded, is that **'we are all narcissists now'**. Thankfully, however, we can now explain why nurturing has been so compromised, why mothers **'do it ill'**. Since virtually all humans now are so upset that virtually no one can hope to love their children as much as their children's instincts expect, parents do have to be realistic. If there is too great an expectation on parents no one will be prepared to have children, which is obviously not the answer. However, with understanding of the human condition and the subsequent ability to admit how delicate our soul is, parenting will, and must, take on a whole new meaning and responsibility.

One of the people I have drawn looking down into the Abyss of Depression (see Part 6:1), holding their head in horror, could be a mother with an autistic child trying to face the truth that lack of love is the main reason for autism—or it could be any human for that matter, trying to confront the extent of their human-condition-afflicted, alienated imperfections. The situation of the mother of an autistic child provides just one stark example of how immense the Abyss of Depression depicted in the *Humanity's Situation* drawing really is that is blocking humanity's path to the truthful, sunlit, TRANSFORMED, human-condition-FREE new world—and therefore how immensely precious and thus important the new Sunshine Highway, TRANSFORMED LIFEFORCE WAY OF LIVING is where we support the truth while avoiding overly confronting it.

Part 6:6 Our libraries are all going to become museums but the same 'let's get out of here' solution applies

There are *so* many unconfrontable truths for humans who weren't able to grow up with the reconciling understanding of the human condition and who are therefore deeply attached to their almost infinite number of denials that they have been using to cope, but thankfully this doesn't mean they can't take up support of the denial-free new world. The examples *are* endless of the shock of exposure day or so-called 'judgment day', but thank goodness there is a way to cope without retreating to denying the truthful paradigm that the human race is now dependent upon if it is to continue—the Sunshine Highway, TRANSFORMED LIFEFORCE WAY OF LIVING. We mustn't, and thankfully don't have to, let our alienation prevent the emergence of a human-condition-free world for all future humans to live in.

With understanding of the human condition, and the ability to be truthful that it makes possible, all the books on psychology are going to have to be re-written. What particularly changes everything in psychology is the truth about the cooperatively-orientated, all-loving instinctive expectations we humans are born with, and therefore how easily children in their trusting naivety blamed themselves for any shortfall in love, and therefore how devastatingly hurtful such conclusions that they are a bad, unworthy person were for children, and therefore how much children had to block out any thinking about that terrible conclusion, and therefore how alienated they became from their true self, and therefore how that lack of access to their true self compromised their ability to nurture the next generation with real love when they in turn became parents. It is our all-loving and thus all-trusting soul that has not been acknowledged in psychology—in fact, it has not been acknowledged in thinking across all aspects of human life.

Indeed, there are so many truths that can and now must be revealed that nearly all academic books will have to be re-written—which is yet another unbearably confronting truth to have to face. Science, for instance, as it has been practiced, will be faced with changing from complying with the practice of denial to having to be honest, which will mean its whole evasive, intellectualism-emphasising-instinctualism-denying structure, including its traditional universities and academic departments and millions of denial-drenched research papers (as has been described and evidenced, the human condition is such that humans have been incapable of being objective), will be faced with obsolescence.

A stark indication of the immense change that comes with the arrival of understanding of the human condition is that with the exception of just a handful of titles (the main ones being the great religious texts), virtually all the world's books have been deeply denial-compliant in their content and will therefore be largely obsoleted by the new denial-free paradigm.

So, all our libraries will become museums—indeed, if it wasn't for the new TRANSFORMED LIFEFORCE STATE that allows everyone to fully participate in the human-condition-understood new world, the whole, current, denial-saturated human race itself would be a museum piece.

While *phenomenal* change occurs with the ending of the denial-based existence, this change can be managed. People are afraid of change almost as much as they are afraid of self-confrontation, but the same, let's-get-out-of-here solution applies. Let's take the Sunshine Highway to the TRANSFORMED LIFEFORCE STATE and end this effectively dead existence we humans have been enduring for so long. We can procrastinate and try to stay in the old, essentially dead, hell-on-earth world, or we can join the new all-exciting world that will be opening up right across the planet. There is now so much to do in support of the liberated existence that the range of new opportunities, needs, positions, industries, services, etc, etc, will be endless—and the best part of it all is the new world for humans will be filled with immense excitement, happiness and fellowship. With understanding of the human condition found there is no longer *any* justification for staying in the old, effectively dead world. Before long *everyone* will be going to work for the fabulously exciting human-condition-understood new world.

The rapid increase of power addict dysfunctionality in society and the epidemic of autism and ADHD provide powerful examples of the end play, terminal levels of alienation situation that humanity was fast arriving at. The rate of increase of alienation is exponential and we had reached that part of the curve where it was rising at a vertical rate. Thankfully, the threat of terminal alienation can now be averted through understanding of the human condition and the adoption of the TRANSFORMED LIFEFORCE STATE that it makes possible. As Richard Neville said, it was **'a race between self destruction and self discovery'**.

What I am going to say now is no exaggeration: we humans are currently living in a place of such pain and deathly alienation it is equivalent to living in a cesspit of excrement—it's dark, it stinks, it's revolting, it's awful—but now there is a ladder up out of it through the man-hole at the top to complete FREEDOM, sunshine and amazing beauty everywhere. All we have to do is climb up and out of the cesspit forever. There is nothing stopping every human now from escaping the horror of the human condition except their habituation to living in the excrement of it all. Our FREEDOM comes as such a shock we don't quite know how to take it initially, but the truth is there is absolutely nothing that justifies *not* taking it.

In Part 7 we will see further descriptions of just how upset the human race now is and therefore just how precious the Sunshine Highway TRANSFORMED LIFEFORCE solution is.

Part 7
How Upset the Human Race Became

Part 7:1 <u>The battle of the sexes</u>

As explained in Part 3:11, the upset state of the human condition became fully developed some two million years ago with the emergence of the large-brained genus *Homo*, which of course includes us modern humans. Knowing this—that we have lived with the injustice of the human condition for such an immense amount of time—gives us some insight into just how upset we humans must have become. Importantly, while we *have had* to live in denial of our extremely upset state because we couldn't explain and defend it, now that we can understand ourselves the truth about the extent of our extremely upset state can at last be acknowledged—and, in fact, *needs* to be acknowledged in order to truly appreciate the opportunity everyone now has to leave their horrifically upset, human-condition-victimised existence behind and adopt the liberated TRANSFORMED WAY OF LIVING.

We can begin this truthful analysis and appreciation of what two million years of living without the ability to explain ourselves has done to us by looking at what happened to, and between, men and women under the duress of the human condition.

Drawing by Jeremy Griffith © 1991 Fedmex Pty Ltd

If we return to the Adam Stork analogy, we can imagine that when Adam and Eve Stork became fully conscious and began their corrupting search for knowledge that they would have sat down together on a log and had a very serious discussion about this terrible new development, at which point Adam would have said to Eve, 'Look, this search for knowledge is going to be so corrupting that it doesn't make sense for both of us to take on that role, especially since you need to retain all the innocence and soundness you can to effectively nurture the next generation.' It makes complete sense that a role differentiation would have been established, where men would have taken up the immensely upsetting job of championing the conscious thinking self or ego over the ignorance of our original instinctive self, while women preserved as much innocence as they could to maintain their role of nurturing the next generation.

As such, our ancestors' social structure underwent a seismic change—for from nine million years ago to two million years ago the priority amongst our human ancestors was that of nurturing and since females conceived, carried, gave birth to and suckled the young it was a role that naturally fell to them. And so throughout that period of time we were a soul-centric, female-led or matriarchal society. But once that priority shifted to championing the conscious thinking self or ego over the ignorance of our instinctive self—a responsibility that naturally fell to men—humanity changed to being an ego-centric, male-role-led, patriarchal society. This was because prior to two million years ago, the role of males was that of group protector. Male gorillas, for instance, are massive in size in order to best protect the group from predatory threats such as leopards. Later in Part 8:4G, we will see how in Dian Fossey's study of mountain gorillas she describes the gorilla Uncle Bert as a **'protective group leader'**. And so, since the threat of ignorance from our instinctive self—our instinctive self's *resistance* to searching for knowledge—posed a threat to the group, namely humanity, and the role of protecting the group fell to males, men had to take it on.

In Part 8:4 we will see how the bonobos are in the process of developing, through nurturing, the fully cooperative integrative state. Bonobos are the most gentle, cooperative and intelligent of all the apes and have achieved that state through nurturing and through cultivating a female-centric, or female-dominant, society—having fostered females who have exceptional strength of character in order to rein in the aggressive competition amongst males for mating opportunities. As a result of these developments bonobos are now on the threshold of where humans once lived, which is in the utterly integrative, unconditionally selfless, 'Garden of Eden'-like state; they are a living example of how we developed our fully cooperative, moral instincts.

But to return to the analogy of Adam and Eve Stork and their encounter with the onset of consciousness. It was suggested that, in keeping with their already established roles, it made sense for Adam to take on the loathsomely upsetting job of championing the ego over the ignorance of our original instinctive self while Eve maintained her role of nurturing a new generation, a task that required the preservation of her innocence. When giving presentations about the emergence of this role differentiation using the analogy of Adam and Eve Stork, at this point in the story I usually go out to an adjoining room where I bang on the wall and

scream and shout—basically I imitate Adam becoming extremely upset from undertaking the job he's been sent out to do. When Adam returns to Eve, I then emulate her reaction, which is, 'You've turned into a monster Adam, I don't want anything more to do with you!' So while Eve agreed that Adam should take up the role of fighting ignorance, in not participating in that terrible battle she is somewhat naive or unaware of the ramifications of fighting that battle. She is, in effect, unsympathetic to the battle, which places Adam in the awful predicament of feeling misunderstood and unjustly condemned by Eve.

Men have had a horrible job: they have had to be strong enough, in effect, to kill soul! They have had to be strong enough to 'fly off course' in search of knowledge and defy our beautiful, cooperatively orientated, original instinctive self or soul! In the Adam Stork drawing, you can see the other wide-eyed innocent stork screaming at him, 'You're bad Adam, you're flying off course, come back here where you should be!' But Adam has to defy this censure without being able to explain why, without being able to explain his actions. However, as emphasised in Part 3:4, for us humans the situation was vastly more diabolical than this because *our* instinctive orientation wasn't to a flight path but to behaving in an utterly cooperatively, loving, unconditionally selfless, integratively-orientated, 'Godly' way, so when *we* 'flew off course' and became angry, egocentric and alienated—all divisive traits—we were, in effect, in violation of 'God'! So from an initial state of upset, men had then to contend with a sense of guilt, which very greatly compounded their insecurity and frustrations and made them even more angry, egocentric and alienated. How tough were men going to have to be to continue to do their job without receiving any respect or appreciation for why they were having to do what they were having to do, not from within themselves, from their own instinctive self or soul, or anyone else! No wonder men have become so incredibly upset.

But what could men do? They couldn't explain themselves to women because they couldn't explain the human condition—they weren't able to defend their corrupted state. Adam Stork couldn't explain why he had become so upset, so egocentric, etc. So what men, in their desperation, did is they turned on women and attacked their innocence—a development I will come to in a moment because I first need to explain that women were not the *original* victims of men's upset. As mentioned in Part 3:11C, *that* tragic distinction went to animals because their innocence—the innocence of all of nature in fact—*also* criticised men. Remember, nature was a friend of our original instinctive self or soul because we grew up with nature—humanity spent all its infancy and childhood alongside nature in the 'Garden of Eden' that was Africa—so by association the natural world also criticised us. Hunting animals was not about food—that was our species' first great contrived excuse for our divisive behaviour—it was about getting even with innocence for its unjust condemnation of men. As mentioned in Part 3:11C, research shows that 80 percent of the food of existing hunter-foragers is supplied by the women's foraging, so what were the men doing hunting all day? They were getting even with innocence. Hunting—human domination over animals—was the first expression of the conscious thinking self or ego's determination to prove that it was good and not bad.

Telling the Hunt

These photographs were included in Part 3:11C, however, I have also included them here because they epitomise what is being explained about the different situations of men and women. *Telling the Hunt* shows male Bushmen of the Kalahari attentively hearing about—and presumably sharing in—the success of the hunt. We can imagine the hunter recounting how he relentlessly pursued his prey, methodically stalking and finally vanquishing it, to the cheers of his audience. With their backs turned to nature, you can sense the oppression men feel from the world at large. And so in a world that condemns them they sought fellowship and support in each other's company.

Women with infants digging roots

While the men are thus preoccupied satisfying their egos, we find the women in this second photograph having to gather the food and nurture the children; again, as the female narrator in the soundtrack of the 1986 African musical *Ipi Tombi* complained, **'The women had to do all the work because the men were so busy being big, strong and brave.'**

What makes these images such good illustrations is that they are of the relatively innocent race, the Bushmen of the Kalahari. While aboriginal races are necessarily more innocent than those that have advanced further along the soul's exhaustion curve, they are still members of the highly embattled, sophisticated-in-the-art-of-denial, soul-devastated, alienated, pseudo idealistic, *Homo sapiens sapiens*, as these pictures confirm. The basic adaptations humans made to the human condition are clearly well established in the Bushmen—these could as easily be photos of businessmen discussing a company takeover and women shopping.

But to return to the division unfolding between men and women, as illustrated by Adam and Eve Stork. 'Adam' has returned from doing his job in a state of extreme upset that 'Eve' is not sympathetic towards. Although she agreed that he should 'take up the sword' of searching for knowledge because she can't appreciate that job and its corrupting ramifications she is critical of his extremely egocentric, upset state. But what could Adam do? He couldn't explain himself but nor could he just stand there and take the criticism—he had to do *something* to defend himself. But because Adam needed Eve to reproduce the species he couldn't kill her the way he destroyed animals over their unjust condemnation, so instead he/men violated her/women's innocence or 'honour' through rape. Men perverted 'sex', as in 'fucking' or destroying, making it discrete from the act of procreation. What was being fucked, violated, destroyed, ruined, degraded or sullied was women's innocence. Through these means women's innocence was oppressed and they too came to share men's upset. Interestingly, in Christianity Christ's mother is described as a **'virgin'** (Matt. 1:23, Luke 1:27, 34), which we can now understand is a perfect metaphor for a mother who, as was explained in Part 5:1, is sufficiently innocent to nurture an innocent offspring such as Jesus. The renowned English writer D.H. Lawrence recognised the essential innocence of the 'Virgin' Mary when, in reference to her, he wrote, **'Oh, oh, all the women in the world are dead, oh there's just one'** (mentioned in *Lawrence Durrell: Conversations*, Lawrence Durrell & Earl Ingersoll, 1998, p.178 of 261).

To reiterate, men's burden was that they had to suffer self-corruption, they had to **'march into hell for a heavenly cause'**, as the words from *The Man of La Mancha* state—a state of corruption that was compounded by the criticism inherent in women's innocence and naivety. To subdue this criticism, men violated women's innocence through sex. While among humans sex was originally purely a means of procreation (in the case of some species, such as bonobos, it is a means of pacification), it became 'perverted', used as a way to attack innocence, particularly women's innocence. On this level, sex became rape. The feminist Andrea Dworkin recognised this underlying truth in her 1987 book *Intercourse*, when she wrote that **'All sex is abuse.'**

In time, however, the image of innocence in women, their physical beauty that 'attracted' sex, also became a means of inspiring men on humanity's journey to self-understanding. This aspect means that while, at base, sex was rape, on a nobler level it became an inspirational act of love, an act of faith in and affection for men. A sublime partnership between men and women did develop, for when all the world disowned men for

their unavoidable divisiveness, women, in effect, stayed with them, bringing them the only warmth, comfort and support they would know. As it says in Genesis, **'The Lord God said, "It is not good for the man to be alone. I will make a helper suitable for him"…Then the Lord God made a woman…and he brought her to the man'** (2:18,22).

The German supermodel Claudia Schiffer,
Australian *Elle* magazine Aug. 1992

We can see now how women's innocence fell victim to men's upset. Throughout the battle to find understanding women were forced to suffer the destruction of their soul, their innocence, yet all the while their trappings of innocence were being cultivated. As will be explained in Part 8:4D, originally—during humanity's long 10-million-year nurturing Infancy and Childhood stage—cute, neotenous, childlike features (domed forehead, snub nose, large eyes and hairless skin) were considered 'beautiful', and were favoured because they were the hallmarks of innocence and indicative of a potentially integrative individual; as Charles Darwin realised, sexual or mate selection played an important part in our species' development. But when, during humanity's recent two-million-year upset Adolescence, ignorant innocence became a threat, men sought out such 'beauty', such indicators of innocence, for sexual destruction. We've evasively described such cute, neotenous looks as 'attractive' but avoided admitting that what was being attracted was the destruction, through sex, of women's innocence. So while all other forms of innocence were being destroyed, this *image* of innocence—'the beauty of women'—was the only form that was actually cultivated during humanity's upset adolescence. What this means is that the image of innocence (the cute, neotenous, childlike domed forehead, snub nose, large eyes and hairless skin) was being

selected for throughout humanity's ape Infancy, Australopithecine Childhood and *Homo* Adolescence, even though the reason for the selection changed between Childhood and Adolescence. If we look at the skulls of our ancestors again, pictured in Part 3:11, we can see there is an increase in the neotenous traits of a domed forehead, snub nose and large eyes from the time of our ape ancestors right through to the present.

So during humanity's upset Adolescence women's beauty became men's only equivalent for, and measure of, the beauty of their lost pure world. The following quotes reveal just how inspiring women's image of innocence became for men: **'we lose our soul, of which woman is the immemorial image'** (Laurens van der Post, *The Heart of the Hunter*, 1961, p.134 of 233); **'I believe hers to have been the kind of beauty in which the future of a whole continent sings, exhorting its children to renounce what is out of accord with the grand design of life'** (ibid. p.86); **'Woman stands before him** [man] **as the lure and symbol of the world'** (Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, *Let Me Explain*, 1966; trs René Hague & others, 1970, p.67 of 189); **'Women are all we** [men] **know of paradise on earth'** (Albert Camus, *The Fall*, 1956, p.73 of 108); **'Beauty will save the world'** (Fyodor Dostoevsky, *The Idiot*, 1868, pt.3, ch.5); **'You give me a reason to live'** (Joe Cocker's 1986 song *You Can Leave Your Hat On*); **'I, I who have nothing / I, I who have no one / Adore you and want you so'** (Jerry Leiber & Mike Stoller's 1963 song *I Who Have Nothing*); **'Sex is life'** (graffiti on a granite boulder at Meekatharra in Western Australia). Friedrich Nietzsche was another who recognised the role women played in inspiring the world with their illusion of innocence when he wrote, **'her great art is the lie, her supreme concern is appearance and beauty. Let us confess it, we men: it is precisely *this* art and *this* instinct in woman which we love and honour'** (*Beyond Good and Evil*, 1886; tr. R.J. Hollingdale, 1972, p.145 of 237).

So it is little wonder men 'fell in love' with women. Again, their representation of innocence, their representation of our now lost pure world, has been the only form of that purity that has been continually cultivated since we were apes—which is why the beauty, the attractiveness of the image of innocence in women, has had absolutely *extraordinary* power, as the quotes above recognise.

The great 'mystery of women' was that it was only the physical *image* or object of innocence that men were falling in love with. The illusion was that women were both psychologically and physically innocent. For their part, women were able to fall in love with the dream of their own 'perfection' that men projected—of their being truly innocent. Men and women *fell* in love: we abandoned reality in favour of the dream. It was the one time in our life when we could romance—when we could be transported to how life once was and how it could be again. The lyrics of the song *Somewhere*, written by Stephen Sondheim for the 1956 blockbuster musical and film *West Side Story*, perfectly describe the dream of the heavenly state of true togetherness that humans allow themselves to be transported to when they fall in love: **'Somewhere / We'll find a new way of living / We'll find a way of forgiving / Somewhere // There's a place for us / A time and place for us / Hold my hand and we're halfway there / Hold my hand and I'll take you there / Somehow / Some day / Somewhere!'** Cole Porter's 1928 song *Let's Fall In Love* also contains lyrics that reveal how falling in love is about allowing yourself to dream of the ideal state, of 'paradise': **'Let's fall in love / Why shouldn't we fall in love? / Our hearts are made of it / Let's take a chance / Why be afraid of it / Let's close our eyes and make our own paradise.'** The escape from the horror of a world oppressed and upset by the human condition that falling in love promised is also expressed in the lyrics of the 1977 Fleetwood Mac song *Sara*: **'Drowning in the sea of love / Where everyone would love to drown.'**

The silent recognition that women become invisible when they grow old is an acknowledgment that the role they have played, as sex objects, is behind them. It's the innocence of *youth* that has been both attractive to men for sexual destruction and an inspiration to them because it represented the image of their lost pure world that they were ultimately fighting to re-establish, and as such it is that youthful innocence that women have strived to emulate—long, healthy hair, eyes made large with make-up, legs made longer with high heels to imitate the coltish, long legs of pubescent teenagers, etc, etc. Since sex was about attacking innocence, for a woman to be attractive she needed to look innocent. Men's preoccupation with youthfulness has nothing to do with younger women having greater potential to reproduce their genes, as dishonest mechanistic scientists have told us—it has to do with sex being about attacking innocence, which means you can't be attractive for sex if you're not innocent looking and the most innocent age is that of the thin, long-legged, pubescent teenager, so that is what women had to imitate to be most attractive, regardless of how unnatural that is for adult, wide-hipped-for-child-bearing women.

While different cultures exhibit different perceptions of female beauty, essentially men have been 'attracted' by innocent looks, which are youthful, neotenous features. The popular saying 'Blondes have more fun' illustrates the tendency in Caucasian cultures to regard blondes as more attractive because many young Caucasians have blond hair, a sign of youth/innocence. In his 1940 detective novel *Farewell, My Lovely*, Raymond Chandler acknowledged the appeal of blondes when he wrote, **'It was a blonde. A blonde to make a bishop kick a hole in a stained glass window'** (ch.13). Long, healthy hair is associated with youth, which is why men find long hair on women attractive. In general, any feature unique to women will be attractive and signal a sex object to men, hence the desirability of breasts, shapely hips and a narrow waist. Different cultural and historical definitions of beauty can also be explained in terms of what signifies innocence. For instance, in times when few could afford to eat or live well, women we would now consider overweight were deemed beautiful because their appearance indicated that they had been well cared for, better nurtured and thus less embattled and more innocent.

What all of this means is that men and women became highly adapted to their roles under the duress of the human condition. Women's beauty—their image of innocence—became valued as a reminder and an inspiration to men of their lost pure world that they were fighting to restore

through the finding of sufficient knowledge that would finally end the unjust criticism emanating from our instinctive self. Women's and men's magazines serve as a powerful illustration of how adapted women and men have become to their roles. Almost exclusively, women's magazines contain nothing but instructions on how to become a better sex object—from cover to cover they are all about being glamorous and seductive, specifically through trying to maintain a youthful appearance. Women's magazines reveal just how reliant, to the point of codependency, women have become on reinforcement from men for their beauty. Men's magazines on the other hand, apart from some material about chasing sex, are all about competition—in business and in sport, the latter of which is really a ritualised battle for success, basically emblematic of men's need to champion the ego or conscious thinking self over an ignorant world.

So while relations between men and women *did* develop into a partnership, there remained between them an underlying conflict, a lack of understanding, a **'war of the sexes'**. Women's ignorance and thus lack of sympathy for men's role in the world is starkly apparent in this statement by the leading feminist Germaine Greer: **'As far as I'm concerned, men are the product of a damaged gene. They pretend to be normal but what they're doing sitting there with benign smiles on their faces is they're manufacturing sperm'** (*Sydney Morning Herald*, 14 Nov. 1991). Greer believes that the wilful, competitive, egocentric nature of men is nothing more than a selfish drive to reproduce their genes. The truth is, rather than being driven by selfishness, men have been involved in serving humanity in a most remarkable way. Their role in the world has been entirely honourable, brave and *selfless*. Another influential feminist, Gloria Steinem, expressed a similar complete lack of sympathy for men's role in the world when she said, **'A woman needs a man like a fish needs a bicycle'** (*TIME* mag. 18 Sept. 2000). These two statements are two of the most embarrassingly wrong statements made in history, and yet, in her secret self, every woman has been making them for two million years—which we can now understand is why men have 'fucked' women, attacked and violated their innocence. The cruellest statement I have ever heard a man make about women is that **'they don't even exist'**. Thank heavens then that with men now finally able to explain themselves to women the horrific battle between the sexes can be brought to an end and men and women *can* finally be united in real love for one another. Stacy Rodger's affirmation in Section 3:7 of *Freedom Expanded: Book 2* says it all about just how relieving it is for women to finally be able to understand men's extremely upset, silent state.

In his brilliantly insightful cartoon, included in Part 3:7 and reproduced in the next image, Michael Leunig was accurate in his depiction of women's lack of empathy with the horrifyingly difficult and immensely upsetting task men have had of defying the ignorance of our naive, innocent, ideal-world-demanding instinctive self or soul. In this cartoon, while Eve is shown as not disowning or deserting her man, as natural selection has taught women not to do, she is, nevertheless, deeply perturbed and distressed by his behaviour.

Cartoon by Michael Leunig that appeared in Melbourne's *The Age* newspaper on 31 Dec. 1988

It has been an astronomically difficult job being a man. They have had to be tough enough to defy innocence, have the whole world criticise them and never be able to explain themselves; even their womenfolk considered them monsters, just useless, immensely destructive blights on Earth. But the truth, as we can now see, is that, instead of being the villains, men are in fact the heroes of the whole story of life on Earth. Consciousness is nature's greatest invention and to have championed consciousness, to have found the greater dignifying understanding of the human condition, as men have now done, means men are the heroes of the story of life on Earth.

Not surprisingly, men's movements have, in recent years, been growing in popularity as men try to rebuild their self-esteem because, after living with such condemnation, such crippling accusations that they are meaningless blights on this planet, they are now hardly able to show their faces to the world. The feminist movement has been so intimidating that men are now supposed to disown their masculinity and become 'metrosexual', effeminate versions of themselves. As described in Part 3:11H, pseudo idealism, the dogmatic, artificial imposition of the non-embattled, men-should-stop-being-egocentric-and-aggressive, ideal world, has virtually taken over the planet, destroying truth and burying humanity in the deepest and darkest corner of Plato's cave of alienation. It is true that men's job of conquering ignorance *had* produced so much upset that the world was almost destroyed by it, at which point the upset behaviour had to be harnessed, but having to resort to lies, such as that men are no different from women and irrelevant meaningless monsters, was dangerously dishonest. The question no one was asking was 'But *why* are men so angry and egocentric? *Why* have they been destroying nature?' And the reason no one asked those real questions was because they raised the unconfrontable issue of the human condition. Everyone has just been skating around on the surface of life, with no real questions asked or real answers sought. A tidal wave of total superficiality had swamped the world.

Cartoon by Michael Leunig (detail) that appeared in Melbourne's *The Age* newspaper on 31 Dec. 1988

The tragedy of the situation was that the more men tried to do their job of fighting to defeat ignorance and protect the group (humanity), the more embattled, upset and corrupted they became and thus the more they appeared to worsen the situation. In the end they were turning the world into the wasteland that Michael Leunig so honestly depicted in his Adam and Eve cartoon (above). The **'Give me liberty or give me death'**, **'No retreat, no surrender'**, **'Death before dishonour'**, **'Death or glory'** scenario was erring dangerously on the side of **'death'**. In short, the harder men tried to do their job of protecting humanity the more they appeared to *endanger* humanity. As a result, many men *did* become almost completely ineffective or inoperable, paralysed by this paradox—cowered not only by condemnation from the world at large, but by their own awareness of the extent of their self-corruption and its effects. As a result, women have had to usurp some of the day-to-day running of affairs. Not oppressed

by the overwhelming responsibility and extreme frustration that men felt, women could, to an extent, remain effective. Further, when men crumpled women *had* to take over otherwise the family, group or community involved would disintegrate. The trend toward a return to matriarchy, such as we have recently seen in society, was a sign that men in general had become almost completely exhausted. However, *total* matriarchy has not emerged because as long as the fundamental battle still existed men could not afford to stand aside completely—they still needed to stay in control and vigilant against the threat of ignorance. So while some elements in the recent feminist movement seized the opportunity to avenge men's oppression, the movement was in general borne out of necessity—but, as we saw in Part 3:11H, it was a dangerous development.

The danger of relinquishing power to women was that they were not appreciative of the nature of the battle that humanity was waging. They have not been, as it were, 'mainframed' to the battle—just as men have not been 'mainframed' to the role of nurturing as women intuitively are. For example, in the 1987 film *Three Men and a Baby* the men pass the baby around hoping one of the other men will change the nappy, even bribing one another to do it. Not appreciating the nature of the battle, women could be overly idealistic in their decision-making, or even overly realistic in the sense of being unduly vengeful. If you are not appreciative of and sympathetic towards the battle it is hard to know where the balance lies. The American author Camille Paglia recognised this truth when she famously said, **'If civilization had been left in female hands, we would still be living in grass huts'** (*Sexual Personae*, 1990). This 'grass huts' comment can be understood both literally and metaphorically because the fundamental situation was that if our instinctive self or soul (which women represented) had its way the intellect would never have been allowed to search for knowledge. The soul's ignorance *had to be* defied if knowledge and ultimately self-understanding was to be found. To give in to soul was to go nowhere, to give-up, to remain in **'grass huts'**. Incidentally, Paglia also defied the feminist code when she said, **'Wake up, men and women *are* different'** (*The Australian*, 4-5 Jul. 1992).

So while both men and women have had to live in denial of the battle of the human condition, men have been astutely aware of the issue of the human condition and their job of championing the ego to solve it; they had to maintain an awareness of the battle because they were the ones who had to fight it. Women, on the other hand, have trouble identifying with the discussion in my books about the battle of the human condition—to them, it has all largely been a mystery. If you look at the quotes used throughout my books, and there are hundreds of them, the vast majority come from male philosophers, scientists, writers, songwriters, etc. It was men's job to champion the ego, to find the liberating understanding of the human condition, and so while all men share this awareness of the underlying battle, women do not. In Bob Dylan's 1968 song *All Along the Watchtower* he referred to men, the **'princes'** who **'kept the view' 'all along the watchtower' 'while all the women came and went'**. Men waited steadily for the answers to the human condition to arrive but women weren't so focused. This limitation on the part of women was described by Sir Laurens van der Post in his 1976 book *Jung and the Story of Our Time*, when he related a dream Carl Jung had about a blind woman named Salome. Sir Laurens wrote that **'Salome was young, beautiful *and* blind'**, explaining the symbolism of Salome's blindness with **'Salome was blind because the anima** [the soulful, more feminine aspect of humans] **is incapable of seeing'** (p.169 of 275).

I could talk for days about the differences and dynamics between men and women because there is so much now that we can explain and needs to be explained about the world of men and women, but in doing so we once again come face to face with unbearably confronting truths. Men, for instance, have to face the truth of how diabolically upset they have become; how massively arrogant and deluded and brutal they have been—in particular, how destructive they have been of women, of nature, in fact of innocence in *all* its forms. Women, on the other hand, have to face the truth that they unjustly condemned men and that they have not been 'mainframed'. They also need to face the truth about their role as sex objects and that being a sex object is about imitating innocence and that sex destroys women's innocence, and—finally—they need to face the truth of the importance of nurturing their children.

Importantly, however, it is not necessary to fully face the truth of the extent of our upset condition. As has been explained and will be further fleshed out in Part 9, 'The Transformation of the Human Race', we *can* support the truth without fully confronting it, however, it is important to know that the truth does exist and has finally been explained because that is the all-precious ingredient for a new world that we will be defending when we take up the Sunshine Highway, TRANSFORMED WAY OF LIVING.

Now, at last, the world of men can be understood and through that understanding the battle between the sexes can finally be brought to an end—but not artificially through dogmatic feminist demands that men disown their masculinity and wash the dishes, etc, but rather through men being able to say, 'This is why I am upset, there was a *good* reason for my upset, I happen to be *good*, in fact, not just good but an absolute legend, the hero of the story of life on Earth! And I have had the most horrific job that wasn't made any easier by you women criticising me.' And for their part women can respond with, 'I understand that now, but our job was to keep the soulful true world alive as much as possible and to nurture a fresh generation which wasn't made any easier by you men being so egocentric and self-preoccupied.' So with dialogue now possible between men and women, the war between the sexes can finally come to an end.

However, as stated earlier, the problem was that the longer it took to find this reconciling understanding of the human condition the more upset amplified. Eventually, humanity arrived at the precipice of self-destruction at which point panic set in and instead of carefully persevering with the upsetting battle to find liberating understanding of ourselves, a strident majority advocated abandoning the battle and 'flying back on course'. But to do so was suicide—a 'loss of nerve', as the British science historian Jacob Bronowski summed up the danger of this march of pseudo idealism: **'I am infinitely saddened to find myself suddenly surrounded in the west by a sense of terrible loss of nerve, a retreat from knowledge into—into what? Into…falsely profound questions about, Are we not really just animals at bottom; into extra-sensory perception and mystery. They do not lie along the line of what we are now able to know if we devote ourselves to it: an understanding of man himself. We are nature's unique experiment to make the rational intelligence prove itself sounder than the reflex** [instinct]**. Knowledge is our destiny. Self-knowledge, at last bringing together the experience of the arts and the explanations of science, waits ahead of us'** (*The Ascent of Man*, 1973, p.437 of 448). What has happened is that give-up-the-battle, 'fly-back-on-course', left-wing political ideology has threatened to take over the world.

One of the great dangers of left-wing political ideology was that it operated under the delusion that giving up the battle was the ideal, responsible path to take. The left-wing deluded itself that it held the moral high ground when, as we can now explain, it was the right-wing, in its preparedness to pursue the upsetting battle to find liberating understanding, that actually lay claim to that mantle. We have always known that when the truth arrived it was going to shatter many illusions and delusions. For example, instead of men being the absolute villains of the story of life on Earth they are suddenly revealed to be the heroes of that story. The truth was not as it appeared. Left-wing advocates weren't the idealists they presented themselves to be; we can see now that they were actually advocating giving up the battle to overthrow ignorance. At the end of the day, the right-wing is revealed to have been the true idealists because only by continuing the heroic, albeit corrupting, search for knowledge could freedom from the human condition be achieved. All along, the right-wing has been doing the *right* thing and yet they have been erroneously labelled **'neocons'**, short for **'neoconservatives'**. The left-wing love that nickname because it is almost saying that the right-wing are 'con men', but we can now see that it was the left-wing that was conning us, not the right-wing. Real idealism, as opposed to pseudo idealism, involved continuing the corrupting search for knowledge.

The danger of pseudo idealism, especially those increasingly dishonest forms that emerged in the last 200 years, was described in Part 3:11H. There it was described how, in the Bible, the prophets Christ and Daniel anticipated the development of pseudo idealistic causes, describing such causes as **'the abomination that causes desolation'** (see Daniel:11, Matt:24, Mark:13)—**'the abomination'** that leads nowhere except to even greater levels of alienation. Christ warned that when pseudo idealism threatens to take over the world we should **'flee to the mountains'** (Matt. 24:16), because by then the artificiality of the world would be so great that there was a very real risk that the associated truthless, nerveless, terminal levels of alienation could very well destroy the world. Everywhere pseudo idealistic, left-wing causes like feminism, environmentalism and political correctness dominated.

But taking up the option of 'flying back on course' was never going to lead to the answers, it was only ever going to add more dishonesty, more denial, more alienation that would one day have to be seen through and dismantled. As described in Part 3:11G, the great beauty of religions, especially Christianity, was that they contained a degree of honesty. In the case of Christianity, by deferring to Christ you were indirectly acknowledging your own alienation and corruption and Christ's lack thereof. Pseudo idealistic causes like environmentalism, on the other hand, required no honesty, no confrontation with the truth of your corrupted condition, no recognition of the underlying issue of the human condition—as the editor of *TIME* magazine, Richard Stengel, recognised, **'The environment became the last best cause, the ultimate guilt-free issue'** (*TIME* mag. 31 Dec. 1990). In fact, the honesty inherent in religions such as Christianity is precisely the reason they have waned in popularity in recent years. As we humans became more upset we found it increasingly difficult to accept any confrontation with the truth of our condition, and so any emphasis on guilt became unbearable. Not surprisingly, Buddhism has been growing in popularity because it places no emphasis on guilt or on a confronting idealistic 'God'. As one Buddhist convert said, Buddhism is **'non-judgemental, there's no notion of sin, there's no**

notion of good and evil, you don't embrace negativity' (from *Light at Edge of the World: Science of the Mind of Buddhism*, National Geographic Channel, 2006). But to completely strip religions of their emphasis on guilt was to strip them of their aligning honesty.

Indeed, one of the most dishonest, sophisticated-in-the-art-of-denial of the pseudo idealistic causes was postmodernism, which took guilt stripping to the extreme by actually maintaining that there was no such thing as 'truth'! What rubbish! The whole purpose of human endeavour was to find the truth, not to give up and argue that it doesn't even exist.

However, while pseudo idealistic denials have been spreading like wildfire across the world—about men being useless and about there being no real difference between men and women, and there being no such thing as 'truth' anyway, etc, etc—the *real* truth about the role differentiation between men and women, and the impact of that differentiation on their lives under the duress of the human condition, has been sitting there, openly acknowledged, in the Bible for some 3,500 years. In Genesis, Moses said, **'the Lord God made a woman…and he brought her to the man…**[to] **be united to his wife…The man and his wife were both naked, and they felt no shame'** (2:22-25). Moses then said that when the **'fruit' 'from the tree of…knowledge'** (3:3, 2:17) was taken and the search for knowledge began, **'the eyes of both of them** [Adam and Eve] **were opened, and they realised that they were naked; so they…made coverings for themselves'** (3:6-7). Then, acknowledging that it became a patriarchal world after the upsetting search for knowledge began, Moses said, **'To the woman he** [God] **said…Your desire will be for your husband, and he will rule over you'** (3:16). In other words, before the patriarchal search for knowledge began, humans were innocent and during this time of innocence men did not use sex, or any other means, to attack the innocence of women, but then men became upset and turned on women and attacked their innocence through the perversion of sex, at which point humans had to invent clothes in order to conceal our bodies because our nakedness incited lust. So while clothes became necessary to keep neotenised, hairless humans warm, they also became necessary to dampen lust. Even the relatively innocent Bushmen, who go about semi-naked most of the time, wear loincloths to conceal their genitals. Once humans became extremely upset even the glimpse of a woman's face or ankle became dangerously exciting to men, which is why in some cultures women are completely shrouded and persecuted if any part of their body is revealed in public. It was a reverse-of-the-truth lie to say, as it is frequently argued, that this concealment of women was introduced out of 'respect for women'. The truth is, it was enforced because women were being *disrespected*.

So that is why the world has been patriarchal, what sex, as humans practice, is and why innocence has been attacked everywhere. It has been an utterly tragic story. The deeper you look into the human condition the more horrific it becomes, but thank God we *can* now look into it, understand it and leave it behind forever.

(Much more can be read about the life of men and women under the duress of the human condition—including explaining such battle-to-find-knowledge-sympathetic women as Ayn Rand and Margaret Thatcher, and the non-reproducing, seemingly-biologically-impossible sexual state of homosexuality—in my freely available, online book *A Species In Denial* in the chapter titled 'Bringing peace to the war between the sexes' at <www.humancondition.com/asid-men-and-women>.)

Part 7:2 How Angry did we become?

Understanding the extent to which we have become upset after having to live on this planet unjustly condemned for two million years will help us appreciate the magnificence of the solution to our upset state of the TRANSFORMED LIFEFORCE WAY OF LIVING. Of the three main elements of our upset—anger, egocentricity (which our selfishness is a subset of) and alienation—we will begin by examining how angry we became.

The truth is, we humans have been capable of *horrendous* atrocities. Our planet is encrusted with the blood spilt by our immense anger. To provide just a single example, in one book (and it doesn't matter what its title is because such examples are innumerable) it is described how members of a persecuted faith were **'blown from cannon mouths, hacked to death by axes and swords, and led to their deaths with burning candles inserted into open wounds in their bodies'**. I have previously read about this particular incident, which occurred in Persia (now Iran) in the mid-1800s. The victims had their stomachs removed while they were still alive, had large saucer shaped candles placed inside their stomach cavity and were then forced to walk the streets until they died.

While we have learnt to civilise our upset, disguise it, underneath our manufactured facade of restrained peacefulness, even a manufactured happiness, lies volcanic anger—because the people who committed those atrocities are us, humans; *within the make-up of all humans is a capacity for extraordinary violence*. But we can at last understand the origin of this cauldron of anger that lies within us humans: we have been unjustly condemned for two million years! We have had to live on a planet where everything on it—innocent nature, the integrative theme of existence, others more innocent than ourselves, indeed the whole natural world—was screaming at us, 'You are bad, evil, God (Integrative Meaning) defying and defiling, worthless, destructive, meaningless monsters!' We never were those things, but we couldn't explain *why* we weren't! In reality, we were the opposite of evil—we were the absolute heroes of the whole story of life on Earth, but we had no way of arguing our case! Could a more horrible torture be imagined? And could you imagine one that had to be endured for so long? It would hardly seem possible.

It is difficult to think of an analogy to describe this torturous existence, but just imagine living in a community where, for instance, it is decreed that no one can plant roses, but for some reason that you can't explain, you have to plant roses. What would happen? After a couple of days people would stop talking to you, then the shopkeepers would stop serving you, then children would start putting dead cats in your letterbox. And that is only after one week. Now try to imagine how two million years of such ostracism by our whole world would have impacted upon us. There must be an almost bottomless well of frustrated fury inside us humans! So it is fortunate, for the sake of our species' survival, that over time the immensely upset human race *did* learn to civilise its upset—to restrain its anger, conceal it, hide it, contain it—but that upset, with all its volcanic anger, could never be eliminated until the dignifying and thus relieving understanding of it was found. Despite all our efforts to restrain, contain and disguise our upset it was always building, always intensifying, which means by now, two million years after upset began, the levels within us must be mountainous, which they are!

Indeed, like the Persian incident provided above, history abounds with heinous examples of unleashed upset; for instance, the thirteenth century Mongol conqueror Genghis Khan was certainly someone who lived out his upset to the full. He let it all hang out. Everyday he satisfied his anger through bloodletting, his egocentricity through domination of others, and his mind or spirit by blocking out any feeling of guilt or remorse emanating from his moral instincts. As Genghis Khan is reputed to have said, **'Happiness lies in conquering one's enemies, in driving them in front of oneself, in taking their property, in savouring their despair, in outraging their wives and daughters.'** And the Mongols did exactly that. They would attack vast cities and kill every person living there. They even employed specialised troops who knew all the desperate tricks people would use to try to escape, such as digging holes in which to hide. These troops would stay behind after the initial massacre and wait until those who were in hiding emerged and then they would kill them too. They were ruthless, leaving great mounds of human bones in their wake. Such is the level of fury inside of all humans now after two million years of having to live unjustly condemned on this planet.

Ralph Steadman's *The Lizard Lounge* 1971

The drawings of the British cartoonist and caricaturist Ralph Steadman have always managed to wrench to the surface the truth of the full horror of our human condition. In this particularly revealing drawing, titled *The Lizard Lounge*, Steadman depicts humans as reptiles. The drawing, which I referred to in Part 3:11F, first appeared in the American author Hunter S. Thompson's classic 1971 novel about the utter madness of the human condition, *Fear and Loathing in Las Vegas*. The arrogantly deluded, egocentric pretentiousness of all the male

lizards, with their lurid looks and attitudes towards the victims of men's upset, the sickly-looking old female crows, are all frighteningly truthful renditions of our human condition. The fierce expression of the central dragon is an honest depiction of just how angry humans, especially men, have become. We see beside the main dragon others who have lost their nerve and are ingratiating themselves to the main dragon, looking to him to do all the fighting.

Cartoon by Michael Leunig (detail) that appeared in Melbourne's *The Age* newspaper on 31 Dec. 1988

Notice how the ferociously angry expression on Steadman's central dragon is exactly the same as the ferociously angry countenance Leunig gave Adam in his cartoon about our banishment from the Garden of Eden. We didn't deserve to be banished from the Garden of Eden and in that cartoon Adam expresses just how resentful we humans became as a result.

But this is where men have got to—hollow eyes devoid of any sensitivity or empathy for anything real in the world, interested only in the glory that gives them relief from the criticism that they are bad when they are not; men who are totally punch-drunk with the need for power and glory; men who are taking the saying **'give me liberty or give me death'** all the way to the wire or finishing line of **'death'**! 'I want more glory, I want to buy 10 more companies, I'm going to conquer the world, I've trodden on so many people to get here and, if necessary, I'll tread on as many more again to get the glory and relief I crave!' We see in men's clubs how incredibly arrogant men are. With their big armchairs and limousines parked out the back, they swagger about posturing here and there, careful not to tread on each other's egos, only talking about the weather and the last football game, although occasionally saying 'sell those shares', 'email my secretary', 'have your people get in touch with my people', etc, etc. Men's lives have been so artificial and fragile it is truly tragic.

Although it is mostly concealed from view by hundreds of thousands of years of practiced civility, the truth, as has been emphasised, is that there are volcanic levels of upset in humans. Our ability to at last admit this truth, because we can at last explain and thus understand it, means we can finally explain the ritual of human sacrifice, something that occurred in nearly all ancient cultures, including the Inca civilisation. While the sacrifice (actually murder) of our instinctive self or soul's friends, the animals, which also often occurred, was shockingly offensive to our cooperatively-orientated, all-loving original instinctive self or

soul, sacrificing (actually murdering) a fellow human was *astronomically* offensive to our soul. However, the upset in humans has been so great that only such astronomically shocking acts as murdering our fellow humans could exceed our astronomical levels of upset, and by exceeding the upset temporarily quell it. The associated feeling of shock overrode the feeling of upset and, in so doing, temporarily eliminated the latter. To illustrate, it was mentioned in Part 5:1 that the terrible bloodletting that took place during the Second World War represented such a valving off of upset that it brought about a period of freedom from upset, which gave rise to the freshness of the 1960s post-war generation. The 'valving off of upset' can be better understood as the souls of those involved being so revolted and shocked by all the bloodletting that the upset in those involved was, for a time, nullified.

It's a phenomenon that also occurs when we shoot animals (and must have also occurred when our ancestors ritually sacrificed the life of an animal)—the shock to our soul of what hunting truly involves temporarily subsides the immense anger in us, which is why some people become addicted to shooting animals. In fact, in order for professional hunters of wildlife to shoot accurately they first have to learn to overcome the momentary mental 'blackout' that is brought about by the shock of what they are about to do. All hunters—indeed, anyone about to kill an animal—are aware, if they are honest, of the momentary 'blackout' their mind experiences when they are about to kill an animal.

Interestingly, referring to an article published in *New Scientist* magazine (20 Aug. 2005) titled 'Sexy images cause temporary blindness', the journalist Petra Newman wrote that **'Research suggests that when shown erotic or gory images, the brain fails to process images seen immediately afterward. This phenomenon is known as "emotion-induced blindness."…**[or] **short-vision blackout'** (from the publishing website *Helium*. Accessed April 2010: see <www.wtmsources.com/176>). While the researchers cited in the article weren't able to explain this phenomenon, we now can. In Part 7:1 it was described how sex, as humans practice it, has been a way of attacking the innocence of women for their lack of appreciation of men's upsetting battle to champion the conscious thinking self or ego over the ignorance of our original instinctive self or soul. Therefore, sex has been extremely offensive to our instinctive self or soul, which is why it causes the same **'emotion-induced'** shock to our soul and thus temporary **'blackout'** in our mind as killing animals or our fellow humans. The **'emotion'** is our soul communicating extreme distress to our mind. Humans don't remember sexual episodes very well and the reason we don't is because sex, as currently practiced, is a violation of our soul and we don't want to remember such violation.

The extraordinary extent of the innocence of our soul, and the extraordinary extent of the upset in humans now, especially in men, are two immensely confronting truths that understanding of the human condition now reveals, but what is so wonderful about the TRANSFORMED WAY OF LIVING is that we don't have to fully confront the truth of the extent of the upset within us. Popular songs typically focus on the exciting potential of the human race, not on the truth of the extent of the devastation within us and around us, and they do that because it is the future of a human-condition-ameliorated world alone that is worth dreaming of, holding on to, and working towards. The abyss of confronting truths in the *Humanity's Situation* drawing (shown in Part 6:1) *is* immense. It really is exposure day, honesty day, truth day, transparency day, revelation day, shake down day, come clean day—in fact 'judgment day'—when we'll be stripped naked and exposed, but thankfully there is a way to cope.

Part 7:3 How Egocentric did we become?

So, it has been a case of **'Give me liberty or give me death'**, **'No retreat, no surrender'**, **'Death before dishonour'**, **'Death or glory'**—'I am going to pursue as much reinforcement as I can through winning power, fame, fortune and glory because I will never accept that I am bad.'

In truth, no amount of power, fame, fortune and glory could establish that we were good—only clarifying explanation of the human condition could achieve that—but at least the upset human race could derive some relief from the implication that we were bad through winning power, fame, fortune and glory. And because it was the only thing that could sustain us, the selfish greed from egocentrically seeking power, fame, fortune and glory was never going to subside until understanding of the human condition was found—even though that selfish greed was destroying the Earth and would eventually destroy humanity through terminal levels of alienation, as the explanation given in Part 6:4 made clear when it described how egocentricity turned children into power-addicted adults. Only the arrival of understanding of the human condition could stop the march to self-destruction.

'Power', 'fame' and 'glory' were to do with achieving success—becoming the best, dominating, receiving accolades, etc. 'Fortune', as in wealth or money, could buy us goods and services and a lifestyle that would relieve the implication that we were bad—it supplied us with *material* success. We were forever talking about materialism without ever stopping to ask what we really mean by the term, but in truth, materialism became the poor substitute for the spiritualism we couldn't have: we couldn't find sustenance for our mind or spirit, we couldn't explain that we were good and not bad, so all we could do was seek material relief. A bigger house and a bigger car were statements of defiance of the implication that we were bad when we rightly didn't accept that we were. Ultimately, we built not just bigger houses, but buildings that were so big they 'scraped' the sky. Skyscrapers were *giant* statements of defiance of the implication that we humans were bad. There was no end to our will to never back down and accept that we were bad—but, by inference, there was also no limit to the destruction we were prepared to wreak in our pursuit of relief from that criticism.

And such rampant materialism is now a global phenomenon; today the immense populations of China and India are seeking all the material trappings of the Western world. These, and many other once-labelled second and third world nations, have tried all the false starts to an upset-free new world, such as socialism/communism, but dogma—the insistence to just *be* social and communal despite the reality of humans' embattled condition—was never going to work. *Only* through the opposite of mind-less dogma, which is mind-full understanding, could an upset-free, cooperative new world emerge. Artificially restraining people, pretending that they are not enormously upset and therefore enormously in need of material reinforcement and self-distraction, was not realistic. Socialism and communism were lies that denied reality; they said that everyone could live in humble sackcloth, but that was a complete denial of the fact that people needed *something* to embellish their lives, *anything* to make them feel better about themselves. These movements pretended that the human condition didn't exist. Of course, to supply material reinforcement required money or capital, and so capitalism accompanied materialism.

Self-distraction and entertainment were also part of the materialistic lifestyle, the materialistic way of gaining relief from the agony of the insecurity of the human condition. As the American film director, writer, actor and comedian Woody Allen once said, **'Don't underestimate the power of distraction to keep our minds off the truth of our situation'** (interview with Bob Costas, titled 'Woody', *Dateline* NBC, 29-30 Nov. 1994).

So yes, the human race has been on an all-out bender to find distraction, find relief from the human condition, so much so that we were prepared to destroy the planet if need be—**'Death before dishonour.'** Greed, greed, greed, selfishness, selfishness, selfishness—nothing could stop our march to destruction, except the arrival of dignifying understanding of the human condition. We even had to block out nature because since our original instinctive self or soul grew up with nature, by its association with our instinctive self it too criticised us. The innocence of nature also confronted us with our own lack of innocence. In fact, the reason spiky plants like cactus and palms became popular in landscaping was because they look as alienated as we humans are—they are 'punk', angry, aggressive and dead-looking. Mosques in the Islamic culture invariably feature soothing, stop-the-pain-in-the-brain blue colours and running water, while other decoration is restricted to stylised lettering, or occasionally very stylised images of nature. Generally, any images that relate to humans or to nature are avoided because they can trigger thoughts about the issue of our imperfect human condition. The extent of the insecurity of humans now is extreme.

Blocking out the subject of our rapidly increasing upset, corrupted condition through distracting and entertaining ourselves—or even through mentally not allowing ourselves to think about such unpleasant subjects—meant that we humans became more and more superficial and artificial, more and more disconnected from our true self or soul. In the end, as mentioned earlier, even our political stance became a superficial farce in which we adopted pseudo forms of idealism such as feminism, environmentalism and postmodern political correctness as a supposed solution to our and the world's problems. Our world was quietly going completely mad. 'Quietly' in the sense that no one was seeing through what was happening, seeing the extreme danger of the situation. There was once concern about the dogma of socialism taking over the world but the threat of the dogma of pseudo idealism has been far more real and dangerous and yet virtually no one was recognising and acknowledging that threat; in contrast, many of the world's political leaders, and its press, noisily advocate its 'merits'.

Essentially, the emergence of the upset state of the human condition meant that we humans became self-preoccupied—preoccupied trying to validate ourselves by whatever means possible while we lacked the understanding that would, once and for all, explain our fundamental goodness. For men, as the party who had to champion the ego, those means translated into power and glory, while women channelled their efforts into being 'attractive' because that was their way of gaining reinforcement, gaining relief from the insecurity of their condition. Of course, when men became so embattled, so punch-drunk for power and glory and women so desperate for attention and as a result had their innocence destroyed through sex, it all had a devastating effect on the next generation who are born innocent and unaware of such upset in the world.

As mentioned in Part 6:4, Adam Stork has a child, Adam Stork Junior, who comes into the world expecting his or her father to be at home and emotionally present and *not* preoccupied with some terrible battle—*not* punch-drunk, narcissistic, angry and preoccupied, with no empathy for anything or anyone aside from his own circumstances. But given this was the case under the duress of the human condition, when Adam Stork Junior *did* receive some attention from his or her father it was conditional on proving his or her self worth, thereby contributing to his or her father's ego castle. In the case of mothers, they were preoccupied with having to pander to their husband's every need. Men have been so embattled and needing of endless attention that they have been like black holes in space from which nothing can escape, so somehow mothers had to juggle the task of nurturing and raising children around their husbands' insatiable need for attention. And worse, having been used as sex objects their relatively innocent, soulful true self had been sullied or corrupted; in fact, women's encounter with the immensely upset world in general so compromised their innocent soul that many ended up neurotic. As described in Part 6:5, children in their innocence could sense this neurosis in their mothers and somehow had to adjust to it—many, however, could not adapt and instead were forced to dissociate from the world, become autistic, or extremely mentally distressed, which is what Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD) is. Children come into the world so innocent they are like little Christs and while parents can't see their own alienation, children can and are forced to adjust to it very quickly by blocking out the pain of it, and as a result dissociating from their true, innocent, ideal, happy and loving soulful self that is trying to understand why the world has become so wrong—as the following quotes make very clear. The great Scottish psychiatrist R.D. Laing recognised how innocent all children are to begin with when he said that **'Each child is a new beginning, a potential prophet'** (*The Politics of Experience* and *The Bird of Paradise*, 1967, p.26 of 156). The American architect and philosopher Buckminster Fuller also recognised the fleeting nature of children's innocence when he described the odds of such innocence surviving in the world today: **'All children are born geniuses. 9999 out of every 10,000 are swiftly, inadvertently de-geniused by grown-ups'** (*Education for Human Development: Understanding Montessori*, by Mario M. Montessori Jr., Paula Polk Lillard & Buckminster Fuller, 1987, Foreword). The Irish writer Samuel Beckett was another who wrote about the brevity of the life of the soul today: **'They** [humans] **give birth astride of a grave, the light gleams an instant, then it's night once more'** (*Waiting for Godot*, 1955). The British artist Francis Bacon made this brutally honest admission on the topic, **'the shadow of dead meat is cast as soon as we are born'** (*The Australian*, 15 June 2009, reprinted from *The New Republic*), while the nineteenth century French poet Stéphane Mallarmé bravely acknowledged that **'L'enfant abdique son extase'**, **'To adapt to this world the child abdicates its ecstasy'** (*Prose pour des Esseintes*, 1885; tr. from R.D. Laing's book, *The Politics of Experience* and *The Bird of Paradise*, 1967, p.118 of 156). William Wordsworth also truthfully said that **'something that is gone / … Whither is fled the visionary gleam? / Where is it now, the glory and the dream? // Our birth is but a sleep and a forgetting'** (*Intimations of Immortality from Recollections of Early Childhood*, 1807). Similarly, in *House of Cards*, a 1993 film based on a screenplay by Michael Lessic, one of the characters makes the following intuitive comment about how sensitive and vulnerable innocent children have been to the horror of the alienated world of adults: **'I used to watch Michael** [a character in the film] **about two hours after he was born and I thought that at that moment he knew all of the secrets of the universe and every second that was passing he was forgetting them** [he was having to live in denial

of them]**.'** These quotes provide a measure of how alienated we humans now are because if our soul died as much as has been described in the first moments of life, how much would it have died off by the end of the first day of our life, let alone the first week or even year. Truly, as Laing said, by the time we are adults there must be **'fifty feet of solid concrete** [denial]**'** between us and our true selves. Again, these are all terrifying truths that exist deep in the middle of the abyss of depression in the *Humanity's Situation* picture.

The point is, the Adam Stork picture describes the pristine situation where there is no prior upset. In reality, once a generation has become upset then the next generation not only has to contend with the upset that comes about as a result of their own search for knowledge, but, before they even reach that stage, they have to cope with the impact their parents' upset has upon them. They have to cope with inadequate love and reinforcement, and worse, a world of utter silence and denial—because everything their resigned parents say is shot through with denial/lies, which children in their innocence recognise. The embattled egocentric world of adults has devastated not only the world but also the next generation, the future.

Part 7:4 How Selfish did we become?

While anger, egocentricity and alienation are the three fundamental components of upset, selfishness, while a subset of egocentricity, is such an important aspect of upset it could be identified as a fourth fundamental component in its own right. So, before describing how alienated we became, a description of the ever-increasing levels of cynicism and selfishness in human society will now be included.

In Part 6:4 I described at some length how egocentricity has been increasing at such a rapid rate that the extremely egocentric 'power addict' state was becoming so universal that it was about to render all parts of the world dysfunctional. Another aspect of this end play, terminal situation facing the human race was the spread of selfishness, especially cynicism.

As the Adam Stork story reveals, the human race started out in a state of innocence. Our species was once instinctively orientated to behaving in a cooperative, unconditionally selfless, loving, altruistic, consider-the-welfare-of-the-whole-above-your-own-welfare way, however, as the upsetting/corrupting search for knowledge developed, humans naturally became more and more adapted to that upset/corrupted life. It follows that, given this trajectory, humans could eventually become *so* adapted to an upset/corrupt world that they were born cynical, to a degree instinctively expecting the world to be so corrupt that if you behaved selflessly your goodness would only be exploited by others and therefore you should look after yourself, be selfish.

The section 'The Denial-Free History of the Human Race' from my book *A Species In Denial* (see <www.humancondition.com/asid-the-denial-free-history-of-the-human-race>) describes in some detail how humans became increasingly adapted to life under the duress of the human condition, with some races becoming more adept at that adaptation than others. Just as individual humans vary in their degree of alienation from our species' original instinctive selfless, all-loving and trusting soulful true self, so races of humans naturally vary in their degree of alienation. The longer an individual or a race of people were subjected to

life under the duress of the human condition, the more they naturally became adapted to that corrupt existence. While a relatively innocent person or relatively innocent race still behaved relatively ideally themselves and expected others to do the same ('innocence' being lack of exposure to and familiarity with the upset state of the human condition), other individuals and races became so adapted to the upset/corrupt world that they no longer behaved ideally themselves and no longer expected others to behave ideally either. The longer humans were exposed to the human-condition-afflicted state the more cynical they became about human existence—a 'cynic' being **'one who doubts or denies the goodness of human motives'** (*Macquarie Dictionary*, 3rd edn, 1998). As mentioned in Parts 3:8 and 3:11B, the Austrian psychiatrist Wilhelm Reich wrote honestly about the effects of the different levels of upset in the human race when he described how **'The living** [those relatively free of exposure to upset]**…is naively kindly…It assumes that the fellow human also follows the laws of the living and is kindly, helpful and giving. As long as there is the emotional plague** [the flood of upset in the world]**, this natural basic attitude, that of the healthy child or the primitive…**[is subject to] **the greatest danger…For the plague individual also ascribes to his fellow beings the characteristics of his own thinking and acting. The kindly individual believes that all people are kindly and act accordingly. The plague individual believes that all people lie, swindle, steal and crave power. Clearly, then, the living is at a disadvantage and in danger'** (*Listen, Little Man!*, 1948, p.8 of 109).

The consequences for a society of its people becoming overly cynical was that it meant that there would be too little soulful, selfless idealism and too much upset-adapted cynicism-derived selfishness for the society to operate effectively. In the situation where it wasn't possible to explain and thus defend the upset state of the human condition, the closest people could come to admitting and talking about the fact that people became adapted to the human condition was to describe individuals or families or races or civilisations as having become **'dysfunctional'** and **'decadent'**—and, especially in the case of civilisations, as having **'passed their prime'** or **'peaked'** in terms of their creative powers.

Conversely, some races, like some individual humans, have, in fact, been too innocent to function in the extremely upset-adapted, human-condition-afflicted, corrupt world. As mentioned in Part 5:2, Sir Laurens van der Post once described how a member of the relatively innocent Bushmen race found it impossible to cope with having his innocent, natural spirit compromised: **'You know I once saw a little Bushman imprisoned in one of our gaols because he killed a giant bustard which according to the police, was a crime, since the bird was royal game and protected. He was dying because he couldn't bear being shut up and having his freedom of movement stopped. When asked why he was ill he could only say that he missed seeing the sun set over the Kalahari. Physically the doctor couldn't find anything wrong with him but he died none the less!'** (*The Lost World of the Kalahari*, 1958, p.236 of 253). Sir Laurens was more specific when he stated that **'mere contact with twentieth-century life seemed lethal to the Bushman. He was essentially so innocent and natural a person that he had only to come near us for a sort of radioactive fall-out from our unnatural world to produce a fatal leukaemia in his spirit'** (*The Heart of the Hunter*, 1961, p.111 of 233). The honey-coloured Bushmen are probably the most instinctively/genetically innocent race of people living today. They are more innocent, less soul-corrupted, less human-condition-adapted, less adapted to upset, less toughened, than dark-skinned Bantu Africans, but in turn Bantus are not as toughened and thus as operational and successful in the human-condition-afflicted corrupted world

as Caucasian races. For example, I once saw a documentary in which a black African said something to the effect that **'My people can't compete with white people, you go to sleep at night only to wake up in the morning to find white people own everything.'** In turn, Caucasian races aren't as cynical, toughened and opportunistic—selfish—as races from even more ancient civilisations, like the Chinese from the ancient Yellow River valley civilisation, the Indians and Pakistanis from the ancient Indus and Ganges River valley civilisations, and the Arabs and Jews from the ancient Tigress, Euphrates and Nile River valley civilisations.

As mentioned in Part 4:4E, when the problem of prejudice was briefly introduced, the situation in Fiji provides a good case-study of what invariably took place when races of varying degrees of upset cohabitated.

In the late 1800s British colonists brought Indians to Fiji as indentured labour to farm sugar cane, and so by the mid-1960s half the Fijian population was Indian. As a result, a serious conflict arose between the Indian and native Fijians, which we can now understand. The Indian Fijians, coming from an older and thus naturally more cynical, human-condition-toughened, human-condition-realistic and thus opportunistic civilisation, have been so industrious and materially successful that they now monopolise the small business sector in Fiji to the extent that the native Fijians feel their country has been taken over by the Indian Fijians; for *their* part, however, the Indian Fijians also feel discriminated against. Indian Fijian sugar growers in particular feel this inequity, for while they produce 90 percent of the country's sugar, they are only allowed to lease land from the native Fijians (who own 90 percent of the land). Furthermore, since gaining independence in 1970 the native Fijians have ensured their domination of the political process—a state of affairs that was reinforced in 1990 when the Fijian constitution restricted the Indians to a maximum of 27 seats in the country's 71-seat Parliament. When this provision was amended in 1997 the Indians came to dominate the political scene, successfully electing an Indian Prime Minister in 1999. This situation, however, was overthrown in 2000 when the native Fijians led a coup—and they have remained in power ever since. As mentioned, the Indian Fijians come from a very ancient civilisation in India, one where innocence has long given way to more upset-adapted humans. In comparison, the native Fijians are still relatively innocent, yet to become embattled, hardened and upset-adapted. They aren't manically driven to win power and glory like more embattled, upset-adapted races, preferring to spend their day tranquilly occupied by such activities as playing music, drinking the sedating kava and eating taro roots from their gardens. It is akin to a 20-year-old, or thereabouts, equivalent race having to co-exist and compete with a toughened, cynical, more-upset-and-thus-more-insecure-about-their-goodness-and-thus-more-egocentrically-driven-to-try-to-prove-they-are-good-and-not-bad, opportunistic 50-year-old, or thereabouts, equivalent race.

Some races are so relatively innocent and naive about life under the duress of the human condition that they lack the toughened self discipline and insecure egocentric drive to succeed of the more upset-adapted races and, therefore, can't legitimately compete with such races, so when they do see an opportunity to obtain money or power they can't resist taking it, whether it's rightfully due or not. When my partner Annie and I travelled through central Africa in 1992 everywhere we went, at every level of society, there was dysfunction, graft and corruption—even when we landed in Kenya we couldn't leave Nairobi airport until we paid certain 'fees'

to various airport officials. At the top of such societies you invariably find completely despotic regimes—for instance, we were told that the reason the roads beyond the centre of Nairobi weren't sealed and were in a terrible state was because all the money for such infrastructure had been syphoned off by the country's leaders to buy villas on the French Riviera and other luxuries. At the other end of the spectrum of alienation, however, there are races where everyone is so upset-adapted and cynically selfish that graft and despotism is similarly endemic in their societies. In early 2011 the extreme despotism of almost every, if not every, Arab country right across North Africa and the Middle East provoked democracy-demanding uprisings throughout the region—a revolutionary wave that continues today. It is only at the middle of the spectrum of alienation, amongst 30-and-40-year-old, or thereabouts, equivalent races where there is enough upset-adapted self discipline and toughness, but not so much that there is excessive cynicism and thus selfishness, that you get maximum functionality and operable behaviour in life under the duress of the human condition. The Anglo-Saxons are the stand-out example of such functionality, coming as they do from the more isolated and sheltered-from-upset north-western edge of Europe—they are actually more 30-year-old equivalents than 40-year-old equivalents. As mentioned in Part 6:4, although Anglo-Saxons come from a small, resource-deficient island country, they have been so operable and thus successful and thus influential that they have led the so-called 'globalisation of the world' to the point where **'A quarter of the world's population speak English…English is increasingly becoming entrenched as the language of choice for business, science and popular culture. Three-quarters of the world's mail, for example, is currently written in English'** (*TIME* mag. 7 July 1997).

I should clarify that if all the humans who have lived in the last 50,000 years belong to the 40-year-old, Born-Again, Pseudo Idealistic Late Adulthood Stage of Adolescent Humanity, as is asserted in Part 3:11E where the stages of humanity's maturation are described, then why am I referring to humans of today as inhabiting all these different stages, such as the 20-year-old, or thereabouts, equivalent stage, or the 50-year-old, or thereabouts, equivalent stage? The answer is that these descriptions refer to another level of refinement of the already established stages of maturation. To elaborate, while the first T-model Ford car had all the basic elements of a car in place, that didn't mean the elements could not become much more refined over time. Well, the relatively innocent hunter-gatherer Bushmen people of the Kalahari have all the basic adjustments in place for managing extreme upset. They are, for instance, civilised, instinctively restrained from living out all their upsets; they don't generally attack when they feel frustrated and angry. They have a form of marriage to artificially contain sexual adventurousness. They clothe their genitals to dampen lust. The women love to wear adornments such as jewellery; they are adapted to being sex objects. The men love hunting animals; they find relief from attacking innocence. Men and women don't relate to each other as well as they do with their own gender; there is a lack of understanding between the sexes. They make jokes about their fraudulent state; they employ a sense of humour to lighten the load of the agony of being so corrupted and false. They employ fatigue-inducing dance to access their repressed soul. In short, they are members of 'Born-Again, Pseudo Idealistic Late Adulthood Stage of Adolescent Humanity'. But while they have these basic adjustments for managing extreme upset firmly in place, they are still a relatively innocent race compared to other more human-condition-embattled-and-adapted races living today.

Before continuing to describe how races of humans have become more or less adapted to the upset state of the human condition, I should mention some of the human-condition-avoiding, denial-based reasons that have been put forward to explain the dysfunctionality of African countries like Kenya. It is claimed that such countries are on the same journey as European nations, which went through their own dysfunctional stage before organising themselves into upset-restraining, so-called 'civilised' democracies—basically that black African races aren't any more innocent than European races and will, in time, be able to develop functional democracies. In keeping with this theory, instead of using terms like 'First, Second and Third World countries', the current politically correct description for the different states of functionality of countries is to refer to them as being either 'developing' or 'developed'. But if time, rather than degrees of innocence, or lack thereof, was the issue then races from ancient civilisations should not be dysfunctional—and yet they are. The Greeks gave us Plato, Socrates, Aristotle and the foundations of 'western civilisation' and yet, in 2011, through their present innocence-destroyed, selfish greed and resulting dysfunction, brought the world's economy to its knees—and they continue to undermine its stability. Another excuse for the dysfunctionality of these African societies was to blame colonialism. As I mentioned in Part 3:11C, colonialism certainly had negative repercussions and it did seriously disrupt the old tribal system that operated throughout most of Africa, but while tribalism, an authoritarian, dictatorial system in which the most powerful ruled, brought some peace and order (as it effectively does in all non-human societies, such as in wolf packs or in any herd animal species), it was still dysfunctional for human societies in that it oppressed individual freedoms/liberties. Of course, you *can* manage humans by tying them all down, as was done in tribal situations and communist/socialist regimes, but then they will no longer be humans—they will no longer be conscious beings fulfilling their fundamental responsibility of exercising their minds and learning to understand existence. Colonialism gave individuals many freedoms they hadn't had that the individual then had to manage—but the challenge for humans has been to manage their consciousness-derived freedom *effectively*. As has been explained, the lack of effectiveness of that management across a social structure was due to races being either too sensitive and naive about life under the duress of the human condition, or too toughened, soul/innocence-destroyed, cynical and selfish.

In one of his famous speeches, Sir James Darling (the denial-free thinking prophet who was headmaster at Geelong Grammar School when I was a student there) recognised what is really an obvious truth, which is that for a person to be as functional as possible under the duress of the human condition they needed both human-condition-adapted toughness and sensitive, selfless, innocent, soulful soundness. While he was specifically talking about the qualities that education should strive to cultivate in an individual, what he said also applies to what a society of people needed if they were to be functional in the human-condition-afflicted world. In his address to The Royal Australasian College of Surgeons in 1960 Sir James said: **'The quality which, above all other, needs to be cultivated** [in education] **is sensitivity…**[Education's] **objective is a development of the whole man, sensitive all round the circumference…the future…lies not with the predatory** [selfish] **and the immune** [alienated] **but with the sensitive** [innocent]**…There is a threefold choice for the free man…He may** [become overly selfish and] **grasp for himself what he can get and trample the needs and feelings of others beneath his feet: or he may try to withdraw from the**

world to a monastery [find himself too innocent to cope with the upset world, like the Bushman who died in jail]**…or he may "take up arms against a sea of troubles, and by opposing** [all the selfish, corrupt behaviours] **end them"…**[and so] **There remains the sensitive, on one proviso: he must be sensitive *and* tough…Only by a growth of sensitivity can man progress from the alpha of original chaos to the omega of God's** [ordered] **purpose for him…Sensitivity is not enough. Without toughness it may be only a thin skin…**[only from] **an inner core of strength are** [you] **enabled to fight back** [against all the wrongness in the world]**…Can such men be? Of course they can: and they are the** [real] **leaders whom others will follow. In the world of books there are, for me, Antoine de Saint-Exupéry, or Laurens van der Post'** (*The Education of a Civilized Man*, 1962, pp.28-36). To be most operational under the duress of the human condition required a balance of innocent, soulful sensitivity and human-condition-adapted toughness, which is what the 30-year-old equivalent state represents.

The end result of this, in truth, very obvious difference in functionality under the duress of the human condition was that the less functional and thus less materially successful races naturally became extremely resentful and thus angry towards the more materially successful races. Their self-esteem suffered so much that angry retaliations, like the flying of those planes into The Pentagon and the World Trade Center on September 11, 2001, occurred—Osama Bin Laden actually said the 9/11 attacks **'were revenge for Western humiliation of Muslims'** (*TIME* mag. 7 May 2012). The *real* debate about both the horrific inequality in the world and about the terrorism and frightening instability in the world requires analysis of the differences in upset-adaption or alienation-from-soul between individuals, races, genders, generations, countries, civilisations and cultures, but until the human condition could be explained and the upset state of the human condition compassionately understood and thus defended that debate could not take place. The problem of selfishness in the world was not being addressed honestly and thus properly anywhere.

While holidaying with Annie in Fiji in 1997 a resident there gave us this description of the structure of Fijian society: **'The Chinese** [who he said were **'the Jews of the East'**] **own all the big tourist resorts where the big money in Fiji is made, the Indians run all the shops and smaller businesses and produce all the sugar cane, and the Caucasians run the country in that they occupy so many of the important administrative positions, providing the good structure and order required for the whole society to function.' 'Fiji,'** he added, **'is one of the few countries in the world where the indigenous people still control the country even though they are the least materially productive and successful.'** When I asked other residents, including an Indian Fijian and a native Fijian, if they thought this was an accurate description they agreed it was but said that they would never say so publicly for fear of being labelled a racist. The human-condition-understanding-reconciled interpretation of this description is that as soon as you have an unavoidable and necessary battle such as the one that the human race has been involved in, it is inevitable that everyone involved is going to become variously adapted to that battle depending on how long they have been exposed to it—with the result that the Chinese and Indians are the cynical 50-year-old equivalent races, the Caucasians are the toughened, but not too toughened, too insensitive or too selfish, more operational 30year-old equivalent race, while the native Fijians are the 20-year-old equivalent, overly innocent race. Such differences are simply and obviously what manifest when you have an upsetting battle such as the one the human race has been involved in, where some people will have been involved in the battle longer and/or more intensely than others. If you

are going to have the truthful, meaningful, productive, effective discussion about human behaviour—which is both possible and necessary now that the upset state of the human condition has been explained and defended—then the inevitable differences in upset (in particular differences in alienation from our species' all-trusting, sensitive, loving, selfless and sharing original instinctive self or soul) have to be acknowledged.

Again, such admissions of the relative innocence, or lack thereof, of different individuals, races, genders, generations, countries, civilisations or cultures have, until now, had to be avoided because they led to prejudiced views that some individuals, races, genders, generations, countries, civilisations or cultures are either good or bad, superior or inferior, when the truth is that while humans do vary in their degree of upset, all humans are equally good—because, as understanding of the human condition finally makes clear, upset was the inevitable result of the necessary and heroic battle humanity had to wage in order to find knowledge. Upset is not a bad, evil state, but a good, heroic one. Trying to manage differences in upset between individuals, races, genders, generations, countries, civilisations and cultures has been extremely difficult, but once the prejudiced views of some individuals, races, genders, generations, countries, civilisations or cultures being either good or bad, superior or inferior, more worthwhile or less worthwhile, arose terrible atrocities and injustices very often followed. For instance, in the last century alone, we have seen the Holocaust in which approximately six million European Jews were exterminated by the Nazis during the Second World War; the attempted 'ethnic cleansing' by the Bantu Hutu of an estimated 800,000 of the more upset-adapted Nilotic Tutsi in 100 days of bloodshed in Rwanda in 1994; Idi Amin literally throwing out of Uganda, in 1972, all the Indians and Pakistanis, some 40,000-80,000 people, who owned and operated most of the businesses there because he claimed **'they** [were] **sabotaging the economy of the country'** (*Jet* mag. 14 Sept. 1972); the just mentioned terrorist attacks on the Pentagon and the World Trade Center on September 11, 2001; the racial segregation of apartheid in South Africa that was enforced between 1948-1993; and the 'White Australia Policy', which in essence restricted 'non-white' immigration to Australia and wasn't completely abolished until 1973.

The difficulty in managing differences between individuals, races, genders, generations, countries, civilisations or cultures is that not all discrimination between individuals, races, genders, generations, countries, civilisations or cultures has necessarily been wrong, although they could be said to be fundamentally unjust. For example, Geelong Grammar School was originally a school for boys only. It was only after Sir James Darling's tenure as headmaster ended that it became co-educational. It could be argued, and probably was, that having a boys-only policy was discriminatory and unjust, but I believe Sir James Darling's approach of educating boys and girls separately was right. With so much upset in humans, placing boys and girls together during their senior school years is too distracting and problematical, especially if you are trying to preserve and foster innocence, as I believe schooling should be focused on doing. Even though there is a need, as Sir James said, to cultivate qualities of toughness as well as preserving innocent, soulful sensitivity, I agree with Sir James' belief that the *central*, **'prime'** objective in raising new generations has to be the preservation of their innocent, sound original instinctive self or soul for as long as possible. As Sir James said about schooling, **'the needs of the moment demand more than they ever have done the most acute**

sensitivity…It should be the prime object of education…to develop this sensitivity…the truly sensitive mind is both susceptible and penetrating: it is open to new ideas, and it seeks truth at the bottom of the well' (*The Education of a Civilized Man*, 1962, p.63-64 of 223). Sir James similarly said, **'It is the awakening and vivifying of the conscience…which ought to be the chief purpose of a Church school…because… conscience** [our instinctive self or soul's moral sense] **is the executive part of consciousness'** (ibid. p.96). (I should include an aside here that now that we can admit that sex, as humans have practiced it, has been all about attacking innocence—as was explained in Part 7:1—we need to carefully review the whole issue of the interaction between boys and girls. Indeed, we are going to realise that a significant amount of the rapid increase in upset in generations today has been due to sexual liberalism. Under the unbearable burden of the human condition sex has been a wonderful way of relieving our upset, of making our lives more interesting and exciting, and even of expressing our love for someone, but it also involved the destruction of innocence. Sex has been a medium by which the more innocent have been psychologically destroyed by the more upset, and no one has been admitting this—and certainly no one has been telling children this. Magazines for young people, for example, are full of presentations about how to make yourself more attractive—for sex—and stories about how to improve your sex life, etc, etc. It is extraordinary how unrestrained sex has become and the consequences are contributing greatly to the drab and miserable lives of young people everywhere. As Darling said, **'conscience'**, soul, **'is the executive part of consciousness'**: destroy the innocent soul and life becomes uninspired, empty, drab and meaningless.)

In another example of an argument existing for discrimination, in Section 4:1 of *Freedom Expanded: Book 2* I describe how incredibly important the survival of Celtic, Irish innocence was in Australia—that its presence basically allowed the human condition to be solved and humanity saved from extinction—and the fact is, the survival of that Celtic, Irish innocence was in large measure due to the extremely unjust, discriminatory 'White Australia Policy'. As has been emphasised, discrimination in the form of the management of human interactions based on levels of innocence or lack thereof is not in itself bad or immoral; after all, we go to great lengths to protect the innocence of children. What *is* wrong or immoral is to base those management decisions on judgments about the goodness or badness, superiority or inferiority, of different *levels* of innocence or lack thereof. Unable to explain the human condition, explain the good reason for the upset, soul-and-innocence-destroyed, corrupted state of humans, any acknowledgement of upset invariably led to those who were more upset being, and feeling, condemned as bad or inferior or worthless, and, in response, retaliating, in which case *no* differentiation according to levels of upset could afford to be tolerated. The 'White Australia Policy' was wrong and couldn't be tolerated *not* because humans aren't differently upset, but because it led to prejudiced/wrong views about some races being better or superior than others, which often, in fact invariably, led to serious and damaging consequences.

As I mentioned in Parts 4:1, 4:4E and 5:1, Plato quite sensibly wanted to have the least ego-embattled/most innocent—the **'philosopher kings'** or **'philosopher rulers'** or **'philosopher princes'** or **'philosopher guardians'** as he variously described them—lead society. He wrote, **'isn't it obvious whether it's better for a blind man** [an alienated person] **or a clear-sighted one** [an innocent, ego-unembattled, denial-free, honest person] **to keep an eye on anything'** (*Plato The Republic*, tr. H.D.P. Lee, 1955, p.244 of 405), arguing that **'If you get, in public affairs, men who are so morally impoverished**

that they have nothing they can contribute themselves, but who hope to snatch some compensation for their own inadequacy from a political career, there can never be good government. They start fighting for power…[whereas those who pursue a life] **of true philosophy** [honest, unresigned, egocentricity-free thought] **which looks down on political power…**[should be] **the only men to get power…men who do not love it** [who don't egocentrically hunger for power, fame, fortune and glory]**…rulers** [who] **come to their duties with least enthusiasm'** (p.286). Completely **'obvious'** as Plato's idea was of having the most innocent run society, such honesty was untenable and couldn't be tolerated because differentiation between individuals according to degrees of alienation or soundness left those no longer innocent unjustly condemned as bad and unworthy. And, as was mentioned in Part 4:4C, it wasn't as though we didn't know who was soul-corrupted, upset and alienated and who was relatively innocent—to ignore, deny, repress and, in the extreme, persecute to the point even, in the case of Christ, of crucifying innocence, as we have done because we found their honest, truthful innocent soundness too confronting, we had to first be able to recognise it. It would have been as easy, indeed, probably much easier, to design exams that tested a person's level of alienation or soundness or soulfulness quotient, their SQ, than it was to design exams that tested their intelligence quotient or IQ.

Again, until we were able to explain the human condition and by so doing defend and understand the upset, corrupted state, any acknowledgement of who was upset and who wasn't only led to prejudice, led to the more innocent condemning the less innocent as bad or unworthy or even evil.

Not only have the expressions of prejudice been innumerable and varied, they go right back to when extreme upset first developed in humans—as perfectly summarised in that greatest of all reservoirs of denial-free truth, the Bible, in the aforementioned story of Cain and Abel: **'Abel kept flocks,** [he lived the nomadic life of a shepherd, staying close to nature and innocence] **and Cain worked the soil** [he cultivated crops and domesticated animals and as a result was able to become settled and develop towns and cities and through greater interaction with other humans became increasingly upset]**…Cain was** [became] **very angry, and his face was downcast** [he became depressed about his upset state and]**…Cain attacked his** [relatively innocent and thus unwittingly confronting and condemning] **brother Abel and killed him'** (Gen. 4:2, 5, 8).

The simple fact is, the longer the battle to find understanding went on, the more upset humans became—and the simple fact that flows from this is that those people and races who have been in the thick of the battle a long time will be more upset—and also more instinctively adapted to upset, including becoming instinctively cynical and selfish—than those who haven't been in the thick of the battle for as long—and the simple fact that flows from *that* is that all manner of insecurities, inequalities and frustrations are going to arise from those differences.

Everywhere innocence has been affected by upset, and vice versa. As explained in Part 7:1, men have oppressed women because of women's relative innocence. Older people have tended to limit young people's access to power and position because young people could be too innocent and naive about the realities of life under the duress of the human condition, and it would also involve relinquishing their own power base. As mentioned in Part 4:4E when the problem of prejudice was briefly introduced, when we get up in the morning we are much fresher, more enthusiastic and idealistic than we are by the end of the day, such that our end-

of-the-day-just-want-some-luxury-self wouldn't entertain the more optimistic and altruistic enterprises of our more soulful, socially healthy and operational morning-self. By evening, most people are in need of a stiff drink to escape the tribulations of their day's exertions under the duress of the human condition. Whatever idealistic, selfless, soul-inspired enterprises they might have been thinking about in the morning have, by day's end, been replaced by a selfish preoccupation with a need for ego-reinforcement from others, relief from exertion and for escape from the whole horror of life under the duress of the human condition. The most productive and creative time of the day is when we are, as we say, 'fresh', which is the morning. That is the time of day when I do all my writing. As the day wears on I quickly lose my enthusiasm and inspiration. My life has followed the same path. Albert Einstein once commented that **'a person who has not made his great contribution to science before the age of 30 will never do so'** (Selig Brodetsky, 'Newton: Scientist and Man', *Nature*, 1942, Vol.150), and certainly, while my most creative years were not **'before the age of 30'** they were very soon afterwards when I had accumulated enough experience of life under the duress of the human condition but still had lots of youthful enthusiasm and soul-guided inspiration. Indeed, my early 30s was a period of absolutely fabulous creativity when, in a few short years between 1975, when I was 30 and began to actively write down my thinking on the problem of the human condition, to 1983, when I was 38, I solved all the great questions in biology; it was during this time that I explained the human condition (as summarised in Part 3:2), explained the meaning of existence (Part 8:1), explained how we humans acquired our unconditionally selfless moral instincts (Part 8:4B), and explained how and when we humans became conscious (Part 8:4C). As I mentioned in Part 4:14, in 1983 I went to London in an unsuccessful attempt to interest the leading science journals in the world at that time, namely *Nature* and *New Scientist*, in the complete synthesis—my submission, which can be read on our website at <www.humancondition.com/nature>, was, however, unsuccessful because denial-based, mechanistic science would not tolerate my denial-free ideas. Again, I need to emphasise that finding these insights was due to the fact that I was thinking in a denial-free way and doesn't at all mean that I am in any way special or gifted. The point being made here is that having to live with all the stresses from a deeply upset, human-condition-afflicted world has meant that in the course of one day in the life of a human he or she regresses from a state of fresh, boundless energy and enthusiasm to a state of physical and emotional exhaustion. Such has been the overall change in the mindset of humans over one day, over a lifetime, over generations, and over the whole two million year upsetting journey of humanity from its original state of innocent idealism to its variously embattled, punch-drunk, distressed, soul-exhausted state today! Everywhere that the battle of the human condition has been raging there have been differences in upset with all manner of consequences, some horrifically tragic.

What people are really doing through their efforts to either try to or actually remove tyrants/despots like Robert Mugabe, Saddam Hussein, Muammar Gaddafi, Hosni Mubarak, etc, etc, from power in the hope that those countries will become functional democracies is trying to make 20-year-old equivalents and 50-year-old equivalents behave like 30-and-40-year-old equivalents. But, as explained, societies of 20-year-old equivalents and 50-year-old equivalents *are* going to revert to selfishness, at which point a selfish power struggle will occur where, in the end, the most ruthless will take over once again. Having solved nothing

at a fundamental level, the society will invariably remain dysfunctional, resulting in yet another flood of refugees from that country to countries populated by more functional 30-and-40-year-old equivalent races. Efforts to avoid this cycle, or at least contain it somewhat, in countries where there is too much cynical selfishness led to the creation of authoritarian, dictatorial, freedom-and-democracy-denying, free-thinking-restricted, human-mind-oppressive regimes—which were therefore still fundamentally tyrannical and despotic—like those that have been established in China, and (to a degree) by Lee Kuan Yew in Singapore. The other form of tyranny that developed to contain excessive cynical selfishness was strict obedience to fundamentalist interpretations of religious teachings—as has been the case in many parts of the Arab world.

In the old human-condition-afflicted-pre-TRANSFORMED world, it was not realistic to believe you could make a family with a selfish power addict father functional—because it is a contradiction in terms: you can't be dysfunctionally selfish and at the same time be functionally selfless. Similarly, therefore, if there wasn't a significant proportion of functional 30-and-40-year-old equivalents in a society then that society was not going to be functional. The cynical 50-year-old equivalent Jews have managed to remain operational and, as a result, extremely materially successful by living amongst relatively selfless, functional 30-and-40-year-old equivalent races—which is the real reason they have been persecuted in the predominately 30-and-40-year-old equivalent countries where they settled. The Pygmies and the Bushmen resent the Bantu for being more operational and materially successful than they are, and in turn the Bantu resent the Caucasians for being more operational and materially successful than they are—and in turn the Caucasians resent the Jews for being more operational and materially successful than they are. Everywhere the inevitable differences in upset between individuals, races, genders, generations, countries, civilisations and cultures have caused immense problems, so the greater truth is that it is a very great tribute to the character and courage of the human race as a whole that it has managed to maintain some semblance of functionality under that almost impossible situation.

We can see then in hindsight that colonisation under the rule of 30-year-old equivalents did make significant sense—as Sir James Darling was quoted as saying earlier in Part 6:4 about the British Empire, **'the function of Empire is to educate rather than to oppress'**, and the British have **'an unbeaten record in the history of civilization'**. All the history books written by truth-denying-in-order-to-artificially-make-everyone-equal postmodernists that condemned colonialism as the worst evil are going to have to be re-written truthfully. Although 'stereotype' concepts about the character of different races have been much denigrated and dismissed in the human-condition-avoiding, denial-compliant world as unfounded, there was often truth in them, which is not surprising given such concepts were conventional, widely held. In fact, most of the time I'm expressing truths that we all at least intuitively know but haven't been able to adequately express—that is, express in a way that wasn't prejudicially unbalanced—because we haven't had the compassionate framework of understanding of upset needed to safely acknowledge them. Without the defence for upset it was virtually impossible to talk about upset in a way that didn't infer that it was somehow bad. As will be emphasised next in Part 7:5, with understanding of the human condition at last found the essential equality of goodness of all people is at last established. While all humans *are* variously upset, *all*

humans are equally good because upset was a result of an unavoidable and necessary battle humanity had to wage to find knowledge. The equality of goodness of all people is a first-principle-established, fundamental and universal truth now. We can now *explain*, *understand* and *know* that that is a fundamental truth. The prejudiced views of some individuals, races, genders, generations, countries, civilisations or cultures being either superior or inferior, good or bad, are eliminated by understanding of the human condition. With this truth of the fundamental equality of goodness of all people established it at last becomes safe—and necessary if we are to understand ourselves and by so doing ameliorate and heal our upset lives—to truthfully analyse human behaviour by recognising differences in upset between individuals, races, genders, generations, countries, civilisations and cultures. The liberation of the human race is unavoidably and necessarily also 'judgment day', exposure day, honesty day, truth day, transparency day, revelation day—the time when **'your nakedness will be exposed'** (Isa. 47:3). Our species' liberation from terminal alienation and thus extinction comes at a price, which is exposure of all our falseness/lies/denials, but that price is not too high because the TRANSFORMED WAY OF LIVING allows everyone to joyously cope with that exposure.

During January and February 2011, the British Prime Minister David Cameron, German Chancellor Angela Merkel, French President Nicolas Sarkozy, former Spanish Prime Minister Jose Maria Aznar and former Australian Prime Minister John Howard all declared that **'multicultural policies'** have been a **'failure'** because **'immigrants'** had **'not successfully integrated'** (UK's *Daily Mail*, 11 Feb. 2011). Just as an individual person's lifestyle was inevitably going to largely be a response to that person's particular level of upset, so too a race's culture was inevitably going to largely be a response to that race's particular level of upset, which means different races with their different cultures inevitably found it difficult co-existing. You don't very often see 30-year-olds forming close friendships with 50-year-olds, or even 20-year-olds with 30-year-olds. Most people relate much better to their own age group. In fact, the stages that occurred with different ages under the duress of the human condition changed so rapidly and were so dramatically different that 18-year-olds typically found it difficult relating even to 21-year-olds. Outside of family situations, everyone tended to fraternise with their own age group. The same situation of incompatibility obviously applied between races of people. Different levels of upset had different needs. For example, as mentioned in Part 7:1, once humans became extremely upset even the glimpse of a woman's face or ankle became dangerously sexually exciting to men, which is why in some cultures women are completely shrouded and persecuted if any part of their body is revealed in public. Imagine how difficult it has been for individuals from such extremely upset cultures to see young women from less upset cultures running around at liberty in bikinis and mini-skirts.

Add envy of the material success of the more operational to the situation where the more upset found women's beauty overly exciting and the whole situation became unbearable for the more upset—especially when, with the advent of television and the internet, they could actually see the material success and the exposed beauty of women. Imagine how distressing it has been for the less materially successful to see such luxurious surroundings and the beautifully groomed, half-naked, Californian beach babes on television programs like *Baywatch*. The envy and resentment in less materially successful countries of all the luxury in the West that television had made them aware of is palpable in this stark, firsthand account

from the psychiatrist Professor Clancy McKenzie: **'While visiting Machu Picchu in Peru in 1979 I noted very poor persons, living in the mountains, who had only the clothes they wore and perhaps a lama or two, but had beautiful, warm smiles and seemed content and happy. Days later I was in Bogota in Colombia. It was a very hot day and we asked the driver to stop at an outdoor tavern to buy cold beer. The people were very impoverished, but there was a TV playing and they were able to view the "outside world" where everyone seemed to have more, and luxury was abundant. I offered to go in with the driver and he urged me to wait in the car. I soon learned why. The absolute hatred was so intense that it was palpable. These people did not have less than those in Machu Picchu but they saw others who had more, and their needs were intensified'** (Letter to Prof. Harry Prosen, 27 Mar. 2006).

Aside from the fact that with the speed-up of technology-led globalisation (especially phone, television and internet technologies) no longer can any group live unaffected by and thus independent of other groups, the truth is the stresses arising from the upset state of the human condition have become so great that even if different races/cultures/societies could stay separate (as Abraham Lincoln advocated at one stage in his US presidency to stop the friction between white and black Americans), the differences in the level of upset between members of the same race/culture/society has made cohesion impossible *even within* those races/cultures/societies. Indeed, the reality is that upset is now so great everywhere that people can't even live with themselves, let alone anyone else. As mentioned in Part 3:11H, Australia has been, and, to a degree, still is one of the most sheltered and isolated and thus innocent countries left in the world, but even our society is on the brink of disintegration because of people's inability to live with each other, as this 2011 news report, which featured on the front page of the *Sydney Morning Herald*, indicated: **'The well-being of Australia's children and young people has declined alarmingly in the past decade—and plunging marriage rates are partly to blame, a major study has found. Growing rates of child abuse and neglect, of children being placed in foster care, and of teenage mental health problems, including a rise in hospital admissions for self-harm, are rooted in the rise of one-parent families and de facto couples, violent and unstable relationships, and divorce, the report says'** ('Decline in marriage blamed for neglect', 6 Sept. 2011). It is end game wherever we like to look in the world. We have reached the point where only understanding of the human condition and the TRANSFORMED WAY OF LIVING that leaves the whole upset state of the human condition behind forever can save the world. What finally brings all the horror of life under the duress of the human condition to an end is the TRANSFORMED WAY OF LIVING.

Managing upset was always going to become impossible once upset reached a certain level. *Only* the finding of understanding of the human condition and the TRANSFORMED STATE that it made possible could save the human race from terminal levels of upset. We certainly have been, as Richard Neville said, **'locked in a race between self destruction and self discovery'**. Thankfully the **'race'** was won by **'self discovery'**, but it *was* a very near thing!

Tragically, because of our monumental insecurity about our human condition, we humans have a better understanding of the behaviour of elephants and of tiny little insects like tree-hoppers, and even of grass, than we do about our own behaviour, so if you would like to learn more about the social effects of our different states of upset read 'The Denial-Free History of the Human Race' chapter in my book *A Species In Denial*. (To read this chapter, go to <www.humancondition.com/asid-the-denial-free-history-of-the-human-race>.) My biology professor at Sydney University, Charles Birch, was making this point about

the almost complete black-out—actually, 'block-out'—of any understanding of the all-important subject of our human behaviour when, in launching our WTM website in 1998 at the Australian Museum in Sydney, he said in his speech about the importance of our work that **'We** [humanity] **are drowning in information—just look at the internet—but we are starving for wisdom'** (16 Oct. 1998).

Indeed, given this need for **'wisdom'** in this all-important subject area of human behaviour, I should conclude this description of the different levels of upset in races of humans with the following balancing overview from the 'The Denial-Free History of the Human Race' essay.

'With understanding of the human condition it at last becomes possible to explain psychologically what was actually happening when history books talked of civilisations having 'peaked' and become 'decadent'. Under the duress of the human condition all races eventually became overly corrupted, corruption of our original instinctive self or soul being the price of humanity's heroic search for knowledge. In this journey from innocence to exhaustion of soul the most creative period was the toughened and disciplined, but not yet overly corrupted, 30-year-old equivalent stage. As each race and its associated civilisation passed through this stage it made its particularly creative contribution to the human journey. This was when civilisations were at their 'peak', however, inevitably, they entered a more corrupted 'decadent' stage. The Mediterranean, Middle East and Indian civilisations all made extensive contributions to the human journey during their energetic and creative 30-year-old equivalent stage. The Egyptians and peoples from the fertile crescent of the Tigris and Euphrates delta in the Middle East began the civilisation of the 'known world', for example they invented the wheel, mathematics and writing. Greeks and Romans laid the foundations for 'western civilisation' during this most creative stage of their journey through ever-increasing levels of upset. The great religions of the world, Hinduism, Buddhism, Judaism, Christianity and Islam, were developed in India and the Middle East when there was still enough soundness left in their populations to produce some exceptionally sound, denial-free thinkers or prophets.

With understanding of the human condition the various stages of soul corruption can be compassionately understood. To become corrupted was an unavoidable consequence of having to participate in humanity's heroic journey to defy ignorance and find understanding, ultimately self-understanding. To illustrate how races progress from innocence to corruption of soul I have used [in 'The Denial-Free History of the Human Race' essay] the history of the Aryan Anglo-Saxons and Celts. I have done this because they are currently in their 'peak' state of contributing to the human journey to enlightenment, and because that journey is in its crucial final stage where a great deal of honest explanation of the events that are taking place is needed. However, I could have chosen the history of the Aryan Greeks and Romans, the Aryan Indians, the Middle Eastern Semites, the Chinese (who during their most creative stage contributed to the human journey such wonderful inventions as paper, moveable type, the compass and gunpowder) and other races of Asia, or the Aztecs and Incas of Central and South America to illustrate the same journey. Each of their rich histories would have shown the same pattern of progressing from a state of innocence through an operational, exceptionally creative 30-year-old equivalent stage and on to a more corrupted, soul-burnt-out, selfish, cynical, 'decadent' state.

Every civilisation has contributed to the advance of knowledge. Just where the leading edge in the advancement of knowledge was occurring at any one time depended on what stage in the human journey from innocence to exhaustion or decadence the various civilisations were at, so it is in truth meaningless passing out accolades to any particular individual, race or civilisation. For example, I have employed the commonly used terms of 'East' and 'West' descriptions for the world's different civilisations but that Europe-centric view is in truth unjustly prejudiced.

It should also be emphasised that even races at the more corrupted end of the alienation spectrum still contribute to the human journey. Every individual and every race always sought to contain and minimise the negative aspects of their particular condition and develop and maximise the positive aspects of that condition. The 40-year-old equivalent, or thereabouts, Italians, for instance, despite having progressed past their 'peak', still contribute to the human journey on many fronts. For example, their mature sophistication has made them masters in the creative world of design.'

I might add, to what was said in the above extract from 'The Denial-Free History of the Human Race' essay, a balancing comment regarding my earlier statement about the Jewish race having benefited from living amongst more innocent, soulful, selfless 30-and-40-year-old equivalent races. In Part 3:11C, when analysing the graph of *The Development of Mental Cleverness*, I mentioned that the graph indicated that brain volume rose rapidly from two million years ago onwards, only to plateau towards the end of that two million year period, and that anthropologists haven't been able to account for why this growth in brain volume plateaued, however, with understanding of the human condition, we can now explain the slowdown: it is because a balance was struck between the need for cleverness and the need for soundness—between knowledge-finding yet corrupting mental cleverness and conscience-obedient yet non-knowledge-finding lack of mental cleverness. The average IQ today represents that relatively safe conscience-subordinate compromise. It is true that the ability to find answers didn't necessarily accompany increased intelligence because, as described, increased intelligence tended to lead to an increase in upset and thus alienation, and alienation made thinking truthfully and thus effectively very difficult, however, a high degree of intelligence was still required to find knowledge, most especially in complex subject areas like higher mathematics and physics. Thus, if the human race couldn't develop exceptionally high levels of intelligence then many crucial understandings about the nature and workings of our world would not have been able to be found. The Jews are renowned for being exceptionally intelligent and it is from within their ranks that some of the greatest minds and insights have emerged: Albert Einstein, with his breakthrough insights into the physical nature of our universe, is the most obvious example. It is true that Einstein must have had an exceptional degree of soundness to have been as an effective thinker as he was, but he also must have been exceptionally intelligent to so successfully grapple with the extremely complex subjects he was dealing with. I haven't ever tried to collect together and list all the contributions to the human race that the Jews have made but it would be very significant. By, in effect, allowing exceptional cleverness/intelligence to develop by countering its corrupting effects with the presence of people who were not so intellectually clever and thus not so upset and thus not so upset-adapted was, in the bigger picture, a fortuitous outcome for the human race.

Basically, the human journey has been such a complex story that a perfectly balanced view is beyond the powers of effective interpretation in this very early stage of viewing the history of the human race in a denial-free way. And such a detailed interpretation can actually wait because what is so important now is that the human race can leave behind its whole upset history as compassionately dealt with—our history *is finally*, as the saying goes, just that—it's 'all just history' now. As emphasised, what brings all the horror of life under the duress of the human condition to an end is the TRANSFORMED WAY OF LIVING.

Before beginning the next Part I want to include the following piece of writing because it adds to some of the points I have been making. In thinking about the obvious, but historically denied, truth that individuals and races *do* differ in how adapted to upset they have become, I have written that basketball players are typically very tall because the game is geared towards tall players, and cars are streamlined to cut down air resistance—the point is, everything becomes adapted to its environment. Humans have been involved in an upsetting battle, so the longer humans have been in the battle and/or the more intensely they have been exposed to it, the more affected by, and adapted to upset they will have become. It's simply the truth. All I am saying is not 'simply not true', or 'maybe only somewhat true', as the denial-complying, defensive mind will try to assert, but both obviously true and extremely true—in fact, much truer than I'm even capable of describing it as—maybe I should try: what I'm saying is as obvious as the sky is blue. All I ever do when I'm thinking is let my mind say what is obvious. As I mentioned in Part 3:11C, I call it 'thinking like a stone', or 'thinking like a child'. I have learnt over and over again that if I can't solve a problem I am thinking about, explain something, it's because I'm not thinking simply and straight-forwardly enough. 'Let your inner, soul-guided true self say the obvious and you will have the answer', is what I say to myself, because it will make sense of what I am looking at and trying to find the explanation for—what did Sir James Darling say, '**'conscience…is the executive part of consciousness'**. That is how I found the explanation of the human condition and the hundreds of other answers I have found.

I should explain that through understanding the human condition we can understand why this 'thinking like a stone/child' was necessary. We humans are so saturated with the insecurity caused by the issue of the human condition that all our thinking is tainted by it. The truth is, we hardly want to think honestly at all, which means we hardly want to think—truly, Bertrand Russell *wasn't* exaggerating when he said, **'Many people would sooner die than think.'** With our minds *so* trained and *so* steeped in dishonesty the only way to avoid the dishonesty is to not engage in any conventional thinking—you have to avoid that tainted practice, start again, go back to the most elementary thoughts and stay with them, 'think like a stone/child would think', say the simple, obvious, untainted, unadulterated truth. And I should say about all my thinking, that my job, as the deliverer of understanding of the human condition, is to get at least the main descriptions of all the hard truths up and dealt with so that humanity can move well out into the clear of the past. As I have emphasised, we get the truth up and then we move on. We leave the old effectively dead, dishonest, human-condition-afflicted world behind forever. That is the indescribable magnificence of the TRANSFORMED LIFEFORCE STATE. As Bono sang, **'I've conquered my past / The future is here at last / I stand at the entrance to a new world I can see / The ruins to the right of me / Will soon have lost sight of me.'** Also, as Beethoven's symphony anticipated, **'Joy'**, **'Joyful, as a hero to victory!'**, **'Join in our jubilation!'**, **'We enter, drunk with fire, into your** [understanding's] **sanctuary…Your magic reunites…All men become brothers…All good, all bad…Be embraced, millions! This kiss for the whole world!'**

Honestly, 'who's fucked and who isn't fucked'—it just doesn't fucking matter anymore. WE ARE OUT OF THERE—GONE—THAT'S ALL OVER, IT'S HISTORY. WE, THE HUMAN RACE, IS FREE! It no longer matters who is more cynical, more human-condition-adapted, because the TRANSFORMED STATE leaves all that behind. The greater truth is we have *all* become well and truly fucked/stuffed/corrupted/upset anyway, and it all doesn't matter now because we *are* out of there, we have won the match and we now all head for the showers and get ready for humanity's great victory party—and soon even the different scars we all carry from the match will be gone, soon the human race will be psychologically healed. It *is* all history now, **'the ruins to the right of** [us]**, will soon have lost sight of** [us]**'**.

Part 7:5 How Alienated did we become?

The final element of our upset is our alienation, the truth of the extent of which is even more shocking than the just-described extent of the anger and egocentricity (and cynical selfishness) in humans. So, the question this raises is: just how alienated are we humans after two million years of not having any other psychological defence for our corrupted condition other than to block the truth of it out of our minds?

As described in Part 6:2, Plato said our species' alienation was so great that it was as if we were imprisoned in a cave **'a long way underground'**, where we could see only **'shadows'** that were **'illusions'** and **'delusions'** of the real world outside the cave. As mentioned earlier in Part 3:5, the cover of my book *A Species In Denial* (pictured below) features two powerful paintings by William Blake: *Cringing in Terror* (c.1794-96), which shows a person in a foetal position, screaming in terror—yet another accurate depiction of our horrifically estranged, alienated state—and *Albion Arose* (c.1794-96), which symbolises our liberation from our terrible state of cave-dwelling alienation; in this picture Blake has even included a bat flying out of a supposed cave.

The most honest description I have ever read of the extent of alienation of the human race comes from the aforementioned great Scottish psychiatrist R.D. Laing, who wrote that **'Our alienation goes to the roots. The realization of this is the essential springboard for any serious reflection on any aspect of present inter-human life'** (*The Politics of Experience* and *The Bird of Paradise*, 1967, p.12 of 156). Before presenting more of this quote, we should consider what Laing has said here—**'our alienation goes to the roots'** of our condition, but if we are not prepared to admit that then we

are not even beginning to think effectively about human behaviour; we are not in a position to undertake **'any serious reflection on any aspect of present inter-human life'**. Darwin, for example, didn't try to look into human behaviour because he responsibly recognised that he wasn't prepared to take this, according to Laing, necessary step and look into our species' alienated condition. But, as has been described, other biologists weren't so scrupulous—*they* found ways to deny the issue of the human condition and therefore didn't conduct a **'serious reflection on any aspect of present inter-human life'**.

As described in Part 7:4, the situation is that humans have become so insecure, so unable to make **'the realization'** that **'our alienation goes to the roots'**, that no one has been allowed to even acknowledge differences in alienation between individuals, races, genders, generations, countries, civilisations and cultures. Sir Laurens van der Post made the **'academic experts' 'berserk with rage'** when he dared to talk about the relative innocence of the Bushmen of the Kalahari. In Parts 6:4 and 7:4, but more so in my book *A Species In Denial* in the aforementioned chapter, 'The Denial-Free History of the Human Race', I talk about the relative innocence of the Aryans of northern Europe. The original Greeks and Romans also came from Aryan stock, but they had their innocence bled dry through endless wars and other agonising struggles that arose from being overly exposed to the upset state of the human condition, as did other races around the Mediterranean, so that in the end the only relatively innocent people left in Europe were those isolated in the northern outreaches of the continent. But such descriptions about different levels of innocence that feature in my books and in this presentation would be regarded as heretical; indeed, I could be falsely accused of being racist, such has been the extent of pseudo idealistic, politically correct, postmodern denial in the world today. There has been no tolerance of truth at all. Denial/alienation has been plunging the world into total darkness. Truth has been denied in favour of fabricating equality by denying there are any differences between individuals, races, genders, generations, countries, civilisations and even cultures.

The problem was that while we couldn't explain the human condition and therefore defend the upset state, any acknowledgment of people being differently upset would have led to the more upset being accused of being evil and bad, and worse, actually *believing* they were evil or bad, in which case they could, in desperation, go out and shoot themselves. Descriptions of some people being more alienated than others would only lead to prejudice against such people. The deeper truth that we have always intuitively believed in, which has now at last been explained, is that no human is fundamentally bad, which is why we have always tried to be compassionate towards overly upset humans—for example, most countries have abandoned the practice of capital punishment, keeping the worst of criminals in jail rather than killing them. Obviously, despite displays of compassion, we haven't been able to tolerate or manage or rehabilitate upset beyond a certain point because we have not been operational enough or, more importantly, had the psychological insights into the human condition to do so, but enlightened societies at least chose to remove the death penalty.

But with understanding of the human condition now found the essential equality of goodness of all people is finally established. As the story of Adam Stork at last makes clear, while all humans are variously upset, *all humans are equally good because upset was a result of an unavoidable and necessary battle*. Some people are taller or shorter than others, but they are all equally good. In exactly the same way, some people have been more or less

involved in humanity's great heroic battle than others and are thus more or less embattled/upset, but they are all equally good. The equality of goodness of all people is a first-principle-established, fundamental and universal truth now. Humanity no longer has to rely on dogmatic assertions that **'all men are created equal'** because it is a **'self-evident'** truth, as the United States' Declaration of Independence asserts. We can now *explain*, *understand* and *know* that our equality is a fundamental truth. Prejudice, the view that some individuals, races, genders, generations, countries, civilisations or cultures are either superior or inferior to others, is eliminated by understanding of the human condition. In fact, with understanding of the human condition the concepts of good and bad, superior and inferior, disappear from our conceptualisation of ourselves.

So we haven't been able to talk about different levels of innocence without condemning those more corrupted as bad when they are not. In effect, a lie that said there was no difference in alienation between people was less of a lie than a partial truth that said there were differences with some people being 'good' and others 'bad'. The end result of taking this denial to the extreme has been the emergence of an unsaid, blanket rule where no one is allowed to say anything meaningful about human behaviour—to the extent that even the children's nursery rhyme *Baa Black Sheep* is said to be racist and must instead be recited as **'Baa baa *rainbow* sheep'** (London's *Daily Telegraph*, 18 Feb. 1997). Political correctness is a dogma that has become ridiculous and yet that is where the human race has wound up—in a state where totally superficial, truthless non-sense reigns! Feminists are now saying there is no real difference between the sexes, and even men can now give birth through some weird surgery. Under this blanket rule, in order to avoid prejudice we are not allowed to talk about different individuals, races, genders, generations, countries, civilisations or cultures being more or less innocent than other individuals, races, genders, generations, countries, civilisations or cultures. No one is allowed to talk about such differences and yet they are the only differences that will make any real sense of the different behaviours that each human exhibits. Our different personalities reflect our various states of alienation, how hurt we were in our childhood, etc, so if we want to understand human behaviour, we *have* to look at how upset we humans are—in particular at how much denial we are practicing. As Laing said, **'the essential springboard for any serious reflection on any aspect of present inter-human life'** depends on acknowledging that **'our alienation goes to the roots'**.

As outlined in Part 4:4E when the problem of prejudice was introduced, since the basis of coping with the issue of our upset, corrupted human condition has been denial—the result of which is alienation—when understanding of the human condition arrives that denial is obsoleted: the lies are replaced with the truth and the alienation is revealed. It can't be any other way. We can't have the truth and not have the truth, but the problem is that while all the upset that the denials/lies/degrees of alienation have been concealing is now safely explained and defended it still comes as a shock to have it all laid bare. The situation where there was *no* acknowledgment of differences in alienation between individuals, races, genders, generations, countries, civilisations or cultures suddenly changes to having *all* those previously hidden differences exposed—such as the Anglo-Saxons being acknowledged in Parts 6:4 and 7:4 as being sufficiently free of alienation and its cynicisms to still remain functional, or prophets being acknowledged in Part 5:1 as being sufficiently free of alienation to think truthfully and thus effectively. This outcome is actually described in the Bible where, immediately after

describing the arrival of the all-exposing, shocking truth about the human condition as being **'like the lightning, which flashes and lights up the sky from one end to the other'** (Luke 17:24, see also Matt. 24:27), Christ describes how **'two people will be in one bed; one will be taken** [revealed as sound, non-alienated] **and the other left** [revealed as being alienated]**. Two women will be grinding corn together; one will be taken and the other left'** (Luke 17:34, 35; see also Matt. 24:40). Again, it has to be stressed that **'judgment day'** is not a time when some will be judged as deserving of being **'taken'** to heaven and others **'left'** rejected, but a time of compassionate understanding of everyone. With the arrival of understanding of the human condition no one is going to be **'left'** behind. When the TRANSFORMED LIFEFORCE STATE is described in Part 9 it will be explained that *all* humans will *fully* participate in the new human-condition-liberated world. There will be no inequality, no prejudice and no discrimination of *anyone*. Implying that the more upset would be **'left'** behind when understanding of the human condition arrived was simply a way of trying to dissuade people from allowing their upset to continue to express itself; it was to stop them 'sinning'. Like using the dishonest threat of going to a burning hell if you sinned, it was a way of intimidating people into behaving in a less upset, destructive way by misrepresenting the future. As the Turkish poet, who was cited earlier, said, 'judgment day' is **'Not the day of judgment but the day of** [compassionate] **understanding'** (Merle Severy, 'The World of Süleyman the Magnificent', *National Geographic*, Nov. 1987). The paradox of being wonderfully liberated but at the same time agonisingly exposed was captured by the prophet Isaiah when he said that the liberation that **'gives you relief from suffering and turmoil and cruel bondage…will come with vengeance; with divine retribution…to save you. Then will the eyes of the blind be opened and the ears of the deaf unstopped…Your nakedness will be exposed'** (Bible, 14:3; 35:4, 5; 47:3).

Following on from Laing's comment that any **'serious reflection'** of human behaviour depended on recognising that **'our alienation goes to the roots'**, Laing went on to practice what he preached, confronting the truth of the extent of our alienation by saying, **'We are born into a world where alienation awaits us. We are potentially men, but are in an alienated state** [p.12 of 156] **…the *ordinary* person is a shrivelled, desiccated fragment of what a person can be. As adults, we have forgotten most of our childhood, not only its contents but its flavour; as men of the world, we hardly know of the existence of the inner world** [p.22] **…The condition of alienation, of being asleep, of being unconscious, of being out of one's mind, is the condition of the normal man** [p.24] **…between *us* and It** [our true self or soul] **there is a veil which is more like fifty feet of solid concrete** [p.118]**'** (*The Politics of Experience* and *The Bird of Paradise*, 1967). What Laing has said here is supported by a quote from the Russian philosopher George Gurdjieff, who said that **'It happens fairly often that essence dies in a man while his personality and his body are still alive. A considerable percentage of the people we meet in the streets of a great town are people who are empty inside, that is, they are actually *already dead*'** (*In Search of the Miraculous*, P.D. Ouspensky, 1950, ch.8, p.164). The prophet Isaiah in the Bible similarly described the extent of humans' alienation when he said, **'"You will be ever hearing, but never understanding; you will be ever seeing, but never perceiving." This people's heart has become calloused** [alienated]**; they hardly hear with their ears, and they have closed their eyes'** (Isa. 6:9,10, footnote).

I should say that Laing's phrase about our alienation being like **'fifty feet of solid concrete'** is probably the most used phrase in my writing. There *is* **'fifty feet of solid concrete'** between us and our true self or soul—that *is* how deep the human race has dug itself into the cave of denial. We have blocked all the light of truth. It is as if our whole world is now encased

in a fifty foot layer of solid concrete—worse, it is as if the outside of that layer of concrete is enclosed in another layer of steel that has been bolted on so no light gets in at *all*, so that no truth exists on Earth! So heavily blocked out was the truth, so deeply in denial has the human race been living, that E.O. Wilson could swan around unchecked as 'captain of the world'—the recognised leader of humanity in its quest to find the biological understanding of humans—spreading all his dishonest thinking about human behaviour for the rest of the world to gladly, and gratefully, believe in.

That one person managed to penetrate all that denial, all that concrete and steel, and remain on their feet and bring this truth out about the human condition *is* incredible. Again, being able to do so has nothing to do with being special in any way, it is simply the result of the extraordinary set of circumstances described in Part 5:1. Historically people have talked about a 'second coming' of innocence, but, as I mentioned in Part 5:1, in the spectrum of alienation that has necessarily existed in humanity's great battle against ignorance, there have always been a few individuals left out on the fringes of the battle who were still relatively innocent. Thankfully, even in this end play stage of that great battle where the exhausted state of extreme alienation has become all but universal, that situation still applied and there was enough innocence left to finally make its contribution to the battle. Importantly, it was science—and humanity as a whole as the support base for science—that had to do all the hard work of accumulating sufficient understanding of the mechanisms and workings of our world that would finally make it possible for denial-free innocence to assemble the clarifying explanation of the human condition. Innocence played an important but miniscule concluding role. It is science, and in fact humanity as a whole, that is the 'messiah' or liberator of humanity. As I mention in Section 1:14 of *Freedom Expanded: Book 2*, it is like in a game of gridiron football where the team as a whole, with one exception, does all the hard work, gaining yardage down the field. Finally, when the side gets within kicking distance of the goal posts, a specialist kicker, who until then has played no part, is brought onto the field. While he—in his unsoiled attire—kicks the winning goal, the win clearly belongs to the team of exhausted players who did all the hard work. Soul/instinct was the synthesiser and science/knowledge/intellect was the liberator. In the end all the fundamental elements in our mind's make-up came to play a role.

Following on from his statement that **'between *us* and It** [between our current alienated, estranged state and our true self or soul] **there is a veil which is more like fifty feet of solid concrete'**, Laing continued his deadly honest treatise on the extent of alienation in the world today, saying, **'*Deus absconditus*. Or we have absconded** [p.118] **…The outer divorced from any illumination from the inner is in a state of darkness** [the darkness of Plato's cave]**. We are in an age of darkness. The state of outer darkness is a state of sin—i.e. alienation or estrangement from the inner light** [p.116] **…We are all murderers and prostitutes—no matter to what culture, society, class, nation one belongs… We are bemused and crazed creatures, strangers to our true selves, to one another, and to the spiritual and material world** [pp.11-12]**'** (*The Politics of Experience* and *The Bird of Paradise*, 1967). **'We are dead, but think we are alive. We are asleep, but think we are awake. We are dreaming, but take our dreams to be reality. We are the halt, lame, blind, deaf, the sick. But we are doubly unconscious. We are *so* ill that we no longer feel ill, as in many terminal illnesses. We are mad, but have no insight** [into the fact of our madness]**'** (*Self and Others*, 1961, p.38 of 192).

This cartoon by the American artist Skip Williamson, which appeared in *Playboy* magazine in May 1982, bares out the truth about **'our modern condition'** of **'alienation'** that R.D. Laing so honestly described.

Laing wrote his above description of our state of alienation in the relatively innocent 1960s. Since then, the levels of alienation have become much, much worse—if that were possible! As mentioned in Part 3:12, recent generations have been revealingly labelled the 'X generation', the 'Y generation', and now the 'Z generation', which, according to Wikipedia, comprises **'people born between the mid-1990s and late 2000s'**. The Canadian writer Douglas Coupland defined a Generation X'er as one who **'lives an X sort of life—cerebral, alienated, seriously concerned with cool'** (*Sydney Morning Herald*, 22 Aug. 1994). These are all qualities associated with having had to adjust to an extremely soul-exhausted world. In Part 3:11H, the adolescent psychologist Michael Carr-Gregg was reported as saying that **'Generation Y is being ravaged by depression, anxiety disorders and stress disorders'** ('Face it, we are all narcissists now', Miranda Devine, *Sydney Morning Herald*, 3 Sept. 2009). The obvious question that was also asked was what exactly did we mean when we said the X, Y, Z generations? The answer is the end game state of alienation, terminal alienation. After all, what comes after Z? Look at the colours in the clothing that are considered fashionable now, it's all black, charcoal, grey, dark blue, dirty browns—drab, depressed, alienated colours. If you look at a crowd of people now there is hardly any brightly coloured clothing to be seen. Young people slouch around in hooded jackets and dark glasses that they hide away from the world in, seemingly eking out a living like depressed souls from some dark underworld. Life for humans had become unbearably painful.

A 2008 documentary on the destructive effects of all the consumer advertising directed at children featured a montage of powerful news clips from American television that provides a graphic snapshot of the symptoms of terminal levels of alienation being reached in society. In the first clip the newsreader reported that **'Forty times as many young people are now being diagnosed with bipolar disorder** [the less confronting term now being used for what was once more honesty termed manic depression] **than 13 years ago.'** The second clip reported that **'Almost 4.5 million children in this country have been diagnosed with ADHD, Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder.'** The third clip said that **'Doctors are writing a growing number of prescriptions for anti-depressants for children, as many as eight million a year.'** The fourth clip reported that **'One in three children born in the year 2000 will develop diabetes.'** The fifth clip said that **'For the first time in decades the rate of hypertension in children is rising** [with a medical journal cover in background

saying] **2 million + American children may have high blood pressure.'** The sixth clip reported that **'This generation of children is the heaviest in American history. An estimated 16% of all children and teenagers are overweight—four times as many since the 1960s. Life expectancy of children today will be shorter than that of their parents—the first such decline in modern times'** (*Consuming Kids: The Commercialization of Childhood*, Media Education Foundation).

I should comment that while technology is helping the alienated human race by giving it a means to further distract itself from its immensely upset condition, it is also rapidly increasing and spreading the level of alienation in society. In a 2010 BBC documentary series about the world wide web called *Virtual Revolution*, in the episode *Homo Interneticus*, the presenter, Dr Aleks Krotoski, comments that **'Burners Lee** [who invented the web in 1990] **built into it what is called hyperlinks, the ability to link from one piece of information to another. But the question is whether hyperlink associative thinking is good for us. In mirroring the way the brain functions by darting from subject to subject in a click, does this make us lazy and easily distracted?'** Nick Carr, author of *Is Google Making Us Stupid?*, is then quoted as stating, **'I think science shows us that our brain wants to be distracted and what the web does by bombarding us with stimuli and information it really plays to that aspect of our brain, it keeps our brain hopping and jumping and unable to concentrate.'** Krotoski continues: **'We used to be trained in the discipline of reading and writing and language. Now the generation raised on the web of associative links seem unable to face the rigours of such lineal thinking—even it seems at our top universities.'** David Runciman, a Political Scientist at Cambridge University, then says, **'What I notice about students from the first day I see them when they arrive at university is that they ask nervously "What do we have to read?" And when they are told the first thing they have to read is a book they all now groan, which they didn't use to do five or ten years ago, and you say, "Why are you groaning?", and they say "It's a book, how long is it?"'** The great attraction of the web and its offshoots, like Facebook and Twitter, is of course not that **'it makes us easily distracted'** but that it *allows* us to be **'easily distracted'**; that, as Nick Carr who, as the program said, wrote the book with the title that appropriately asks *Is Google Making Us Stupid?*, said, **'our brain <u>wants</u> to be distracted'**. In the case of Facebook, it allows people to be preoccupied/distracted (from the human condition) all day long with inane, frivolous, narcissistic, superficial gossip. As Krotoski said herself, **'In my life it is increasingly rare that I have time on my own, time to think. I have a Twitter account and several blogs to maintain, plus my Facebook status updates, my photo diary, my video blogs and my podcasts that I have to record. And that's the content that I create, there is also the content that I consume. Not least of which is the emails that are in my inbox and all the messages on my answering machine. I was away for a week and I had 283 emails that I had to go through.'**

The program tried to present the web age in a positive light because obviously people weren't going to admit how superficial and trashy their lives have become—how could they live with that truth without the defence of the explanation of the human condition! It noted, for example, that in the 1960s the Canadian maverick thinker Marshall McLuhan actually anticipated the internet age but saw it as a positive development because he said everyone would be more connected and, as a result, more informed, warning that **'We go on singing the old song of fragmentation and alienation because every society always looks at the preceding age while living in the new, current age. It never sees the age it's living in.'** It's true that all kinds

of massive generation gaps occur, but the fact is increase in **'alienation'** *is* the underlying and overwhelming trend, and being more informed doesn't necessarily mean more *deeply* informed, better able to think deeply or understand and comprehend more effectively. As the Australian journalist and newspaper editor Peter Hartcher said about Facebook: **'Users get attention from hundreds or thousands of people on a scale that, before now, only the famous or the freakish could expect'** (*Sydney Morning Herald*, 25 Jan. 2011). Facebook feeds the overly embattled and insecure self-esteem or ego of current generations by making each person feel as though they are the centre of attention, but that egalitarian equality of attention is at the expense of attention being directed to what is meaningful in terms of our species' core responsibility to find and accumulate knowledge. Put simply, Facebook has become the greatest facilitator of alienation ever invented, single-handedly threatening to derail the whole human race from the pursuit of knowledge—it is another illustration of humanity entering dangerous end play. The internet *is* the ultimate communication technology, but it is currently being used to spread and increase alienation, not knowledge. Television and materialism in general also fed and spread escapism and alienation but, unlike the internet, they haven't threatened the pursuit of knowledge. To use the Adam Stork analogy to make the situation clear, the *only* way Adam can stop the upsetting criticism coming from his instinctive self is to find sufficient knowledge to explain why he has had to defy his instincts. His core task and responsibility is to find that knowledge and until he succeeds he will only become more upset—more angry, egocentric and alienated. So, to paraphrase Richard Neville, Adam is in a race between self-discovery and self-destruction from becoming excessively upset—excessively angry, egocentric and alienated. Since upset is the unavoidable price he has to pay to search for knowledge, he needs ways to express his anger to some degree; and he needs to contrive ways to find some reinforcement for his ego or sense of self-worth; and he needs to employ some escapism and denial from the guilt or criticism he is having to live with if he is to continue the task of searching for knowledge—but he can't afford to become too corrupted/upset/angry, egocentric and alienated. Television and materialism have, in general, supplied a degree of escapism, but developments such as Facebook are so powerfully self-distracting they are fast leading the human race to excessive, indeed terminal, levels of alienation.

Overall, what has happened is that communication technology has accelerated humanity's already rapid progress towards excruciating, unbearable levels of alienation, so much so that humanity *has* arrived at the situation where levels of alienation in humans are now almost terminal. The problem raised by this situation is that while the need for the relieving understanding of the human condition has become absolutely desperate, the levels of alienation now, of deafness, of inability to take in and think about any deeper analysis of our human predicament, have become so great that there is a very great risk that the arrival now of the liberating understanding of the human condition will not be able to rise above the ruckus and be heard! In 2011, a writer, identified only as 'Fitzy', published an online article about my work, in which he recognised its importance, writing that **'The cause of the malaise** [in the world] **is exposed, remedied and the reader is left with the very least an understanding of themselves, and for me something of an optimism for the future.'** However, he *also* recognised the danger of these answers going unheard when, in the same article, he commented that **'We have a lot of competing noise for**

our attention these days, and it would be criminal to let that overwhelm our true potential, by masking [this] **useful information with hideous noise'** (*Humanitus Interruptus – Great Minds of Today*, 21 Oct. 2011; see <www.wtmsources.com/106>). Yes, there is a real danger of all the extremely superficial, escapist, me-only-focused, **'hideous noise'** in the world now making it impossible for these all-precious answers about the human condition to be heard—but thankfully, as this response from 'Fitzy' demonstrates, there *are* still people who can hear this information. There is naturally a 'deaf effect' for everyone who is resigned when they try to listen to or read discussion of the human condition—in fact, 'Fitzy' himself acknowledged that he too initially encountered this deaf effect with my writing when he wrote in his article that **'The core concepts keep slipping from my mental grasp, at the time I put it down to bad writing, however a second reading revealed something the Author had indicated from the outset—*your mind doesn't want to understand the content*. The second read was quick and painless.'** But, again, at least there *are* still people like 'Fitzy' who aren't so deafened by the **'hideous noise'** in the world now that they eventually *can* still hear analysis of the human condition. As predicted in the Bible, by the time the liberating understanding of the human condition was finally found the levels of alienation amongst humans will have likely become extreme, so much so, in fact, that the liberating understanding will at first be **'rejected by this generation'** (Luke 17:25) and few **'will understand, but those who are wise will understand'** (Dan. 12:10). Yes, thankfully there **'will'** still be enough 'hearability' left in the world for the truth about the human condition to be recognised now that it has finally arrived.

To return to the main discussion about how alienated the human race has become.

Plato and R.D. Laing were both extremely honest about the true extent of alienation in humans and we can now add to their honesty the truthful expression and descriptions of the alienated state of humanity that can be found in music. Part 3:12, 'Anticipations of the arrival of our species' liberation from the horror of the human condition and resulting TRANSFORMATION of the human race', documented the many, many honest descriptions of the human condition that I have come across in music. As I mentioned there, while some of the lyrics referred to, most particularly the lyrics of Bob Dylan, John Lennon, Jim Morrison and Bono, were extraordinarily prophetic in their anticipations of our species' liberation from the human condition, the lyrics and music most deeply revealing of the actual agony of the human condition are those of the American heavy metal band, With Life In Mind.

If you search the band With Life In Mind on the internet and listen to a YouTube video of their music, what you will hear is basically an intense, excruciating droning barrage of unabated pain! As mentioned in Part 3:12, their music is a terrifyingly honest portrayal of the terminal level of alienation that the human race has now arrived at—which, as described above, Generations Y and Z so suffer from. At the time of writing this inclusion in *Freedom Expanded: Book 1* about the band With Life In Mind (which was February 2012), the online store Relapse, which specialises in the heavy, 'death' metal music so popular amongst young people today, listed the following bands as their top selling artists: Death, Repulsion, Toxic Holocaust/Midnight, Neurosis, Spawn of Possession and Brutal Truth. These names alone reveal the end play state of alienation that the human race has arrived at.

Set against a blood red background, the cover of With Life In Mind's first album, titled *Grievances* (see next image), which was released in 2010, depicts a person being ruthlessly beaten up, with the victim's hand seen clawing at the air in horrific pain and a desperate plea for help. It's an absolutely deadly honest metaphor of how horribly we humans have been brutalised by the human condition for some two million years, and how desperate our need for release from that condition has become!

The cover of the metal band With Life In Mind 2010 *Grievances* album

This album, with its Biblical-Job-like, human-condition-protesting title, contains the following songs whose titles fully reveal the whole horror and saga of the human condition: *Grievances*, *King of Frauds*, *The Collapse of Men*, *Anxiety Ridden*, *Surroundings*, *One Day It Will All Make Sense*, *The Human Condition*, *Plagued*, *Silenced*, *Self-Righteous* and *Our Endless Existence*!! The song that the band actually titled *The Human Condition* contains this amazingly honest description of the human condition: **'We're staring through the eyes of a bitter soul. Constantly surrounded by this empty feeling…Never good enough for those ideals that seem to mean the most…Driven into madness, I see no end in sight, and inadequacy seems like the only means to pass through this life. And I sit and ask myself when will it end? The art of contention is an uphill battle I'm not ready to fight.'** Yes, we would be **'driven into madness'** with **'no end in sight'** to the unbearably depressing **'empty feeling'** caused by the terrible **'inadequacy'** of our seemingly horrifically

imperfect **'human condition'** if we didn't resign ourselves to giving up trying to **'conten**[d]**'** with it, confront it, stop trying to live **'with'** the issue of **'life in mind'**! Denial of the human condition *has* been the only way we have been able to cope with the human condition while we couldn't explain it. What has happened in recent times, the last 20 years or so, is that the agony of the human condition has become so great for humans that any representation of life that doesn't express this agony is inappropriate and meaningless—which is why the music of young people today is so saturated with this pure pain; any other description of life today would be completely dishonest, hypocritical. Terminal alienation *is* the subject the current Y and Z generations are the absolute specialists in.

To illustrate something of the extraordinary honesty about the human condition that young people's music of today reveals I have compiled some of the other lyrics from With Life In Mind's *Grievances* album. You will see that many of the lyrics are very, very similar to the truthful poems that people wrote during Resignation, such as Fiona Miller's Resignation poem that was reproduced in Parts 3:8 and 3:11B. These parallels are not surprising since Resignation was the time when people most acutely felt the agony of the human condition before learning to block it out, and, as just pointed out, this agony of the human condition has now become so great that trying to block it out, live in denial of it, has become all but impossible. The agony of the human condition is now so great that even the resigned—those committed to living in denial of the human condition—can't deny the agony of it. So, in addition to the lyrics that were included earlier from their **'Human Condition'** track, the following are some of With Life In Mind's other song titles and lyrics from their *Grievances* album that are so indicative of the end play state of terminal alienation that the human race has arrived at:

From **ANXIETY RIDDEN**: **'It scares me to death to think of what I have become…I feel so lost in this world…This self loathing can only get me so far.'**

From **OUR ENDLESS EXISTENCE**: **'Our innocence is lost.'**

From **SURROUNDINGS**: **'I scream to the sky but my words get lost along the way. I can't express all the hate that's led me here and all the filth that swallows us whole. I don't want to be part of all this insanity. Famine and death. Pestilence and war.** [Famine, death, pestilence and war are traditional interpretations of the 'Four Horsemen' described in Revelation 6 in the Bible. In Matthew 24:6-8 and Luke 21:10-11, Christ referred to similar **'Signs of the End of the Age'** (as those sections of the Bible are titled) and all of these descriptions from Revelation, Matthew and Luke are accurate because such extreme disintegration *is* the end play state of terminal alienation that occurs at the conclusion of humanity's heroic search for knowledge.] **A world shrouded in darkness…Fear is driven into our minds everywhere we look. We'll never forget all the sadness of this world and this tragedy that surrounds us. This tragedy that consumes our lives.'**

From **THE COLLAPSE OF MEN**: **'We've been lying to ourselves for so long. We truly forgot what it means to be alive. Trying so hard for a life with such little purpose. How could we ever recover? Lost in oblivion. Through our failed attempts, we try to find meaning in this chaos. Shackled in chains, bound and held down. We're constantly repressed by our actions to live a lie. We could never be content. We could never face our own reflections in the mirror.'**

From **SILENCED**: **'Your hands tied. You are bound and gagged. Everything you've been told has been a lie…We've all been asleep since the beginning of time. Why are we so scared to use our minds?… We pretend as if it** [the human condition] **doesn't even exist. Muzzles are tied to our mouths…What will it take for us to come alive?'**

From **KING OF FRAUDS**: **'How long do you have to live a lie before you've convinced everyone that it's true? Realize that what everyone sees in you was nothing more than a well stacked ten stories… The man you are is not the man you were meant to be. A coward. A fake. Keep pretending; soon enough things will crumble to the ground. You're the king of a world you built for yourself, but nothing more than a fraud in reality…If they could only see the truth they would coil in disgust. How much longer until the pressure makes you break? You have been exposed as the monster that you are'**.

From **SELF-RIGHTEOUS**: **'How do you judge the ones that are carbon copies of yourself?…You feed on the power; the idea that you're superior. You raise your head so high…Judge so blindly to a world you don't understand. Your ignorance displays shallow existence.'**

From **PLAGUED**: **'How do we save ourselves from this misery…So desperate for the answers, we search for a reason to survive. We spend our days staring at the sun, only to be blinded by the mere thought…We're straining on the last bit of hope we have left. No one hears our cries. And no one sees us screaming.'**

From **GRIEVANCES**: **'Our fight is the struggle of man…we search for this form of clarity. Hoping that this life has any purpose. This is the end.'** And finally, **ONE DAY IT WILL ALL MAKE SENSE**, an instrumental without lyrics.

With Life In Mind's lyrics absolutely beg for relief from the human condition: **'I feel so lost in this world'**, **'Lost in oblivion…we try to find meaning in this chaos…We could never face our own reflections in the mirror'**, **'I scream to the sky but my words get lost along the way'**, **'What will it take for us to come alive?'**, **'How could we ever recover?**, **'How do we save ourselves from this misery…So desperate for the answers, we search for a reason to survive…We're straining on the last bit of hope we have left. No one hears our cries. And no one sees us screaming'** and **'we search for this form of clarity'**. Thankfully, since the pain they are expressing is so, so terrible, With Life In Mind *have* been able to look forward to a time when **'one day it will all make sense'**—and at last it *has* all made sense—the human condition *has* been explained and humans *have* been dignified and redeemed. As 'Fitzy' also said in his online article about my work, **'In light of Griffith's work, this** [dark] **behaviour is easily understandable, we can arrive at conclusions about our Human dark behaviour, that are compassionate and humane, better still we can be left with enthusiasm and a realistic hope for the future. When we stop damning ourselves, because we understand how we arrived at this junction, we can start living free and fair lives based on knowing what we are.'**

The lyrics **'No one hears our cries. And no one sees us screaming'** from the song *Plagued* remind me of the artist Edvard Munch's famous 1895 painting *The Scream* (see next image). This painting has become an iconic representation of the end play state of terminal alienation that the human race has arrived at. Indeed, in announcing its May 2012 auction of the only one of four versions of the *Scream* that was still held privately, Sotheby's auction house described Munch's work as **'the defining image of modernity'** and said they were expecting it to attract one

of the highest prices ever for a painting (*The Australian*, 23 Feb. 2012). And indeed it did, selling for almost $US120 million—$US40 million above expectations!

Edvard Munch's *The Scream* 1895

With the subject of visual representations of the agony of the human condition now introduced, it is necessary to move discussion onto the British painter Francis Bacon's extraordinarily honest depictions of humans' alienated state. In fact, if no one, prior to the human condition being explained, had managed to describe the situation of the human condition as well as Plato, and no one had managed to write about the extent of the alienation involved in our species' condition as well as Laing did, and no band had managed to create music about the agony of the human condition as truthfully as With Life In Mind, then no one has been able to visually depict the human condition more truthfully than Francis Bacon (1909-1992).

The following three paintings by Bacon provide an indication of the nature of his work. Even on quick inspection, there is no mistaking the agony of the human condition in Bacon's twisted, smudged, distorted, death-mask-like—alienated—human faces and tortured, contorted, arms-pinned, psychologically imprisoned bodies, and in his frequent use of the grey-green of decaying flesh and the purple-red of a carcass to accentuate the deadness of our immensely alienated state. (As an aside, these images recall Irish step dancing—made famous by the aforementioned *Riverdance* phenomenon of the mid-1990s—in which the feet dance but the arms remain rigidly in place beside the dancer's body, which is really an accurate representation of how humans have lived in a psychologically imprisoned or shackled state—especially white people because black people seem to exude so much more rhythm and freedom in their movement.)

Study after Velazquez's Portrait of Pope Innocent X 1953

Study for self-portrait (detail) 1976

Seated Figure 1977

While Bacon's subject matter is unmistakable, we humans are so in denial of our condition that most struggle to recognise what it is that he is depicting. In shocked

bewilderment his work has been described as **'obscene'** (*Sydney Morning Herald*, 29 April 1992), **'enigmatic'** (*Sydney Morning Herald*, 30 April 1992), and **'embodying a singularly bleak view of human existence'** (ibid). It's not a **'bleak'** view in the sense of being unjustified, rather it is an honest view—as Bacon himself said in an interview with the distinguished art critic David Sylvester: **'I am trying to…set a trap…to catch the fact at its most living point** [p.54 of 176]**'** with **'facts'** being **'what used to be called truth** [p.48]**', 'you unlock the areas of feeling which lead to a deeper sense of the reality of the image** [p.66]**'** (*Interviews with Francis Bacon*, David Sylvester, 1975 & 1980). In the interview Sylvester referred to some of the bewildered interpretations that have been applied to Bacon's work, saying that **'people seem to feel in looking at your figures that they are seen in moments of crisis, moments of acute awareness of their mortality, moments of acute awareness of their animal nature'** (ibid. p.80). It's clearly not **'moments of crisis'**, or an **'acute awareness'** of one's **'mortality'**, or humans' supposed **'animal nature'** that is being portrayed—as Bacon himself acknowledged. When Sylvester asked Bacon directly to **'tell me what you feel your painting is concerned with'**, Bacon replied, **'it's concerned with my kind of psyche, it's concerned with my kind of—I'm putting it in a very pleasant way—exhilarated despair'** (ibid. p.83). *That's* what the human condition is: excruciatingly heightened **'despair'**. The Danish philosopher Søren Kierkegaard made that abundantly clear in his book *The Sickness Unto Death* where he gave this account of the near suicidal, worse-than-**'death'** depression that the human condition has caused the human race: **'the torment of despair is precisely the inability to die** [and end the torture of our unexplained human condition]**…that despair is the sickness unto death, this tormenting contradiction** [of the human condition]**, this sickness in the self; eternally to die, to die and yet not to die'** (1849, tr. A. Hannay, 1989, p.48 of 179). The philosopher Michael Leiris, who was a friend of Bacon's, spoke the truth about Bacon depicting our species' present tortured state of near total alienation when he said that his **'searing'** paintings **'express the human condition as it truly and peculiarly is today; man dispossessed of any durable paradise'** (*The Times*, 15 Sept. 1983).

Not surprisingly, the brutal honesty of Bacon's paintings has been unbearable for some. In a review of a retrospective exhibition of Bacon's paintings that in 2009 toured the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York, the Tate in London and the Prado in Madrid, the art critic Jed Perl described Bacon's works as **'angst for dummies'**, **'the 20th century's most august visual claptrap'**, **'high-style bummers, bad dreams with fashionable upholstery'**, **'cheap sensation'**, a **'freakshow'**, Bacon as a **'poseur'**, and the whole show as a **'hideous spectacle of an artist in the process of eviscerating the art of painting'** (*The Australian*, 15 June 2009, reprinted from *The New Republic*). Throughout the ages, there have always been people who became extremely angry towards anyone who dared to reveal the truth about the human condition. As has been mentioned, I have had such fury and dishonest vitriol directed at me in buckets full, but the depth of the anger is just a measure of how confronting the issue of the human condition has been. What has to be understood now is that with redeeming understanding of the human condition found it is at last possible, and indeed necessary, to be honest about the human condition. At least

the extraordinary integrity/honesty of Bacon's work is now being recognised in dollar value, with one of his triptychs in 2013 fetching $US142.4 million, making it **'the most expensive work of art ever sold at auction, breaking the previous record, set in May 2012, when a version of Edvard Munch's *The Scream*** [another exceptionally honest, human-condition-revealing painting] **sold for $119.9 million'** (*TIME* mag. 25 Nov. 2013).

Of Bacon's paintings, the one I like the most is one I have included above, his *Study for self-portrait* (1976), which happens to be held at the Art Gallery of New South Wales in Sydney. I noticed that a recent book about his work (*Bacon*, ed. Rudy Chiappini, 2008) uses that particular painting on its cover. Bacon's painting on the top left of the three, of the screaming pope, is of Pope Innocent X. He doesn't look so innocent!

In terms of art being able to reveal the underlying tortured state of our condition, the drawings of the renowned British cartoonist and caricaturist Ralph Steadman, along with the work of the great Spanish artist Francisco José de Goya y Lucientes (1746-1828) should also be mentioned.

Steadman's *The Lizard Lounge* drawing has already been included twice—first to illustrate Hollow Adolescentman in Part 3:11F, and again in Part 7:2 to illustrate how angry we became—but it is so revealing of all aspects of the human condition that it should be included once more to illustrate just how alienated we became. The empty, hollow eyes of the main dragon in the very middle of the picture especially reveal how lost and deranged we humans have become.

Ralph Steadman's *The Lizard Lounge* 1971

Like Bacon and Steadman, Goya was an artist who throughout his career bravely tried to penetrate the facade of denial and its fabrication of an artificially happy state and reach the underlying truth of our tortured, human-condition-afflicted reality. I have included here two paintings that encapsulate Goya's heroic journey and which are best introduced through the words of someone who has been described as **'the best known art critic in the world'** (*The Bulletin* mag. 11 Nov. 2003), the Australian Robert Hughes, who for many years was *TIME* magazine's art critic. Once again we can see in the following comment how much it escapes people what it is that is being portrayed by the likes of Bacon and Goya, namely the agony of the human condition. In a documentary Hughes made in 2002, titled *Goya: Crazy Like A Genius*, he commented that **'ever since I started writing art criticism more than 40 years ago…I have always been fascinated by one artist…Goya. For years I have been trying and failing to write a book about him…For a long time now he has haunted my dreams…I have wanted to understand him…There are two paintings of the same subject that sum up the huge changes that took place in Goya across his long career.** [The paintings are of] **a big religious festival, that of St. Isidro. On that day thousands of citizens, in their Sunday best, converged on a pilgrimage chapel outside Madrid and had a picnic.**

Francisco Goya's *St. Isidro's Meadow* (detail) 1788

[In the first representation, shown above, titled] ***St. Isidro's Meadow*…the girls are in their white parasols, the men in their finery, the scene is of social pleasure and jollity…**

Francisco Goya's *The Pilgrimage of St. Isidro* (detail) 1821-1823

Thirty years later Goya returned to the same theme. In this picture [above, titled]**…** ***The Pilgrimage of St. Isidro*****, instead of these happy fashionable well-dressed young people, you have this horrible snake of…dark figures…like demons crawling across an ash heap. The faces are…of madmen and hysterics… The whole picture is deeply threatening, deeply irrational, profoundly weird…**[This is what] **Goya saw through the filter of his old age and his intense pessimism.'** In his 2003 best-selling book *Goya*, which accompanied the documentary, Hughes again began by focusing on these two paintings and the profound mystery they presented to him. In the book, Hughes referred to Goya's so-called 'Black Paintings', a series that includes *The Pilgrimage of St. Isidro*, as **'deeply enigmatic'** (p.11 of 429). He also mentioned that **'it is not so long ago…that most people who thought about Goya considered him mad'** (p.25). It is only a measure of how in denial we are of our actual practice of denial that *The Pilgrimage of St. Isidro*, and so much of Goya's work, could be viewed as **'deeply irrational'**, **'profoundly weird'** and **'deeply enigmatic'** because in truth what Goya sought to depict was very rational, un-weird and clear. It wasn't Goya who was **'mad'**; it is our extreme estrangement or alienation from the truth of our condition that is the real madness on Earth. As Laing was quoted earlier as saying, **'We are dead, but think we are alive. We are asleep, but think we are awake. We are dreaming, but take our dreams to be reality. We are the halt, lame, blind, deaf, the**

sick. But we are doubly unconscious. We are *so* ill that we no longer feel ill, as in many terminal illnesses. We are mad, but have no insight [into the fact of our madness]**.'** Goya knew humanity was living a completely fraudulent, escapist, deluded existence. In an accompanying text to his *Capricho 6* etching he even wrote that **'The world is a masquerade. Looks, dress and voice, everything is only pretension. Everyone wants to appear to be what he is not. Everyone is deceiving, and no one ever knows himself.' 'No one ever knows himself'** echoes Laing's observation that **'we are mad, but have no insight'** into the fact of our madness. Goya knew that **'The world is a masquerade'** and he sought to unmask it. As part of this courageous journey to bring out the underlying truth of our alienation, Goya *did* utilise horrific pictures of humans being tortured, inmates in mad houses, strange apparitions and weird creatures, but these were only situations and forms that he could draw upon as being *emblematic* of our inner, underlying condition—as this comment accurately recognises: **'In** [Goya's] **later plates, however, phantoms, witches, goblins and a variety of metamorphosed animals begin to vie for centre stage. Brilliantly utilizing these creatures as symbolic forces, Goya's examination of the human condition leaves the particular and enters the universal'** (<https://www.artoftheprint.com/artistpages/goya_francisco_quienlocreyera.htm>). The fact is, it wasn't, as Hughes asserted, an **'intense pessimism'** from his **'old age'** that Goya was revealing in his series of 'Black Paintings', which were painted in his final years, but hard-won insight into the truth of our condition. Indeed, towards the end of the documentary, Hughes reported that a friend of Goya's observed that in his old age the artist was **'so happy and so anxious to try everything'**. Having finally succeeded in reaching the truth about humans in his art it is reasonable to surmise that Goya would have been content and expansive.

In *Goya*, Hughes wrote that **'The book I meant to write on him** [Goya] **had hit the wall; I had been blocked for years before the** [car] **accident** [that led to Hughes writing *Goya*]**'** (p.9). **'The wall'** that Hughes hit and couldn't get through (and still didn't get through in *Goya*) was the **'fifty feet of solid concrete'** wall of denial that Laing referred to. As mentioned, the incredible thing about Goya is he did finally get back through that all-but-impenetrable wall of denial and reach the truth of the horrific pain that we humans have been experiencing from the insecurity of our tortured condition. So it is a measure of how almost totally lacking in **'insight'** (as Laing pointed out) we are that such an acclaimed art critic as Hughes could have failed to recognise, despite lifelong efforts, what such a central figure in art as Goya was seeking to depict. But although Hughes couldn't decipher his meaning, he did at least recognise that Goya held the secret to what is going on in human life, namely an utterly escapist preoccupation with evasion and denial of the unbearably depressing issue of our human condition.

Mention must again be made of the exceptional human-condition-revealing honesty of the ceremonial masks that have been used in almost all cultures. In Part 3:11C it was explained how masks were a powerful means of exorcising both the truth of the extent to

which our soul has been brutally repressed, and the depth of the anger of our conscious mind. Having learnt to contain and restrain our, in truth, extremely upset state, and also conceal it from view so that we weren't confronted with the extent of it—having, as we say, learnt to 'civilise' our upset—such denial of our true situation could also become unbearable, in fact, psychologically and physically sickening, at which point some purging, cathartic, exorcising honesty was needed. The wearing of masks that revealed the true depth of how either soul-dead or furiously angry we humans had become was a powerfully effective way of bringing some relieving, therapeutic honesty to our lives. Reference was made to this quote from Picasso, in which he recognised the healing purpose of masks: **'The** [African] **masks were not simply sculptures like any other. Not at all. They were magic objects… They were weapons. To help people stop being ruled by spirits, to free themselves. Tools. <u>If we give a form to these spirits, we become free</u>…I understood why I became a painter…*Les Demoiselles d'Avignon* must have come to me that very day** [when I visited the museum and saw the African masks]**, but not at all because of the forms; because it was my first exorcism painting'**. Picasso's painting of *Les Demoiselles d'Avignon*, a detail of which is included in the next image, was also shown in Part 3:11C.

The following extraordinary similarities between some of the tribal masks that were included in Part 3:11C and the faces from Bacon's *Study for self portrait* 1976, Steadman's *The Lizard Lounge*, Goya's *The Pilgrimage of St. Isidro* and Picasso's *Les Demoiselles d'Avignon* show just how brilliantly revealing of our alienation and anger masks have been. Since these paintings and drawings are representatives of our greatest works of art, and these various masks are equally powerful in what they reveal about our true condition, it follows that these masks must also rank amongst our greatest works of art. Indeed, as described at some length in Part 3:11C, the African masks, like the two shown here, were the actual inspiration for modern art! In titling his 1985 book *<u>I Am Not Myself</u>: The Art of African Masquerade*, the African art historian Herbert Cole was recognising how the mask allowed the wearer to disengage from his everyday **'pretension'/'masquerade'** that Goya referred to when he wrote, **'The world is a masquerade. Looks, dress and voice, everything is only pretension. Everyone wants to appear to be what he is not. Everyone is deceiving, and no one ever knows himself.'** Masks allowed the wearer to momentarily relieve themselves of their extremely dishonest everyday **'masquerade'** of being a secure, sound, well-adjusted, happy person, and let the truth out, which could be very therapeutic for both the wearer and the observer. Interestingly, the same inability of humans to recognise in their everyday, alienated state what was being depicted in Bacon and Goya's paintings also applied to their observations of tribal masks—in the book *African Masks: The Barbier-Mueller Collection*, it records that **'Some observers…described them** [African masks] **as "horrible, ugly, devil's grimaces"'** (Hahner, Kecskési & Vajda, 2007, p.11 of 287)!

Left: Francis Bacon's *Study for self-portrait* (detail), 1976

Right: Wooden Pende Mask, Royal Museum for Central Africa, Belgium, acquired: 1959, collected: Kwilu, Congo

Left: Pablo Picasso's *Les Demoiselles d'Avignon* (detail), 1907

Right: Fang mask, Gabon, Africa, c. 19th century, the Pavillon des Sessions in Louvre Museum

Left: Ralph Steadman's *The Lizard Lounge* (detail), 1971

Right: Bhairav Mask, Nepal, Amogh Siddhi Shakya, Nepal

Left: Francisco Goya's *The Pilgrimage of St. Isidro* (detail), 1821-1823

Right: Maori Koruru (gable mask), New Zealand, c.1880, Peabody Essex Museum, Gift of the Dominion Museum, Wellington, NZ, 1956

At this point it should be reiterated that while humans have been as torturously alienated as Plato, Laing, With Life In Mind, Bacon, Steadman, Goya and the mask-makers have revealed, this is not the full story about humans. As has been emphasised throughout this presentation, the greater truth is that humans have also been the most courageous, heroic, successful and meaningful creatures to ever exist on Earth. We are not the awful beings we appeared to be; rather, given the magnificence of our fully conscious mind, nature's greatest invention, and given all the injustice we humans have had to endure for some two million years, we fully deserve to be considered divine beings. While there has been much conjecture as to whether that most contemporary of artists, Britain's Damien Hirst (1965-), did sell his now famous diamond-encrusted human skull (see next image) in 2007 for the £50 million he claims, or whether it was sold for a figure half or even a fifth of that, or even whether Hirst still owns it, the fact is it is an extraordinarily value-deserving emblematic representation of what humans are: we humans have appeared to be the walking dead, but the truth now revealed is that we are such incredibly wonderful beings that we do indeed deserve to be encrusted in diamonds. The paradox of the human condition is perfectly captured by this diamond-encrusted skull.

We can even make sense of the seeming sacrilege of the title Hirst gave his creation, *For the Love of God*. With understanding of the human condition now found we can see that while we humans did become walking corpses, we did so in order to fulfil the potential of nature's/Integrative Meaning's/God's most magnificent invention, namely the fully conscious thinking mind—so we did suffer becoming corrupted *For the Love of God*! Hirst's skull appears to be smiling, which is also a just representation of the final paradox of the human condition where we can jubilantly rejoice in our victory of having established that we humans are good and not bad after all.

For the Love of God by Damien Hirst, 2007

So although we had to pay the price of becoming immensely upset/corrupted/alienated/dead, we humans ARE the heroes of the story of life on Earth. Furthermore, as a result of finding this greater dignifying understanding of the human condition, our species' tortured state of alienation is about to end, and virtually overnight—well, in only a number of decades which, in the scheme of things, is a very short time—because being able to understand the human condition makes it possible for *everyone* to finally escape the tortured human-condition-afflicted state and fully participate in a glorious, truthful, sun-filled, effectively alienation-free world. It has already been emphasised, and will be further explained in Part 9, that while we won't be able to eradicate all the psychosis of alienation from human life for a number of generations, humans can immediately be TRANSFORMED and live *effectively* FREE of the alienated state through their support of a denial-free, truthful, human-condition-understood world. This is the new, all-exciting, Sunshine Highway, Liberated, Exhilarated and Empowered, TRANSFORMED LIFEFORCE WAY OF LIVING that is going to sweep the world and become universal in an extremely short time once this incredible opportunity to be FREE of the horror of the human condition catches on. (Affirmations from people practicing this TRANSFORMED LIFEFORCE WAY OF LIVING can be read in Section 3 of *Freedom Expanded: Book 2*, or viewed at <www.humancondition.com/affirmations>.)

If we deliver these reconciling understandings of our corrupted, damaged, less-than-ideal human condition to new generations of humans they will not have to grow up employing denial to cope with their corrupted condition and, not having to adopt a false existence, will be able to remain secure in self, free of the artificiality and superficiality of our alienated state—and very soon after the emergence of these secure generations other generations will appear who aren't corrupted and damaged in self. It is these damage-free generations who will know of an existence that for us immensely heroic but at the same time immensely embattled, exhausted and alienated humans will be so glorious it is beyond our comprehension. We can see here that the liberation of humanity from the human condition is a three-stage undertaking—commencing with us present day insecure generations, progressing to secure generations, and then finally concluding with the emergence of human-condition-free generations.

While past and current generations have had to live in near total denial of the truth of our upset in order to cope with the horror of it, our struggle with the human condition has been *so* preoccupying, *so* dominating, *so* oppressive and *so* destructive of our lives that our ability to access the true potential of existence has been stymied to the point where we have been living only on the surface meniscus of life, confined to a dark, deadened, estranged, blocked-out, alienated, cave-like, almost totally superficial and artificial state. Clearly when this horrific siege of the human condition is lifted a near total change comes to humans—we will be like a new species, able to access all the dimensions and depths of existence that have previously been denied us. Indeed, the TRANSFORMATION and transmutation—in fact, transfiguration—

will be so great we will be virtually unrecognisable as humans, so much so that the name 'humans' should be changed. Instead of being 'the alienated ones', we will be an utterly integrated, harmonious, upset-free, all-loving species with such great sensitivities towards each other and the world and indeed the universe around us that we will be properly termed 'UNIVERSAL BEINGS'. In Buddhist scripture there is a reference to this time when humans **'will with a perfect voice preach the true Dharma** [preach the supreme wisdom, namely understanding of the human condition]**, which is auspicious and removes all ill'**; it states that **'Human beings are then without any blemishes, moral offences are unknown among them, and they are full of zest and joy. Their bodies are very large and their skin has a fine hue. Their strength is quite extraordinary'** (Maitreyavyakarana, tr. Edward Conze, *Buddhist Scriptures*, 1959, pp.238-242). The Bible similarly describes how **'Another book** [will be]**…opened which is the book of life** [the human-condition-explaining and humanity-liberating book]**…**[and] **a new heaven and a new earth** [will appear] **for the first heaven and the first earth** [will have]**…passed away…**[and the dignifying full truth about our condition] **will wipe every tear from…** [our] **eyes. There will be no more death or mourning or crying or pain** [insecurity, suffering or sickness]**, for the old order of things has passed away'** (Rev. 20:12, 21:1,4).

Some glimmer of an indication of this coming time, when **'Human beings are…without any blemishes, moral offences are unknown among them, and they are full of zest and joy'**, can be gleaned from another photograph from my picture collection. Included overleaf, it is a photograph of two young girls from a Hare Krishna commune that featured on the cover of *LIFE* magazine in April 1980. The photograph accompanied an article about **'an austere commune in the West Virginian hills'** in the United States called **'New Vrindavan'** where children are **'raised…according to…ascetic practices'** and where **'The elders hope to prevent their children's "contamination" by the culture outside.'** The article reported that **'To prevent the children's "corruption" by the "material world" adults restrict the books, photos and television programs the children see.'** It also mentioned that **'the virtue of chastity is repeatedly impressed upon the women, and the sexes are segregated whenever possible.'** The group's leader said that **'Some children produced here are very special…The parents' souls are pure and they attract a pure soul in the womb.'** Maintaining such extreme austerity in the midst of the immensely upsetting battle that the human race *has had to* wage in order to find redeeming understanding of the human condition has not been realistic for most people—and I don't know how many of these communes still exist, I suspect not many; it is certainly many years now (2011) since I saw the orange-robed Hare Krishnas on Sydney's streets like I once did. But whether such communes have been realistic or not, we can see something of what a human-condition-free face will look like in these children's faces. It seems to me that while the elements of each face, the eyes, nose, mouth and overall shape and proportion of each face, are not aesthetically perfect in terms of what is considered classically beautiful, there is so much purity and freedom in each child's face that they are both perfectly beautiful. True beauty does indeed come from our soul.

Children from West Virginian Hare Krishna commune
Photo by Ethan Hoffman; featured on the cover of *LIFE* magazine, April 1980

I might comment on the fact that in the 1980 article on the Hare Krishna commune, one of the commune's teachers said that **'girls don't have an inclination towards philosophic exploration'**, while the group's leader was quoted as saying that **'feminism is a trap'** because **'women need men to protect them'**. These are brave statements that few would be game to make publicly under the current intimidation of political correctness, and it is true that acknowledgments of differences between men and women have often led to unjust prejudice against women—indeed, the article said that in their **'school, girls receive less instruction than boys'** because of their lack of interest in philosophy, and that if couples don't seek permission from their leader to bear children they **'may be "punished" by giving birth to a female baby'**!! As explained in Part 7:1, men and women have had different roles to play in humanity's battle to find understanding of the human condition—and as a result women haven't been as responsible as men for seeking that understanding; and as a result of that women haven't been as aware of the nature of that battle—as 'mainframed'—as men have been; and as a result of that women have needed men to not only help protect them physically from all the upset in the world but also help them judge where the realistic balance lies in situations involving the highly imperfect, non-ideal state of the human condition. But thankfully, with understanding of the human condition now found there is no longer any reason for women not to be as cognisant of the battle that humanity has been through as men. It is understanding of the human condition that alone could achieve the freedom that feminists—indeed, *all* women—have yearned for.

Part 8
The New Biology
The denial-free, *real* biological story of life on Earth

Before presenting the real, fully accountable, truthful biological story of life on Earth it should be emphasised that what is to be described does not bear any relationship whatsoever to all the human-condition-avoiding, dishonest, mechanistic/reductionist biological thinking that has been filling the biology shelves of libraries the world over since Charles Darwin first put forward his truthful concept of natural selection in 1859. Indeed, when Charles Birch observed that **'Biology has not made any real advance since Darwin'** (In recorded conversation with this author, 20 Mar. 1987) he was acknowledging what has happened—or, more accurately, 'not happened'—in biology as a direct result of its practitioners taking the evasive, human-condition-avoiding, denial-complying, mechanistic/reductionist-not-holistic/teleological path.

In Part 4:12 I documented and analysed the litany of dishonest biological thinking that followed the original denial-complying misrepresentation of Darwin's idea of natural selection as being a divisive, selfish, 'survival of the fittest' process. From that initial corruption—which took the form of Social Darwinism—to Sociobiology, and then Evolutionary Psychology, and then the by-products of natural selection theory, and then Multilevel Selection theory, through to the theory of Eusociality, we have seen how biologists desperately sought to find a way to explain human behaviour without having to confront the *real*, psychological issue of our human condition—and we saw how, as a result of that approach, they got absolutely nowhere in their thinking. You can't find the truth with lies. So again, the biology that is about to be presented here in Part 8 bears no relationship to all that dishonest biological thinking. <u>What follows *is* the fully accountable and thus true biological story of life on Earth</u>.

Part 8:1 <u>Integrative Meaning and our necessary denial of it</u>

A very important question that needs to be addressed is what was humans' original instinctive orientation? While it certainly wasn't to the migratory flight path that instinctively guides Adam Stork, we humans must have had an instinctive orientation to life before we became a fully conscious species, and indeed that instinctive orientation must still exist within us, so what was it? The answer, which will now be explained, is that *our* instinctive orientation was to behaving in a completely cooperative, unconditionally selfless, fully altruistic, loving way. If you are a biologist the query that should immediately arise in your mind on reading this is, 'But how can such unconditionally selfless behaviour possibly develop when the fundamental situation is that genetics can't develop unconditionally selfless traits because such self-sacrificing traits tend to self-eliminate and for a trait to develop and become established it needs to reproduce and carry on?' Self-eliminating traits apparently cannot develop in animals.

As has already been discussed, the most selflessness that can seemingly be developed genetically is reciprocity, where an animal behaves selflessly on the condition it is or will be treated selflessly in return, which means the trait is, in fact, intrinsically selfish and thus able to carry on from generation to generation. So how could our species have developed an original instinctive orientation to behaving in an *unconditionally* selfless, *truly* altruistic way?

To answer this question, it is first necessary to more fully explain Integrative Meaning because the integrative, cooperative theme or meaning of existence that we humans were instinctively orientated to is actually what 'God' is the personification of—so when we defied our instincts we were in effect defying the integrative ideals or 'God', which produced an extremely guilt-ridden state. Thus, an understanding of Integrative Meaning will account for the extraordinary sense of guilt that lies at the base of the problem of the human condition. (Note: While Integrative Meaning was briefly introduced in Parts 3:4 and 4:4B, a much more detailed explanation now needs to be presented.)

The most obvious characteristic of our world is that it is full of 'things', 'objects'—enduring arrangements of matter, in fact—such as trees, animals, houses, rocks and clouds, etc. When we look around that is what we see, all these things, these enduring arrangements of matter, these collections of parts that stay together in a fixed arrangement through time. And not only that, it is obvious that all these arrangements of matter consist of a hierarchy of ordered parts; a tree, for instance, is a hierarchy of ordered matter—it has a trunk, limbs, roots, leaves, bark and wood cells. Our bodies are a similar collection of parts, as are our homes, which are built from different molecular compounds. Everywhere we look there are hierarchies of ordered matter, collections of elements or parts. Furthermore, what we see has happened over time to these arrangements of matter is that there has been a progression from simple to more complex arrangements. From the fundamental ingredients of our world of matter, space and time, matter has become ordered into ever larger in space and more stable or durable in time arrangements.

To elaborate, our world is constructed from some 94 naturally occurring elements—hydrogen, helium, lithium, beryllium, boron, etc—that came together to form stable arrangements. For example, two hydrogen atoms with their single positive charges came together with one oxygen atom with its double negative charge to form the stable relationship known as water. Over time, larger molecules and compounds developed. Eventually macro compounds formed. These then integrated to form virus-like organisms, which in turn came together or integrated to form single-celled organisms, that then integrated to form multicellular organisms, which in turn integrated to form societies of single species that then integrate to form stable, ordered arrangements of different species. Clearly, what is happening on Earth is that matter is integrating into larger and more stable wholes. And this development of order is not only occurring here, it is also happening out in the universe, where, over the eons, a chaotic cosmos has organised itself into stars, planets and galaxies. As two of the world's greatest physicists, Stephen Hawking and Albert Einstein, have said, respectively, **'The overwhelming impression is of order…**[in] **the universe'** ('The Time of His Life', Gregory Benford, *Sydney Morning Herald*, 28 Apr. 2002), and that **'behind everything is an order'** (*Einstein Revealed*, PBS, 1997).

The following is a chart of the development of order of matter on Earth.

Development of Order or Integration of Matter on Earth
A similar chart appears in Arthur Koestler's 1978 book, *Janus: A Summing Up*

To account for this integration of matter, it is necessary to introduce the Second Law of Thermodynamics, which, like gravity, is one of the physical laws of existence. This law states that over time all forms of energy, and matter is a form of energy, tend to end up as heat energy. This Second Law of Thermodynamics can also be stated in terms of the concept of entropy, which is the degree of randomness of a system at the atomic, ionic, or molecular level. Stated in terms of the concept of entropy, the Second Law of Thermodynamics says that the entropy, or randomness, of a system increases with time.

Importantly, however, this natural direction of energy transfer *is* reversible but to reverse it requires the use of energy from an *outside* source if the system is not to eventually wind down to heat energy, to the maximum degree of randomness or entropy. This reverse direction where, instead of breaking down, matter builds up and becomes more ordered and complex is recognised in physics as the 'Second Path of the Second Law of Thermodynamics' or 'Negative Entropy'. Earth, as it happens, is not a closed system but an open system because it has an outside inflow of energy from the sun and, as such, an opposite direction to this breakdown towards heat energy has been possible. On Earth, instead of matter breaking down there has been a steady building up or integration of matter into ever larger and more stable arrangements of matter; there has been a steady development of order. Thus, subject to the influence of Negative Entropy, the 94 elements, of which our world is built, develop ever larger and more stable wholes. (Incidentally the universe may not be a closed system either—thus the possibilities of maximum entropy, the so-called 'heat death of the universe', is not yet able to be determined.)

In summary, Negative Entropy causes, or allows, or has led to, matter self-organising into larger and more stable wholes. It has led matter to integrate, develop order—a path, as mentioned above, that has resulted in atoms arranging themselves, or coming together, or integrating, to form molecules. Those molecules have, in turn, integrated to form compounds, which have then integrated to form single-celled organisms, which have then integrated to form multicellular organisms. The next larger whole to form is integrations of multicellular organisms, which societies of multicellular organisms represent the beginnings of.

So the theme of existence, the overall direction or destiny of change, or, from a conscious observer's point of view, the overall purpose or meaning of existence, is the ordering or integration or complexification of matter.

In fact, the concept of 'holism' is an acknowledgment of this Integrative Meaning of existence. The 'alternative' culture has embraced the word holism on the superficial basis that it refers to the interconnectedness of all matter; however, the true, deeper, core meaning of holism is **'the tendency in nature to form wholes'** (*Concise Oxford Dict*. 5th edn, 1964). The concept was first introduced by the great South African denial-free thinker or prophet, the statesman, philosopher and scientist Jan Smuts (1870-1950) in his 1926 book *Holism and Evolution*. Smuts conceived 'holism' as **'the ultimate organising, regulative activity in the universe that accounts for all the structural groupings and syntheses in it, from the atom, and the physico-chemical structures, through the cell and organisms, through Mind in animals, to Personality in Man'** (p.341 of 380). 'Teleology', **'the belief that purpose and design are a part of nature'** (*Macquarie Dict*. 3rd edn, 1998), is, like holism, another term that has been used to describe the integrative purpose or meaning or theme or design in the universe.

But while the integrative meaning of existence *is* the most obvious of all truths, it has also been the most difficult of all truths for us humans to acknowledge, and for an *extremely* good reason.

The difficulty arises from the fact that for a collection of parts to stay together as a whole, the parts of the whole must cooperate, behave selflessly, place the maintenance of the whole above the maintenance of themselves. Put simply, selfishness is divisive or disintegrative while selflessness is integrative. But, if the meaning of existence is to behave *integratively*, which means behave cooperatively and selflessly, *why* do we humans behave in the completely opposite way, in a competitive and selfish *divisive* way? The integrative theme of existence confronts us humans squarely with the issue of the human condition, the issue of our non-ideal behaviour. So the situation has been that until we could explain why we humans have been divisively rather than integratively behaved, Integrative Meaning has been an unbearable truth. To admit the truth of Integrative Meaning we first had to explain the human condition. So it's only now that we can explain the human condition, explain the good reason why we have been divisively behaved, that it has become psychologically safe to admit and talk about the truth of Integrative Meaning.

To reiterate, the reason why the cooperation-dependent truth of Integrative Meaning has been *so* unbearable prior to finding the reconciling understanding of our divisive condition is that for a larger whole to form and hold together, for matter to integrate, the parts of the developing whole *have to*, in effect, consider the welfare of the larger whole over their own because if they don't cooperate, if they behave selfishly, inconsiderately towards each other, then the whole disintegrates—the parts break down into the more elementary building blocks

of matter from which they were assembled. For integration to occur, the parts of a developing whole *must* cooperate not compete, they *must* behave selflessly not selfishly. Selflessness is actually the theme of existence because it is the glue that holds wholes together; it is, in fact, the true meaning of the word 'love', with the old Christian word for love being **'caritas'**, meaning charity or giving or selflessness (see Col. 3:14, 1 Cor. 13:1-13, 10:24 & John 15:13). So 'love' is cooperative selflessness, and not just selflessness but *unconditional selflessness*, the capacity, if called upon, to make a full, self-sacrificing commitment to the maintenance of the larger whole. Again, the immense problem with this truth is that if the meaning of existence is to be cooperative, loving and selfless, then why are we humans competitive, aggressive and selfish? If the theme of existence is to be integrative then why are we divisively behaved? And so despite it being such an obvious truth, Integrative Meaning has been *so* horrifically condemning of the competitive, aggressive and selfish human race that we have had no choice but to live in near total denial of it.

When I first started thinking about the human condition I tried to figure out what the theme or meaning of existence was and after some thought I realised that it was this development of order of matter. As I say, Integrative Meaning is actually a completely obvious truth, although almost everyone lives in denial of it. This is an important point: I wasn't clever to find the understandings of the human condition and the many other insights I have found, such as how we humans developed an unconditionally selfless moral instinctive self or soul and how we became conscious when other animals didn't, all of which will be explained shortly, I was simply not living in denial of truths that everyone else knew but were living in denial of—and by acknowledging those truths I was able to think truthfully and thus effectively and thus explain all manner of phenomena that those who were living in denial had no access to. To deny something you first have to know it, so when I 'discovered' the truth of Integrative Meaning I wasn't discovering anything that everyone else didn't already know. Recall earlier in Part 5:1, in the mythology of King Arthur and the Holy Grail, how a **'guileless'**, **'wholly innocent'**, **'simple, naive youth'**, **'an isolated country…boy'**, raised in **'primitive circumstances'**, was the only person who could **'heal'** the **'wound'** in the **'existentially lonely' 'alienated people'** of his kingdom. Everyone knows the truth of Integrative Meaning but virtually everyone spends every moment blocking that truth out from their mind because it is so unbearable; I, on the other hand, **'naive**[ly]**'**, **'guileless**[ly]**'**, **'innocent**[ly]**'**, simply admitted it.

© 1977 Fedmex Pty Ltd

My original 1977 Development of Order drawing

So, on 2 June 1977, I summarised what I could see was going on in the world by drawing three dots in the shape of a triangle. I then put an arrow to those three dots repeated, only this time semi-connected with dotted lines, and then added another arrow to the three dots repeated again but fully connected by solid lines. For me this pattern described the

development of order of matter that I could see occurring everywhere in nature. I then showed this diagram to some friends at the time to see if they knew what this process was called and what was causing it. One friend, Dave Angliss, who had studied Rural Science at the University of New England in regional New South Wales (and also attended Geelong Grammar School when I was a student there), told me that what I was looking at was 'systems'. He said he was taught that a woolshed (where sheep are shorn) represents a system, a collection of parts, but the woolshed was also part of a sheep farm or property, which was a collection of parts, and in turn the property was part of a district, and so on. I then searched the library at Sydney University where I had been a student and found a Russian book titled *Modeling of Thinking and the Mind* (N.M. Amosov, 1965) that explained systems analysis even more clearly. It described how the development of systems had certain universal characteristics and once you understood those characteristics you could apply them to any system development. So just as pulling the cork out of a bottle is difficult until it suddenly gives way, solving a problem is difficult until you hit upon the answer and the logic suddenly becomes apparent. Clouds merge into a mass and produce rain, ideas similarly come together and, at a certain point, produce a surprising outcome. You can approach a problem from all manner of weird angles and thoughts, and by so doing hit upon ideas that throw up a solution to the problem. I have learnt that the ability to think laterally, which is so important in problem solving, comes from recognising that the principles behind the development of systems are universal. You don't know where the solution to a problem will come from, but the more you open your mind up to what is happening in other situations the more likely you are to find the clue that solves your problem. Indeed, the universal principles involved in the development of systems are so important in our ability to find understanding of the world around us that in the denial-free future they will be one of the main subjects taught at school. The point I wanted to make here is that of all the principles in system development that I have learnt about, it is the integration of systems into larger wholes that is the main principle. Another friend, Mike Rigg, told me about a book that another friend, Deeta Colvin (who later married Rod McGeoch, a key person in Sydney's successful bid for the 2000 Olympics) had been reading, titled *Janus: A Summing Up* (1978) by Arthur Koestler, which contains a similar development of order of matter chart to the one included at the beginning of this Part. I had drawn my own version of this chart, of circles within circles, but it was not as simple in its layout as Koestler's version. I'm not certain but I think it was from reading *Janus* that I first learnt that the law of Negative Entropy was the law of physics that causes matter to integrate.

In *Janus*, in the chapter titled 'Strategies and Purpose in Evolution', Koestler wrote that **'One of the basic doctrines of the nineteenth-century mechanistic world-view was Clausius' famous "Second Law of Thermodynamics". It asserted that the universe was running down towards its final dissolution because its energy is being steadily, inexorably dissipated into the random motion of molecules, until it ends up as a single, amorphous bubble of gas with a uniform temperature just above absolute zero: cosmos dissolving into chaos. Only fairly recently did science begin to recover from the hypnotic effect of this gloomy vision, by realizing that the Second Law applies only in the special case of so-called "closed systems" (such as a gas enclosed in a perfectly insulated container), whereas all living organisms are "open systems" which maintain their complex structure and function by continuously drawing materials and energy from their environment** [222 of 354] **…It was in fact a physicist, not a biologist, the Nobel laureate**

Erwin Schrödinger, who put an end to the tyranny of the Second Law with his celebrated dictum: "What an organism feeds on is negative entropy" [p.223] **…Schrödinger's revolutionary concept of negentropy, published in 1944** [p.224] **…is a somewhat perverse way of referring to the power of living organisms to "build up" instead of running down, to create complex structures out of simpler elements, integrated patterns out of shapelessness, order out of disorder. The same irrepressible building-up tendency is manifested in the progress of evolution, the emergence of new levels of complexity in the organismic hierarchy and new methods of functional coordination** [p.223] **…The origin of the concept dates back to Aristotle's *entelechy*, the vital principle or function which turns mere substance into a living organism and at the same time strives towards perfection** [p.224]**.'** Koestler spoke of **'the active striving of living matter towards [order]** [p.223]**'**, of **'a drive towards synthesis, towards growth, towards wholeness** [p.224]**'**. He said that **'the integrative tendency has the dual function of coordinating the constituent parts of a system in its existing state, *and* of generating new levels of organization in evolving hierarchies** [p.225]**'**. (More was included earlier in Part 4:7 about Koestler's acknowledgement of Integrative Meaning.)

Significantly, in terms of behaviour, Koestler observed that **'the integrative tendency'** requires **'coordination'**; as I have emphasised, it requires that the parts of the new whole *cooperate*, behave selflessly, place the maintenance of the whole above the maintenance of themselves. A leaf falling from a tree in autumn does so in order for the tree to survive through winter and carry on. It puts the maintenance of the whole, namely the tree, above the maintenance of itself. The effective functioning of our body depends on the cooperation of all its parts, on every part doing what is best for the whole body. Our skin, for example, is constantly growing and dying to protect our body. Cancer cells, on the other hand, destroy the body precisely because they violate this principle and follow their own selfish, independent agenda. Indeed, as I have mentioned before, the very reason ant and bee societies work so well is because all the parts, the worker ants and bees, behave selflessly—they consider the welfare of the larger whole over their own welfare. Consider the honey bee—it gives its life in the defence of its colony when it stings a person, because once it has used its sting this type of bee dies.

Thus selflessness, specifically unconditional selflessness or altruism, is the glue that holds wholes together. It is the theme or meaning of existence. And since love means unconditional selflessness, love *is* the theme of existence—it *is* the meaning of life. The truthful, denial-free-thinker or prophet Christ emphasised the unconditionally selfless significance of the word 'love' when he said, **'Greater love has no-one than this, that one lay down his life for his friends'** (John 15:13), and **'if anyone wants to be first, he must be the very last, and the servant of all'** (Mark 9:35). Of the biblical references to love provided earlier, Colossians 3:14 perfectly summarises the integrative significance of love: **'And over all these virtues put on love, which binds them all together in perfect unity.'** But, unfortunately, while virtually all the great truths, such as the unconditionally selfless nature of love, are acknowledged in the Bible, in our everyday, resigned world we couldn't admit that love is unconditional selflessness until we could explain why humans don't behave lovingly—why we are so selfish, competitive and aggressive when the meaning of existence is to be selfless, cooperative and loving. In fact, in the human-condition-avoiding mechanistic scientific paradigm it is considered improper, unscientific even, to use the word 'love'—which again is a measure of just how deeply we humans have been living in denial. As mentioned in Part 4:7, the linguist Robin Allott

summarised mechanistic science's attitude to love when he said, **'Love has been described as a taboo subject, not serious, not appropriate for scientific study'** ('Evolutionary Aspects of Love and Empathy', *Journal of Social and Evolutionary Systems*, 1992, Vol.15, No.4 353-370). Indicative of this aversion is the fact that **'more than 100,000 scientific studies have been published on depression and schizophrenia (the negative aspects of human nature), but no more than a dozen good studies have been published on unselfish love'** (*Science & Theology News*, Feb. 2004). So mechanistic science has no interpretation of one of humanity's most used, valued and meaningful concepts! How extremely upset and therefore insecure have we humans been!

Indeed, in an address titled *The Nature of Love*, delivered by the American psychologist Harry F. Harlow in 1958 on his election as President of the American Psychological Association, Harlow made this opening observation: **'Psychologists, at least psychologists who write textbooks, not only show no interest in the origin and development of love or affection, but they seem to be unaware of its very existence. The apparent repression of love by modern psychologists stands in sharp contrast with the attitude taken by many famous and normal people. The word "love" has the highest reference frequency of any word cited in Bartlett's book of *Familiar Quotations*'** ('The nature of love', *American Psychologist*, 1958, Vol.13, No.12). In his 1989 book *Peacemaking Among Primates*, Frans de Waal recounts an anecdote from Harlow and his colleague Clara E. Mears that powerfully illustrates this discord: **'For some scientists it was hard to accept that monkeys may have feelings. In** [the 1979 book] ***The Human Model…***[authors] **Harlow and Mears describe the following strained meeting: "Harlow used the term 'love', at which the psychiatrist present countered with the word 'proximity'. Harlow then shifted to the word 'affection', with the psychiatrist again countering with 'proximity'. Harlow started to simmer, but relented when he realized that the closest the psychiatrist had probably ever come to love was proximity."'**

So, even as an undefined term, 'love' has been an unbearable concept for some, and yet 'love' or unconditional selflessness is only an *aspect* of Integrative Meaning, so how much more unbearable has the *overall* tenet of Integrative Meaning itself been? The answer is the Negative Entropy-driven integrative, cooperative, loving, selfless, order-developing theme or meaning or purpose of existence has been an almost completely unconfrontable truth for the psychologically upset, competitive, aggressive and selfish human-condition-afflicted human race. In fact, we have lived in *such* fear of the truth of Integrative Meaning, lived in such terrified awe of it, been so confronted, condemned and intimidated by it, *so* unable to deal with it on any sort of an equal footing, that we termed it '<u>God</u>'. Indeed, the integrative, cooperative, loving meaning of life has become deified as not just *a* God, but the one and *only* God—*the* most universal and fundamental, yet completely unconfrontable, of truths.

Monotheism, the belief that there is only one God, is an insight that goes back as far as 4,000 years ago to two very great denial-free thinkers or prophets—the Hebrew prophet Abraham, who lived around 2,000 BC, and the pharaoh Akhenaton, who reigned in Egypt from approximately 1,350 to 1,335 BC. Around 360BC the denial-free-thinking prophet, Plato, also recognised that God is Integrative Meaning, writing that **'God desired that all things should be good and nothing bad, so far as this was attainable. Wherefore also finding the whole visible sphere not at rest, but moving in an irregular and disorderly fashion, out of disorder he brought order, considering that this was in every way better than the other'** (*Timaeus*, tr. Benjamin Jowett, 1877).

But *until* we could explain why we humans have been divisive and not integrative, until we could explain the human condition and explain in first-principle-based, scientific terms who, or more precisely, what God is—namely our personification of the Negative Entropy-driven integrative theme, purpose and meaning of life—we had no choice but to leave the religious concept of God in a safely abstract, undefined state. And so despite the truth of Integrative Meaning being *extremely* obvious, with evidence of the hierarchy of the order of matter everywhere we look, prior to finding understanding of our condition it was both important and necessary for humanity that human-condition-avoiding mechanistic science found a way to deny such a seemingly totally condemning truth. This was easily achieved through the simple assertion that there is no meaning or purpose or theme in existence and that while change *does* occur, it is a random, purposeless, directionless, meaningless, blind process. And, as stated, to cope with the imbued recognition of integrative ideality and meaning in the religious concept of 'God', science simply left the concept of 'God' undefined, maintaining it was a strictly abstract, metaphysical and spiritual notion unrelated to the scientific domain—just an inexplicable and undefinable deity seated on a throne somewhere high above the clouds in a remote blue heaven who can be worshipped from afar as someone superior to us while avoiding any direct comparisons with ourselves. Religion and science were firmly demarcated as two entirely unrelated subjects. As the leading mechanistic biologist, E.O. Wilson, has said, **'I take a very strong stance against the mingling of religion and science'** (*National Geographic* mag. May 2006).

But as stated in Part 4:12, the truth of the matter is, to use Nobel Prize-winning physicist Charles H. Townes' words, **'they** [religion and science] **both represent man's efforts to understand his universe and must ultimately be dealing with the same substance. As we understand more in each realm, the two must grow together…converge they must'** ('The Convergence of Science and Religion', *Zygon*, Vol.1 No.3, 1966). And with understanding of the human condition now found, **'converge'** they have. Ideality, which religion and the truthful, denial-free-thinking, God-confronting-not-avoiding, unresigned prophet it was founded around represented, and our search for understanding of our non-ideal reality, which science (the word 'science' literally means 'knowledge') represented, have finally been reconciled. Yes, with the human condition now explained and our divisive, seemingly non-integrative state finally understood, *all* humans can at last safely admit and recognise that there has only been one 'God', one all-dominating and all-pervading universal truth, which is Integrative Meaning. Yes, integration and the selflessness or love that enables it to occur *is* the theme of existence, is 'God'—a truth we recognise when we say **'God is love'** (1 John 4:8, 16).

And remarkably, despite the fact that the admittance of Integrative Meaning first required solving the issue of our divisive human condition, a rare few holistic scientists have courageously defied the almost universal need to deny the development of order of matter on Earth, or Integrative Meaning, and acknowledge that it is what we mean by 'God'. If we include more of what Hawking and Einstein said earlier about order being the main characteristic of change in the universe, we can see that they both regarded 'God' as the personification of Integrative Meaning. In 1989 Hawking said, **'I would use the term God as the embodiment of the laws of physics'** (*Master of the Universe*, BBC, 1989). In 2002 he went further when,

in an article titled *The Time of His Life* (*Sydney Morning Herald*, 28 Apr. 2002), Gregory Benford, a professor of physics at the University of California, chronicled a meeting he held with Hawking, in which Hawking elaborated on this observation about God being the laws of physics. Benford reported that in the course of discussion he had commented that **'there is amazing structure we can see from inside** [the universe]**'**, to which Hawking agreed, saying, **'The overwhelming impression is of order. The more we discover about the universe, the more we find that it is governed by rational laws. If one liked, one could say that this order was the work of God. Einstein thought so…<u>We could call order by the name of God</u>.'** The 1997 PBS documentary *Einstein Revealed* reported Einstein as saying that **'over time, I have come to realise that <u>behind everything is an order</u> that we glimpse only indirectly** [because it's unbearably condemning]**. This is religiousness. In this sense, I am a religious man.'** Yes, this **'order'** is apparent everywhere and it is what our **'religiousness'**, our belief in 'God', is concerned with acknowledging.

The Templeton Prize-winning physicist Paul Davies is another leading scientist who has acknowledged that 'God' is Integrative Meaning. In his 1995 acceptance speech for the Templeton Prize (at approximately US$1.5 million, a financially rewarding honour that is given for the bold objective of **'increasing man's understanding of God'** [*The Templeton Prize*, Vol.3, 1988-1992, p.108 of 153]) Davies said, **'So where is God in this story** [of physics]**? Not especially in the big bang…To me, the true miracle of nature is to be found in the ingenious and unswerving lawfulness of the cosmos, a lawfulness that permits complex order to emerge from the chaos…It points forcefully to a deeper underlying meaning to existence. Some call it purpose, some design'** ('Physics and the Mind of God: The Templeton Prize Address', 3 May 1995). On other occasions Davies has also said that **'these laws of physics are the correct place to look for God or meaning or purpose'** ('God Only Knows', *Compass*, ABC-TV, 23 Mar. 1997), and **'humans came about as a result of the underlying laws of physics'** (*Paul Davies—More Big Questions: Are We Alone in the Universe?*, SBS-TV, 1999). Further, in his 1987 book *The Cosmic Blueprint*, Davies actually went so far as to protest against the denial of Integrative Meaning in the world of science: **'We seem to be on the verge of discovering not only wholly new laws of nature, but ways of thinking about nature that depart radically from traditional science…Way back in the primeval phase of the universe, gravity triggered a cascade of self-organizing processes—organization begets organization—that led, step by step, to the conscious individuals who now contemplate the history of the cosmos and wonder what it all means…There exists alongside the entropy arrow another arrow of time** [the Negative Entropy arrow]**, equally fundamental and no less subtle in nature…I refer to the fact that the universe is *progressing*—through the steady growth of structure, organization and complexity—to ever more developed and elaborate states of matter and energy. This unidirectional advance we might call the optimistic arrow, as opposed to the pessimistic arrow of the second law…There has been a tendency for scientists to simply deny the existence of the optimistic arrow. One wonders why'** (ch.10, 9 & 2 respectively). The reason **'why' 'scientists' 'deny' 'the optimistic arrow'** of Integrative Meaning is because it was far too psychologically dangerous to acknowledge without first finding the biological reason for our divisive, apparently non-integrative, 'un-Godly' human condition.

But again, while our earliest unresigned, denial-free thinking, truthful prophets and a brave few holistic scientists *have* admitted that God is Integrative Meaning, it is only now with understanding of the human condition found that humanity as a whole can afford to demystify the concept of God, explain what we mean by 'God', and bring understanding to our relationship (or our lack thereof) with 'God'. On the face of it, Integrative Meaning

implied that we humans were out-of-step with creation—at odds with God no less—seemingly bad, unworthy, guilty, sinful, defiling, even evil beings, so it is no wonder we have been, as we say, a 'God-fearing', in fact, God-revering to the point of being God-worshipping—*not* a 'God-confronting'—species; as Nikolai Berdyaev put it, **'He** [man] **cannot** [struggles to] **break through to paradise that lies beyond the painful distinction between good and evil, and the suffering connected therewith. Man's fear of God is his fear of himself, of the yawning abyss of non-being** [alienation] **in his own nature'** (*The Destiny of Man*, 1931, tr. N. Duddington, 1960, p.41 of 310).

When I was assembling my ideas about the human condition I took my emerging synthesis to the biologist Ronald Strahan for feedback. Ron, who was head of Sydney's Taronga Zoo at the time, had helped and encouraged me during my search for the Tasmanian Tiger. After a number of visits to Ron to discuss the synthesis he eventually told me, **'Jeremy, I can't keep reading this material you are sending me. Don't you understand I am a *God-fearing* person'** (29 Dec. 1982). I remember Ron turning around to walk back into his house and his wife, who had been standing beside him, looking me straight in the eye and saying words to the effect: **'Jeremy, you can't keep sending your writings to Ron because he just can't cope with what you are writing about, please stop.'** When Ron said he was **'God-fearing'** he was acknowledging that he couldn't confront the truth of Integrative Meaning and all the other truths I had been writing about that follow from it. He was being extraordinarily honest because it is very hard for humans to betray themselves, for to admit you are living in denial is to completely undermine that protective denial.

As has been mentioned before, in approximately 360BC Plato wrote what many consider to be his greatest work, *The Republic*, central to which is the allegory of a cave in which humans are imprisoned, chained together and able only to envisage the outside world via shadows cast on the back wall of the cave. These shadows, which symbolise our limited and distorted, human-condition-avoiding, dishonest, immensely alienated view of the world, are thrown by the light of a fire that, situated in the entrance to the cave, effectively prevents any escape from it. Explaining the symbolism of the fire, Plato wrote that **'the light of the brightly burning fire in the** [cave] **prison corresponds to the power of the sun** [p.282 of 405]**'**, and explained that the sun represents the **'universal, self-sufficient first principle** [p.277]**'**, the **'absolute form of Good** [p.282]**'** and the **'highest form of knowledge** [p.268]**'**, and that **'if he** [a prisoner in the cave] **were made to look directly at the light of the fire, it would hurt his eyes and he would turn back** [p.280]**'** (from H.D.P. Lee's 1955 translation of *The Republic*). We can now understand that Plato's **'universal, self-sufficient first principle'**, the **'absolute form of Good'** and the **'highest form of knowledge'** is Integrative Meaning, the truth that so condemns humans that we have had to live in denial of it—metaphorically speaking, in a dark cave, hidden from the scrutiny of its scorching glare.

Fire appears in many mythologies as a metaphor for the integrative ideals of life, the condemning implications of which prevented our 'escape' from our restricted, chained-up, alienated condition. In the Zoroastrian religion, **'Fire is the representative of God…His physical manifestation…Fire is bright, always points upward, is always pure'** (*Eastern Definitions*, Edward Rice, 1978, p.138 of 433). In Christian mythology, the story of Genesis features **'a flaming sword flashing back and forth to guard the way to the tree of life'** (Gen. 3:24). In an acknowledgment of how suicidally confronting and depressing the truth of Integrative Meaning can be for humans, the Bible also records the Israelites as saying, **'Let us not hear the voice of the Lord our God nor see this great fire**

any more, or we will die' (Deut. 18:16). And in another biblical account, Job pleaded for relief from confrontation with the unbearably depressing integrative, Godly ideals when he lamented, **'Why then did you** [God] **bring me out of the womb?…Turn away from me so I can have a moment's joy before I go to the place of no return, to the land of gloom and deep shadow, to the land of deepest night** [depression]**'** (Job 10:18, 20-22). Job's **'land of gloom and deep shadow…land of deepest night'**, the state of deepest and darkest depression that resulted from trying to confront the issue of the human condition, equates perfectly with life in Plato's cave. Humans could only avoid the terrible depression by turning from the 'sun'/'fire', by living psychologically in denial of the truth of Integrative Meaning and all the truths that related to it. Christ was another who understood the problem of the exposing **'light'** of truth—which he, in his necessarily sheltered-from-exposure-to-the-human-condition-childhood, fully-loved-and-nurtured, relatively innocent, denial-and-therefore-alienation-free, sound state, also represented—when he said, **'the light shines in the darkness but…everyone who does evil** [becomes upset sufferers of the human condition] **hates the light, and will not come into the light for fear that his deeds will be exposed'** (John 1:5, 3:20).

So again, while Integrative Meaning is one of the most obvious, profound and thus important of all truths it is clearly also the truth that has appeared to most condemn humans, and which humans have therefore most feared and found most difficult to confront and accept. We humans have sensibly avoided the subjective dimension to life, the issue of 'self'. Instead of hopelessly and dangerously trying to confront the issue of our non-ideal, corrupted human condition we have sensibly taken one of two options: we either practiced denial of Integrative Meaning, and even of God, and thus of the issue of our self-corruption, or we indirectly acknowledged our self-corruption by acknowledging the existence of God and embracing some expression of faith that a greater dignifying understanding of our divisive condition does exist and would one day be found. To cope with our less-than-ideal human condition there has only ever been either denial or faith. Understanding just how insecure we humans have been in the presence of the integrative ideals or God allows us to understand and thus demystify the origins of the religious impulse. (This subject of the origin of religion was looked at in some detail in Part 3:11G.)

Indeed, in his acceptance speech for the Templeton Prize, Paul Davies also made this comment about the demystification of the religious concept of God: **'Yet among the general population there is a widespread belief that science and theology are forever at loggerheads, that every scientific discovery pushes God further and further out of the picture. It is clear that many religious people still cling to an image of a God-of-the-gaps, a cosmic magician invoked to explain all those mysteries about nature that currently have the scientists stumped. It is a dangerous position, for as science advances, so the God-of-the-gaps retreats, perhaps to be pushed off the edge of space and time altogether, and into redundancy.'** In truth, until understanding of the human condition was found the truly **'dangerous position'** was to demystify God and eliminate the ability for people to **'cling to an image of a God-of-the-gaps'**. The fact is, understanding that God is Integrative Meaning is not something that has **'stumped'** scientists, rather it is something that all humans intuitively know but have almost universally had to conscientiously practice denying. Davies acknowledged this resistance when he said, **'A lot of people are hostile to science because it demystifies nature. They prefer the mystery. They would rather live in ignorance of the way the world works and our place within it'** (ibid). Yes, until the human condition was explained people weren't able to face the truth of Integrative Meaning.

Our ability now to appreciate how important our denial of Integrative Meaning has been means we can finally understand why it has been so important for science to avoid demystifying the concept of God. For instance, the final episode of *Evolution* (a TV series co-produced by WGBH/NOVA Science Unit and Clear Blue Sky Productions in 2001) examined the controversy in American schools and universities over the teaching of Charles Darwin's concept of 'natural selection' as a Godless, meaningless, blind process. The episode's title, 'What about God?', asked why God is excluded from science's interpretation of existence. The answer is that direct acknowledgment of Integrative Meaning was excluded for humans' own sake, for it saved us from suicidal depression. Ensuring the concept of God remained abstract and undefined in scientific terms saved us from direct confrontation with the truth of Integrative Meaning, a confrontation we could not survive until understanding of the human condition was found.

We can also understand now that what supporters of 'Creationism' and 'Intelligent Design' were attempting to do was introduce the concept of God into science, but in a way that didn't involve having to admit to Integrative Meaning and, by so doing, have to confront the suicidally depressing issue of the human condition. They were trying to counter the extreme dishonesty of Integrative Meaning/God-denying mechanistic science with their own form of dishonesty that treated God in a fundamentalist way in which God took the form of an actual being who 'designed' life on Earth, or 'created' the world in just six days. Of course, both positions were immensely dishonest, as they had to be because without understanding of the human condition it was too psychologically dangerous to confront the truth of Integrative Meaning. The difference, however, was that mechanistic scientists wanted to pretend to be rational and either deny any semblance of Integrative Meaning by refuting the existence of the concept of God, or acknowledge the concept of God but claim it has nothing to do with science, while supporters of Creationism and Intelligent Design chose to admit to a semblance of Integrative Meaning in the form of a God who is literally a special person or being or deity who lives in a remote blue heaven surrounded by people with wings, with the downside being that such a stance necessarily meant abandoning all attempts at rationality. (Again, the role of religions and the reason they became more and more simplistic/literalist/fundamentalist was explained earlier when the ever increasing levels of alienation in society was explained in Parts 3:11G and 3:11H.)

We can see that the *real* issue that neither party was willing or able to acknowledge is the issue of Integrative Meaning and its human-condition-confronting implications. And so, in an attempt to keep the issue even further at bay, mechanistic science has, in recent years, evasively shifted its focus away from Integrative Meaning onto the tangential topic of whether the concept of God has been destroyed by science's ability to explain the origins of the universe; of whether physicists' discoveries about the Big Bang origin of the universe, the extinction of time before the Big Bang and, more recently, the possibility of multiple universes (and the search for an ultimate understanding of the cosmos continues), have undermined the concept of God! In other words, can we now understand the origins of the universe without invoking the involvement of a divine agent, someone 'twiddling the dials'? This debate has stalled, however, because the more physicists discover, the more they realise there is to discover. They are unable to give a logical and rational explanation for everything,

such as how did the laws that govern the universe come into being in the first place. As emphasised, this debate has failed to acknowledge the involvement of the issue of the human condition—the existence within our species of a collective, shared-by-all psychosis that is resisting recognition of the existence of meaning and purpose in our existing world and the demystification of the concept of God that that makes possible. As will be explained shortly when the development of order of matter is explained, the truth is that, starting with the boundaries of our reality of matter, space and time, and drawing on the laws of physics with which we live, we can construct the human condition, and also solve it—and, by so doing, make it possible to demystify God, and, indeed, bring to an end the whole debate about 'His' existence. Paul Davies was right when, as mentioned earlier, he said, **'So where is God in this story? Not especially in the big bang…To me, the true miracle of nature is to be found in the ingenious and unswerving lawfulness of the cosmos, a lawfulness that permits complex order to emerge from the chaos.'**

And so, the upset human race has been 'God-fearing' not 'God-confronting', to the extent that God was left un-demystified as a great truth 'out there' that was deemed impossible to confront. The real issue in the debate about the validity of Creationism and Intelligent Design is the issue of the human condition, our inability to confront truths that are condemning until we can explain the human condition. Creationists and supporters of Intelligent Design recognised that mechanistic science was denying a great truth about our world, which they wanted to stop, but they were not recognising that in order to stop the denial the human condition had to be confronted and explained. Creationists and supporters of Intelligent Design tried to counter the denial of Integrative Meaning in mechanistic science with dogma; they wanted the abstract concept of God to be taught in schools, but science—indeed all education—is about demystifying abstract concepts. Again, the word 'science' actually means 'knowledge'. If they were serious about ending the dishonesty of mechanistic science they should have started looking into the issue of the human condition and tried to explain it, but that was typically the last option they wanted to take. After all, they were advocates of dogma not knowledge, but dogma got us nowhere. The whole Creationism and Intelligent Design debate, like the whole scientific debate about whether God has been destroyed by science's ability to explain the origins of the universe, was a fraud, a distraction from the real issue of the human condition that no one was prepared to talk about.

Only now that we can understand the human condition is it at last psychologically safe to demystify God—and, by doing so, reconcile religion and science; as the scientist-philosopher and denial-free thinking prophet Pierre Teilhard de Chardin recognised, **'I can see a direction and a line of progress for life, a line and a direction which are in fact so well marked that I am convinced their reality will be universally admitted by the science of tomorrow'** (*The Phenomenon of Man*, 1938, p.142 of 320). Mechanistic science couldn't admit to Integrative Meaning because it was a suicidally depressing truth, but now that the human condition has been explained the **'so well marked'** truth of the integrative meaning of existence can at last be safely **'admitted'**.

It should, at this point, be emphasised that the integrative, holistic, teleological meaning or purpose or design in nature is simply a product of possibilities. The differing properties of matter mean that some arrangements of matter break down towards heat energy, while others stay stable and still others become part of *larger* stable associations of matter. In time, all the possible associations of matter will be automatically investigated until the largest stable

association is naturally found. Standing back and observing this process we can say that what happens overall is that larger and more stable wholes of matter develop. There *is* a grand theme or design or purpose or meaning to what is occurring, which is the development of ever larger and more stable wholes. But this doesn't mean that there is some overviewing, guiding hand managing and directing this process; no 'God' or 'Intelligent Designer' in the sense of some agent 'overseeing' our world. The term 'teleonomy' has been used by some scientists to recognise the apparent purposefulness and goal-directedness of the integrative process without invoking the misinterpretation of teleology that some might make that infers the benefit or involvement of some intangible guiding foresight.

The problem with the concept of 'teleonomy' was that while it avoided the misinterpretation that there is some overviewing, guiding hand managing and directing life, its admission of Integrative Meaning left humans unbearably condemned for being divisively behaved. As has been emphasised, the responsible sequence of events was to firstly explain the human condition, explain the reason why humans have had to be divisively behaved, and *only then* admit the truth of the holistic, teleological, integrative meaning of existence. But as illustrated by the aforementioned statements from Paul Davies, a few scientists *have* jumped the gun and admitted to Integrative Meaning before the human condition was explained—and not surprisingly, their work *has* met with much resistance from the mechanistic scientific establishment. Indeed, the Australian journalist Deidre Macken wrote an article titled 'Science Friction' about those scientists who have dared to recognise order/complexity/teleology/holism/purpose/meaning and the hostility they encountered as a result. In the article, Macken wrote of a **'scientific revolution'** and a coming **'monumental paradigm shift'**, reporting that the few scientists who have **'dared to take a holistic approach'** are seen by the scientific orthodoxy as committing **'scientific heresy'**. She went on to write that scientists taking the **'holistic approach'**, including the scientists **'physicist Paul Davies and biologist Charles Birch'** (as has been mentioned, Birch was my biology professor at Sydney University), are trying **'to cross the great divide between science and religion'**, and are **'not afraid of terms such as "purpose" and "meaning"'**, adding that **'Quite a number of biologists got upset** [about this new development] **because they don't want to open the gates to teleology—the idea that there is goal-directed change is an anathema to biologists who believe** [evade the condemning truth of Integrative Meaning by saying] **that change is random…The emerging clash of scientific thought has forced many of the new scientists on to the fringe. Some of the pioneers no longer have university positions, many publish their theories in popular books rather than journals, others have their work sponsored by independent organisations… Universities are not catering for the new paradigm'** (*Good Weekend* mag. *Sydney Morning Herald*, 16 Nov. 1991).

These scientists who **'dared to take a holistic approach'** were committing a very profound **'heresy'** indeed because they were defying the human race's need to deny Integrative Meaning until the human condition was explained. The *real* **'scientific revolution'** and coming **'monumental paradigm shift'** when **'the great divide between science and religion'** is **'cross**[ed]**'** occurs when understanding of the human condition is found, as it now is, because *only then* does it become safe to admit Integrative Meaning.

I might add that in addition to Hawking, Einstein, Koestler, Davies and Birch, there have actually been quite a few scientists who have 'jumped the gun', admitted Integrative Meaning before the human condition had been explained, which the titles (particularly the words I have

underlined) of the following books illustrate (Davies' and Birch's works are also included in this list): Professor John Morton wrote *Man, Science and God* in 1971 and *Redeeming Creation* in 1984; Professor David Bohm wrote *Wholeness and The Implicate Order* in 1980; Professors Ilya Prigogine and Isabelle Stengers wrote *Order Out of Chaos* in 1984; Professor Paul Davies wrote *God and the New Physics* in 1983, *The Cosmic Blueprint* in 1987 and *The Mind of God: Science and the Search for Ultimate Meaning* in 1992; Professor Charles Birch wrote *Nature and God* in 1965, *On Purpose* in 1990 and *Biology and The Riddle of Life* in 1999; Dr M. Mitchell Waldrop wrote *Complexity: The Emerging Science at the Edge of Order and Chaos* in 1992; Roger Lewin wrote *Complexity: Life at the Edge of Chaos, the major new theory that unifies all sciences* in 1993; Professor Stuart Kauffman wrote *The Origins of Order: Self-Organization and Selection in Evolution* in 1993, *At Home in the Universe: The Search for the Laws of Self-Organization and Complexity* in 1995 and *Anti-chaos* in 1996; and Dr Richard J. Bird wrote *Chaos and Life: Complexity and Order in Evolution and Thought* in 2003. The terms 'wholeness', 'order', 'self-organisation' and 'complexity' used in these titles are all aspects of the purposeful, meaningful, goal-directed, holistic, teleological, Godly, integrative theme of existence.

As emphasised in Part 4:4B, coming off such a fundamentally false base as mechanistic science has been, by maintaining that change is **'random'**, that there is no meaning or purpose in existence, that there is no direction or goal—by denying such a fundamental truth as Integrative Meaning no less—has meant its ability to interpret its own findings has been deeply compromised, which is why it has struggled to make much sense of the real nature of life on Earth, in particular make sense of human nature. In fact, denial-complying mechanistic science has been such a superficial and thus ineffective form of enquiry that there is a world-wide loss of faith in science. The American General Omar Bradley, who rose to eminence during the Second World War, highlighted the extreme deficiency of mechanistic science when he said, **'The world has achieved brilliance…without conscience. Ours is a world of nuclear giants and ethical infants'** (Armistice Day Address, 10 Nov. 1948, *Collected Writings of General Omar N. Bradley*, Vol.1). Carl Jung recognised science's failure to enlighten us about ourselves when he said that **'Man everywhere is dangerously unaware of himself. We really know nothing about the nature of man, and unless we hurry to get to know ourselves we are in dangerous trouble'** (*Jung and the Story of Our Time*, Laurens van der Post, 1976, p.239 of 275). Charles Birch spoke the truth when he said, '[mechanistic] **science can't deal with subjectivity…what we were all taught in universities is pretty much a dead end'**. Mechanistic science hasn't been able to deal with the truth about ourselves and our world, something Paul Davies certainly identified when he said, **'For 300 years science has been dominated by extremely mechanistic thinking. According to this view of the world all physical systems are regarded as basically machines…I have little doubt that much of the alienation and demoralisation that people feel in our so-called scientific age stems from the bleak sterility of mechanistic thought'** ('Living in a non-material world—the new scientific consciousness', *The Australian*, 9 Oct. 1991). The Russian philosopher Nikolai Berdyaev also recognised the problem of alienation from meaning in mechanistic science when, in an aforementioned quote, he wrote that **'Philosophy…regards him** [man] **as belonging to the kingdom of the spirit, while science studies man…as an object…Nothing that is an object…has meaning…The only way radically to distinguish between philosophy and science is to admit that philosophy is…knowledge of meaning**

and participation in meaning. Science and scientific foresight give man power and security, but they can also devastate his consciousness and sever him from reality. Indeed it might be said that science is based upon the alienation of man from reality and of reality from man…The historical method which…objectifies ideas, regarding them entirely from outside…[means that] **the discovery of meaning becomes impossible. It is the enslavement of philosophy by science—scientific terrorism'** (*The Destiny of Man*, 1931, tr. N. Duddington, 1960, p.6-7 of 310).

Plato recognised the consequences of denial of such fundamental truths as Integrative Meaning when he wrote that **'the Good** [Integrative Meaning]**…gives the objects of knowledge their truth and the mind the power of knowing…**[just as] **the sun…makes the things we see visible… The Good therefore may be said to be the source not only of the intelligibility of the objects of knowledge, but also of their existence and reality'** (*Plato The Republic*, tr. H.D.P. Lee, 1955, p.273). Plato also said that **'when the soul** [our integratively orientated original instinctual self] **uses the instrumentality of the body** [uses the body's intellect with its preoccupation with denial] **for any inquiry…it is drawn away by the body into the realm of the variable, and loses its way and becomes confused and dizzy, as though it were fuddled** [drunk]**…But when it investigates by itself** [free of human-condition-avoiding, intellectual denial]**, it passes into the realm of the pure and everlasting and immortal and changeless, and being of a kindred nature, when it is once independent and free from interference, consorts with it always and strays no longer, but remains, in that realm of the absolute** [Integrative Meaning]**, constant and invariable'** (*Phaedo*, tr. H. Tredennick). Plato also referred to the need to be able **'to look straight at reality'** if we are to effectively **'learn'** when he wrote, **'this capacity** [of **a mind…to see clearly**] **is innate in each man's mind** [we are born with a truthful, instinctive orientation to the cooperative, loving, integrative meaning of existence]**, and that the faculty by which he learns is like an eye which cannot be turned from darkness to light unless the whole body is turned; in the same way the mind as a whole must be turned away from the world of change until it can bear to look straight at reality, and at the brightest of all realities which is what we call the Good** [Integrative Meaning or God]**'** (*The Republic*, tr. H.D.P. Lee, 1955, p.283 of 405).

This loss of **'the power of knowing'** has been very serious. Mechanistic science has suffered very greatly from an inability to think truthfully and thus effectively, it certainly has, as Plato said, **'los**[t] **its way and become confused and dizzy, as though it were fuddled** [drunk]'. Indeed, Arthur Koestler bemoaned the **'fuddled'**, stalled situation of all of science, but of biology and psychology in particular, when he said that the human-condition-issue-avoiding, Integrative-Meaning/God-shunning, whole-view-evading, details-only-focused, blind, reductionist, mechanistic science's denial of Integrative Meaning has **'taken the life out of biology as well as psychology'**, writing that **'although the facts** [of the integration of matter] **were there for everyone to see, orthodox evolutionists were reluctant to accept their theoretical implications. The idea that living organisms, in contrast to machines, were primarily *active*, and not merely *reactive*; that instead of passively adapting to their environment they were…creating…new patterns of structure…such ideas were profoundly distasteful to** [Social] **Darwinians, behaviourists and reductionists in general** [p.222 of 354] **… Evolution has been compared to a journey from an unknown origin towards an unknown destination, a sailing along a vast ocean; but we can at least chart the route …and there is no denying that there is a wind which makes the sails move…the purposiveness of all vital processes…Causality and finality are complementary principles in the sciences of life; if you take out finality and purpose you have taken the life out of biology as well as psychology** [p.226]**'** (*Janus: A Summing Up*, 1978).

Towards the end of his momentous book *The Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection*, Charles Darwin anticipated that **'In the distant future I see open fields for far more important researches. Psychology will be based on a new foundation…Light will be thrown on the origin of man and his history'** (1859, p.458 of 477). Given Koestler's comment that **'if you take out finality and** [**integrative**] **purpose you have taken the life out of biology as well as psychology'**, what was required to bring about Darwin's **'new'** en-**'light'**-ening **'foundation'** for **'far more important research'** in **'biology as well as psychology'** was acknowledgment of **'integrative' 'purpose'**. As Arthur Schopenhauer pointed out, **'The discovery of truth is prevented most effectively…by prejudice, which…stands in the path of truth and is then like a contrary wind driving a ship away from land'** (*Essays and Aphorisms*, tr. R.J. Hollingdale, 1970, p.120 of 237). This **'prejudice'**, **'contrary wind'** that has been **'driving'** biologists away from insight into the nature of our world and our place in it is the practice of, as Koestler described it, **'denying that there is a wind which makes'** matter integrate, **'the purposiveness of all vital processes'**.

So yes, we were never going to get to the liberating truth about the crux problem facing our species of the human condition using lies, most especially denial of Integrative Meaning. When Charles Birch said, **'what we were all taught in universities is pretty much a dead end'**, he was prescient in his choice of words, because **'dead end'** is an apt description for the stalled state of science today, in particular of the stalled state of that discipline within science of biology. In fact, he also once said that **'Biology has not made any real advance since Darwin'** (In recorded conversation with this author, 20 Mar. 1987). Birch also summarised the overall situation faced by mechanistic science when he said that **'the traditional framework of thinking in science is not adequate for solving the really hard problems'** (ABC Radio National, *Ockham's Razor*, 16 Apr. 1997). Well, the **'hard**[est] **problem'** of all for denial-complying mechanistic science to solve has been the all-important issue of the human condition.

Science, which, as mentioned, literally means knowledge, has been *so* deeply committed to denial that it has been failing in its responsibility to find knowledge, ultimately self-knowledge, understanding of the human condition no less—indeed, it has been failing in its responsibility to even assist or encourage those engaged in this all-important realm of enquiry. Not only has my work of studying the human condition been resisted by conventional science, it has very often been ruthlessly attacked by those sympathetic to maintaining all the denial in science. There has been an all-out effort to destroy my work—and me. It is a very serious situation that I am only just still on my feet and working to bring liberating understanding to the all-important issue of the human condition. In her article, Macken wrote that **'many** [holistic scientists have had to] **publish their theories in popular books rather than journals, others have their work sponsored by independent organisations'**. I had to found an organisation that could nurture and support enquiry into the human condition. We in the WTM, who are dedicated to bringing understanding and amelioration to the all-important issue facing the human race of the human condition, have had no assistance at all from the establishment, quite the contrary—we have been viciously attacked by it. In contrast, mechanistic scientists are paid by universities and given access to all manner of facilities, support and encouragement. Sadly, history shows that the present doesn't just resist the future, it actively despises it.

The physicist Max Planck succinctly described this resistance between old science and new science when he wrote that **'science progresses funeral by funeral'** (see his *Scientific Autobiography*,

1948)—a sentiment shared by the science historian Thomas Kuhn who said that **'the old scientists who became established within the dominant paradigm have to die off first: they will virtually never accept the new paradigm. Only the younger generation of scientists, who don't have the emotional attachment to the old paradigm, will be willing to change their minds'** (a reference to the work of Kuhn by Marilyn Ferguson, *New Age* mag. Aug. 1982). Schopenhauer summarised the journey that new ideas in science have historically had to undergo when he famously said that **'the reception of any successful new scientific hypothesis goes through predictable phases before being accepted'**. First, **'it is ridiculed'** and **'violently opposed'**. Second, after support has begun to accumulate, **'it is stated that it may be true but it's not particularly relevant'**. Third, **'after it has clearly influenced the field it is admitted to be true and relevant but the same critics assert that the idea is not original'**. Finally, **'it is accepted as being self-evident'** (compiled from two references to Schopenhauer's work—*New Scientist*, 15 Nov. 1984 & *PlanetHood*, Ferencz & Keyes, 1988). Note that each stage of recognition is achieved in a way that protects the ego of the onlookers. The extent of insecurity in the human make-up is very apparent.

Relievingly, with understanding of the human condition now found, religion and science, faith and reason, the abstract acknowledgment of the ideal truths and our first principle-based enquiry into reality, are finally reconciled. Indeed, 'God' and man are finally reconciled—de Chardin's **'omega point'** has been reached!

Part 8:2 The history of the development of order of matter on Earth

I have said that prior to becoming fully conscious and before the upset state of the human condition emerged, we humans lived in a completely cooperative, harmonious, loving, unconditionally selfless, fully integrated state—which raises the question: how could a gene-based learning system develop such unconditionally selfless, altruistic traits given that unconditionally selfless traits self-eliminate and so, it would follow, can't become established genetically?

To answer this question it is necessary to firstly look truthfully at the history of the development of order of matter on Earth. As was pointed out towards the end of the previous Part 8:1, Darwin anticipated that **'In the distant future I see open fields for far more important researches. Psychology will be based on a new foundation…Light will be thrown on the origin of man and his history'**, and given Koestler's comment that **'if you take out finality and [integrative] purpose you have taken the life out of biology as well as psychology'**, what was required to bring about Darwin's **'new'** en-**'light'**-ening **'foundation'** for **'far more important research'** in **'biology as well as psychology'** was acknowledgment of **'integrative' 'purpose'**. So, to end the current crippled, atrophied, stalled state of biological thinking requires putting aside all the denial-distorted thinking that so saturates biological dialogue and texts up until now, and, starting from the **'new foundation'** of the acceptance of the purpose of developing the order of matter, think simply, cleanly and freshly through the whole biological story from its beginning. We need to assume Integrative Meaning and examine the fundamental ingredients of our world and follow where the process of integration takes us.

Firstly we need to replace the word 'evolution' with the word 'development'. Evolution implies that organisms do change or evolve but avoids acknowledging that there is a direction and purpose to that change, which is to *develop* the order of matter.

To begin: the study of physics has revealed that our world consists of three fundamental ingredients—time, space, and energy, with energy taking the form of the 94 or so naturally occurring elements of matter—hydrogen, helium, lithium, beryllium, boron, etc. These ingredients are subject to the laws of physics. As has been explained, when subjected to the laws of physics, particularly the law of Negative Entropy, matter in space and time became ordered or integrated. It formed more stable or enduring (in time) and ever larger (in space) arrangements.

This development of order of matter involved the initial mixture of the Earth's elements and their gradual formation into stable arrangements called molecules—earlier I provided the example of a water molecule being the stable arrangement of two single positively charged hydrogen atoms with one double negatively charged oxygen atom. In time, through the mixing of different elements, each with their own particular properties, many other stable arrangements were found or developed, leading to even more and greater order and complexity of arrangements. In time, molecules became organised or integrated into very complex macromolecules involving many different elements.

The problem, however, for the development of order was that the more complex these macromolecules became, the more unstable they tended to be. Highly complex macromolecules would only occasionally form and when they did they didn't tend to hold together for long before breaking down into their separate parts. Eventually an impasse was reached where instability set a limit on how complex macromolecules could become. When this instability limit was reached it appeared Negative Entropy, or 'God' if we were to personify the process, could not develop any more order of matter on Earth.

However, one day in the primordial soup a complex macromolecule occurred with an unusual property—DNA, or deoxyribonucleic acid. What was unusual about DNA was that it could replicate. It could split, allowing the two halves to draw material from the environment to build two complete DNA molecules. The significance of this replication was that it meant DNA could defy breakdown. It could turn a relatively brief lifetime for a complex macromolecule into a relatively indefinite one. DNA's ability to replicate meant that even though some of the replicates disintegrated into smaller parts, others would survive and go on to replicate further. With slight variations called mutations occurring from the effects of solar radiation, replicates were 'found' that were even more stable/enduring (in time) and more ordered/complex/larger (in space). The process of natural selection of more stable and larger arrangements of matter—and the origin of an indefinite lifetime, or 'life' as we call it—appeared.

In this process, each replicating arrangement of matter or reproducing individual was in effect being tested both for its ability to survive and reproduce in its lifetime and, over generations of offspring, for its ability to adapt to changes in the environment in which it lived, with those that managed to survive and adapt inevitably, whenever possible, finding/refining/achieving/growing/developing even greater order of matter. The effect of this process over time was that more and greater order of matter was integrated. It was the ability to survive and adapt that supplied the opportunity for more and greater order of matter to develop. Thus, using the tool of replicating DNA, Negative Entropy was able to integrate matter into larger wholes—it was able to develop ever more and ever greater order of matter on Earth.

DNA is actually a very complex crystal. Crystal molecules abound—common salt, sodium chloride, for instance, is one—and in a suitable nutrient environment they all have the capacity to reproduce, of growing their structure from their structure. However, being much simpler than DNA—having far less variety of elements within their molecules—they have little or no potential for adaption and development of greater order.

Variability is so critical to this DNA process of developing greater order of matter that 'sexual reproduction' of DNA molecules developed where the split halves from two closely related DNA molecules were made, through natural selection, to come together (be 'attracted to and mate with each other as males and females') to form a new, slightly different whole DNA-based sexually reproducing individual. This greatly increased the variety of a particular DNA type or 'species' and, by so doing, greatly increased its chances of finding/achieving/growing/developing larger and more stable arrangements of matter. Sexual reproduction, therefore, soon replaced non-sexual or 'asexual' reproduction as the most successful or effective form of DNA reproduction in this business of finding or developing greater order of matter.

As has been mentioned, Negative Entropy is really only a product of possibilities. The differing properties of matter mean that some arrangements of matter break down towards heat energy, while others stay stable and still others become part of larger stable associations of matter. In time, all the possible associations of matter will be automatically or, as Darwin called it, 'naturally' investigated until the largest stable association is naturally left or found or, as Darwin described it, 'selected'. What happened with DNA was that it not only turned a relatively short lifetime for extremely complex molecules into a relatively indefinite one, it also made a business, as it were, of this negentropy direction—both of resisting breakdown and of developing order. The replicating DNA molecule gave rise to a process that actively resisted breakdown and actively developed ever more and greater order of matter. This is **'the active striving of living matter towards order'**, **'a drive towards synthesis, growth and wholeness'**, the **'active'**, **'creating'**, **'purposiveness'** of life that Koestler wrote of. As has been mentioned, this negentropy surviving and building process does require energy from an external source, which in Earth's case is provided by the sun.

If we want to know what is occurring on Earth—'what is the meaning of life?'—we only have to cut off many short lengths of wire (representing the different elements), bend them into different shapes such as hooks, loops and spirals (representing the different properties of those building blocks of our world), put them into a box (representing space), shake the box up (representing time), and then lift the lid and look inside and see what has occurred. What we will see is that the wire pieces have formed themselves into all sorts of tangles; they have developed larger arrangements or wholes of matter. Again, Integrative Meaning is a simple and obvious truth but for all its obviousness it has been the main truth we insecure humans have had to learn to block-out or deny.

To continue our analysis of the involvement of DNA in the development of order, the DNA unit of inheritance is called a gene, and the study of the process of change that genes undergo has been labelled 'genetics'. As a tool for Negative Entropy's development or refinement of the order of matter on Earth, the genetic process was very powerful—it was able to develop the great variety of ordered matter we call life. From DNA, virus-like organisms developed, then

from virus-like organisms developed single-celled organisms, and from single-celled organisms developed multicellular organisms. The next level of order to be developed or integrated by Negative Entropy was societies or colonies or ordered arrangements of multicellular organisms. It was at this point that Negative Entropy or 'God' encountered another major impasse.

While genetics has proved to be a marvellous tool for integrating matter it has one very significant limitation, which arises from the fact that each sexually reproducing individual organism has to struggle, compete and fight selfishly for the available resources of food, shelter, territory and a mate that it needs if it is to successfully reproduce its genes. What this means is that integration, and the unconditionally selfless cooperation it depends on, cannot normally develop between one sexually reproducing individual and another. Indeed, the competition between sexually reproducing individuals is the basis of the natural selection process that gave rise to the great variety of life on Earth. The word 'selection' in 'natural selection' implies competition—comparison between sexually reproducing individuals for their ability to survive, adapt and develop greater order of matter. So integration beyond the level of the sexually reproducing individual—that is, the coming together or integration of sexually reproducing individuals to form a new larger and more stable whole or association or aggregation or assemblage or amalgamation or unification or conglomeration of sexually reproducing individuals—could not, normally, develop. This was the second major impasse that Negative Entropy (or 'God') encountered. The development of order of matter on Earth had seemingly come to a stop at the level of the sexually reproducing individual.

Each sexually reproducing individual normally has to ensure its own genes reproduce, which means sexually reproducing individuals can't normally develop the ability to behave unconditionally selflessly towards other sexually reproducing individuals—which, as was explained in the previous Part 8:1, is what full cooperation and thus complete integration requires. Certainly sexually reproducing individuals can develop *conditionally* selfless behaviour towards other sexually reproducing individuals. Situations of reciprocity can develop where one sexually reproducing individual selflessly helps another on the proviso that they are selflessly helped in return, which in effect means both parties are still selfishly benefiting. So sexually reproducing individuals *can* develop reciprocity because it is, in essence, still selfish behaviour: it doesn't give away an advantage to other sexually reproducing individuals and therefore doesn't compromise the reproductive chances of the sexually reproducing individual practicing the behaviour. Unconditionally selfless, altruistic traits, on the other hand, do give away an advantage to other sexually reproducing individuals—that being the meaning of unconditional selflessness, that you are giving without receiving—and therefore unconditionally selfless, altruistic, self-sacrificing traits *do* compromise the reproductive chances of the sexually reproducing individual practicing such behaviour and therefore cannot normally develop.

So cooperation between sexually reproducing individuals cannot normally be developed beyond a situation where there is reciprocal/conditional selflessness, and, since conditionally selfless behaviour is still basically selfish behaviour, full cooperation and thus complete integration cannot normally be developed between sexually reproducing individuals. This inability to develop unconditionally selfless, altruistic behaviour leaves sexually reproducing individuals competing relentlessly with each other for available resources of food, shelter,

territory and a mate. So much so, in fact, that what we see happening between sexually reproducing individuals as they try to develop more integration under this limitation of not being able to develop unconditionally selfless behaviour is that the competition between them becomes *so* intense that the only way they can contain it at all is by establishing a dominance hierarchy, where each individual accepts its position in a hierarchy that is ordered according to the competitive strengths of the various individuals involved. The benefit of a dominance hierarchy, or a so-called 'peck order', is that, once established, the only time competition breaks out is when an opportunity arises to move up the hierarchy; for the rest of the time there is relative peace. The emergence of a dominance hierarchy is a sign that a species has developed as much integration as it possibly can.

It should be pointed out that in situations where a dominance hierarchy breaks down, where, for instance, male elephants or whales or kangaroos or birds or solitary insects, etc, etc, chase a female in estrous, it's not simply because the female wants to discover which is the strongest male with which to mate to ensure her offspring is the strongest, most competitively successful individual it can be, as is currently taught, but because the Negative Entropy integrative tendency has driven the males and the females to that extreme state of competition. Such extreme competition is a result of trying to develop greater order of matter. More will be said about this shortly, but the real story is about integration, not selfish competition.

Although dominance hierarchy hides it from view for most of the time, the reality is that *extreme* competitiveness characterises the behaviour of the more cooperative and thus integrated, or what has evasively been called 'social', species. In my youth I remember feeding hens in our hen house and seeing a hen twist her leg and become temporarily crippled, at which point all the other hens immediately attacked her. In that instant it was suddenly apparent to me just how closely and intensely each hen was watching all the other hens for an opportunity to literally move up the peck order. The hen house was not at all the gregarious, peaceful community I thought it was; rather, it was a place of absolutely fierce competition! Charles Darwin recognised this truth about the real struggle in the lives of most animals when he wrote that **'It is difficult to believe in the dreadful but quiet war of organic beings, going on** [in] **the peaceful woods and smiling fields'** (12 Mar. 1839, *Charles Darwin's Notebooks*, Barrett et al., 1987, p.429).

This situation where sexually reproducing individuals relentlessly compete for available resources is the situation, the condition, that almost all animals have to endure—it is the great, agonising 'animal condition', about which much more will be said in Part 8:4C. When we humans become free of our numbed, alienated human condition we are going to be shocked by the agony of the animal condition: we are going to *feel* the distress that all non-human animal species live under, where each sexually reproducing individual is having to relentlessly and fiercely compete to reproduce its genes. Unfortunately, because animals' innocence confronts us with our lack of innocence, we humans presently so hate, despise and resent animals that we hunt and shoot them for 'sport'; but one day we are going to have so much sympathy for animals because of what they have to endure trapped in a life of having to relentlessly compete with each other, often with their closest friends! Certainly the same extremely competitive state exists for plants, insects and microbes, but not having the developed nervous system of animals their awareness of the agony of that horrifically competitive existence could not be as great as it is for animals.

What now needs to be explained is firstly that while sexually reproducing individuals cannot normally be integrated, the sexually reproducing individual itself could be elaborated, made bigger, which, as will be explained next, is how single celled organisms developed into multicellular organisms, and how multicellular colonial ants and bees integrated into their fully cooperative and thus completely integrated colonies. Significantly, in these 'elaborated sexually reproducing individuals', the cells of the multicellular body, or the individual ants and bees in their fully integrated colonies, are no longer sexually reproducing individuals themselves, but part of a larger sexually reproducing individual which is the body, or, in the case of ants and bees, the colony. Secondly, it has to be explained why I have been saying it is 'normally' not possible for sexually reproducing individuals to become fully integrated. There was, in fact, one species who managed to achieve the development of the next larger whole in the integration of matter on Earth of the integration of sexually reproducing individuals: our human ape ancestors. As will be fully explained in Part 8:4, this amazing step in the development of matter was achieved through the nurturing of our offspring, which has been another of those unbearable truths that we couldn't face until we could explain the human condition.

To summarise what has been explained so far: in the development of order of matter on Earth, all non-human animal species are stuck in the 'animal condition', with each sexually reproducing individual member of the species forever having to compete to ensure its genes reproduce and carry on. *That* is the essential fact or rule of the gene-based natural selection process—genes are unavoidably selfish, they have to ensure they reproduce if they are to carry on. It is important to note, however, that even though this selfishness and the extreme competition between the sexually reproducing individuals it gives rise to is the characteristic of virtually all of nature, the truth is such selfishness is only occurring because of the *limitation* of the genetic process of *normally* being unable to develop unconditional selflessness between sexually reproducing individuals. In his 1850 poem *In Memoriam*, the English poet laureate Alfred Tennyson famously wrote: **'Who trusted God was love indeed / And love Creation's final law / Tho' Nature, red in tooth and claw / With ravine** [in violent contradiction]**, shriek'd against his creed.'** While Integrative Meaning or **'God'** and its theme of unconditional selflessness or **'love'** is the **'creed'** or **'final law'** of **'creation'** that the competitive, selfish and aggressive, **'red in tooth and claw'** characteristic of so much of **'Nature'** seems to be in violent contradiction **'against'**, we can now understand that this selfish characteristic doesn't mean that the *overall* biological reality of existence—life's meaning and theme—is to be selfish, as the dishonest theories of Social Darwinism, Sociobiology, Evolutionary Psychology, Multilevel Selection and Eusociality would have us believe. As will be explained shortly in Part 8:4, in the case of humans, we don't have selfish instincts like other species, rather we have *unconditionally selfless* instincts. And the selfishness that is characteristic of so much of nature is *only* occurring because of the *limitation* of the gene-base refinement process, its inability to develop unconditional selflessness. The genetic process would develop unconditionally selfless, fully cooperative behaviour between all sexually reproducing individuals if it could—because such selflessness is what is required to maintain a fully integrated whole—but, because of its particular *limitation*, it can't. Integrative selflessness, not divisive selfishness, is the *real* nature or characteristic of existence, the theme of life.

Part 8:3 Elaborating the sexually reproducing individual

As stated, while sexually reproducing individuals cannot normally be integrated, the sexually reproducing individual itself could be elaborated, made bigger, which, as will now be explained, is how single celled organisms developed into multicellular organisms, and how multicellular colonial ants and bees integrated into their fully cooperative colonies. Struggling to find a way to develop greater order of matter by integrating sexually reproducing individuals, it was as if Negative Entropy (or 'God') decided, 'Well, what I'll do is develop greater order of matter *within* each genetically reproducing individual, making it bigger.'

As was also mentioned, in these 'elaborated sexually reproducing individuals', the cells of the multicellular body, or the individual ants and bees in their fully integrated colonies, are no longer sexually reproducing individuals themselves, but part of a larger sexually reproducing individual which is the body, or, in the case of ants and bees, the colony.

The biological mechanism for elaborating the sexually reproducing individual involved the member cells, or the multicellular bees/ants, leaving the task of sexual reproduction to another part of the whole that *specialises* in reproduction. In the case of the integration of single-celled organisms, the green algae known as *Volvox* provides an example of an organism in transition from the single-celled to the multicellular state, as this quote describes: **'Volvox is…a small, green sphere…composed of thousands of flagellates embedded in the surface of a jelly ball… Volvox is a colony of unicellular animals rather than a many-celled animal, because even the simplest many-celled animals have considerably more differentiation between cells than appears among the cells of Volvox. The colony swims about, rolling over and over from the action of the flagella; but, remarkably enough, the same end of the sphere is always directed forward…Its behaviour can be explained only by supposing that the activities of the numerous flagellates are subordinated to the activity of the colony as a whole. If the flagella of each member of the colony were to beat without reference to the other members, the sphere would never get anywhere. In such subordination of the individual cells of a colony to the good of the colony as a whole we see the beginnings of individuality as it exists in the higher animals, where each animal behaves as a single individual, although composed of millions of cells…The co-ordination of numerous components into an individual is usually followed by the specialisation of different individuals for different duties. Only the slightest degree of specialisation is seen in the Volvox colony; the flagellates of the back part of the colony are capable of reproduction, while the front members never reproduce but have larger eyespots and serve primarily in directing the course of the colony'** (*Animals without Backbones*, R. Buchsbaum, 1938, p.50 of 401).

The marine invertebrates known as siphonophores, which include the Portuguese man-of-war, live in colonies composed of 'zooids'—individual animals that are not fully independent; indeed, their reliance upon, and integration with, each other is so strong that the colony attains the character of one large organism. In fact, most of the zooids are so specialised that they lack the ability to survive on their own. Thus siphonophorae, like Volvox, exist at the boundary between colonial and complex multicellular organisms.

We can imagine the path to the creation of Volvox and siphonophores began with cloning, the asexual reproduction of identical offspring where competition between the clones is

pointless and unnecessary since each individual is genetically the same and therefore division of labour and cooperation can develop and exist between the clones. One concern with cloning is loss of variability—for example, if one colony kept reproducing asexually it could become so big it monopolised the available resources of food, space and territory, so that other colonies couldn't survive, leading to a lack of variability in the species. We can imagine that eventually a limited, functional size would be arrived at, which presumably is the size at which Volvox and siphonophores operate. Obviously to maintain variability it would also be beneficial for sexual reproduction to occur from time to time, as it does amongst both Volvox and siphonophores.

In the case of bees (ants also employ a similar chemical retardant), the queen bee feeds all of her offspring that she intends to be workers a 'royal jelly' that causes sterility. To ensure the reproduction of their genes these sterile offspring then have to support the queen because she carries their genes. (It should be mentioned that saying the queen 'intends' and the offspring 'have to' is obviously personifying the genetic process. The queen and the offspring are obviously not conscious thinking organisms, deciding they 'intend' and 'have to' do something or other as we humans do, however, such anthropomorphism is simply a useful way of describing what *in effect* occurs. For example, the way genetics actually causes offspring to 'have to' support the queen is that out of the many different mutational varieties of offspring that appear over time only those that happen to have a genetic make-up that inclines them to support the queen will tend to reproduce, naturally selecting that particular behaviour for all subsequent generations and eventually the whole species.)

Elaborating the sexually reproducing individual allows the members of the elaborated individual to develop the ability to at least *behave* unconditionally selflessly, which, as has been explained, is fundamental for the fully cooperative integration of members into a new whole to develop. The reason our body works so well is because each part has sublimated its needs to the greater good of the whole body; each part behaves unconditionally selflessly. Our skin is constantly growing and dying to protect our body. The leaves that fall in autumn do so to ensure the tree survives through winter. Bees and ants readily sacrifice themselves for their colony; for example, when a bee stings to protect its hive, its innards are attached to the sting that is left in its victim, so when it stings it dies. The skin, leaves and bees/ants have behaved unconditionally selflessly—they have, in effect, considered the welfare of the greater good above their own welfare.

Significantly, however, our body's skin, the tree's leaves and the bees/ants have only *behaved* unconditionally selflessly because their selflessness is *not* actually unconditional selflessness, it is *not* true altruism. This is because the self-sacrificing skin, leaves and bees/ants are all indirectly selfishly ensuring their own genetic existence will be maintained by supporting the body, tree, or bee/ant colony that carries the genes for their existence and so reproduces them when it reproduces itself as a whole. Genetically they are selflessly fostering the body/tree/colony to selfishly ensure their own genetic reproduction. Their apparently unconditionally selfless *behaviour* is not actually unconditional and thus altruistic, but rather a subtle form of selfishness. As explained earlier, such reciprocity can develop genetically because it doesn't compromise the chances of the sexually reproducing individual reproducing its genes. (As pointed out in Part 4:12, the dishonest biological theory of Sociobiology/Evolutionary Psychology was truthful to the extent that it did recognise this fact that the selfless behaviour of social ants and bees is due to reciprocity—where the theory was dishonest was in its application of 'kin selection' to explain *all* social behaviour, even our own *unconditionally* selfless, *universally* benevolent, *fully* altruistic moral instincts.)

It now needs to be explained that <u>large animals couldn't employ this device of elaborating the sexually reproducing individual</u> to develop a fully cooperative, integrated association or whole of their members because for them it involves too great a loss of the variability that all species need to be able to adapt to their environment. For example, if a female buffalo happened to be born with a particular mutation that caused her to produce a chemical in her milk that retarded the sexual maturation of her offspring such that her offspring then had to have selected mutations that inclined them to protect her to ensure their genes are successfully reproduced by her, and this became a common practice amongst buffalos with every queen buffalo having, say, nine protector sacrificial buffalos, then the genetic variety of a population of 1,000 buffalos would be reduced to just 100, a drastic loss of variability. In the case of bees/ants, they are so small in relation to their environment that they can afford to have many fully integrated colonies in their environment without any significant loss of variability within their species.

The following two photographs illustrate the point. While there are millions of termites in the termite mounds, in terms of the *genetic variety* present in the territory shown, these mounds do, in fact, represent a similar number of sexually reproducing individuals to the

number of sexually reproducing individual buffalos shown in a corresponding area in the second photograph.

Magnetic Termite Mounds, Litchfield National Park, Northern Territory, Australia, 2010.

Asian Buffalo, Northern Territory, Australia, 2010. Photographs by Jeremy Griffith.

Quite a number of species that are much larger than ants and bees are attempting to create the integrated society of members by temporarily elaborating the sexually reproducing individual. Many bird species, such as the Australian Kookaburra, delay their sexual maturation for a few years after they fledge, during which time they selflessly help raise their parents' subsequent offspring. Wolves, African wild dogs and meerkats do the same thing. However, what they have obviously found is that to delay their sexual maturation permanently leads to too great a loss of variability in their species.

Underground-living colonial naked mole rats form fully integrated colonies of up to 300 members comprising one queen who uses hormones to inhibit the sexual maturation of nearly all the others who then act as 'workers' and 'soldiers'. A few 'sexual disperser caste' are allowed to reach sexual maturity and these periodically escape their natal burrow to access other colonies and, in doing so, help maintain the genetic variety of the mole rat species. Significantly, like colonial ants and bees, and the dozen or so other varieties of multicellular organisms that have been able to permanently elaborate the sexually reproducing individual, mole rats are relatively small, typically individuals are only 8 to 10 centimetres (3 to 4 inches) long.

What has been explained here is very significant for humans because it means that, as large animals, we could not have employed the integrating device of elaborating the sexually reproducing individual to create the pre-conscious and pre-human-condition-afflicted, fully cooperative, completely integrated, 'Golden', 'Garden of Eden'-like state that our distant ancestors lived in. Further, during that fully integrated, idyllic past our instinctive orientation was *not* to reciprocity's subtle form of selfishness that the parts of multicellular organisms and bee/ant colonies practice, as the theory of Sociobiology/Evolutionary Psychology claims, but to being truly altruistic, genuinely unconditionally selflessly orientated towards *all of life*. Thus, even if we could have employed the device of elaborating the sexually reproducing individual it would not even begin to account for our *unconditionally* selfless, moral soul. I italicised '*all of life*' because while ant and bee colonies have members who are dedicated to supporting each other, each colony is, in fact, engaged in fierce competition with other colonies. Worker ants and bees are not interested in behaving selflessly towards *all of life*, which, contrary to what the theory of Eusociality claims, our moral self is interested in. Our ability to love unconditionally didn't arise from an ability to war successfully!

The question therefore remains: how did we humans manage to develop our absolutely wonderful and astonishing *unconditionally* selfless, *genuinely* altruistic, *all*-loving moral instinctive orientation to the world? How did we humans become unconditionally selflessly behaved such that we had become a fully integrated association of sexually reproducing individuals—indeed, a fully integrated species? Yes, elaborating the sexually reproducing individual does allow greater order of matter to be developed but it doesn't achieve the next level of integration, which is the coming together or integration of sexually reproducing individual members of a species to form the Specie Individual or whole, which is what our ape ancestors managed to achieve. As was mentioned at the end of Part 8:2, and as will be fully explained shortly in Part 8:4B, the reason I said that 'normally' it is not possible to

integrate sexually reproducing individuals is because Negative Entropy or 'God' *did* find one way to integrate sexually reproducing members of a species to form the Specie Individual, which was through the nurturing of offspring, which is the device our human ape ancestors employed to become fully integrated, the instinctive memory of which is our unconditionally selfless, genuinely altruistic, all-loving moral instinctive self or soul.

Before explaining how humans acquired our unconditionally selfless, moral instincts, this summarising point needs to be made about the stages of integration between multicellular members of a species to form the fully integrated larger whole of the Specie Individual. As has been emphasised, all species are trying to become integrated, but the amount of integration they have been able to develop varies according to their circumstances. In particular it depends on how much selfless, cooperative behaviour they can develop before they reach the integration limit where they have to establish dominance hierarchy—and beyond that situation, on whether they can temporarily or fully elaborate the reproductive individual—and beyond that situation, on whether they can develop love-indoctrination. Many species have been able to develop a degree of selfless cooperation or socialness through developing some reciprocal selflessness (which is ultimately selfish behaviour and thus can be developed by natural selection); African buffalos, for example, form semi-cooperative, 'social' herds as the herd provides individuals, in particular newborn calves, with physical protection against predators. Grazing animals in general form semi-cooperative, 'social' herds because, for one thing, if you are a grazing animal and have to have your head down feeding most of the time and you are in a herd it is likely that at least one member will have their head up and see an approaching predator and give a signal to the others of the threat. These are examples of reciprocal selflessness because while on occasion a member happens to be the selfless buffalo that most directly confronts the predator, or the grazing animal that draws attention to itself by giving the alarm call, on average each individual herd member benefits more than they risk from others making the defence or giving the alarm. It has already been explained how temporarily or permanently elaborating the reproductive individual enables cooperation to develop. <u>What is significant is that under the limitation of the gene-based, natural selection process, while *a little* integration can be developed through occasional acts of reciprocal selflessness (such as occurs in buffalo herds), and *somewhat more* integration can be developed through temporarily elaborating the sexually reproducing individual (such as occurs in wolf packs), and *continuous* and thus *full* integration can be developed through permanently elaborating the sexually reproducing individual (as occurs in ant colonies), the *continuous* and thus *full* integration of sexually reproducing individuals to form the Species Individual can *only* occur through love-indoctrination (as is occurring in bonobos and occurred in our ape ancestors)</u>.

Part 8:4 How humans acquired our moral soul and conscience — our original instinctive orientation to behaving unconditionally selflessly

Part 8:4A Introduction

While a description of how we humans acquired our unconditionally selfless moral instinctive self or soul and conscience was very briefly presented in Parts 3:4 and 4:4D, a comprehensive description now needs to be provided.

As has previously been described in Parts 4:6 and 5:2, our mythologies and most profound thinkers have recognised that our distant ancestors lived in a pre-conscious, pre-human-condition-afflicted, innocent, unconditionally selfless, genuinely altruistic, fully cooperative, universally loving, peaceful state. As Richard Heinberg's summary of his research into the subject of our memory of a 'Garden of Eden' 'Golden Age' in our species' past states, **'Every religion begins with the recognition that human consciousness has been separated from the divine Source, that a former sense of oneness…has been lost…everywhere in religion and myth there is an acknowledgment that we have departed from an original…innocence'** (*Memories & Visions of Paradise*, 1990, pp.81-82 of 282). The eighth century BC Greek poet Hesiod also referred to this 'Golden Age' in our species' past in his poem *Works and Days*: **'When gods alike and mortals rose to birth / A golden race the immortals formed on earth…Like gods they lived, with calm untroubled mind / Free from the toils and anguish of our kind / Nor e'er decrepit age misshaped their frame…Strangers to ill, their lives in feasts flowed by…Dying they sank in sleep, nor seemed to die / Theirs was each good; the life-sustaining soil / Yielded its copious fruits, unbribed by toil / They with abundant goods 'midst quiet lands / All willing shared the gathering of their hands.'**

Even the meaning and origin of the words associated with our moral nature reveal our awareness of the extraordinarily loving, ideal-behaviour-expecting, 'good-and-evil'-differentiating, sound nature of our instinctive self or 'psyche' or 'soul', the 'voice' or expression of which is our 'conscience'. The *Concise Oxford Dictionary* defines our 'conscience' as our **'moral sense of right and wrong'**, and our 'soul' as the **'moral and emotional part of man'**, and as the **'animating or essential part'** of us. And the *Penguin Dictionary of Psychology* says: **'psyche: The oldest and most general use of this term is by the early Greeks, who envisioned the psyche as the soul or the very essence of life'** (1985). Indeed, the **'early Greek'** philosopher Plato said about our born-with, instinctive self or soul's ideal or 'Godly' behaviour-expecting moral nature, that we humans have **'knowledge, both before and at the moment of birth…of all absolute standards…**[of] **beauty, goodness, uprightness, holiness…our souls exist before our birth'** (*Phaedo*, tr. H. Tredennick). He went on to write that **'the soul is in every possible way more like the invariable'**, which he described as **'the pure and everlasting and immortal and changeless…realm of the absolute…**[our] **soul resembles the divine'** (ibid).

The philosopher Nikolai Berdyaev also truthfully acknowledged the recognition within us all of a past innocent, uncorrupted instinctive self or soul when he wrote that **'The memory of a lost paradise, of a Golden Age, is very deep in man'** (*The Destiny of Man*, 1931, tr. N. Duddington, 1960, p.36 of 310); while the philosopher Jean-Jacques Rousseau *also* expressed what we all intuitively do know is the truth about our species' past innocent existence when he wrote that **'nothing is more gentle than man in his primitive state'** (*On The Origin of Inequality*, 1755; *The Social Contract and Discourses*, tr. G.D.H. Cole, 1913, p.198 of 269).

Yes, as philosopher John Fiske wrote about our moral nature: **'We approve of certain actions and disapprove of certain actions quite instinctively. We shrink from stealing or lying as we shrink from burning our fingers'** (*Outlines of Cosmic Philosophy*, 1874, Vol. IV, Part II, p.126). And our moral instinctive self or soul is not only concerned with not ill-treating others, it is also deeply concerned with their welfare. When Joe Delaney, a professional footballer, acknowledged that **'I can't swim good, but I've got to save those kids'**, just moments before plunging into a Louisiana pond and drowning in an attempt to rescue three boys ('Sometimes The Good Die Young', *Sports Illustrated*, 7 Nov. 1983), he was considering others above his own welfare. The truth is everywhere we look we see examples of humans behaving unconditionally selflessly, such as those who sacrifice their lives for moral or ethical principles, or show charity to the less fortunate. Indeed, now that we can explain the human condition it becomes clear that since the human condition emerged when we became conscious some two million years ago, every generation of humans has suffered becoming self-corrupted in an unconditionally selfless effort to add to the accumulation of knowledge that might one day liberate humanity from the human condition—to again use the words from *The Man of La Mancha*, every generation has altruistically **'march**[ed] **into hell for a heavenly cause'** (*The Impossible Dream*, Joe Darion, 1965).

Our species' unconditionally selfless moral nature is indeed a wonderful phenomenon. The philosopher Immanuel Kant was so impressed with it he had these words inscribed on his tomb: **'there are two things which fill me with awe: the starry heavens above us, and the moral law within us'** (*Critique of Practical Reason*, 1788). Charles Darwin was similarly awed by the existence of our moral instincts, writing that **'the moral sense affords the best and highest distinction between man and the lower animals'** (*The Descent of Man*, 1871, ch.4).

The poet Alexander Pope, however, was *not* so impressed by our **'divine'**-like, **'absolute standards…**[of] **beauty, goodness, uprightness, holiness'**-expecting, **'animating'**, **'very essence of life'**, **'awe'**-inspiring, **'best and highest distinction'**-deserving, **'moral and emotional'**, **'essential part'** of us, pointing out that **'our nature** [is]**…A sharp accuser, but a helpless friend!'** (*An Essay on Man*, Epistle II, 1733). And he was right in the sense that, as has been made very clear, our conscience *has* been **'a sharp accuser, but a helpless friend'**; it *has* criticised us aplenty when what we needed was redeeming *understanding* of our 'good-and-evil'-afflicted, corrupted or 'fallen' present human condition—which, thank goodness, we now at last have.

Yes, paradoxically we couldn't afford to face the truth that our **'awe'**-inspiring, **'best and highest distinction'**-deserving, moral soul is our instinctive memory of an unconditionally selfless, all-loving past until we could explain our present **'sharp accus**[ation]**'**-from-our-conscience-deserving, soul-devastated, innocence-destroyed, angry, egocentric and alienated condition—as the psychologist Ronald Conway noted about our human-condition-avoiding, mechanistic attitude to the subject of our soul: **'Soul is customarily suspected in empirical psychology and analytical philosophy as a disreputable entity'** (*The Australian*, 10 May 2000). But now that we have the fully accountable, human psychosis-addressing-and-solving, truthful explanation of the human condition we *can* acknowledge what our soul is, and, most significantly, heal our species' psychosis or **'soul-illness'**. Yes, since *psyche* means **'soul'** and *osis*, according to *Dictionary.com*, means **'abnormal state or condition'**, we can at last ameliorate or heal our species' psychosis, its alienated, psychologically **'ill'**, **'abnormal state or condition'**.

While we can now heal our species' psychosis, and while our mythologies, profound thinkers and the meanings behind some of the most used words recognise that we humans did once live in an unconditionally selfless, all-loving, moral instinctive state, a very great mystery remains, which is *how could we humans have possibly acquired such a **'distinct'** from other **'animals'**, **'awe'**-inspiring but **'sharp accus**[ing]**'** instinctive orientation?*

To look at the biology involved in the question of the origin of our species' extraordinary moral nature. As was explained in Parts 8:2 and 8:3, while the gene-based system for developing the order of matter on Earth is powerfully effective—it developed the great variety of life we see on Earth—it has one very significant limitation, which

arises from the fact that each sexually reproducing individual organism has to struggle and compete selfishly for the available resources of food, shelter, territory and a mate it requires if it is to successfully reproduce its genes. What this means is that integration, and the unconditionally selfless cooperation that it depends upon, cannot normally develop between one sexually reproducing individual and another; which *then* means that integration beyond the level of the sexually reproducing individual—that is, the coming together or integration of sexually reproducing individuals to form a new larger and more stable whole of sexually reproducing individuals, the Species Individual—can also not normally develop. Thus, it appeared that Negative Entropy's, or 'God's', development of order of matter on Earth had come to a stop at the level of the sexually reproducing individual. The integration of the members of a species into the larger whole of the Specie Individual could seemingly not be developed.

What all this means is that only a degree of cooperation and thus integration could be developed between the sexually reproducing individual members of a species before the competition between them became so intense that a dominance hierarchy had to be employed to contain the divisive competition; and, in fact, that is where most animal species are stalled in their ability to integrate. They could become to a degree integrated (what has been termed 'social'), but not completely integrated into one new larger organism or whole. Certainly each sexually reproducing individual could be either temporarily (in the case of large animals like wolves) or permanently (in the case of small animals like ants and bees) 'elaborated', made larger, thus allowing greater integration of matter to develop *within* the sexually reproducing individual, but the sexually reproducing individuals (the wolf packs or the ant/bee colonies) of such species were still engaged in competition with each other. It seemed that the integration of sexually reproducing members of a species and thus the full integration of the members of a species into a Specie Individual could not be achieved; Negative Entropy, or 'God', *had* seemingly developed as much order of matter on Earth as it could.

HOWEVER, the integration of matter *hadn't* come to an end because a way *was* found by Negative Entropy, or 'God', to integrate the members of a species into the larger whole of the Specie Individual, AND it was our ape ancestors who achieved this extraordinary step. As it says in Genesis in the Bible, we humans once lived **'in the image of God'** (1:27), we were once a fully cooperative, unconditionally selflessly behaved, completely integrated species; we *did* once live in **'the Garden of Eden'** (3:23) state of original cooperative, loving, innocent togetherness, then we became conscious, took the **'fruit' 'from the tree of…knowledge'** (3:3, 2:17), and, as a result, **'fell from grace'** (derived from the title of Gen. 3, **'The Fall of Man'**) because we became divisively behaved sufferers of the human condition, supposedly deserving of being **'banished…from the Garden of Eden'** (3:23) of original innocent togetherness, and left **'a restless wanderer on the earth'** (4:14); left in our present, immensely upset, psychologically distressed condition, a state we can now at last emerge from because we can finally explain and thus compassionately understand *why* we *had to* search for **'knowledge'** and suffer becoming corrupted. We can explain that we upset humans are not 'unGodly' after all; that we had to master our conscious mind in order to be able to securely manage the development of order of matter from our knowing, understanding position.

© National Geographic Society

Africa—our soul's home—the Garden of Eden

Lucas Cranach the Elder's *Adam and Eve* (1526)

Photograph by Peeter Vilsimaa

We can still see the remnants of the time when our species lived in a pre-human-condition-afflicted, innocent, Garden-of-Eden-like state in the happiness and togetherness of children.

In his wonderful 1807 poem *Intimations of Immortality*, William Wordsworth gave this rare honest description of our species' tragic journey from its original soulful, innocent, instinctive, moral state to its present soul-devastated, often-immoral, apparently—but, as has now been explained, not actually—non-ideal or, to use religious terminology, 'unGodly' state: **'The Soul that rises with us, our life's Star…cometh from afar…trailing clouds of glory do we come / From God, who is our home.'** In the poem Wordsworth described how quickly this **'life's Star'** of

our ideal, moral, **'God**[ly]**' 'Soul'** that is **'with us'** when we are born becomes corrupted as we grow up in the human-condition-afflicted world of today: **'There was a time when meadow, grove, and streams / The earth, and every common sight / To me did seem / Apparelled in celestial light / The glory and the freshness of a dream / It is not now as it hath been of yore / Turn wheresoe'er I may / By night or day / The things which I have seen I now can see no more… I know, where'er I go / That there hath past away a glory from the earth…Thou Child of Joy / Shout round me, let me hear thy shouts, thou happy Shepherd-boy! // Ye blessed Creatures…Whither is fled the visionary gleam? / Where is it now, the glory and the dream? // Our birth is but a sleep and a forgetting… Heaven lies about us in our infancy! / Shades of the prison-house begin to close / Upon the growing Boy…Forget the glories he hath known / And that imperial palace whence he came.'**

So THE GREAT QUESTION is, how did Negative Entropy, or 'God', achieve the amazing integration of our human forebears into the Specie Individual? How did our human ancestors develop the fully integrated state, the instinctive memory of which is our unconditionally selfless, genuinely altruistic, moral self or 'soul', the 'voice' or expression of which in us is our conscience? What is the biological origin of our species' extraordinary moral nature?

Part 8:4B Love-Indoctrination

As stated in Part 8:2, while the integrative limitation of genes of having to always selfishly ensure their own reproduction was the normal situation, Negative Entropy did find one way to overcome this limitation, which was through *nurturing*—a mother's maternal instinct to care for her offspring. Throughout this Part it will be shown that evidence, from the anthropological record as well as that provided by living non-human primates, overwhelmingly indicates that it was this nurturing path to integration that our distant ape ancestors took.

Genetic traits for nurturing are selfish (which, as stated, genetic traits normally have to be), for through the nurturing and fostering of offspring who carry her genes the mother's genetic traits for nurturing are selfishly ensuring their reproduction into the next generation. However, while nurturing *is* a genetically selfish trait, from an observer's point of view it *appears* to be unconditionally selfless behaviour—the mother is giving her offspring food, warmth, shelter, support and protection for *apparently* nothing in return. This point is most significant because it means from the infant's perspective, its mother is treating it with real love, which, as explained in Part 8:1, is unconditional selflessness. The infant's brain is therefore being trained or conditioned or indoctrinated with unconditional selflessness and so, with enough training in unconditional selflessness, that infant will grow into an adult who behaves unconditionally selflessly. Apply this training across all the members of that infant's group and the result is a fully integrated society.

The 'trick' in this 'love-indoctrination' process lies in the fact that the traits for nurturing are encouraged, or selected for genetically, because the better infants are cared for, the greater are their, and the nurturing traits', chances of survival. This process does, however, have an

integrative side effect in that the more infants are nurtured, the more their brains are trained in unconditional selflessness. There are very few situations in biology where animals appear to behave unconditionally selflessly towards other members of their species—normally, they each selfishly compete for food, shelter, territory and mating opportunities. Maternalism, a mother's nurturing of her infant, is one of the few situations where an animal appears to behave selflessly towards another animal and it was precisely this *appearance* of selflessness that provided the opportunity for the development of love-indoctrination or training in unconditional selflessness in our ape ancestors.

I would now like to explain in more detail how the process of 'love-indoctrination' overcame the inability of genes to develop love or selflessness.

In Part 8:2 it was pointed out that the most amount of selflessness that can as a rule or normally develop genetically (that is, not taking into account the love-indoctrination opportunity) is reciprocity, where one individual 'selflessly' helps another on the proviso that they are 'selflessly' helped in return, which in effect means that both parties are behaving selfishly with their own benefit in mind—so far from being selfless, reciprocity is actually entirely driven by selfish behaviour.

Normally, only traits that are selfish—that is, traits that tend to reproduce—can become established in a species. Whenever a selfless genetic mutation, a selfless trait, appears in a species it undermines its chances of reproducing, that being what selflessness means—putting others before yourself, advantaging others at your own expense. Apart from the opportunity presented by love-indoctrination, the only way selflessness could develop would be if *all* members of a group have the selfless gene/trait because as soon as one member doesn't have it they will be advantaged by the selfless treatment it would receive from the others, prospering to their detriment. For example, imagine if a mother was born with a mutation that meant all her offspring were born with an inclination to behave selflessly. If she were to live isolated from others it is feasible that she could produce a small group of offspring who all behaved selflessly. So, in such circumstances it would be possible to develop a group where every member had the selfless trait, BUT the problem then would be how to maintain that delicate equation against outside influences—for *any* pressure from limited food, shelter or territory would inevitably result in a breakout of competition for those limited resources, thus threatening that selfless behaviour. The greater the deficiency in needed resources, the harder it would be for selflessness to be maintained. Since ideal conditions of there being ample food, shelter and territory are going to be rare, and if or when they do occur are unlikely to last, the reality is that even this scenario for establishing a selflessly behaved fully integrated new species is not going to be sustainable. The fact is, selfless behaviour cannot become established except through love-indoctrination. (Again, by 'selfless behaviour' I mean 'unconditionally selfless behaviour' because, as explained, the conditional selflessness involved in reciprocity, where others are selflessly helped on the proviso that the selfless favour is returned, is in truth selfish behaviour because it is only done on the basis of mutual benefit.)

What is significant about the nurturing, love-indoctrination opportunity to develop selflessness is that it is *not* based on a selfless genetic mutation that, as just described, is in reality impossible to establish in a species, but rather nurturing, which is a behaviour favoured by genetics; in fact, nurturing is a well established behaviour, at least among mammals who suckle their young. As will become clear, this nurturing of selflessness or love does depend on, firstly, the ability to develop nurturing by selecting for more maternal mothers and longer infancy periods for the training of love, and, secondly, on there being ideal conditions: ample food, territory and shelter, including an absence of competition for resources from other species. A shortage of any of these factors will cause a breakout of selfish competition for the limited resource, with those who are inclined to be selfless losing out to those who are selfish. BUT—and this is most significant—nurturing is a behaviour that does keep occurring, which means it is not eliminated by a breakout of selfish opportunism like a selfless genetic mutation would be. The traits for nurturing don't disappear when selfish competition occurs—they are always there to be developed if a species finds itself in a position to be able to develop love-indoctrination. As will become clear, while love-indoctrination is an extremely difficult and fragile process to develop, it *can* be developed; setbacks *can* be overcome and full integration finally achieved. As we are going to see, such integration occurred in our ape ancestor, the result being our fabulous unconditionally selfless instinctive moral self or soul, the expression or 'voice' of which within us is our 'conscience'.

Yes, as we will see, love-indoctrination *is* a fragile, difficult development because it does depend on a species being both exceptionally able to develop nurturing *and* fortunate enough to live in ideal conditions—but it also has the advantage of being able to survive a breakout of selfishness. Certainly, if a species can develop this nurturing love-indoctrination 'trick', there is still the fundamental genetic difficulty that while the nurturing of infants is strongly encouraged genetically because it ensures greater infant survival, the side effect of training infants to behave selflessly as adults is that selflessly-behaving, and even self-sacrificing, adults tend not to reproduce their genes as successfully as selfishly-behaved adults. The genes for the exceptionally maternal mothers so necessary for the development of love-indoctrination tend not to endure because their offspring tend to be the most selflessly behaved—they are too ready to put others before themselves, leaving the more aggressive, competitive and selfish individuals to take advantage of their selflessness, with males in particular seizing any mating opportunities for themselves. Such break-outs of selfish opportunism can, however, be substantially countered by ensuring all members of the group are equally well nurtured with love, equally trained in selflessness—this situation being another of the delicate balances that has to be maintained if love-indoctrination is to develop. As emphasised, any breakdown in nurturing across a group that is in the midst of developing love-indoctrination would see the whole situation revert to the old state of the 'each-for-his-own', opportunistic, all-out-competition-where-only-dominance-hierarchy-can-bring-some-peace, selfish-genes-rule, 'animal condition'. So, while the love-indoctrination process has some robustness, some ability to keep occurring and therefore to survive a breakout of selfish opportunism (a tenacity the selfless mutation didn't have) it is certainly still a delicate and difficult development—but the whole point is that, delicate as it is, love-indoctrination

did provide a way for Negative Entropy or 'God' or the integrative development of order of matter process to integrate sexually reproducing individuals and produce a fully integrated large multicellular animal species, which, as we will see, was our australopithecine ancestors. Negative Entropy or 'God' did find a way to develop the Specie Individual, the integration of the sexually reproducing individual members of a species into one fully integrated, cooperatively behaved, ordered species.

To now look more closely at how love-indoctrination developed. In order to foster nurturing—this 'trick' for overcoming the gene-based learning system's seeming inability to develop unconditional selflessness—a species required the capacity to allow its offspring to remain in the infancy stage long enough for the infant's brain to become trained or indoctrinated with unconditional selflessness or love.

Rhesus monkey with infant. This picture illustrates the difficulty of carrying an infant and suggests the reason for bipedalism.

In most species, infancy has to be kept as brief as possible because of the infant's extreme vulnerability to predators. Zebra foals, for example, have to be capable of independent flight almost as soon as they are born, which gives them little opportunity to be trained in selflessness. As the above photo of a rhesus monkey trying to carry its infant illustrates, being semi-upright as a result of their tree-living, swinging-from-branch-to-branch, arboreal heritage meant primates' arms were largely freed from walking and thus available to hold dependents. Infants similarly had the capacity to latch onto their mothers' bodies. This freedom of the upper body meant primates were especially facilitated for prolonging their offspring's infancy and thus developing love-indoctrination. A species that cannot carry and thus easily look after its infants, and where infants can't easily hold onto their mothers, cannot prolong infancy and thus develop love-indoctrination.

The exceptionally maternal, matriarchal, cooperatively behaved bonobo species (*Pan paniscus*) provide living evidence of a species in the final stages of developing this training-in-love process. Indeed, not only are bonobos extraordinarily loving and nurturing of their infants and the most cooperative and peaceful of all non-human primates, they are also the non-human primate that is most often seen walking upright, which, along with their peaceful cooperative nature, we can now explain. The longer infancy is delayed, the more and longer infants had to be held, and thus the greater selection for arms-freed, upright walking.

Humans' bipedalism is, therefore, a direct result of the love-indoctrination process and, as such, must have developed early on in the emergence of humans. Indeed, when I first put forward this nurturing, 'love indoctrination' explanation for humans' unconditionally selfless moral soul in my 1983 submission to *Nature* and *New Scientist* magazines (which can be read at <www.humancondition.com/nature>), I pointed out at the time that, contrary to prevailing views, it meant bipedalism must have developed early in this nurturing of love process, and in fact the early appearance of bipedalism in the fossil record of our ancestors is now being found. For example, in 2009 it was reported that a **'4.4 million-year-old skeleton of a likely human ancestor known as *Ardipithecus ramidus*'**, discovered in Ethiopia in 1994, has features that indicate it **'walked upright on two legs'** ('A Long-Lost Relative', *TIME* mag. 12 Oct. 2009).

While bipedalism was the key factor in developing nurturing and thus love-indoctrination, other influences also played a pivotal role, most notably the presence of ideal nursery conditions. This of course entailed uninterrupted access to food, shelter and territory, for if any element was compromised, or other difficulties and threats from predators excessive, then we can assume that there would have been a strong inclination to revert to more selfish and competitive behaviour. The successful nurturing of infants therefore required ample food, comfortable conditions and security from external threats. However, it wasn't enough to simply look after them—in addition to these practical factors, the infants had to be *loved*, and so maternalism became about much more than mothers simply protecting and providing for their young: it became about actively loving them. Significantly, we speak of 'motherly love', not 'motherly protection'.

So, in addition to needing to select for the ability to prolong infancy periods to allow for the training of unconditionally selfless love, and requiring ideal nursery conditions to support this process, a further factor needed to occur—the selection for more maternal mothers. But as just pointed out, the difficulty with selecting for more maternal mothers is that their genes don't tend to endure because their offspring tend to be the most selflessly behaved, too ready to put others before themselves, leaving the more aggressive, competitive and selfish individuals to take advantage of their selflessness—but, again, such selfish opportunism could be avoided if all members of the group were equally well nurtured with love, equally trained in selflessness—as tenuous as that was in itself.

Taking into account all of these considerations, love-indoctrination was obviously an extremely difficult development even for the advantageously-built primates. It also has to be remembered that delaying maturity, as love-indoctrination does, postpones the addition of new generations that are so vital for the maintenance of a species whose reproduction is limited mostly to single offspring births. New generations ensure variety. Indeed, the numerous and not incidental challenges involved would explain why almost all primate species have not been able to complete the development of love-indoctrination to the point of becoming fully integrated.

For instance, bonobos, or pygmy chimpanzees as they were once called, have lived in the food-rich, shelter-affording ideal nursery conditions of the rainforests south of the Congo River and are by far the most cooperative/harmonious/cohesive/social/selflessly behaved/integrated of the non-human primates. The comfort of the bonobos' environment and their cooperativeness compared to that of their chimpanzee cousins (or *Pan troglodytes*) who live north and east of the Congo River, is apparent in this quote: **'we may say that the pygmy chimpanzees historically have existed in a stable environment rich in sources of food. Pygmy chimpanzees appear conservative in their food habits and unlike common chimpanzees have developed a more cohesive social structure and elaborate inventory of sociosexual behavior. In contrast, common chimpanzees have gone further in developing their resource-exploiting techniques and strategy, and have the ability to survive in more varied environments. These differences suggest that the environments occupied by the two species since their separation by the Zaire** [Congo] **River has differed for some time. The vegetation to the south of the Zaire River, where *Pan paniscus* is found, has been less influenced by changes in climate and geography than the range of the common chimpanzee to the north. Prior to the Bantu (Mongo) agriculturists' invasion into the central Zaire basin, the pygmy chimpanzees may have led a carefree life in a comparatively stable environment'** (*The Pygmy Chimpanzee*, ed. Randall L. Susman, ch.10 by Takayoshi Kano & Mbangi Mulavwa, 1984, p.271 of 435). It is an indication of just how difficult it is to develop love-indoctrination that even the bonobos, living as they do in their ideal conditions—and who **'have developed a more cohesive social structure'** than their chimpanzee relatives—have found it necessary to employ sex as an appeasement device to help subside residual tension and aggression between individuals; this is the **'elaborate inventory of sociosexual behavior'** referred to in this quote.

Of the key resources animals need of food, shelter, territory and a mate, while a situation can be reached of there being sufficient food, shelter and territory, from a genetic point of view there can usually never be enough mates, simply because the more successfully an individual can breed, the more their genes can carry on and multiply. Since females are obviously limited in how often they can reproduce due to pregnancy and, in the case of mammals, lactation, it is the males who have the opportunity to breed continuously, and so it is the competition for mating opportunities by the males that is the most difficult

form of genetic selfishness to overcome. Making mating opportunities available to everyone all the time, as bonobos do, would be one way of rendering competition for mating opportunities obsolete—after all, if everyone is regularly mating with everyone else then there really isn't any competition. Further, what aggression and tension does still occur would be greatly appeased by making readily available the feelings of pleasure, excitement and fulfilment that have historically become biologically associated with mating to ensure and encourage its occurrence. Shortly, it will be explained that monogamy is an even more effective way of containing sexual opportunism, but for that to develop, and, as will be explained, it would have developed in our australopithecine forebears, selfishness had to already have been completely overcome, which, at the bonobo's stage of developing integration, is not the case. Even making mating opportunities available to everyone, and concealing ovulation, which is also practiced by bonobos to reduce the aggression from males competing for mating opportunities, could not be developed until the typical fierce competition for mating opportunities that exists amongst mammal males had largely been brought under control by love-indoctrination. This is because whilst ever competition to mate is intense, if a female makes mating available to every male, and/or doesn't advertise she is ready for fertilisation, she can't ensure she mates with the strongest, most virile male and her offspring won't be successful competitors. Making sex continually available and concealing ovulation could assist love-indoctrination but not initiate the development of love/unconditional selflessness.

I will continue this analysis of bonobo behaviour in further detail in Part 8:4F, but it should already be clear that although the process is not yet complete, this species has been able to develop a great deal of love-indoctrination, which means a great deal of training in unconditional selflessness. Like all primates, bonobos are exceptionally facilitated by their arms-free arboreal heritage to prolong the infancy period needed to develop love-indoctrination. They have also especially benefited from the ideal nursery conditions of their home in the food-rich Congo River basin. The result is that bonobos have been able to develop the nurturing that love-indoctrinated training in selflessness depends on to such a high degree that they have even been able to bring to an end that most difficult of all forms of selfish competitiveness, male competition for mating opportunities (although they still have to employ sex as a way of appeasing residual tension and aggression). In fact, bonobos have been so successful at reining in male competition for mating opportunities that within bonobo society there has been what could be described as a gender-role reversal, with bonobo females forming alliances and dominating social groups, both of which are distinctly male activities in chimpanzee, gorilla, orangutan and other non-human primate societies. As will be explained more fully in Parts 8:4F and 8:4G, when further comparison is made between bonobos and chimpanzees, bonobo society is matriarchal, female-dominated, controlled and led. Further, in bonobo society, the entire focus of the social group does seem to be on the maternal or female role of nurturing infants. The following photographs of bonobos with infants reveal something of just how exceptionally nurturing bonobo females are—and even males, because the bottom left photo is of a male lovingly playing with an infant. Bonobos clearly have the environmental comfort and the freedom from fighting and tension in their world needed to develop the ability to love their infants.

Frans Lanting/Mint Images/Getty Images; Manny Rubio (middle left) and San Diego Zoo (bottom left and right)

Bonobos nurturing their infants

This gender-role reversal in bonobo society is a stupendous achievement, a very great breakthrough in the development of integration. When watching wildlife documentaries or observing animals in nature, what is so very apparent is how the females of most animal species taunt the males—letting them fight with each other furiously, having them chase them endlessly, encouraging (in the case of birds) the growth of ever more exotic plumage, etc, etc—so that they can establish which is the strongest, most virile male to mate with, obviously to ensure their offspring will also inherit the strongest, most virile genetic make-up. So, to bring about a change where instead of the strongest and most aggressive males being successful in winning mating opportunities, the most gentle, least aggressive are the most successful and favoured is a truly extraordinary turnaround, but that is what the bonobos (and our own ape ancestors) achieved! As extremely difficult as it is to develop, such is the awesome power of the love-indoctrination tool for developing integration! Importantly, to achieve this amazing gender-role reversal, this incredible change from patriarchy to matriarchy, love-indoctrination was assisted by an emerging conscious mind. Just how love-indoctrination enabled consciousness to emerge and come to the assistance of the love-indoctrination process will be explained next in Parts 8:4C and 8:4D, but one of the other amazing attributes of bonobos is that they are the most conscious, the most intelligent of all animals next to humans.

In the context of our own human origins, it follows from what has been said that for our ape ancestors to have become totally cooperative and integrated—to have developed an unconditionally selfless, altruistic, moral instinctive self or 'soul', as I am asserting occurred—they must have been blessed with all the conditions necessary to complete the love-indoctrination process; in particular, they must have lived in ideal nursery conditions in their home somewhere in Africa. (We know from fossil evidence that our original ancestors emerged in Africa—as we intuitively recognised, Africa *was*, as we say, **'the cradle of mankind'**—but we don't as yet know the exact location of this original 'nursery'.)

It has to be emphasised again that while the bonobos have almost completed the love-indoctrination process and become a fully integrated Specie Individual like our ape ancestors did, the fact that they still have to employ sex as an appeasement device to quell remaining tension and aggression indicates they haven't quite succeeded. Similarly, while chimpanzees, gorillas, orangutans and even baboons and some other monkeys have also been able to develop love-indoctrination to the point of achieving a high degree of integration, they too have failed to complete the love-indoctrination development of integration—indeed, as will be described more fully shortly, they have yet to overcome the problem of male mating opportunism because their societies are still male-led or patriarchal. The fact that all these primates are still unable to complete the love-indoctrination process demonstrates that it *is* an extremely difficult development. The reality is that developing love-indoctrination to the point where the indoctrinated love or unconditional selflessness or altruism or morality becomes instinctive (a process that will be explained shortly) was akin to trying to swim upstream to an island—any difficulty or breakdown in the nurturing process and you are invariably 'swept back downstream' once more to the old competitive, selfish, each-for-his-own, opportunistic situation. Powerful illustrations of how any disruption to the love-indoctrination process quickly can lead to a regression back to the more competitive, opportunistic, pre-love-indoctrination, animal-condition-afflicted situation will be provided shortly in Part 8:4G.

Thus, while the development of unconditional selflessness through the love-indoctrination process of a mother's nurturing care of her infant *was* possible, it was a very difficult, and also a very slow, process. What the situation needed was a mechanism to assist, speed up and help maintain love-indoctrination's development of integration—assistance that came from the emergence of a conscious mind. What began to occur was the conscious self-selection of integrativeness, especially the female sexual or mate selection of less competitive and aggressive, more integrative males with which to mate. (It might be mentioned that in his 1871 book *The Descent of Man and Selection in Relation to Sex*, Charles Darwin suggested the role mate selection could have played in our human development, although he didn't understand its significance in the context of the love-indoctrination process.)

Later, in Part 8:7B, 'Why, how and when did consciousness emerge in humans?', it will be fully explained how the nurturing, love-indoctrination process liberated consciousness in our ape ancestors and that it was the emerging conscious intellect in our forebears that began to support the development of selflessness, for when our ape ancestors became conscious they were able to recognise the importance of selflessness and, having realised that, begin to actively select for it.

However, in the interim and for the purposes of explaining this conscious self-selection of selfless cooperativeness process, a brief summary of the full explanation that appears in Part 8:7B will be provided next, in Part 8:4C. But before doing so, I should quickly point out that with love-indoctrination and mate selection of cooperative integrativeness recurring over many generations, unconditional selflessness or love would have eventually become instinctive or innate. This is because once unconditionally selfless individuals were *continually* appearing, the genes 'followed' the whole process, reinforcing that selflessness. Similarly, when the conscious mind fully emerged within humans and went its own way—embarked on its course for knowledge—genetic adaptation followed, reinforcing that development. Generations of humans whose genetic make-up in some way helped them cope with the human condition were selected naturally—making, amongst other adjustments, humans' alienated state somewhat instinctive today. We have been 'bred' to survive the pressures of the human condition; to block out or deny the issue of the human condition has been our main way of coping with the dilemma it represented. Genes inevitably follow and reinforce any development process—in this they are not selective. The difficulty lay in getting the development of unconditional selflessness to occur, for once it was regularly occurring it would naturally become instinctive over time. Thus, with unconditional selflessness or love occurring over many generations and becoming instinctive or innate, our instinctive moral self or soul, the 'voice' of which is our 'conscience', became established in our ape ancestors. A powerful illustration of this moral instinct in us that continues to guide us to behave in this all-loving way was given in a *Sports Illustrated* magazine article that reported how Joe Delaney, a professional footballer, acknowledged that **'I can't swim good, but I've got to save those kids'**, just moments before plunging into a Louisiana pond and drowning in an attempt to rescue three boys ('Sometimes The Good Die Young', 7 Nov. 1983). This is but one example of our moral, altruistic nature in action, but no doubt we have all heard, seen, or read of similar situations.

In terms of developing love-indoctrination, obviously the more instinctive unconditional selflessness or love became, the more any regression to selfish behaviour was able to be resisted. Instincts have their own power, their own ability to ensure that what they expect happens, so as love became instinctive so love, unconditional selflessness, became a stronger force.

An important point that should also be made before presenting the summary of how consciousness emerged is how difficult it has been for denial-complying, human-condition-avoiding, mechanistic science to even consider, let alone accept, the love-indoctrination explanation for human origins; in fact, for what gave us our unique, unconditionally selfless moral instinctive self or soul. It turns out that I'm not the first person to realise and put forward the love-indoctrination explanation for our extraordinary unconditionally selfless moral sense. As will be described in Part 8:5B, when the American philosopher John Fiske first presented the idea only 15 years after Charles Darwin published his idea of natural selection in his 1859 book *The Origin of Species*, it prompted some very eminent scientists of that era to describe Fiske's hypothesis of **'the Struggle for the Life of Others'** or **'altruistic Love'** (which was said to be **'the real law of evolution'**, and as having **'developed in the course of evolution from the necessities of maternity'**) as a **'far more important' 'principle'** than Darwin's selfish, **'natural selection by means of the struggle for survival'**; in fact, as **'one of the most beautiful contributions ever made to the Evolution of Man'**! However, in Part 8:5B I also record that despite this recognition of the immense importance of Fiske's nurturing hypothesis for our altruistic moral nature, the idea also **'attracted a good deal of opprobrium** [abuse]**'** at the time and was eventually totally ignored and left to die! Again, as pointed out in Parts 4:4D and 4:4F when the six great unconfrontable truths were described, the two truths that are being admitted in this whole nurturing, love-indoctrination explanation for our moral nature—that humans have selfless, loving instincts and that nurturing has been, and still is, so important in human development—have been unbearable to face and acknowledge. The problem is they beg the question, 'Why aren't we humans now loving and selflessly behaved, and why aren't we capable of adequately nurturing our infants?' The fact is, it is *only* now that we can explain our upset, corrupted, embattled, little-time-for-nurturing, human-condition-afflicted lives that we can afford to admit these truths. The truth that can now at last be admitted is that nurturing was the main influence or prime mover in human development—*not* tool use or bipedalism or language development or mastery of fire or any one of the other evasive explanations that denial-complying biologists have been putting forward in the mountain of books that have been published on human origins. The nurturing explanation for human origins is actually a reasonably obvious truth if you are thinking in a denial-free truthful way because in time it should occur to you that in the maternal situation there already exists an apparently unconditionally selfless relationship and thus the potential for true integration to develop. But as with so many historically unbearable truths, it is *only* now that the human condition has been explained that it finally becomes psychologically safe to admit all these unbearable truths, including the importance of nurturing and the existence of our moral soul.

Part 8:4C A brief summary of how consciousness emerged

As foreshadowed in the previous Part, the following is a brief summary of the full explanation that will be provided in Part 8:7B of how consciousness emerged. (Note, while a description of how consciousness emerged should begin with a description of what consciousness actually is—and such a complete description will be provided in Part 8:7—the following very brief description of at least the *emergence* of our consciousness is necessary here to enable the reader to understand the explanation that is about to be given for how consciousness was able to support the love-indoctrination process.)

Since a conscious, self-adjusting mind would seem to be a very great asset for an animal to have, the obvious initial question when thinking about consciousness is, 'Why haven't many animals developed it?' Despite this being an obvious question, it is conventionally argued that consciousness only emerged in humans because of our need to manage complex social situations—an argument known as the 'Social Intelligence Hypothesis' (which will be discussed more in Parts 8:5D and 8:7B). For example, E.O. Wilson relies upon this theory in *The Social Conquest of Earth*, when he says that **'to feel empathy for others, to measure the emotions of friends and enemy alike, to judge the intentions of all of them, and to plan a strategy for personal social interactions…the human brain became…highly intelligent'** (2012, p.17 of 330). Social problem solving *is* an obvious benefit from being conscious, but *all* activities that animals have to manage would benefit enormously from being able to understand cause and effect, so it is completely illogical to argue that it wasn't until the need to manage extremely complex social situations that consciousness developed. Any sensible analysis of the question of the emergence of consciousness must be based on the question of what has *prevented* its development in other animals? It is such a powerful asset for an animal to have that something must have stopped it being selected for in other species. The lack of social situations doesn't explain why the fully conscious mind hasn't appeared in non-human species. There was ample need for a conscious mind prior to the appearance of complex social situations.

As emphasised, one of the limitations of the gene-based learning system is that it normally can't select for unconditionally selfless, altruistic, self-sacrificing behaviour because altruistic traits tend to self-eliminate—they tend not to carry on and so normally can't become established in a species. The effect is that the gene-based learning system actively resists altruistic behaviour. It follows then that in terms of the development of consciousness, the gene-based learning or refinement system was, in effect, totally opposed to any altruistic, selfless thinking. In fact, genetic refinement developed instinctive *blocks* in the minds of animals to prevent the emergence of such thinking. And it is this block against truthful, selflessness-recognising-thinking in the minds of almost all animals that prevents them from becoming conscious of the true relationship or meaning of experience.

An example of how genes resist self-destructive behaviour may be helpful here. In what are termed 'visual cliff' experiments, newborn kittens are placed on a table and while they will venture towards the edge of the table, they won't allow themselves to go beyond the edge and fall—a sheet of glass is actually placed over the table to prevent them from accidentally

slipping off the edge, but the point is the glass is unnecessary because the kittens instinctively know not to travel beyond the table's edge. Presumably, this instinctive orientation against doing so evolved because any cat that did venture too close to a precipice invariably fell to its death, leaving only those that happened to have an instinctive block against such self-destructive practices. Natural selection or genetic refinement develops blocks in the mind against behaviour that doesn't tend to lead to the reproduction of the genes of the individuals who practice that behaviour.

Just as surely as cats were eventually selected for their instinctive block against self-destruction, most animals have been selected with an instinctive block against selfless thinking because such thinking also tends not to lead to the reproduction of the genes of the individuals who think that way. The effect of this block was to prevent the developing intellect from thinking truthfully and thus effectively.

As pointed out when Integrative Meaning was explained in Part 8:1, selflessness or love is the theme of existence, the essence of integration, the meaning of life. While the upset, alienated human race has learnt to live in denial of this truth of the selfless, loving, integrative meaning of existence, it is in fact an extremely obvious truth and one that is deduced very quickly if you are able to think honestly about the world. We are surrounded by integration. Every object we look at is a hierarchy of ordered matter, witness to the development of order of matter. It follows then that if you aren't able to recognise and thus appreciate the significance of selfless, Integrative Meaning you are not in a position to begin to think straight and thus effectively; you can't begin to make sense of experience. All your thinking is coming off a false base and is therefore effectively derailed from the outset from making sense of experience. As Arthur Schopenhauer said, **'The discovery of truth is prevented most effectively…by prejudice, which…stands in the path of truth and is then like a contrary wind driving a ship away from land'** (*Essays and Aphorisms*, tr. R.J. Hollingdale, 1970, p.120 of 237). You can't think effectively with lies in your head, especially with such important lies as denial of selflessness-dependent Integrative Meaning. Your mind is, in effect, stalled at a very superficial level of intelligence with little ability to understand the relationship of events occurring around you.

To elaborate, any animal able to associate information to the degree necessary to realise the importance of behaving selflessly towards others would have been at a distinct disadvantage in terms of its chances of successfully reproducing its genes. It follows then that those animals that *don't* recognise the importance of selflessness are genetically advantaged, which means that eventually a mental block would have been 'naturally selected' to prevent the emergence of the ability to make sense of experience, to prevent the emergence of consciousness. At this point in development, genetic refinement favoured individuals that were not able to recognise the significance of selflessness, thus ensuring animals remained incognisant, unconscious of the true meaning of life.

Having denied the truth of Integrative Meaning and the importance of selflessness, it is not easy for the alienated human race to appreciate that conscious thought depends on the ability to acknowledge the significance of selflessness/love/Integrative Meaning. However, our own mental block or alienation is, in fact, the perfect illustration of and parallel for this block in the minds of animals. Unable to think truthfully about the selfless, loving integrative theme of existence, all our thinking has also been coming off a false base and, as a result, we

too have been unable to think effectively. Alienation has rendered us almost stupid, incapable of deep, penetrating, meaningful thought.

Wallace & Gromit by Nick Park and Bob Baker of Aardman Animations

When it comes to thinking truthfully and thus soundly, humans are now almost as mentally incognisant as animals—a state of affairs that is played on in the popular animated cartoon *Wallace & Gromit* (pictured above). In the series, Wallace is a lonely, sad—alienated—human figure whose dog Gromit is very much on an intellectual par with him in his world. Both wear the same blank, stupefied expression as together they muddle their way through life's adventures.

Again, much more will be explained in Part 8:7 about the nature of consciousness, how blocks developed against its development in the minds of most animals, and the similarities with our own alienation, however, the reality is that the human mind has been alienated from the truth twice in its history: once when we were like other animals, instinctively blocked from recognising the truth of selflessness, and then again in our species' current adolescent state, during which we became insecure about our divisive nature with no choice but to live in Plato's dark cave of denial of the selfless, loving integrative meaning of existence.

While humans have gradually retreated from consciousness into virtual unconsciousness because of our insecurity about our non-ideal, soul-corrupted, 'fallen', human-condition-afflicted state, we were, to our knowledge, the first animals to become fully conscious. So, the next question is, how were our ape ancestors able to overcome this block that exists in the minds of the great majority of animals and become capable of making sense of experience, become conscious? (As will be explained later in Part 8:4G, all animals are trying to develop love-indoctrination and to what degree they have been able to develop it will dictate to what degree they have been able to develop at least a rudimentary level of consciousness, but no other species has developed full consciousness like humans have, and bonobos almost have.)

Understanding how the nurturing love-indoctrination process was able to develop selfless, moral instincts in our ape ancestors (and in some other primates today) allows us to answer this crucial question. The reason we were able to become fully conscious is that, quite by accident, the nurturing of selfless instincts breached the block against thinking truthfully

by superimposing a new, truthful, selflessness-recognising mind over the older, effectively dishonest, selfless-thinking-blocked one. Since our ape ancestors could develop an awareness of cooperative, selfless, loving meaning, they were able to develop truthful, sound, effective thinking and so acquired consciousness, the essential characteristic of mental infancy.

To use a comparative example, chimpanzees are currently in mental infancy—they have the conscious mental powers of, approximately, a two-year-old human and demonstrate rudimentary consciousness, making sufficient sense of experience to recognise that they are at the centre of the changing array of events they experience. They are beginning to relate information or reason effectively. Experiments have shown that they have an awareness of the concept of 'I' or self and are capable of reasoning how events are related sufficiently well to know that they can reach a banana tied to the roof of their cage by stacking and climbing upon boxes.

In the case of bonobos, evidence suggests that they are now the most intelligent or conscious animals next to humans. This level of intelligence or consciousness is evident in this quote: **'Everything seems to indicate that** [Prince] **Chim** [a bonobo] **was extremely intelligent. His surprising alertness and interest in things about him bore fruit in action, for he was constantly imitating the acts of his human companions and testing all objects. He rapidly profited by his experiences…Never have I seen man or beast take greater satisfaction in showing off than did little Chim. The contrast in intellectual qualities between him and his female companion** [a chimpanzee] **may briefly, if not entirely adequately, be described by the term "opposites"'** (*Almost Human*, Robert M. Yerkes, 1925, p.248 of 278).

So how did the process of nurturing overcome the instinctive block? It makes sense that at the outset the brain was relatively small with a limited amount of cortex, the matter in which information is associated. These brains had instinctive blocks preventing the mind from making deep meaningful/truthful/selflessness-recognising perceptions. At this stage, however, these small, inhibited brains were being trained in selflessness, so although there was not a great deal of unfilled cortex available, what was available was being inscribed with a truthful, effective network of information-associating pathways. The mind was being taught the truth and given the opportunity to think clearly, in spite of the existing instinctive blocks or 'lies'. While at first this truthful 'wiring' would not have been very significant due to the small size of the brain, it had the potential for much greater development, for were an individual to be born with a genetic make-up that meant it had a larger cortex it could receive more training of love in that cortex, thus producing a more selflessly trained and truthful, effective thinking, conscious being. And, as has been explained, with this selfless training/'wiring' of the brain occurring over many generations, the selfless 'wiring' would have gradually become instinctive or innate. Again, genes inevitably follow and reinforce any development process—in this they are not selective. The difficulty lay in getting the development of unconditional selflessness to occur, for once it was regularly occurring—as it now was as a result of love-indoctrination—it would naturally become instinctive over time, which it did. Our instinctive moral soul, the 'voice' of which is our 'conscience', was formed. We are born with a brain that has instinctive orientations that incline us to behave unconditionally selflessly towards others, and to expect to be treated unconditionally selflessly by others.

Thus, the brain was trained or inscribed or programmed or 'brain-washed' or 'indoctrinated' with the truthful 'wiring' necessary to think in spite of the original instinctive

blocks working against such training; our mind had, at last, been stimulated by the truth. Of course, it must be remembered that in this early stage of development the emphasis was on training in *love*, not on the liberation of the conscious ability to *think*, which was incidental to Negative Entropy's push for our forebears to become an integrated group of large multicellular animals. While, as will now be described, the development of conscious thought greatly assisted the love-indoctrination process by allowing for the conscious selection of less aggressive mates, its development would have only been gradual. As evidenced by the picture of the skulls of our ancestors included later in Part 8:4H, the association cortex didn't develop strongly until thinking took on a critical role in humanity's adolescence when we had to find understanding in order to defend ourselves against ignorance.

Part 8:4D Self-selection of integrativeness through sexual or mate selection

Part 8:4C provided a brief description of how our ape ancestors, and some other primate species living today, developed consciousness. What now needs to be explained is how this emerging consciousness began to support love-indoctrination's development of selflessness, thus helping to both accelerate and maintain the development of the integration of our ape ancestors. To be more precise, I need to explain how the emerging consciousness enabled self-selection of integrativeness—especially through the sexual or mate selection by females of less competitive and aggressive, more cooperative and selfless and thus integrative males with which to mate.

In beginning this explanation it needs to be emphasised again that unconditional selflessness or love is the real objective of existence; it *is* the meaning of life. Having had to live in such deep denial of the integrative, selfless, loving theme of existence while we couldn't explain our seemingly unloving, non-integrative, 'unGodly' human condition, it is now very difficult for the alienated human race to appreciate that selfless love is the obvious theme of existence and universal objective for behaviour. But the truth is that love, selflessness—in fact, unconditional selflessness or altruism or true kindness—is an *extremely* obvious theme and meaning of existence and objective for behaviour. Everything, all of life, is trying to develop order, is trying to integrate—is, in effect, desirous of achieving a state where love/unconditional selflessness, and the fully integrated state that it makes possible, reigns.

The immense problem, however, for virtually all living organisms is that they have been 'locked out' of becoming fully integrated by the gene-based learning system's inability (except through the use of love-indoctrination) to develop unconditional selflessness. While all living organisms owe their origins to the gene-based learning system, that system's inability to develop unconditional selflessness ultimately limited the amount of order, the amount of integration, that they could achieve. It is as though the gene-based learning system has been a great tease: it gave life but prevented that life from achieving real harmony and peace. To use religious terminology, living things were allowed to approach the 'Godly', 'heavenly', fully integrated state but were then denied the opportunity to actually enter that state. This is the great problem, the great 'agony' of the 'animal condition': almost all animals have been 'locked out' of 'heaven'. In fact, the 'animal condition' has, in its own way, been just as torturous as the 'human condition'!

An excellent description of the agony of the 'animal condition' can be found in Part 3:11C where I discuss the extraordinary 30,000-year-old Neolithic cave drawings in the Chauvet Cave in southern France. I wrote there that when our current human-condition-afflicted minds become preoccupied with upset, with soul-repression or psychosis and thought-repression or neurosis, we lose the ability to take an interest in the world around us. The pain in our brain prevents us from truly feeling or seeing or engaging in our surroundings. It follows then that as the human race became more and more upset, so its ability to feel and savour the world around it shrank. So although the humans responsible for the drawings in the Chauvet Cave were not anything like as upset-free/innocent as humans were two million years ago when upset first began to develop in earnest, their ability to draw the animals around them so vividly indicates they were much, much more innocent than humans today. Clearly alienation has increased at an extremely rapid rate in the final stages of humanity's two-million-year journey to find self-understanding. When all the upset in humans subsides, as it now will with understanding of the human condition finally found, the world is going to open up for us humans enormously—we are going to be able to feel everything around us. We are going to have so much kindness and love and empathy for each other and our fellow creatures because we will, once again, be able to feel everything they are experiencing, including just how embattled the lives of other animals are. While the nurturing, love-indoctrination process enabled *our* ape ancestors to break free from the tyranny of genes having to ensure their own reproduction, other animals are stuck having to perpetually compete for food, shelter, territory and a mate; unlike humans, they can't develop full unconditionally selfless cooperative instincts. And so, in the amazing Chauvet Cave drawings, above all else, it is this empathy with, this feeling for, the relatively short, brutish, forever-having-to-fight-for-your-chance-to-reproduce lives of animals that those who made these drawings have so sensitively expressed. You can sense the whole internal struggle of the animals' lives in these drawings. Their huge chests heave with their brutal and tough battle to reproduce their genes—they are struggling so much to endure their lot it is as if they have asthma! One day, when we humans get over the terrible agony of our 'human condition', we will again be able to empathise with the terrible agony of the 'animal condition'. It's not very nice to have to belt the living daylights out of others to ensure your genes reproduce! It's not at all easy being a non-human animal—and that is an extreme understatement! It was mentioned in Part 8:2, but it should be mentioned again here, that the competitive state that exists amongst animals obviously also exists amongst plants, insects and microbes, however, not having the developed nervous system of animals their awareness of the agony of that horrifically competitive existence could not be as great as it is for animals.

Yes, the 'animal condition', being 'locked out' of 'heaven', *is* an awful existence to have to endure—as I said, it's as horrific in its own way as our current immensely upset and alienated 'human condition'. We can appreciate therefore how immensely relieving it must have been when our ape ancestors were finally liberated from the agony of their 'animal condition'! While love-indoctrination's development of selflessness was a difficult and fragile process, once it succeeded in creating a selflessly trained and thus truthfully wired brain capable of the level of consciousness that we term 'infancy', the block to not being able to cultivate love/unconditional selflessness and thus the fully integrated, 'Godly', 'heavenly'

state was finally completely breached—the biological gate stopping the development of integration had finally been swung right open.

For a mind to be set free—both instinctively and consciously—must feel like the whole world has opened up, almost as if everything can be seen and experienced for the first time. Indeed, when humans leave behind the human condition (as now occurs when they take up the TRANSFORMED LIFEFORCE WAY OF LIVING (see Section 3 of *Freedom Expanded: Book 2*), or even when they have a near-death experience) the world does suddenly open up, they can suddenly access feelings and sensitivities and awarenesses that are almost overwhelming in their intense beauty and excitement. Similarly, as explained in Part 7:1, when we humans fell in love we let go of our attachment to the human-condition-afflicted world of reality and allowed ourselves to dream of and be transported to a world free of the human condition, and again, the feelings we experienced in that state were overwhelmingly wonderful and thrilling. So it can be appreciated that species emerging from the stupor of the animal condition would similarly experience those exciting feelings and awarenesses that come from being liberated from an immensely oppressed situation and at last accessing the integrative, all-loving true world. But above all, it is the sheer excitement, thrill and power that comes with this freedom to finally be part of the all-loving, true world that would have given our ape ancestors, and be giving the bonobos today, the ability to finally stop being owned by the world of competition and change sides and take up support of the world of selfless love. And, as will be described shortly, it was the females who were the first to be able to begin to savour this amazing freedom from the competitive, have-to-reproduce-your-genes, fight-for-every-mating-opportunity animal condition and change sides and take up support of the loving, true world. As mentioned earlier, the normal situation amongst animals is for the females to taunt the males—letting them fight with each other ferociously, making them chase them endlessly, encouraging (in the case of birds) the growth of ever more exotic plumage, etc, etc—so that they can establish which is the strongest, most virile male to mate with, obviously to ensure their offspring will also inherit the strongest, most virile genetic make-up. So to have a change where instead of this competitive situation where the strongest and most aggressive males dominate and succeed in reproducing, the most gentle and least aggressive are successful and favoured, is a truly extraordinary turnaround.

Again, under the duress of the human condition, it is virtually impossible for humans today to appreciate the power that comes with being able to access the true world, but it is an absolutely awesome power and one our ape ancestors gained access to—as have now the bonobos. Later, in Part 8:4G, a horrific description will be given of male chimpanzees who have had their developing love-indoctrinated world devastated by environmental pressures and, as a result, have been turned into brutal, murderous, blood-thirsty beasts. It will be explained there that such demonic behaviour arises from the fact that knowing both instinctively and consciously of the existence of the all-loving, animal-condition-free, true world, and then being denied access to it, effectively rejected from it, left them feeling extremely distressed, resentful and angry—even furious to the point of being hateful and sadistic. Once you have a situation of love then you also have the potential for the reversal of that situation, for the possibility of the situation of there *not* being love—there exists a negative counter-position. For once animals know love, to then find themselves deprived of it

and/or unable to be loving is a *very* frustrating, upsetting and even guilt-producing situation to be in. In the case of the human condition, what the human race did to artificially rid itself of the agony of that condition was to say that there is no integrative meaning/purpose to life because then there was no problem with not being integrative, no dilemma and thus no agony of the human condition from which to suffer. We got rid of the positive situation so we wouldn't experience the negative situation—actually, we only deluded ourselves we had eliminated the positive situation; as stated, we only 'artificially' rid ourselves of it—but the point being revealed is that once you have the positive situation then you also have the potential for the distressing negative situation to occur. Once a species was liberated from the animal condition and knew love, whenever there was a subsequent breakdown in nurturing, or a break-out of competition for resources, those animals then *knew* what they were missing out on and/or not behaving in accordance with, which could make them *extremely* upset, psychotic (psyche/soul-hurt) and neurotic (neuron/mind-distressed); it could make them **'demonic'**. The point here is that the degree that these chimpanzees became sadistic and demonic as a result of not being able to be loving and/or experience love is also a measure of how aware their species must be of the fabulous all-loving, true world. They know all about love and its value, and, just as they can behave and act in an upset way as a result of that knowledge, so they can also behave and act in a loving way as a result of that knowledge—they can actively favour selfless behaviour in others; females can choose less aggressive males with which to mate.

To describe what took place when love-indoctrination had developed sufficient love for the conscious mind to appear and start supporting the love-indoctrination development of the all-wonderful, 'Godly', 'heavenly', unconditionally selfless, all-loving, integrated state it will be helpful to very briefly revisit the stages of maturation that a conscious mind goes through, as initially outlined in Part 3:11. 'Infantman' was our ape ancestor who developed the nurturing training in selflessness that liberated consciousness. Then, when this consciousness had developed sufficiently to begin to experiment in self-adjustment and manage events to its own chosen ends, 'Infantman' became 'Childman', the australopithecines. The main phases within childhood were 'Early Happy Childman' (*Australopithecus afarensis*), who evolved into 'Middle Demonstrative Childman' (*Australopithecus africanus*), who then developed into 'Late Naughty Childman' (*Australopithecus boisei*). At each stage greater experimentation in conscious self-management took place—from demonstrating the power of free will in mid-childhood, to beginning to challenge the instincts for the right to manage events in late childhood. When the conscious mind broke free of the influence of the instincts and took over management of events—which occurred at an ever increasing rate from the beginning of childhood onwards—the instincts began to, in effect, resist that takeover, a tension that at around two million years ago resulted in the distressing, sobering upset state of the human condition, a development that saw the transition from 'Childman', the australopithecines, to 'Adolescentman', *Homo*. But now, with the finding of understanding of the human condition, the human race matures from insecure adolescence to secure adulthood—'Adultman' emerges. (Note, while the descriptions 'infancy', 'childhood' and 'adolescence' are sometimes used to describe the early stages of maturation of many species they are particularly used to describe the stages of maturation that a conscious mind goes through; in non-conscious

species, terms such as 'the young', 'juveniles' and 'subadults' are mostly used to describe their early stages of maturation. It needs to be emphasised that in this presentation the terms 'infancy', 'childhood', 'adolescence' and 'adulthood' are referring to the stages of maturation that a conscious mind goes through.)

Of these stages of maturation, the one that we are particularly interested in here in terms of understanding how consciousness came to support the love-indoctrination process is infancy—the stage when consciousness, understanding of cause and effect, develops sufficiently for the conscious mind to realise that it is at the centre of constantly changing experiences, that 'I exist.' Self-awareness is one of the first consequences of being able to make sense of experience. Another expression of this emerging power to understand cause and effect and therefore manage events was cited earlier, using as an example the chimpanzees' ability to reason that by stacking boxes they could climb up and reach a banana tied to the roof of their cage. However, while such self-awareness and ability to manage events over a very short time interval were the first expressions of the emergence of consciousness that occurred in infancy, it wasn't until childhood that active experimentation with the ability to effectively understand and thus manage change began.

Infancy is all about receiving unconditionally selfless treatment or 'love'. It is only in early happy, innocent childhood that the outward expressions of the emerging intellectual ability to experiment in self-management begins. As described in Part 3:11A, it is in childhood that the power of free will is innocently tested or played with; it is during childhood that the conscious mind starts to experiment with the awesome ability that consciousness provides of managing events to bring about its own desired outcome. We call it 'play' in recognition of the naive unawareness children have at this stage of the problems associated with having free will, particularly their unawareness of the conflict it inevitably leads to with our instincts. At this stage we are still, as it were, holding onto our mother's apron strings, our instinctive orientations, with one hand, while carrying out short experiments in conscious self-management with the other.

This reference to still 'holding onto our mother's apron strings', still depending on our instinctive orientations for the management of our life, is significant when understanding how consciousness came to support our love-indoctrination process. Throughout infancy and childhood we still depend on our established instinctive responses, namely our nurtured orientation to love, for the overall management of our life, and further, it is not until childhood that we begin to actively experiment in managing our life from a basis of understanding. Infancy is when we are *fully* immersed in the state of loving integrativeness, which, incidentally, is why when the young of most species are in this stage they are so incredibly joyous. In the case of our ape ancestors, and some other primates living today, infancy is when their brain was/is indoctrinated or inscribed or trained with unconditional selflessness, which, as has been explained, eventually became/becomes instinctive. It is when the unconditionally selfless, moral instinctive self or soul is created, and it is when this selflessly inscribed and thus truthful brain begins to make sense of experience, become conscious of the relationship between cause and effect. Love-indoctrination produced a mind instinctively orientated to behaving selflessly, which also happened to be a mind that was conscious. The instinctively orientated instinctive self is also a conscious mind—in this infancy stage they are one and the

same thing. What happens in childhood is that this 'sameness' begins to fragment because the conscious mind becomes sufficiently developed, sufficiently understanding of cause and effect, to begin experimenting with understandings, the effect of which is to begin challenging the instincts' control of the individual—a process that culminates in the upset state of the human condition. It is only when the conscious mind begins to experiment in self-management that a schism develops between the instincts and the conscious mind. In infancy, which is the stage *before* this experimentation in self-management begins, the instincts and the conscious mind are fully immersed in feelings of both appreciating and wanting love (in the case of the instincts), as well as thoughts that similarly appreciate and want love (in the case of consciousness).

In infancy, the love-indoctrinated instinctive self and the conscious thinking self are in harmony, both liberated from the selfish opportunistic 'animal condition' and aligned with, inspired by, committed to and desirous of producing loving behaviour. Within this state we can expect that, to begin with, the love-indoctrinated instincts would be the dominant force in maintaining unconditionally selfless, loving behaviour, however, it also makes sense that as the conscious mind developed it would have played an ever-increasing role in seeking and maintaining such loving behaviour. To make the point, if we were to put a 20-year-old human's conscious brain in an animal that had totally selfless instincts, and if we imagine that the 20-year-old conscious brain was free of any human-condition-type conflicts with the instincts and thus totally able to appreciate the importance of loving selflessness, then it makes sense that that individual's insistence on selfless behaviour would largely be driven by the all-powerful, self-adjusting, self-managing conscious mind, with the instincts very much only of secondary influence. Extrapolating backwards then, the influence of the conscious mind of a one-year-old in maintaining selfless behaviour would not be very great, with the maintenance of that selflessness largely dependent on the selflessness-demanding instincts. In fact, it is not until around two years of age that the power of the developing conscious mind finally becomes effective in maintaining selflessness.

This previous line begs the question: what happens to consciousness at around two years of age that makes such a difference in the maintenance of selflessness? Psychologists recognise that it is only after about the age of two that infant humans are able to recognise themselves as an entity separate to their mother. This time of 'differentiation', as it is termed, is a natural consequence of discovering 'I', of becoming self-aware that was described earlier. If we replace 'mother' with the love-indoctrinated instinctive training in love—which is reasonable since it has the equivalent role of a mother—then it follows that a pre-two-year-old infant isn't able to recognise itself as separate from its training in love, which means it isn't able to act independently of it. However, when at two the infant *is* able to see itself as separate from that training in love it is then in a position to act independently of that training—it can knowingly start implementing the immense desire for the world to be loving that comes with being free of the animal condition. It can consciously self-select for loving integrativeness, especially through the sexual or mate selection of less competitive and aggressive, more cooperative and selfless and thus integrative individuals with which to mate.

With regard to infants being capable of having, as I said, 'an immense desire for the world to be loving that comes with being free of the animal condition', it should be pointed out that while the level of consciousness that occurs in infancy is not sufficiently developed to

begin experiments in managing life from a basis of understanding, it is still a highly conscious state of awareness. In fact, as the human race leaves the human-condition-afflicted situation of having lived in so much denial of so many truths, we are going to be astonished at just how much conscious awareness infants have of the world. The level of consciousness that two to three year old humans have—which is the level of consciousness that the great apes (the bonobos, chimpanzees, gorillas and orangutans) have, and the level of consciousness our ape ancestors had when they began to complement the love-indoctrination process with the self-selection of cooperativeness through mate selection—is *very* aware of what represents an ideal, all-loving, integrative, 'heavenly', true world and what doesn't, of what is desirable behaviour and what isn't. Just how extraordinarily aware the human mind is has been revealed by the experiences of those who have undergone primal therapy, which involves memory regression back to traumas that occurred during their infancy, at birth, and even as a foetus in the womb—and the awareness of even the foetus is astonishing. A pioneer of primal therapy, the psychiatrist Frank Lake (1914-1982), wrote that **'fetal life is not drifting on a cloud,** [but is as] **eventful as the nine months that come after birth. The foetus is not unaware of itself, or of the emotional response of the mother to its presence, but acutely conscious of both and their interaction'** (*Mutual Caring*, ed. Stephen Maret, 1982, p.58). The literature on primal therapy is full of examples of the level of awareness that a foetus has, such as the following: **'I myself** [Dr Farrant] **am a survived abortion attempt and in Denver it took me four months of** [regular primal therapy sessions to connect with the full trauma]**. I had a toxic headache, confusion state, irritability, terror, rage, all confusedly mixed. It was like a jigsaw puzzle that I would put a piece of each time I primaled and one day the final piece went in and I knew. So profound was the knowing that I rang my 79-year-old mother and told her what she had done…My mother in 1927 was a fashion model…with a svelte-like figure…When I came along the figure changed shape, so she didn't like that…So she took a bunch of pills and got into a hot bath, which is exactly what I told her** [in other words, what the foetus knew] **she had done. She burst into tears and revealed that I couldn't possible know that because she had not even told my father, she never told anybody'** (psychiatrist Graham Farrant, M.D., Keynote address at the 14th International Primal Association Convention, 30 Aug. 1986). As we are going to discover, the level of awareness of human infants is such that they have been deeply cognisant of the whole dilemma of the human condition, deeply aware of what the world should ideally be like and therefore how seemingly wrong it currently is. Although infants haven't been consciously mature enough to try to actually understand and explain the imperfections of the world like older children and adolescents attempted to do, they have been *deeply* aware of the problem of the imperfections of the human condition and have been distressed by it. Indeed, much of the difficulties associated with the stage known as the 'terrible two's' that infants have gone through have probably been due to their struggles with, and protests against, the 'wrongness' of the human condition, and I am not just talking about instinctive expectations not being met, but conscious awarenesses of what is right behaviour not being enacted; I am talking about both psychosis and neurosis. Some evidence of the awareness infants have of the wrongness of the human-condition-afflicted world is that the infants of relatively innocent, less human-condition-afflicted races of humans today, such as the Bushmen of South Africa and the Australian Aboriginal, rarely cry—to quote a renowned paediatrician, **'!Kung** [Bushmen]**…infants hardly ever cry'** (*Cultures without Colic: Breastfeeding & Other Baby Lessons from the !Kung San*, by Dr Harvey Karp, accessed 2 Apr. 2012: see <www.wtmsources.com/117>).

In terms of when our ape ancestor inhabited the two-year-old infancy stage of consciousness, and other primates who are currently in that stage of development, they would have had, and have, in the case of the other primates, an extremely strong conscious awareness of what constitutes ideal behaviour and what doesn't, and therefore they would have wanted to, and would want to, and been able to, and be able to, favour and select for ideal behaviour. Other animals certainly have strong instincts against any treatment that hinders their genes' chances of reproducing, they don't in effect like being ill-treated, but because they suffer from the animal condition they haven't been able to develop loving instincts that actually *desire* love—and because they aren't conscious they cannot consciously appreciate and consciously want love. As has been described, while other animals have been locked out of love/'heaven', this is not the case for two-year-old equivalent primates. Love-indoctrinated two-year-old equivalent primates *can* behave selflessly themselves, and *can* seek to ensure others in their group behave selflessly—and they can consciously deeply appreciate and favour non-aggressive behaviour.

If you have a genetic/instinctive block against selfless behaviour it means two things: firstly, that you can't start behaving selflessly because selfless behaviour can't be selected for genetically; and secondly, that you can't begin to think truthfully and thus effectively and therefore can't become conscious of the importance and magnificence of selfless behaviour. To recap, if you have a genetic/instinctive block against selfless behaviour your genes won't let you behave selflessly and you also aren't able to think truthfully and thus realise that selflessness is the right behaviour. You are blocked on both fronts. BUT, once you breach the first block of not being able to develop selfless instincts you can then breach the second block and become conscious, thus allowing you to both behave selflessly *and* consciously appreciate the importance of selflessness, and, through that conscious appreciation, actively favour those who are more selfless/integrative. (Again, by 'selfless' I mean 'unconditionally selfless', because the selflessness involved in reciprocity is actually selfishness.)

Species that can't develop love-indoctrination can't overcome the instinctive block they have against behaving unconditionally selflessly. For example, dogs have an instinctive block in their brain that prevents them from thinking that selflessness is meaningful and, as a result, behaving selflessly, and, as a result of that, becoming conscious of the true relationship of events that occur through time. The only way dogs *could* become conscious would be to develop love-indoctrination, have what unfilled cortex is available in their brain inscribed in selfless training, BUT the problem for dogs, and nearly all other species, is they can't develop love-indoctrination because they haven't been able to afford to leave their young in infancy long enough to inscribe sufficient love/selflessness/truth into that cortex.

Interestingly, in chapter 4 of *The Descent of Man*, Darwin wrote that **'The following proposition seems to me in a high degree probable—namely, that any animal whatever, endowed with well-marked social instincts, the parental and filial** [offspring] **affections being here included, would inevitably acquire a moral sense or conscience, as soon as its intellectual powers had become as well, or nearly as well developed, as in man.'** Yes, **'as soon as'** an animal's **'intellectual powers had become as well, or nearly as**

well developed, as in man' (in other words, as soon as the animal had become conscious) it **'would inevitably acquire a moral sense or conscience'** because it would recognise and appreciate that the theme or meaning of existence is to be integrative, which means cooperative and loving—especially if it is living in a **'social'** situation where conflict causes disorder, but even if it is not in a social situation it would realise the importance of integration because order is an obvious universal objective. Darwin was certainly a denial-free, honest and thus effective thinker.

With regard to infancy being a state that is fully immersed in love, it should be mentioned that by mid-childhood, when the conscious experimenting in self-management got underway and the conflict with the instincts emerged that gave rise to the human condition, this state of being both instinctively and consciously in love with love, immersed in the desire to have and maintain a fully integrated state, did start to rupture, but by that point the fully integrated instinctive state had become fully established. Our moral soul and its 'voice' within us, which is our 'conscience', was by then firmly in place.

So, it wasn't until the level of consciousness of a two-year-old emerged that conscious self-selection for less aggressive behaviour could begin in earnest. Thus, it was when love-indoctrination allowed primates to develop the level of consciousness of a two-year-old that we can expect that conscious self-selection for integrative, cooperative, loving selflessness would have greatly assisted love-indoctrination's development of integration.

What now needs to be stressed is that while chimpanzees, gorillas and orangutans have this two-year-old, or thereabouts, equivalent level of consciousness where they have independent self-awareness and therefore can assertively select for selfless behaviour, especially by the females trying to favour less aggressive males to mate with, they still haven't been able to completely bring an end to the animal condition because they still endure the situation of a male-dominated world where males aggressively compete for mating opportunities. The fact that they have the independent consciousness of a two-year-old and therefore must have highly love-indoctrinated instincts for love/selflessness well established and yet still haven't been able to bring to an end the competition amongst males for mating opportunities that results in male dominance is witness to just *how* difficult it is to complete the love-indoctrination, mate selection process and develop full integration. As will be described shortly in Part 8:4G, the limiting factor for these primates is that they lack a sufficiently food-rich environment. As explained, our ape ancestor and bonobos are seemingly the only primates to have been blessed with all the conditions necessary to develop full integration. But again, even the bonobos who have been able to develop much more love-indoctrinated integration than chimpanzees, gorillas and orangutans—to the point of being able to bring to an end male competition for mating opportunities and the male dominance that goes with it—have still not yet fully completed the nurturing infancy stage because they have to use sex as an appeasement device to counter a residual tension and aggression. If bonobos *had* been able to complete the infancy stage and become a fully integrated species they would no longer need to use sex as an appeasement device and, in fact, would have developed <u>monogamous relationships</u>.

To explain, once competition for mating opportunities was brought under control, monogamy would have become the natural state because, firstly, each female pairing with a different male maintains more variability than the situation where one male dominates a group of females, and, secondly, because it provides infants with the greatest stability and continuity of love. Although the multiple partners, 'free love' strategy that bonobos are having to employ for appeasement while selflessness is still being perfected does provide more variability than monogamy, it doesn't offer infants the same stability and continuity of love as monogamy. Again, the reason variability is advantageous is because it gives a species the greatest chance to genetically adapt to different situations, and it has to be remembered that the longer life span that accompanied the longer infancy period in the love-indoctrination process limited variability and thus adaptability, so monogamy helped counter that limitation. With regard to humans having lived in monogamous relationships, as was explained in Part 7:1, with the emergence of the upset state of the human condition sex became perverted, used as a means of attacking innocence, particularly the innocence of women. When this happened the original monogamous state of human relationships that we would have lived in since the end of our species' infancy stage began to break down as men in particular became preoccupied seeking out more 'attractive' innocent looking younger women for sexual destruction. As explained in Part 3:11C, it was at this point that the convention of marriage was introduced to try to lock men and women into permanent relationships, especially because such breakdowns in relationships were so hurtful to children who not only instinctively expect to grow up in a monogamous family situation, but consciously want the world to be loving. The saying **'the first cut** [the first falling out of love] **is the deepest'** is an acknowledgment of the deep and total commitment humans make to their first love; it reveals that the original, relatively innocent relationship between a man and a woman was a monogamous one.

To return now to the description of consciousness' support of the love-indoctrination process.

In terms of being able to consciously favour the more selfless/integrative in order to achieve greater selflessness and with it integration, the fastest, most effective way of doing so would be through selecting mates who are more selfless because that way you are eliminating selfishness at the fundamental level of your species' genetic make-up. Further, since it is the males who are most preoccupied with competing for mating opportunities, it is the females who are in the best position to implement this selection of less aggressive individuals with which to mate. Despite being unaware of this process of love-indoctrination that liberated consciousness, which in turn allowed self-selection of integrativeness, especially through mate selection, primatologists have verified this selection of cooperative integrativeness by females: **'Male** [baboon] **newcomers also were generally the most dominant while long-term residents**

were the most subordinate, the most easily cowed. Yet in winning the receptive females and special foods, the subordinate, unaggressive veterans got more than their fair share, the newcomers next to nothing. Socially inept and often aggressive, newcomers made a poor job of initiating friendships' (Shirley Strum, *National Geographic* mag. Nov. 1987); and **'The high frequencies of intersexual association, grooming, and food sharing together with the low level of male-female aggression in pygmy chimpanzees may be a factor in male reproductive strategies. Tutin (1980) has demonstrated that a high degree of reproductive success for male common chimpanzees was correlated with male-female affiliative behaviours** ['affiliative' is an evasive, denial-complying, mechanistic term meaning friendly/cohesive/social/loving/integrative]**. These included males spending more time with estrous females, grooming them, and sharing food with them'** (*The Pygmy Chimpanzee*, ed. Randall L. Susman, ch.13 by Alison & Noel Badrian, 1984, p.343 of 435).

While the observations made in the popular documentary series *Orangutan Island* (about a group of juvenile orphaned orangutans being rehabilitated on a protected island in a river in Borneo) probably can't be considered a product of rigorous scientific research, they do provide revealing footage and interesting commentary about orangutan behaviour. In the 2007 episode 'House of Cards', an orangutan named Daisy, who is the dominant young female in the island group (in the series she is described as 'Sheriff Daisy'), is seen strongly reprimanding another young female, Nadi, who repeatedly behaves selfishly. The narrator says, **'As usual, Daisy is keeping a watchful eye on all the action and she spies someone who is not playing fair—it's repeat offender Nadi who is refusing to share** [a jackfruit]**…Daisy decides it's her duty to step in…Daisy is refusing to allow Nadi anywhere near the eating platform because Nadi's been upsetting the order in this peaceful community…Daisy is making Nadi pay for her behaviour, so to avoid starving Nadi has no choice but to leave.'** Whether or not it is an accurate interpretation of events, the footage appears to fully support the commentary—a female is seen to be maintaining **'the order in this peaceful community'**. Many more illustrations of strong-willed, female primates insisting on integrative behaviour will be given shortly in Part 8:4F.

Yes, since it is the males who are the most preoccupied with competing for mating opportunities, the females must have been the first to select for selfless, cooperative integrativeness by favouring integrative rather than competitive and aggressive mates—and it was this process of the conscious self-selection of integrativeness, especially the sexual selection of less aggressive males with which to mate, that greatly helped love-indoctrination subdue the males' divisive competitiveness. Moreover, by seeking out less aggressive, more integrative mates the females were, in essence, selecting those who have been most love-indoctrinated. This raises the next point to be explained, which is that the most love-indoctrinated and thus most integrative individuals will be those who have experienced a long infancy and exceptional nurturing and are closer to their memory of their love-indoctrinated infancy; in a word, younger. During the development of love-indoctrination, when unconditionally selfless, loving behaviour had not yet become instinctive, the older

individuals became, the more their infancy training in love wore off. In the case of our ape ancestors (and this recognition would be occurring amongst all the great apes), they began to recognise that the younger an individual, the more integrative he or she was likely to be and, as a result, began to idolise, foster, favour and select for youthfulness because of its association with cooperative integration. The effect, over many generations, was to retard physical development so that adults became more infant-like in their appearance—which explains how we first came to regard neotenous (infant-like) features, like large eyes, dome forehead, snub nose and hairless skin, as beautiful and attractive.

The neotenous or infant-like large eyes of seal pups and frogs, and the large eye spot markings together with the soft, typically infant-like, moppish ears of giant pandas, are what makes these animals so 'appealing'. The following drawing of a panda depicted without its trademark spotted eyes and round ears, but with pricked ears and small eyes, shows just how quickly it loses its 'cute' appeal.

Illustration by Robert Parkinson

'Would we care if they weren't so cute? White out the black eye spots and give the ears points, and the panda loses much of its appeal.' Illustration by Robert Parkinson. *Good Weekend* supplement, *Sydney Morning Herald*, 23 Sept. 1989

The following three photographs, of an adult chimpanzee, an infant chimpanzee and an adult bonobo, show the similarity between the infant chimpanzee and the adult bonobo, indicating the effects of the love-indoctrination, mate selection neotenising process.

Taronga Zoo; M. Rayner; Animals Animals

Adult chimpanzee; infant chimpanzee; and an adult bonobo

These photographs below of an infant and adult chimpanzee show the greater resemblance humans have to the infant, also illustrating the effect of neoteny in human development.

Infant and adult chimpanzee from *The Mismeasure of Man*, Stephen Jay Gould, 1981

The following photograph of a chimpanzee foetus at seven months shows body hair on the scalp, eyebrows, borders of the eye lids, lips and chin—precisely those places where hair is predominantly retained in adult humans today, again illustrating the effect of neoteny or pedomorphosis in human development. Clearly, humans are an extremely neotenised—love-indoctrinated—ape. 'Pedomorphosis' (derived from the Greek *pais* meaning 'child' and *morphosis* meaning 'shaping') was the term given by the biologist Walter Garstang in 1894 to a mode of evolution in which the adult form of the descendant resembles the young form of the ancestor. Garstang showed that it was from the free-swimming larval forms of echinoderms that the evolution of chordates and hence of vertebrates, could be most satisfactorily traced.

Chimpanzee foetus
at seven months from
The Life of Primates,
Adolph H. Schultz, 1969

So, we humans did learn to recognise that the older individuals became the more their infancy training in love wore off and therefore that the younger an individual, the more integrative he or she would likely be, and this selection for youthfulness had the effect of retarding our development so that we became more infant-like in our appearance as adults. As stated, this was how we came to regard neotenous features—large eyes, dome forehead, snub nose and hairless skin—as attractive.

It should be noted that, as initially described in Part 7:1, when the upset state of the human condition fully emerged some two million years ago the selection for youthful, neotenous-featured, selfless integrativeness that took place during the love-indoctrination process began to be supplanted by selection for youthful, neotenous-featured innocence for sexual destruction. When upset emerged in humans, innocence, particularly women's innocence, became sought-after for sexual destruction—sex for procreation was perverted, used instead as a way of attacking innocence for its implied criticism of the upset, corrupted state. What this means is that while neotenous features have been continually selected for thousands of generations, from the beginning of the love-indoctrination process in our earliest ape ancestors right up to the present day in modern humans, the *reasoning* behind the selection for neotenous features changed significantly along the way. (Note, this 'selection' is not the 'natural selection' of the gene-based refinement system but 'self-selection' through conscious choice.) At two million years ago, instead of selecting for neotenous features because they signalled a cooperative individual, such features began to be selected for because they signalled an innocent individual who was 'attractive' for sexual destruction. So while humans *are* an extremely neotenised ape and the love-indoctrination process explains how we *first* came to regard neotenous features—large eyes, dome forehead, snub nose and a hairless body—as attractive, love-indoctrination isn't the only reason for the *extent* of the extremely neotenised state of humans today, or the reason we *now* regard neotenous features as beautiful and attractive.

It should be pointed out that the assumption might arise that since juvenile animals haven't yet entered the adult stage where there exists extreme competition and aggression for food, shelter, territory and a mate, that selecting for juvenileness so that eventually the less competitive and aggressive juvenile characteristics are carried through into adulthood might be a way of eliminating aggression from a species, but it isn't. Certainly, as will be described in detail in Part 8:5H, we humans have domesticated dogs and even foxes by selecting for more friendly and social juvenile characteristics, the effect of which was to retard the development of some dogs and foxes so that they retain the more friendly and social behaviour of juveniles into adulthood—with the juvenile neotenous physical characteristics of floppy ears, more neotenous faces, etc, also carrying through into adulthood. Retarding development does bring the tamer, more friendly, social characteristics of the juvenile stages to adulthood, but it still doesn't free the genes from their need to be selfish, and so doesn't eliminate selfish competition and aggression—*only* love-indoctrination can do that. Juvenileness is a form of more friendly socialness but it isn't in itself a selfless state—in

fact, dogs and foxes who have been 'puppyfied' still aggressively compete for the resources of food, territory and mating opportunities. The adult stage of having to reproduce can be delayed and partially submerged by selecting for youthfulness but not eliminated. Again, only love-indoctrination can remove the intrinsic selfishness in a large multicellular animal species, make it a truly selflessly behaved species. This is why I said that in the love-indoctrination process the reason for selecting for youthfulness *was not* because the young haven't yet become aggressive competitors for resources, especially for opportunities to mate, but because 'the older individuals became, the more their infancy training in love wore off'. What is important is the training in love/selflessness, not in delaying the onset of adult competitiveness and aggression. The famous 'dog whisperer' Cesar Millan is forever telling dog-owners that the mistake they are making in trying to control their dogs is that they are attempting to love them into behaving less aggressively when what they have to do if they want to achieve control and reduced aggression in their dogs is impose dominance. This is the point: *our* human development, our humanisation, the elimination of competitive aggression and the formation of our instinctive all-loving, unconditionally selfless, moral soul, was achieved using love-indoctrination supported by mate selection, but love-indoctrination doesn't work with dogs because even if they have been tamed/domesticated through human selection of more juvenile characteristics, they haven't overcome the 'animal condition' of selfishly having to ensure their genes reproduce, which is why dogs are still highly competitive for food, shelter, territory and a mate—a competitiveness that only dominance hierarchy can abate. Dog owners try to, as it were, fill the heads of their dogs with love, try to train their dogs in selfless love, try to nurture them into behaving integratively, in fact, try to love-indoctrinate them, but our selection of dogs has only been for juvenile tameness, not for unconditional selfless love. Incidentally, this is why the taming/domestication of dogs and even foxes has been able to be achieved in a relatively short time, a much shorter time than it takes to achieve love-indoctrination, which, as has been explained, is a difficult, time-consuming process because it has to overcome the powerful intrinsic selfishness of the genes. The fact is, there is a huge difference between the love-indoctrination supported by mate selection process and our domestication of dogs and foxes. Domesticated dogs and foxes are still 'locked out' of the fully integrated, 'heavenly', unconditionally selfless, all-loving state. As Cesar Millan teaches, dogs are trying to dominate all the time. Real love, giving away a competitive advantage, is not a consideration of theirs. Friendliness, or tameness, and love are, in truth, very different.

Mindful of this immense difference, the human domestication of dogs and foxes does dramatically illustrate some of the aspects involved in the love-indoctrination, mate selection process, particularly how powerfully effective in producing a change conscious self-selection can be, and how the development of stages of maturation is retarded by selecting for youthfulness—which is why description of our domestication of dogs and foxes is a worthwhile inclusion here. Again, the huge difference between the love-indoctrination supported by mate selection process and our domestication of dogs and foxes is described in much greater detail in Part 8:5H.

In summary, love-indoctrination enabled genetic refinement's seeming inability to develop unconditional selflessness to be overcome, and the love-indoctrinated emergence of unconditional selflessness allowed consciousness to emerge, and with the emergence of consciousness came the ability to support the love-indoctrination process by actively consciously self-selecting for cooperative integrativeness, especially by females selecting more cooperative individuals with which to mate.

While love-indoctrination can be seen developing in some species particularly primates and especially bonobos, so far the evidence indicates that it has only been our ape ancestors who managed to *complete* the process, the result of which is our species' unconditionally selfless, genuinely altruistic, universally loving instinctive self or 'soul', the 'voice' or expression of which is our moral 'conscience'—a hypothesis the fossil record is now corroborating.

Part 8:4E Fossil evidence confirming the love-indoctrination process

Although the fossil record has been slow to yield evidence of our ape ancestors who lived during humanity's infancy (which, as was explained in Part 3:11, lasted from some 12 to 4 million years ago), fossils of our direct ancestors from this period have been found very recently, and they are confirming the love-indoctrination process. These recently discovered ancestors are *Sahelanthropus tchadensis* (who lived some 7 million years ago and is thought to be the first representative of the human line after we diverged from chimpanzees); *Orrorin tugenensis* (who lived some 6 million years ago); and the two species of *Ardipithecus*: *kadabba* (who lived some 5.6 million years ago), and *ramidus* (who lived some 4.4 million years ago). Incidentally, *Sahelanthropus* means 'Sahel man' (Sahel is an area near the Sahara); *Orrorin tugenensis* means 'original man whose fossils were found in the Tugen region in Kenya'; *Ardipithecus* means 'ground ape', with *kadabba* meaning 'oldest ancestor', and *ramidus* meaning 'root' or basal family ancestor.

It is worth emphasising that these fossils have all been found *very* recently. *Sahelanthropus* was only discovered in 2002 (in the form of a skull) and decisively identified as a human ancestor in April 2013, while fragments of a skull, jaw and thigh bone belonging to *Orrorin* were first unearthed in 2001. Although fragments of *Ardipithecus* were first discovered in 1992, and the unearthing of a largely intact skeleton (which was nicknamed 'Ardi') began in 1994, the remains of the latter—one of only six reasonably complete skeletons of early humans older than 1 million years—were in such poor condition that it took until 2009—over 15 years of analysis—for reports to be published. With studies on all of these recently discovered ancestors now becoming available, including the series of 2009 *Ardipithecus* reports, which *Science* magazine deemed 'Breakthrough of the Year', it is exciting to see that confirming evidence of the love-indoctrination process that led to the establishment of our extraordinary unconditionally selfless moral instincts is slowly but surely emerging.

So, how does this new evidence confirm the love indoctrination process? How, for instance, does it affect our understanding of the emergence of bipedalism, the first key factor in developing unconditionally selfless moral instincts? When I first put forward the nurturing, 'love-indoctrination' explanation for such instincts in 1983, I said, contrary to

prevailing views, that it meant bipedalism must have developed early in this nurturing of love process and, therefore, early in our ancestors' history, and, indeed, this is what these recent fossil discoveries now show. Scientists can infer whether a species was bipedal by several methods, including the position of the foramen magnum (the opening at the base of the skull through which the spinal cord enters), because in species that stand upright the opening appears toward the centre of the skull rather than at the rear. Using information such as this, the current scientific thinking is that bipedalism arose at least as early as *Sahelanthropus tchadensis*, with anthropologists now saying, **'Bipedalism is one of very few human characteristics that appears to have evolved at the base of the hominin clade [species more closely related to modern humans than to any other living species]. Recent fossil discoveries have apparently pushed back the origin of the hominin clade into the late Miocene, to 6 to 7 million years ago (Ma). The oldest known potential hominin** [human line] **fossils** [are] **attributed to *Sahelanthropus tchadensis*'** (Brian G. Richmond & William L. Jungers, '*Orrorin tugenensis* Femoral Morphology and the Evolution of Hominin Bipedalism', *Science*, 2008, Vol.319, No.5870).

The analysis of the fossils belonging to the slightly more recent *Orrorin Tugenensis* provide further evidence of bipedalism. In addition to the evidence presented in the fragments of its skull, the analysis of *Orrorin tugenensis*' femur (thigh bone) has allowed scientists to conclude **'that *Orrorin* was a habitual biped as shown by a suite of features in the proximal femur'** (Martin Pickford et al, 'Bipedalism in *Orrorin tugenensis* revealed by its femora', *Comptes Rendus Palevol*, 2002, Vol.1, No.4), and that **'*O. tugenensis* is a basal hominin adapted to bipedalism, and current evidence suggests that an *Australopithecus*-like bipedal morphology evolved early in the hominin clade and persisted successfully for most of human evolutionary history'** (Brian G. Richmond & William L. Jungers, '*Orrorin tugenensis* Femoral Morphology and the Evolution of Hominin Bipedalism', *Science*, 2008, Vol.319, No.5870).

Fossils of *Ardipithecus*, and particularly *Ar. ramidus*, confirm that bipedalism was *well* established by 4.4 million years ago with studies of 'Ardi' (the relatively intact skeleton), leading the respected anthropologist C. Owen Lovejoy to conclude that **'*Ar. ramidus* was fully capable of bipedality and had evolved a substantially modified pelvis and foot with which to walk upright'** ('Reexamining Human Origins in Light of *Ardipithecus ramidus*', *Science*, 2009, Vol.326, No.5949). Furthermore, Lovejoy confirmed the long history of bipedalism that preceded *Ar. ramidus* when he said that *Ar. ramidus* **'has been bipedal for a very long time'** (Ann Gibbons, 'A New Kind of Ancestor: *Ardipithecus* Unveiled', *Science*, 2009, Vol.326, No.5949).

The second requirement for love-indoctrination to occur is the existence of <u>ideal nursery conditions</u>, namely an environment that provides uninterrupted access to food, shelter and territory. You would perhaps expect such conditions would be found in humid forests and woodlands, where food is plentiful and trees provide shelter and refuge from predators, however, the scientific community's traditional view has been that the juncture in our ancestral history that separated our ancestors from the other apes was when the former ventured onto the savannah. However, in light of the fossil evidence that has emerged in the 10 years prior to the time of writing, which is in 2013—and in the 30 years since I first proposed the nurturing, love-indoctrination explanation—the scientific community now accepts that this separation of our human ancestors from other primates occurred while our ancestors lived in forests and woodlands, the sort of environment I identified as being required for the love-indoctrination process to begin.

Scientists are now able to reconstruct the habitats of *Sahelanthropus*, *Orrorin* and *Ardipithecus* based on those species' physical characteristics, the information provided by the fossils of other animals and plants found accompanying them, as well as climate data. While *Sahelanthropus* fossils are so limited they don't provide the information needed to confirm that they were adapted to climbing trees and thus lived in forests or woodlands, reconstructions of their environment have narrowed *Sahelanthropus*' habitat to **'a mosaic of environments from gallery forest at the edge of a lake area to a dominance of large savannah and grassland'** (Patrick Vignaud et al, 'Geology and palaeontology of the Upper Miocene Toros-Menalla hominid locality, Chad', *Nature*, 2002, Vol.418, No.6894). As we move forward in time to *Orrorin* some 6 million years ago, this species' skeletal structure shows tree climbing adaptations, which clearly point to them living in an arboreal habitat. Associated animal and plant fossils have allowed scientists to infer that **'*Orrorin tugenensis* may have evolved in well wooded to forested conditions margining lakes and streams with open country-side in the vicinity'** (Soizic Le Fur et al, 'The mammal assemblage of the hominid site TM266 (Late Miocene, Chad Basin): ecological structure and paleoenvironmental implications', *Naturewissenschaften*, 2009, Vol.96, No.5); and that **'the surroundings of the site were probably open woodland, while the presence of several specimens of colobus monkeys indicate that there were denser stands of trees in the vicinity, possibly fringing the lake margin and streams that drained into the lake'** (Martin Pickford & Brigitte Senut, 'The geological and faunal context of Late Miocene hominid remains from Lukeino, Kenya', *Comptes Rendus de l'Academie des Sciences – Series IIA - Earth and Planetary Science*, 2001, Vol.332, No.2). Forest and woodlands continued to be the preferred habitat of *Ar. ramidus* some 4.4 million years ago, as indicated by its retention of tree climbing features such as a pelvis that supported large climbing muscles, flexible wrists that allowed walking on all fours along the top of branches, and an opposable big toe that allowed it to grasp the branches with its feet: **'*Ar. ramidus* preferred a woodland-to-forest habitat rather than open grasslands'** (Tim D. White et al, '*Ardipithecus ramidus* and the Paleobiology of Early Hominids', *Science*, 2009, Vol.326, No.5949). In fact, the wealth of surrounding evidence from the *Ar. ramidus* fossil site in Ethiopia allowed the paleoanthropologist Andrew Hill to remark that **'There's so much good data here that people aren't going to be able to question whether early hominins were living in woodlands'** (Ann Gibbons, 'Habitat for Humanity', *Science*, 2009, Vol.326, No.5949), and fellow researcher Giday WoldeGabriel to state that *Ar. ramidus* lived **'in an environment that was humid and cooler than it is today, containing habitats ranging from woodland to forest patches'** (Giday WoldeGabriel et al, 'The Geological, Isotopic, Botanical, Invertebrate, and Lower Vertebrate Surroundings of *Ardipithecus ramidus*', *Science*, 2009, Vol.326, No.5949). Indeed, this **'good data'** associated with the 'Ardi' dig has meant that palaeobiologists have been able to reconstruct *Ar. ramidus'* habitat to an extraordinary level of detail: **'Ardi lived on an ancient floodplain covered in sylvan woodlands, climbing among hackberry, fig, and palm trees, and coexisting with monkeys, kudu antelopes, and peafowl'** (Ann Gibbons, 'Breakthrough Of The Year: *Ardipithecus ramidus*', *Science*, 2009, Vol.326, No.5960) where **'doves and parrots flew overhead'** (Ann Gibbons, 'Habitat for Humanity', *Science*, 2009, Vol.326, No.5949). Combine this environment with our knowledge of *Ar. ramidus'* diet, which indicates *Ar. ramidus* **'was a generalized omnivore and frugivore** [fruit eater]**'** (Gen Suwa et al, 'Paleobiological Implications of the *Ardipithecus ramidus* Dentition', *Science*, 2009, Vol.326, No.5949), and our knowledge of existing ape behaviour, which indicates *Ar. ramidus* **'almost certainly slept and fed in trees'** (Craig B. Stanford, 'Chimpanzees and the Behavior of *Ardipithecus ramidus*', *Annual Review of Anthropology,* 2012, Vol.41), and a picture begins to emerge of the ideal nursery conditions that enabled love-indoctrination to develop.

These ideal nursery conditions also refute the long-held nurturing-avoiding theory that upright walking supposedly developed when our ancestors moved out onto the savannah: **'*Ar. ramidus* did not live in the open savanna that was once envisioned to be the predominant habitat of the earliest hominids'** (Giday WoldeGabriel et al, 'The Geological, Isotopic, Botanical, Invertebrate, and Lower Vertebrate Surroundings of *Ardipithecus ramidus*', *Science*, 2009, Vol.326, No.5949). In fact, the evidence that bipedality developed in **'forest or wooded environments'** is now so conclusive that Hill was able to assert that **'Savannas had nothing to do with upright walking'** (Ann Gibbons, 'Habitat for Humanity', *Science*, 2009, Vol.326, No.5949). Yes, because the development of bipedality is closely associated with the love-indoctrination process it had to have occurred while our ancestors were inhabiting ideal nursery conditions, which clearly suggested an arboreal environment, as I maintained when I originally put forward the love-indoctrination process in 1983.

These recent fossil discoveries also confirm the third requirement for love indoctrination to occur: the presence and influence of more maternal mothers. Scientists are able to deduce a remarkable amount of information about the social behaviour of our ancestors from their fossils, and, as a result of this evidence, are now beginning to acknowledge that these species exhibited low levels of aggression toward one another, and that females were not only not dominated by males, but dictated mate choice by choosing non-aggressive, cooperative males to reproduce with—hallmarks you would expect of a society highly focused on maternal nurturing of their infants.

The first striking evidence provided by the fossil record to support these deductions is that these early humans had small canine teeth: **'male canine size and prominence were dramatically reduced by ~6 to 4.4 Ma'** (Gen Suwa et al, 'Paleobiological Implications of the *Ardipithecus ramidus* Dentition', *Science*, 2009, Vol.326, No.5949). This is relevant because **'canines function as weapons in interindividual aggression in most anthropoid species'** (ibid), particularly in aggressive male-to-male sexual competition for mating opportunities, and so canines **'inform aspects of social structure and behavior'** (ibid), where small canines are **'indicative of minimal social aggression'** (Tim D. White et al, '*Ardipithecus ramidus* and the Paleobiology of Early Hominids', *Science*, 2009, Vol.326, No.5949).

Furthermore, comparisons of canine size in *Ar. ramidus* with current apes indicate that *Ar. ramidus* males **'retained virtually no anatomical correlates of male-to-male conflict'** (C. Owen Lovejoy, 'Reexamining Human Origins in Light of *Ardipithecus ramidus*', *Science*, 2009, Vol.326, No.5949), a situation that would apply to our earlier ancestors *Sahelanthropus* and *Orrorin* since they too had small canines. Given that the reality of the animal kingdom involves fierce competition between sexually reproducing individuals seeking to reproduce their genes, this reduction in aggressive male competition for mating opportunities is an *extremely* significant anomaly, as Lovejoy recognises: **'Loss of the projecting canine raises other vexing questions because this tooth is so fundamental to reproductive success in higher primates. What could cause males to forfeit their ability to aggressively compete with other males?'** (ibid). Traditional attempts to answer this **'vexing'** question have argued either that large canine teeth were made redundant when humans adopted hand-held weapons—the so called 'weapons replacement' hypothesis; or that large, overlapping canines made eating certain foods difficult and, therefore, were selected against; or that large canines had to make way for the large teeth of robust *Australopithecus*. However, the fossil record now shows that canines were reduced well before the emergence of the australopithecines; and as mentioned, it also shows that *Ar. ramidus* **'was a generalized**

omnivore and frugivore [fruit eater]**'**, which is not unlike baboons and many other species of current primates who have retained their large canines. And with regard to weapon use making large canines redundant, the fossil record now shows that our ancestors had developed small canines at least as early as *Sahelanthropus*, which is millions of years before any fossil evidence of weapon or tool use—and even if those ancestors brandished weapons such as branches or bones that would not leave 'evidence', the argument still fails to explain why having weapons *and* large canines would not be an advantage in any contest. A 1992 paper described the confusion that has surrounded the evolution of human canine reduction: **'the issue of human canine evolution has continued to be controversial and apparently intractable'** (Leonard O. Greenfield, 'Origin of the human canine: A new solution to an old enigma', *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*, 1992, Vol.35, No.S15). And the new discoveries have only increased this confusion. But as we can now see, the answer to the **'vexing'** and **'apparently intractable'** question of **'what could cause males to forfeit their ability to aggressively compete with other males'** is the love-indoctrination process. As will be explained in more detail below, conscious self-selection of integrativeness, especially the female sexual or mate selection of less competitive, less aggressive, more integrative males developed to assist, speed up and help maintain love-indoctrination's development of integration. Indeed, male competition for mating opportunities is so **'fundamental to reproductive success'** that only active sexual selection against it can account for its reduction, as is made clear in this quote, **'Canine reduction did not result from a relaxation of selection pressure for large canines, but rather a positive selection against them'** (Arthur Klages, 'Sahelanthropus tchadensis: An Examination of its Hominin Affinities and Possible Phylogenetic Placement', *Totem: The University of Western Ontario Journal of Anthropology*, 2008, Vol.16, No.1). Indeed, it is now so clear that canine reduction could only be caused by **'a positive selection against them'** that the importance of sexual selection is now being recognised by anthropologists such as Lovejoy, Gen Suwa, Berhane Asfaw, Tim White and others, who write, **'In modern monkeys and apes, the upper canine is important in male agonistic** [aggressive] **behavior, so its subdued shape in early hominids and *Ar. ramidus* suggests that sexual selection played a primary role in canine reduction. Thus, fundamental reproductive and social behavioral changes probably occurred in hominids long before they had enlarged brains and began to use stone tools'** (Gen Suwa et al, 'Paleobiological Implications of the *Ardipithecus ramidus* Dentition', *Science*, 2009, Vol.326, No.5949).

As these authors make clear, the reduction in the size of canines was such a remarkable achievement that it required **'fundamental reproductive and social behavioral changes'** in which **'sexual selection played a primary role'**. These scientists are describing a society that switched from being patriarchal—dominated by male sexual selection with males aggressively competing for mating opportunities—to matriarchal, dictated by female sexual selection where females choose mates that are less aggressive; however, these scientists don't explain the *only* mechanism that could allow such a switch: love-indoctrination. This remarkable reversal where females are empowered, and males **'forfeit their ability to aggressively compete with other males'**, is discussed in more detail in Part 8:5, however, it is sufficient to emphasise at this point that the fossil record is increasingly providing compelling evidence that female sexual selection was occurring very early in human history, at least as early as *Sahelanthropus* some 7 million years ago, and that it **'emerged in concert with habituation to bipedality'** (C. Owen Lovejoy, 'Reexamining Human Origins in Light of *Ardipithecus ramidus*', *Science*, 2009, Vol.326, No.5949), which again is in accord with love-indoctrination, all of which I first predicted in 1983.

Another significant factor revealed by the fossil record is the difference in the size between males and females, including their canines, a phenomena known as sexual size dimorphism. Since **'sexual size dimorphism is generally associated with sexual selection via agonistic male competition in nonhuman primates…if a species showed very strong size dimorphism, it probably was characterized by intense male mate competition'** (J. Michael Plavcan, 'Sexual Size Dimorphism, Canine Dimorphism, and Male-Male Competition in Primates', *Human Nature,* 2012, Vol.23, No.1). Conversely, scientists recognise that a low level of sexual size dimorphism is an indicator of a society in which males do not aggressively compete for mating opportunities. As mentioned, the fossil records for our human ancestors show that **'There is no evidence of substantial canine dimorphism in earlier hominins, including *Sahelanthropus*, *Ardipithecus*, and *Australopithecus anamensis*, or later hominins'** (ibid). In addition to this low level of canine dimorphism, *Ar. ramidus* exhibited low levels of body size dimorphism, which, in terms of behaviour, **'were probably the anatomical correlates of comparatively weak amounts of male-male competition, perhaps associated with…a tendency for male-female codominance as seen in *P. paniscus*** [bonobos]**'** (Gen Suwa et al, 'Paleobiological Implications of the *Ardipithecus ramidus* Dentition', *Science*, 2009, Vol.326, No.5949). As will be described shortly, the prevailing view about bonobos is that rather than having achieved **'male-female codominance'**, they have in fact gone further and achieved female dominance, a matriarchy.

So the three requirements of the love-indoctrination process of bipedality, ideal nursery conditions and selection for more maternal mothers are now being dramatically confirmed by the fossil record. However, as I mentioned earlier and will elaborate on shortly, the problem with this nurturing, true explanation, and why its early permutations were discarded by the scientific establishment, is that it has been an unbearably confronting, exposing truth for our present human-condition-afflicted human race that has been so unable to adequately nurture our infants to the extent our instincts expect. This new evidence has left those scientists who continue to deny the importance of nurturing in our development in a predicament in which they are forced to ask the right questions even though they are **'vexing'**, but refuse to acknowledge the truthful answer, because until the human condition was explained nurturing was an off-limits subject. The following passage from Lovejoy exemplifies this predicament: **'Why did early hominids become the only primate to completely eliminate the sectorial canine complex** [large projecting canines that are continuously sharpened against a lower molar]**? Why did they become bipedal, a form of locomotion with virtually no measurable mechanical advantage? Why did body-size dimorphism increase in their likely descendants? These are now among the ultimate questions of human evolution'** ('Reexamining Human Origins in Light of *Ardipithecus ramidus*', *Science*, 2009, Vol.326, No.5949). Lovejoy further reduced these **'ultimate questions'** to this one, final sentence that admits the reality of a cooperative past: **'Even our species-defining cooperative mutualism can now be seen to extend well beyond the deepest Pliocene** [5.3 million years ago]**'** (ibid). The great outstanding mystery for biologists has been how could the cold, selfish, competitive, gene-based natural selection process have possibly created such warm, unconditionally selfless, cooperative, loving instincts in us humans? It is *only* with the explanation of the human condition that we can finally understand *why* we haven't been able to adequately nurture our infants—and with that compassionate insight it at last becomes psychologically safe to admit that nurturing is what made us human, thus allowing these **'ultimate questions of human evolution'** to be answered.

Part 8:4F Bonobos evidence the whole love-indoctrination, self-selection of integrativeness through mate selection process

While these recent fossil discoveries are providing exciting confirmation that our ape ancestors completed the development of the love-indoctrination process, of the living primate species, only bonobos have not only developed love-indoctrination but appear to have come close to completing the love-indoctrination process to become a fully integrated Specie Individual; they are certainly by far the most cooperative/harmonious/gentle/loving/integrated of the non-human primates. It follows then, that although there is no suggestion that bonobos or chimpanzees are a living human ancestor, comparisons have been made between bonobos and our ancestors. For instance, the physical anthropologist Adrienne Zihlman first proposed in 1978 **'that, among living species, the pygmy chimpanzee (*P. paniscus*) offers us the best prototype of the prehominid** [pre-human] **ancestor'** (Adrienne L. Zihlman et al, 'Pygmy chimpanzee as a possible prototype for the common ancestor of humans, chimpanzees and gorillas', *Nature*, 1978, Vol.275, No.5682), using the then earliest known early human, *Australopithecus*, to compare the two species' physical characteristics, including their bipedality, canine teeth and sexual size dimorphism. In 1996 Zihlman refined her assessment to include similarities with the, at the time, newly discovered *Ardipithecus*. In a further example, the primatologist Frans de Waal notes the extraordinary similarity between our ape ancestor and bonobos, saying, **'The bonobo's body proportions—its long legs and narrow shoulders—seem to perfectly fit the descriptions of Ardi, as do its relatively small canines'** (*The Bonobo and the Atheist*, 2013, p.61 of 289). Yes, bonobos are physically extremely similar to our fossil ancestors, but beyond the physical similarities, scientists are suggesting bonobo behaviour *also* corresponds with that of our ancestors. In addition to the view expressed above, that, like bonobos, *Ardipithecus* were not male dominated, Zihlman has suggested that **'the *Pan paniscus* model offers another way to view the social life of early hominids, given their sociability, lack of male dominance and the female-centric features of their society'** ('Reconstructions reconsidered: chimpanzee models and human evolution', *Great Ape Societies*, eds. William C. McGrew et al, 1996, p.301 of 352).

Further comparison between bonobos and common chimpanzees clearly evidences what has been said about the love-indoctrination, sexual or mate selection process, for the bonobos make visible the entire process.

As mentioned, chimpanzees are found in equatorial Africa, north and east of the Congo River. The social model of the chimpanzee is patriarchal or male-dominated. Although there is a focus on nurturing of the young by chimpanzee mothers, the climatically unstable and geographically challenging environments in which chimpanzees live means their social bonds are periodically subjected to stress, such as from food scarcities during drier times. This has meant that the environment in which the females live is often disturbed by males aggressively competing for mating opportunities. This pressured existence also results in fierce inter-group confrontation. To allay food pressures, chimpanzees also regularly hunt colobus monkeys as a source of protein.

In contrast, bonobos live, as mentioned, in the ideal nursery conditions of the warm climate south of the Congo River, a stable environment that offers ample food and the sheltering safety of the jungle's canopy for sleeping, eating and travelling. As a result, their social model is vastly different to that of chimpanzees. Firstly, as has been mentioned, the social dynamic of the bonobo society features a gender-role reversal to that of the

chimpanzees in that bonobo females form alliances and dominate social groups, both of which are distinctly male activities in chimpanzee society. Bonobo societies are matriarchal, female-dominated, controlled and led, and the entire focus of the social group seems to be on the maternal or female role of nurturing infants. Bonobo females have, on average, one offspring every 5 to 6 years and provide better maternal care than chimpanzees. Bonobo infants are born small, develop more slowly than other ape species, and stay in a state of infancy and total dependence for a relatively long period of time—being weaned at about 5 years of age and remaining dependent on their mothers up until between 7 and 9 years of age. Chimpanzees are weaned at about 4 years of age and remain dependent for an average of 6 years. Not surprisingly, amongst the primates only bonobos have well-developed breasts similar to those of female humans—as the upcoming photos of bonobos show—presumably due to their emphasis on nursing.

Primate Life Spans

This chart shows the length of the infancy period for a number of primates. As indicated, lemurs have an infancy period of 6 months, whereas with macaque monkeys it is 18 months.

In chimpanzees it is, as just mentioned, 3 to 4 years. Bonobos' infancy period can last for up to 5 years, and in humans it does last 5 years. As mentioned, to develop love-indoctrination, selection has to occur for long infancies, for exceptionally maternal mothers and for females who have sufficiently strong characters to rein in male aggression. Also necessary are the exceptional nursery conditions of a peaceful and food-abundant environment, which the bonobos have had within the dense forests of the Congo basin in Africa (although the human race's human-condition-afflicted, upset destructive behaviour is now threatening that haven). As explained, any breakdown in the nurturing process would result in a return to the pre-love-indoctrination, competitive state where male aggression from fighting for mating opportunities dominates.

It is possible that the selection for a longer infancy period had the side effect of lengthening all the stages of maturation—perhaps the stages are all linked genetically so that the extension of one stage results in the extension of *all* stages—because the age at which bonobos of both sexes reach sexual or reproductive maturity is 13 to 15 years, whereas in chimpanzees it is only 10 to 13 years for females and 12 to 15 years for males. This extension of all stages of maturation as a result of selecting for a longer infancy may explain how we humans acquired our comparatively long life span.

The primatologist Takayoshi Kano is one of the world's leading experts on bonobos and since 1973 has led the long-running study of bonobos in their natural habitat, at a site in Wamba in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (formerly Zaire). In an interview conducted with Kano, his long-time collaborator Suehisa Kuroda contributed the following observation: **'The long dependence of the son may be caused by the slow growth of the bonobo infant, which seems slower than in the chimpanzee. For example, even after one year of age, bonobo infants do not walk or climb much, and are very slow. The mothers keep them near. They start to play with others at about one and a half years, which is much later than in the chimpanzee. During this period, mothers are very attentive…Female juveniles gradually loosen their tie with the mother and travel further away from her than do her sons'** (*Bonobo: The Forgotten Ape*, Frans de Waal & Frans Lanting, 1997, p.60 of 210). The bond between mother and son is of particular importance in bonobo society. The son will maintain his connection with his mother for life and will depend upon her for his social standing within the group. The son of the society's dominant female, the strong matriarch that maintains social order, will rise in the ranks of the group, presumably to ensure the establishment and perpetuation of unaggressive, non-competitive, cooperative male characteristics, both learned and genetic, within the group. Again, historically, it is the male primates who have been particularly divisive in their aggressive competition to win mating opportunities and therefore the gender most needing of love-indoctrination—as this quote makes clear: **'Patient observation over many years convinced** [Takayoshi] **Kano that male bonobos bonded with their mothers for life. That contrasts with chimpanzee males who rarely have close contact with their mothers after they grow up, instead joining other males in never-ending tussles for dominance'** ('Bonobos: The apes who make love, not war' by Paul Raffaele, Last Tribes on Earth.com website).

The biologist and psychologist Sue Savage-Rumbaugh is America's leading ape-language researcher. In *Kanzi: The Ape at the Brink of the Human Mind* (1994), she and co-author

Roger Lewin offered this insight into bonobo society and its emphasis on nurturing: **'Bonobo life is centered around the offspring. Unlike what happens among common chimps, all members of the bonobo social group help with infant care and share food with infants. If you are a bonobo infant, you can do no wrong. This high regard for infants gives bonobo females a status that is not shared by common chimpanzee females, who must bear the burden of child care all alone. Bonobo females and their infants form the core of the group, with males invited in to the extent that they are cooperative and helpful. High-status males are those that are accepted by the females, and male aggression directed toward females is rare even though males are considerably stronger'** (p.108 of 299).

As mentioned, bonobos are much gentler than their chimpanzee cousins. They are relatively placid, peaceful and egalitarian, exhibiting a remarkable sensitivity to others—and not just sensitivity towards their own kind, as will be shown shortly when it is described how a bonobo cares for an injured bird. In fact, while physical violence is customary amongst chimpanzees it is rare among bonobos where, although the males are stronger, male aggression has been tamed and, unlike other great apes, there is actually little difference in size between the male and female of the species. Bonobos also have reduced canine teeth, another indication they are less aggressive. As mentioned, even sex has been employed by bonobos as an appeasement device for subsiding conflict and tension. The practice of infanticide, while not uncommon amongst chimpanzees, also appears to be non-existent within bonobo societies where even orphan bonobos are cared for by the group. In chimpanzee society orphans are occasionally adopted by a female but are not especially cared for by the group. Social groups of bonobos also have much greater stability than social groups of chimpanzees, with bonobos periodically coming together in large, harmonious, stable groups of up to 120 individuals. For instance, the anthropologist Barbara Fruth, who had spent many years studying bonobos in their natural habitat, observed that **'up to 100 bonobos at a time from several groups spend their night together. That would not be possible with chimpanzees because there would be brutal fighting between rival groups'** (Paul Raffaele, 'Bonobos: The apes who make love, not war', 2003, Last Tribes on Earth.com).

Unlike chimpanzees, bonobos also regularly share their food and while the former restrict their plant-food intake to mainly fruit, bonobos eat leaves and plant pith as well as fruit, a diet more like that of gorillas. While bonobos have been known to capture and eat small game, they are not known to routinely hunt down and eat large animals such as monkeys, like chimpanzees do.

The following extract from the 1995 National Geographic documentary *The New Chimpanzees* provides a good example of the important role a strong matriarchy plays in the prevention of divisive selfish and aggressive behaviour. To quote from the narration: **'An impressively stern** [bonobo] **female enters and snaps a young sapling. Once she picks herself up she does something entirely surprising for a female chimp, she displays** [the female is shown assertively dragging the sapling through the group]**, and the males give her sway** [a male is shown cowering out of her way]**. For this is the confident stride of the group's leader, its alpha female, whom** [Takayoshi] **Kano has named Harloo.'** As mentioned in Part 5:1, those who have studied primates will typically tell you of an extraordinarily self-assured, secure-in-self and strong-willed female in their study group. All primates are trying to develop the nurturing of integrativeness but only our

ancestors and the bonobos have had the right conditions to achieve it. In that Part, when illustrating the strength of character that had to be developed to curtail male aggression and the centred security of self needed to be a good mother, it was mentioned how the American primatologist Dian Fossey, whose work will be further referred to shortly, studied gorillas in the mountain forests of Rwanda in Africa for some 18 years. In her 1983 book *Gorillas in the Mist*, Fossey wrote about a remarkably assured female gorilla named **'Old Goat'** who was such **'an exemplary parent'** (p.174 of 282) that her son **'Tiger' 'was a contented and well-adjusted individual whose zest for living was almost contagious'** (p.186). During a trip to Kenya in 1992, my partner Annie Williams and I were invited to visit anthropologist Shirley Strum's 'Pumphouse Gang' study troop of baboons, which had been made famous through numerous articles in *National Geographic* magazine. During our visit I noticed that Strum kept on her desk the skull of a baboon named Peggy. Displaying a skull is, as I said earlier, a bit macabre but Strum said she did so in memory of Peggy who was an extraordinarily confident, strong-willed, authoritative, charismatic individual who successfully led the Pumphouse Gang for many years. As Strum has written: **'She** [Peggy] **was the highest-ranking female in the troop, and her presence often turned the tide in favor of the animal she sponsored. While every adult male outranked her by sheer size and physical strength, <u>she exerted considerable social pressure on each member of the troop</u>. Her family also outranked all the others…another reason for the contentment in this particular family was Peggy's personality. She was a strong, calm, social animal, self-assured yet not pushy, forceful yet not tyrannical'** (*Almost Human: a journey into the world of baboons*, 1987, pp.38-39 of 294).

Physically, <u>bonobos have more slender upper bodies than chimpanzees, are more arboreal and often walk upright</u>; in fact, they are by far the most upright of the great apes. It has long been claimed that it was the move to savannah and the associated need to see over tall grass that led to bipedalism, yet the bonobos live in the jungle, so some other influence must be at work selecting for upright walking/bipedalism and, as described, the evidence indicates that influence was the need to develop nurturing.

Indeed, the integrative, neotenising effects of nurturing and its role in the emergence of bipedalism, together with the effect of exceptionally strong-willed females helping to rein in any aggression resulting from males' competition for mating opportunities, is apparent in the pre-four-million-year-old fossil evidence that was referred to earlier: **'The 4.4 million-year-old skeleton of a likely human ancestor known as *Ardipithecus ramidus*'**, discovered in Ethiopia in 1994, shows **'males lacked the daggerlike fangs of gorillas and chimps'**, while other features showed they **'walked upright on two legs'** ('A Long-Lost Relative', *TIME* mag. 12 Oct. 2009). Since <u>reduced canines</u> are a feature of the more juvenile state we can attribute such reduction in adults to the neotenising selection of less aggressive mates. I might mention that this *TIME* article erroneously suggested that **'bipedality arose'** for **'carrying food'**. Again, as was pointed out earlier, and as will be elaborated upon in Part 8:5, the all-important role of nurturing in human origins that led to bipedalism has been too confronting to admit for us upset humans who have understandably been incapable of adequately nurturing our children while the battle of the human condition raged. It is *only* now that the human condition is explained that it becomes safe to confront and admit the significance of nurturing in both the maturation of our species and in the maturation of our individual lives.

Upright Bonobos

These photographs show the aforementioned large breasts so characteristic of female bonobos as well as the species' exceptionally upright stance—they are, as stated above, the most bipedal of all the non-human living primates. The longer our ape ancestors had to hold infants, the greater the need became to stand upright, so if we want to assess how much

'love-indoctrination' a primate species has been able to develop we only have to look at how bipedal they have become.

In addition to their remarkably neotenous physical appearance, there is also a marked variance in features between individual bonobos, suggesting the species is undergoing rapid change. This in turn suggests that the bonobo species has hit upon some opportunity that facilitates a rapid development, which evidence indicates is the ability to develop integration through love-indoctrination and mate selection.

We can see then that of all the non-human primates bonobos are by far the most integrated—that is, cooperative and thus peaceful. As has already been mentioned, bonobos are also exceptionally intelligent, almost certainly the most intelligent species after humans. As explained, nurturing liberated consciousness and with it insightful intelligence, so the fact that the bonobos have been able to develop such a high degree of nurturing and are also so intelligent evidences that explanation for the origin of consciousness.

This quote, part of which was included earlier in Part 8:4C, reveals how much more intelligent bonobos are than chimpanzees—as well as their nurtured happy disposition and greater psychological 'room': **'Everything seems to indicate that** [Prince] **Chim** [a bonobo] **was extremely intelligent. His surprising alertness and interest in things about him bore fruit in action, for he was constantly imitating the acts of his human companions and testing all objects. He rapidly profited by his experiences…Never have I seen man or beast take greater satisfaction in showing off than did little Chim. The contrast in intellectual qualities between him and his female companion** [a chimpanzee] **may briefly, if not entirely adequately, be described by the term "opposites"** [p.248 of 278]**…Prince Chim seems to have been an intellectual genius. His remarkable alertness and quickness to learn were associated with a cheerful and happy disposition which made him the favorite of all** [p.255]**…Chim also was even-tempered and good-natured, always ready for a romp; he seldom resented by word or deed unintentional rough handling or mishap. Never was he known to exhibit jealousy…**[By contrast] **Panzee** [the chimpanzee] **could not be trusted in critical situations. Her resentment and anger were readily aroused and she was quick to give them expression with hands and teeth** [p.246]**'** (*Almost Human*, Robert M. Yerkes, 1925). It will be described shortly in Part 8:4H how this conscious intelligence that we can see rapidly emerging in the bonobos led to one variety of ape, or perhaps some varieties of apes, to develop into what we recognise in the fossil record as the australopithecines, and from the australopithecines into the upset, human-condition-afflicted genus *Homo*—us modern humans.

The following section of dialogue about bonobos, from a 1996 Discovery Channel documentary titled *The Ultimate Guide: Great Apes*, confirms some of the main points that have been made about the species thus far. The segment commences with this observation by the primatologist Jo Myers Thompson: **'A female chimpanzee's life is rugged. They have hardships just in daily activities. They are probably lower on the hierarchy, the social status, than males throughout the society and for instance males beat them up, chase them, bully them around and that doesn't happen in bonobo society. The female bonobos are not bullied and chased. Although there can be some male aggression it's very minor. Female bonobos are never raped as far as we know; they have first choice at feeding sites. Their life is much more peaceful.'** The program's narrator then states: **'The physical difference between chimps and bonobos are quite telling. Bonobos have shorter, smaller faces and a more slender physique retaining many of the features seen in juvenile chimps. They're rather like chimps frozen inside adolescent bodies. Even their voices are high-pitched and child-like. The male aggression that is**

so common in chimps is much reduced in bonobos and even relations between neighbouring groups are often peaceful.' Thompson concludes: **'Why do they** [bonobos] **need to be aggressive? They don't have to fight for food, they don't have to fight for sex, they don't have to fight for inter-relationships, they don't have to fight for space. Why would they be aggressive?'** As has been pointed out, ideal nursery conditions alone aren't enough to develop love-indoctrination—there also had to be the ability to hold a dependent infant and thus be able to select for the longer infancy period necessary for the love-indoctrination to take place. If all that was required to produce an integrated, fully cooperative species of large animal was the presence of ideal nursery conditions then it would have been developed many times over because such ideal nursery conditions would not have been that uncommon over the millions of years of biological evolution.

The following quotes offer further insight into how extraordinarily integratively orientated bonobos are and just how wonderful our species' time in the innocent, cooperatively-behaved, loving, 'Garden of Eden', fully integrated, 'heavenly' 'Golden Age' must have been. In fact, I doubt you will find a better clue to our glorious past, and now future, than what you are about to read.

Firstly, this extract from an article titled 'The Bonobo: "Newest" apes are teaching us about ourselves' demonstrates how extraordinarily sensitive, cooperative, loving and intelligent bonobos are, as well as how few exist in captivity: **'Barbara Bell…a keeper/trainer for the Milwaukee County Zoo…works daily with the largest group of bonobos (5 males and 4 females, ranging in age from 3 to 48 years) in North America, making it the second largest collection in the world (the largest can be found at the Dierenpark Planckendael, in Mechelen, Belgium). There are only 120 captive worldwide. "It's like being with 9 two and a half year olds all day," she** [Bell] **says. "They're extremely intelligent."…"They understand a couple of hundred words," she says. "They listen very attentively. And they'll often eavesdrop. If I'm discussing with the staff which bonobos (to) separate into smaller groups, if they like the plan, they'll line up in the order they just heard discussed. If they don't like the plan, they'll just line up the way they want." "They also love to tease me a lot," she says. "Like during training, if I were to ask for their left foot, they'll give me their right, and laugh and laugh and laugh. But what really blows me away is their ability to understand a situation entirely." For example, Kitty, the eldest female, is completely blind and hard of hearing. Sometimes she gets lost and confused. "They'll just pick her up and take her to where she needs to go," says Bell. "That's pretty amazing. Adults demonstrate tremendous compassion for each other." The bonobo's apparent ability to empathize, in contrast with the more hostile and aggressive bearing of the related chimpanzee, has some social scientists re-thinking our behavioral heritage'** (Anthony DeBartolo, *Chicago Tribune*, 11 Jun. 1998).

It should be explained that the reason the term **'newest'** ape is used in the article above, and in the title of the documentary referred to earlier, is because bonobos were only identified as a species separate from chimpanzees in 1928. I might also mention that while they are an endangered species, rare both in the wild and in captivity, many zoos have been reluctant to exhibit bonobos because their overt sexual behaviour has been deemed too embarrassing for the public—surely a problem that can be managed with the right educational information and a sensitive presentation. Such censorship is also a very great shame because it denies the public the chance to view the species that more than any other throws light on the true, loving, soulful nature of our own human origins. Next to humans, bonobos *are* the most astonishing animals on Earth because, for a large animal, they are so extraordinarily loving

and thus integrated. In fact, they are presently more loving than we are—which is obviously a contributing reason for the reluctance to put them on display: they have just been far too confronting for us upset humans!

In 1997 the primatologist Frans de Waal and photographer Frans Lanting released a book titled *Bonobo: The Forgotten Ape* that features another example from Barbara Bell of the truly extraordinary empathy and kindness that exists between bonobos. Fittingly, the extract comes from a chapter titled 'Sensitivity': **'Kidogo, a twenty-one-year-old bonobo at the Milwaukee County Zoo suffers from a serious heart condition. He is feeble, lacking the normal stamina and self-confidence of a grown male. When first moved to Milwaukee Zoo, the keepers' shifting commands in the unfamiliar building thoroughly confused him. He failed to understand where to go when people urged him to move from one place to another. <u>Other apes in the group would step in, however, approach Kidogo, take him by the hand, and lead him in the right direction</u>. Barbara Bell, a caretaker and animal trainer, observed many instances of such spontaneous assistance and learned to call upon other bonobos to move Kidogo. If lost, Kidogo would utter distress calls, whereupon others would calm him down or act as his guides'** (p.157 of 210).

The same book contains this description of the bonobo's apparent sensitivity towards other creatures: **'Betty Walsh, a seasoned animal caretaker, observed the following incident involving a seven-year-old female bonobo named Kuni at Twycross Zoo in England. One day, Kuni captured a starling. Out of fear that she might molest the stunned bird, which appeared undamaged, the keeper urged the ape to let it go. Perhaps because of this encouragement, Kuni took the bird outside and gently set it onto its feet, the right way up, where it stayed, looking petrified. When it didn't move, Kuni threw it a little way, but it just fluttered. Not satisfied, Kuni picked up the starling with one hand and climbed to the highest point of the highest tree, where she wrapped her legs around the trunk, so that she had both hands free to hold the bird. She then carefully unfolded its wings and spread them wide open, one wing in each hand, before throwing the bird as hard as she could towards the barrier of the enclosure. Unfortunately, it fell short and landed onto the bank of the moat, where Kuni guarded it for a long time against a curious juvenile. By the end of the day, the bird was gone without a trace or feather. It is assumed that, recovered from its shock, it had flown away'** (p.156).

In the aforementioned book, *Kanzi: The Ape at the Brink of the Human Mind*, Sue Savage-Rumbaugh recounts the extreme elation and affection shown by her famous bonobo research subject, the young adult male Kanzi, when reunited with his mother Matata after a number of months apart: **'I sat down with him** [Kanzi] **and told him there was a *surprise* in the colony room. He began to vocalize in the way he does when expecting a favored food—"eeeh….eeeh….eeeh." I said, *No food surprise*. *Matata surprise*; *Matata in colony room*. He looked stunned, stared at me intently,**

and then ran to the colony room door, gesturing urgently for me to open it. When mother and son saw each other, they emitted earsplitting shrieks of excitement and joy and rushed to the wire that separated them. They both pushed their hands through the wire, to touch the other as best they could. Witnessing this display of emotion, I hadn't the heart to keep them apart any longer, and opened the connecting door. Kanzi leapt into Matata's arms, and they screamed and hugged for fully five minutes, and then stepped back to gaze at each other in happiness. They then played like children, laughing all the time as only bonobos can. The laughter of a bonobo sounds like the laughter of someone who has laughed so hard that he has run out of air but can't stop laughing anyway. Eventually, exhausted, Kanzi and Matata quieted down and began tenderly grooming each other' (pp.143-144 of 299).

Further wonderful descriptions of the extraordinarily integrative behaviour of bonobos can be found in the Australian primatologist Vanessa Woods' 2010 book, *Bonobo Handshake*.

To conclude this description of the incredible world of bonobos I should again emphasise their ability to nurture their infants, especially since this ability to nurture is the key to the whole love-indoctrination process. While some remarkable photographs of bonobo mothers with their infants were included earlier in Part 8:4B, the most revealing evidence I have seen of the ability of bonobos to nurture their infants and the wondrous effects such nurturing has on their offspring appears in the 2011 French documentary *Bonobos*, which was directed by Alain Tixier. A short segment from the documentary showing the tenderness of the bonobo mothers and the absolute joy and zest for life of their infants can be seen at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=zs71s6oGxpQ>. Copies of the documentary are difficult to obtain, however, we managed to order one through <www.amazon.fr>. If you can't understand the French commentary, it is a story about a young bonobo called Beny who is sold as a pet after his mother is killed by poachers and then rescued by Claudine André who takes him to her wonderful sanctuary called Lola Ya Bonobo before eventually releasing him back into the Congo forest. While the commentary is superficial, there are these two very revealing comments in the short film about the making of the documentary. Alain Tixier says to camera, **'The choice to do a film about bonobos was because they're surely the most fascinating animals on the planet. They're the closest animals to man. They're the only animals capable of creating the same "gaze" as a human. When you look at a bonobo you're taken aback because you can see behind the eyes it's not just curiosity, it's understanding. We see human beings in the eyes of the bonobo.'** And the film's animal advisor, Patrick Bleuzen, says to camera, **'Once I got hit on the head with a branch that had a bonobo on it. I sat down and the bonobo noticed I was in a difficult situation and came and took me by the hand and moved my hair back, like they do. So they live on compassion, and that's really interesting to experience.'**

Part 8:4G The fragility of the love-indoctrination, mate selection process

In Parts 8:4B and 8:4D it was explained that love-indoctrination is an extremely difficult process to develop, but not impossible. Its difficulty was illustrated by the fact that while chimpanzees, gorillas and orangutans have been able to develop a high degree of love-indoctrinated selflessness and the equivalent (or thereabouts) level of consciousness of that of a two-year-old human, where they have self-awareness and can recognise, appreciate and favour selfless behaviour, not one of these species has been able to completely bring an end to the 'animal condition' because they still live in a male-dominated, patriarchal world where males aggressively compete for mating opportunities. It was also stressed that even the bonobos who *have* been able to develop love-indoctrination to the point of bringing to an end male competition for mating opportunities and the male dominated world that results from it, have not yet completed the process because they still need to use sex as an appeasement device to contain residual aggression. So although the development of love-indoctrination assisted by mate selection meant the impasse to developing the fully integrated state had been finally completely breached, that didn't mean the fully integrated state would automatically develop. Rather, the technology was in place for it to be developed but the process was still a difficult one to complete. What follows are some powerful illustrations that show just how difficult and fragile the development of integration through love-indoctrination and mate selection is.

To provide background to these illustrations I first need to introduce the work of the legendary and visionary palaeontologist Louis Leakey (1903-1972). The son of British missionaries in Kenya (where he was born), Leakey so believed **'that knowledge of the past would help us to understand and possibly control the future'** (*Disclosing the Past*, Mary Leakey, 1984) that in 1959, against prevailing views, he began the search for fossil evidence of the emergence of humans in Africa. This search, which was to prove stunningly successful, wasn't Leakey's only incredibly inspired initiative, he also handpicked three women to study the great apes in their natural habitat—Jane Goodall, who began her field study of chimpanzees in Tanzania in 1960; Dian Fossey, who began her field study of gorillas in Rwanda in 1967; and Birute Galdikas, who began her field study of orangutans in South East Asia in 1971. As part of his plan to only study the African apes Leakey originally wanted Galdikas to study bonobos but because of the difficulties involved in living in the Congo she ended up studying the orangutans in Borneo instead. So impressed by, and thankful for, Leakey's initiatives in palaeontology and primatology—the former of which his wife Mary, son Richard and his wife Meave, and granddaughter Louise have carried on—that I dedicated my 1991 book *Beyond The Human Condition* to him (alongside Sir Laurens van der Post and Sir James Darling).

With Dian Fossey Leakey 'struck gold', for she fearlessly acknowledged the truth in what she was observing about the crucial role nurturing was playing in producing the exceptional gentleness and cooperativeness of gorillas. Fossey was a remarkably strong-willed woman and the universally practiced denial-complying variety of mechanistic science held little sway over her. It seems entirely appropriate that after she was murdered at her research station in Rwanda in 1985 she was buried alongside her gentle gorilla friend Digit, who had given his life defending his group from poachers.

Without the relief from unbearable self-confrontation that comes from being able to understand the human condition, few, if any, have been able to cope with the honesty of Fossey's studies and, as a result, she has been misrepresented as merely a fanatical gorilla conservationist—such as in the 1988 film of her life, *Gorillas in the Mist*. However, Fossey's wonderful treatise on gorilla behaviour—the 1983 book *Gorillas in the Mist* upon which the film was based—shows just how courageous a scientist she was. As mentioned in Part 8:4F, and prior to that in Part 5:1, when illustrating the strength of character that had to be developed to curtail male aggression and the centred, security of self needed to be an effective, love-indoctrinating mother, Fossey, in *Gorillas in the Mist*, wrote about how **'Old Goat'** was **'an exemplary parent'** and that, as a result, her son **'Tiger'** was **'a contented and well adjusted individual'**. While gorillas have not been able to develop as much love-indoctrination as bonobos, seemingly because they have lacked ideal nursery conditions, denial-free, honest studies of their behaviour, in particular Fossey's, have revealed the strong relationship between nurturing and integrativeness that is the love-indoctrination process. The following extracts from *Gorillas in the Mist* reveal more about Old Goat's nurturing of Tiger. Not only that, they also reveal the extreme fragility of the love-indoctrination process, showing how any disruption to it would result in a regression back to the competitive, each-for-his-own, opportunistic, divisive, 'animal condition' existence. Again, the underlinings have been added for emphasis: **'Like human mothers, gorilla mothers show a great variation in the treatment of their offspring. The contrasts were particularly marked between** [the gorilla mothers] **Old Goat and Flossie. Flossie was very casual in the handling, grooming, and support of both of her infants, whereas Old Goat was an <u>exemplary parent</u>'** (p.174 of 282). The effect of Old Goat's **'exemplary parenting'** of Tiger is apparent in the following extract: **'Like Digit, Tiger also was taking his place in Group 4's <u>growing cohesiveness</u>. By the age of five, Tiger was surrounded by playmates his own age, <u>a loving mother, and a protective group leader</u>. He was <u>a contented and well-adjusted individual whose zest for living was almost contagious</u> for the other animals of his group. His sense of <u>well-being</u> was often expressed by a characteristic facial "grimace"'** (pp.186-187). The **'growing cohesiveness'** (developing integration) brought about by **'loving mother**[s]**, and a protective group leader'** is love-indoctrination.

Incidentally, with regard to the **'protective group leader**[s]**'**, namely the male silverback gorillas, their large size is not only due to having to compete for dominance but also reflects that while bonobos depend on the safety of trees for the secure, threat-free environment, gorillas evidently selected for physical size and great strength, particularly in the males, to protect their groups from external, predatory threats—as the anthropologist Adolph H. Schultz noted, the adult male gorilla **'is a remarkably peaceful creature, using its incredible strength merely in self-defence'** (*The Life of Primates*, 1969, p.34 of 281).

Fossey's account of the love-indoctrinated Tiger later in life illustrates how nurtured love is necessary to produce the integrated group. It describes how the secure, integrative, loving Tiger tried to maintain integration or love in the presence of an aggressive, divisive gorilla after the group's integrative silverback leader, Uncle Bert, was shot by poachers: **'The newly orphaned Kweli, deprived of his mother, Macho, and his father, Uncle Bert, and bearing a bullet wound himself, came to <u>rely only on Tiger for grooming the wound, cuddling, and sharing warmth in nightly nests</u>. Wearing <u>concerned</u> facial expressions, Tiger stayed near the three-year-old, <u>responding</u> to his cries with <u>comforting</u> belch vocalizations. As Group 4's new young leader, Tiger <u>regulated</u> the animals' feeding**

and travel pace whenever Kweli fell behind. Despondency alone seemed to pose the most critical threat to Kweli's survival during August 1978. Beetsme…was a significant menace to what remained of Group 4's solidarity. The immigrant, approximately two years older than Tiger and finding himself the oldest male within the group led by a younger animal, quickly developed an unruly desire to dominate. Although still sexually immature, Beetsme took advantage of his age and size to begin severely tormenting old Flossie three days after Uncle Bert's death. Beetsme's aggression was particularly threatening to Uncle Bert's last offspring, Frito [son of Flossie]**. By killing Frito, Beetsme would be destroying an infant sired by a competitor, and Flossie would again become fertile. Neither young Tiger nor the aging female was any match against Beetsme. Twenty-two days after Uncle Bert's killing, Beetsme succeeded in killing fifty-four-day-old Frito even with the unfailing efforts of Tiger and the other Group 4 members to defend the mother and infant…Frito's death provided more evidence, however indirect, of the devastation poachers create by killing the leader of a gorilla group. Two days after Frito's death Flossie was observed soliciting copulations from Beetsme, not for sexual or even reproductive reasons—she had not yet returned to cyclicity and Beetsme still was sexually immature. Undoubtedly her invitations were conciliatory measures aimed at reducing his continuing physical harassment. I found myself strongly disliking Beetsme as I watched his discord destroy what remained of all that Uncle Bert had succeeded in creating and defending over the past ten years…I also became increasingly concerned about Kweli, who had been, only a few months previously, Group 4's most vivacious and frolicsome infant. The three-year-old's lethargy and depression were increasing daily even though Tiger tried to be both mother and father to the orphan. Three months following his gunshot wound and the loss of both parents, Kweli gave up the will to survive…It was difficult to think of Beetsme as an integral member of Group 4 because of his continual abuse of the others in futile efforts to establish domination, particularly over the indomitable Tiger…Tiger helped maintain cohesiveness by "mothering" Titus and subduing Beetsme's rowdiness. Because of Tiger's influence and the immaturity of all three males, they remained together'** (pp.218-221).

It is clear from this account how very easily any disruption to the love-indoctrination process can cause a regression back to the competitive, opportunistic, each-for-his-own, pre-love-indoctrination, 'animal condition' situation.

A further example of the difficulty of completing the love-indoctrination process comes from studies of chimpanzees, particularly Jane Goodall's studies of chimpanzees at the Gombe Stream National Park in Tanzania. In 1996 the British primatologist Richard Wrangham published a book titled *Demonic Males* in which he suggested that our aggressive human nature can be traced back to the kind of aggression found in chimpanzees. To support his theory, Wrangham particularly referred to the killing and partial eating of a human child by a male chimpanzee named Frodo, and the killing by one group of male chimpanzees of nearly all the members of a neighbouring group—both incidences involving Goodall's research troops at Gombe. The following is a condensation of dialogue from the 2004 BBC documentary, *The Demonic Ape*, which was based on Wrangham's demonic male hypothesis and featured Goodall.

Early in the documentary, to illustrate the similar level of consciousness a chimpanzee has with a young human, footage is shown of a human child demonstrating that she is capable of what is called 'theory of mind', which is being able to know what another person is thinking. Goodall is then seen to observe that **'chimpanzees'** also **'clearly…do have theory of mind'**. Further on the narrator says that **'we discovered the so-called** [chimpanzee] **vegetarians**

are hunters, they're particularly fond of baby monkeys', to which Wrangham comments, **'You get incredibly excited when you watch chimps hunting…because you identify so strongly with the chimpanzee. They are so intent and they are so excited, the passion that they feel** [in killing and eating a monkey] **is just so extraordinary…there is far more meat eating going on in chimpanzees than there is in any other species of primate than humans.'** The narrator then says that Goodall found that chimpanzees **'did something else that was far more chilling, they killed their own kind. In the sixties the group that Goodall studied split into two factions, Kasakela & Kahama. The rivalry between the two turned into a bloody civil war…One by one the males in the Kasakela group killed every male and some of the females in their neighbouring group. Only a few years before the victims had been their constant companions.'** The program then reported how chimps from one community killed, mutilated and pounded on the body of a neighbouring chimp: **'They'd ripped his trachea out, they'd removed his testicles.'** Wrangham commented that **'There is a sense in which this looks sadistic, the joy, this is kind of hard to take you know because again it's got horrible echoes of what happens with humans at times. The males who attack, they do seem to take a certain joy in the attack, their drinking of the blood sometimes…They look as though they're in a state of intense excitement and maybe joy.'** The narrator then says, **'Chimpanzees can be described as sadistic because they have theory of mind, they know when they're inflicting pain. Not all animals have this ability.'** The primatologist Frans de Waal then observes that **'You cannot have cruelty in creatures that don't have empathy…I don't think a shark can be cruel, it doesn't have the brains to understand what the effect is of its actions. Now chimpanzees do have that kind of understanding. Chimpanzees have empathy and sympathy and so as a result they can also inflict pain on purpose I think.'** The narrator then comments that **'There is only one other animal on the planet that has a similarly dark side, human beings…Because of these revelations Richard Wrangham…put together…**[a theory] **about the origins of human behaviour** [claiming that] **what chimpanzee aggression seems to show is that we, like them, are programmed to be violent. Wrangham calls his theory the demonic male hypothesis'**, because, according to Wrangham, **'of course essentially females don't do it'**. The narrator adds that **'In Britain men are 24 times more likely to kill or assault another person, and 263 times more likely to commit a sexual offence than a woman.'**

The narrator then says that **'Of all the demonic males there have been at Gombe the most demonic is Frodo.'** Goodall adds, **'Frodo was aggressive from a very small age…**[and grew up to be] **a real bully.'** The narrator then reports that **'In 1998 Frodo…became the dominant male. From the start it was clear that Frodo would rule through brute force…he attacked Jane Goodall herself…Not only is Frodo the most powerful chimpanzee at Gombe he is also its finest hunter. In four years he reduced the Colobus monkey population by 10 percent single-handedly…In May 2002 Frodo battered to death…**[a human] **baby girl…The baby's body had been gruesomely mutilated.'**

The narrator then says, **'So had Frodo behaved like a predatory animal, or was this a partially human act, a murder? There is a third possibility…Deep in the heart of the Congo in an area known as the Goualougo Triangle, a young American scientist** [Crickette Sanz] **has recently begun to study a group of chimpanzees…**[who had] **never seen a human being before…**[and, while] **The chimpanzees of the Goualougo are like those at Gombe,** [in that] **they too use tools and they have their own culture…there is one crucial difference, they are not as aggressive.'** Sanz confirms this saying, **'we've never seen chimps killing other chimps. We haven't seen highly elevated territorial disputes.'**

The narrator then points out that **'The place where most violence in chimpanzees has been witnessed is Gombe, and the circumstances are indeed special…Once Gombe was surrounded by forest**

but now the trees have been felled. There is a village within the park which is expanding, refugees surround it. The chimps are completely cut off from the rest of the rainforest.' The primatologist Christophe Boesch adds, **'People are to realise that this encroachment that humans do on nature… including chimpanzees…can present a tremendous stress on them.'** The narrator then comments that **'Chimpanzees in these long term study sites are losing out to logging companies and to poachers who invade the rainforest and snare them for bush meat…Some now believe that stress caused by humans can make chimpanzees more violent.'** Jane Goodall then says, **'I didn't see aggression to start with. There's no question that chimpanzees become more aggressive as a result of crowding, as a result of competition for food.'** The anthropologist Robert Sussman then notes that **'she** [Goodall] **actually stated that the chimpanzees were much less aggressive than they were after provisioning** [them with food to attract them to her study area, which she had been doing for many years]**'**. After which, the narrator concludes that **'In our desire to understand ourselves we may have distorted the very animals we were using as a mirror. We do share much with our closest ancestors, but ultimately chimpanzees are not windows into the human soul.'**

Yes, this last comment is perceptive: chimpanzee (and gorilla) behaviour does **'not'** provide a window into our human nature. It *does* provide a window into the origins of our moral 'soul' but *not* into our present aggressive, human-condition-afflicted behaviour—and I'm sure that in saying **'into the human soul'** what was meant was 'into human nature' because the documentary is all about the origins of our aggressive nature, not the origins of our moral soul. It is about the **'demonic male hypothesis'**; **'that we, like them** [chimpanzees]**, are programmed to be violent'**; that **'the origins of human behaviour'**, our **'dark side'** can be found in the brutal behaviour of these chimpanzees. As we are now able to understand, the immensely upset, brutally angry, aggressive and murderous state of the human condition that we suffer from is a result of the conflict that emerged well after this two-year-old-equivalent infancy stage of consciousness that chimpanzees and gorillas are presently in. In fact, as all the relatively innocent races, such as the Bushmen of the Kalahari, evidence, it is us modern humans today who are the extremely upset, aggressive variety of humans. We humans progressed from an original innocent, upset-free state to an increasingly upset, angry and aggressive state. There are millions of years between the time when we were living in our primate infancy stage and our present extremely upset, human-condition-afflicted, late adolescence stage. To say that **'we, like them** [chimpanzees]**, are programmed to be violent'** provided a convenient excuse for our extremely divisive behaviour—and, no doubt, many people felt relieved to be able to blame our violent behaviour on our distant ape ancestry—but it is not true: we humans have an unconditionally selfless, all-loving instinctive heritage, not a brutal, aggressive one.

But if our aggressive behaviour is not related to this aggressive behaviour in chimpanzees, what is the cause of this **'demonic'** behaviour in these chimpanzees? Firstly, as the evidence provided in the documentary reveals, the lives of the demonically behaved chimpanzees at Gombe have suffered extreme disruption. The ideal nursery conditions that the process of love-indoctrination is so reliant on have been decimated; in terms of the analogy of being swept back downstream, the lives of these chimpanzees have been hit by a tsunami of disruption. But why would this disruption make them **'demonic'**? In Part 8:4D it was described how relieving and exciting it would have been for our ape ancestors—and for bonobos now—to be liberated from the horrible oppression of the 'animal condition' and at last allowed to

be part of the all-loving, true, integrative, 'Godly', 'heavenly' state. It was emphasised that being afflicted by the human condition where we have practiced living in deep denial of the existence of the all-loving, integrative, true world makes it virtually impossible for us humans to now recognise the excitement, relief and satisfaction that comes with being able to access the integrative, all-loving true world, nevertheless, the truth is that it is an awesomely wonderful state to be able to access. While chimpanzees, gorillas and orangutans haven't been able to become fully liberated from the competitive and aggressive animal condition and become fully part of the all-loving, integrative, 'Godly', 'heavenly' true world, they have been able to be part of it to a significant degree, significant enough for these chimpanzees at Gombe to be psychologically devastated from having lost access to it. The demonic behaviour of the Gombe chimpanzees (especially Frodo who, like the gorilla Beetsme, obviously suffered from a lack of nurturing as an infant) would have arisen from the fact that knowing both instinctively and consciously of the existence of the all-loving, animal-condition-free, true world, and then being denied access to it, effectively rejected from it, left them feeling extremely distressed, resentful and angry—even furious to the point of being hateful and sadistic. Once you have a situation of love then you also have the potential for the reversal of that situation, for the possibility of the situation of there *not* being love—there exists a negative counter-position. For once animals know love, to then find themselves deprived of it and/or unable to be loving is a *very* frustrating, upsetting and even guilt-producing situation to be in. In the case of the human condition, what the human race did to artificially rid itself of the agony of that condition was to say that there is no integrative meaning/purpose to life because then there was no problem with not being integrative, no dilemma and thus no agony of the human condition from which to suffer. We got rid of the positive situation so we wouldn't experience the negative situation—actually, we only deluded ourselves we had eliminated the positive situation; as stated, we only 'artificially' rid ourselves of it—but the point being revealed is that once you have the positive situation then you also have the potential for the distressing negative situation to occur. Once a species was liberated from the animal condition and knew love, whenever there was a subsequent breakdown in nurturing, or a break-out of competition for resources, those animals then *knew* what they were missing out on and/or not behaving in accordance with, which could make them *extremely* upset, psychotic (soul-hurt) and neurotic (mind-distressed); it could make them **'demonic'**.

The commentary in the documentary actually seems to recognise that there is psychosis and neurosis involved in the behaviour of the chimpanzees, with the narrator having noted that **'Chimpanzees can be described as sadistic because they have theory of mind, they know when they're inflicting pain. Not all animals have this ability.'** Similarly, Frans de Waal was recorded as saying, **'You cannot have cruelty in creatures that don't have empathy…I don't think a shark can be cruel, it doesn't have the brains to understand what the effect is of its actions. Now chimpanzees do have that kind of understanding. Chimpanzees have empathy and sympathy and so as a result they can also inflict pain on purpose I think.'** Recognising that chimpanzees **'understand'** the **'effect**[s]**'** of their **'actions'** and **'have empathy and sympathy'** leaves the inference that something has happened in the **'understanding'** mind of these chimps for them to no longer be **'empath**[etic]**'** and **'sympath**[etic]**'**; it infers that they have been psychologically and neurologically upset—that their psyche or soul has been hurt and their conscious mind has become distressed and angry.

Yes, as has been emphasised, any breakdown in nurturing, or any disruption to the all-equally-nurtured situation, invariably leads to a reversion to the old 'each-for-his-own', opportunistic, selfish-genes-rule, competitive and aggressive 'animal condition', which *can* be extremely upsetting because it *is* such a retreat from the ideal, all-loving state. We saw at Gombe how **'Frodo was aggressive from a very small age…**[and grew up to be] **a real bully'**, and how **'From the start** [of the time he **became the dominant male**] it **was clear that Frodo would rule through brute force.'** We similarly saw in Fossey's studies of mountain gorillas how **'Beetsme…was a significant menace to what remained of Group 4's solidarity'**, how he **'quickly developed an unruly desire to dominate'**, how he began **'severely tormenting old Flossie three days after Uncle Bert's death'** despite **'the unfailing efforts of Tiger'** to stop **'his continuing physical harassment'**, and how Fossey found herself **'strongly disliking Beetsme as** [she] **watched his discord destroy what remained of all that Uncle Bert had succeeded in creating and defending over the past ten years'**.

So, our upset human condition is not a result of **'we, like them** [chimpanzees]**'** having been **'programmed to be violent'**, as the **'demonic male hypothesis'** claims, rather **'the origins of human behaviour'**, our **'dark side'**, results from a psychological and neurological conflict that developed *after* the infancy stage that the great apes are presently in. It was during the latter stages of childhood, when our conscious mind began to experiment in self-management in the presence of instincts that are **'programmed to be'** loving, *not* **'violent'**, that our upset condition emerged. As usual with our practice of denial, while using the reverse-of-the-truth lie that our instincts are **'violent'** relieved our conscious mind of its sense of guilt it only served to bury us deeper into Plato's dark cave of deathly alienation.

It should also be clarified that while women are less aggressive than men—that, to use the statistic cited earlier, **'In Britain men are 24 times more likely to kill or assault another person, and 263 times more likely to commit a sexual offence than a woman'**—the reason men are so aggressive is because, as explained in Part 7:1, they were the ones who had to take up the extremely upsetting task of championing the conscious thinking self or ego over the ignorance of our original instinctive self. As explained, the aggression of male chimpanzees is a result of that species having not yet reined in the animal condition where males relentlessly compete for mating opportunities. There is a world of difference between the human condition and the animal condition.

Another powerful illustration of the effect of a breakdown in nurturing is supplied by zookeeper Barbara Bell and Professor Harry Prosen's work with bonobos at the Milwaukee County Zoo in the USA, which has one of the largest collections of captive bonobos in the world. Harry Prosen, who is Professor Emeritus at the Medical College of Wisconsin, provided the wonderfully enthusiastic commendation in Part 2:2 of our work at the WTM of bringing understanding to the human condition. Barbara Bell was also introduced earlier in Part 8:4F when describing the integrative behaviour of bonobos. The following is a condensation of a radio interview that was conducted in 2012 with Harry Prosen and Barbara Bell about a very disturbed bonobo named Brian whose condition had, fifteen years earlier, prompted the Milwaukee County Zoo to seek Professor Prosen's assistance. (The full interview, which was broadcast on the *Lake Effect* program on Milwaukee Public Radio on 21 February 2012, can be listened to at: <www.youtube.com/watch?v=_SW0re1LGOs>).

Barbara Bell: **'Brian came to us as a very young individual from another institution. He had not had a normal social upbringing** [later in the interview Bell said that **unfortunately Brian never had a mother…so that's half his problem**]**…What we didn't understand was how severely disturbed** [Brian] **was mentally…Brian was seven years old and he had developed a lot of behaviours that were self-destructive. Some were physical, like he would sit and bang his head on the wall, he would pick his fingernails off. I think we could consider him bulimic, with the vomiting that he would do. When an animal is self-destructing to a point where you have self-mutilation that has to be stopped or the animal will not survive…that is where Harry came in because we had no clue what to do.'**

Harry Prosen then said that **'I proceeded to do what I had done for many years with humans in difficulty and that was to have a case conference…which actually led me to a psychiatric human diagnosis. I thought that Brian had a social anxiety disorder, with a lot of infantile aspects to it, that his development had been regressed or held back. As Brian developed he began to try to act like a mature male and then he'd get torn apart, not literally, but pretty badly** [by the other bonobos because, according to Bell further on in the interview, Brian **had absolutely no social culture** and as a result **they didn't consider him worthy of being in the troop**]**…I realised that mimicry was a way of surviving for some of these adolescent males who are mature in body but had not gone through the normal developmental processes for a bonobo male. And then, using that knowledge, we worked together and Barbara tried many different social groupings. We put Brian on a little medication for his anxiety and it took probably a year or two to begin to see some changes in behaviour but the self-destruction diminished and Brian began to thrive.'**

Bell then said, **'We talked to Dr Prosen…**[and from his] **advice…**[we worked out] **what we could do…Brian had his whole day planned out, we didn't deviate one minute, every day was predictable because this animal lived in fear of change…bonobos'… brains are very plastic, they go with the flow** [but that left]**…Brian swimming in the deep end. So he had to go all the way back and learn how to be a little boy again, and learn how to have joy. So one thing we did was to pair him up with kids** [**two to three year old** bonobos] **who were much younger than him to teach him proper play behaviour…so Brian had to go all the way back, learn the right sequence of play behaviours in order to grow mentally.'**

Prosen concluded: **'It is very significant to realise that a lot of bonobo psychological difficulty is almost identical to that that we see in humans…Barbara and I gave a paper** [about our work with Brian that]**…got worldwide attention and invitations to talk and a multitude of consultations…**[from other institutions about] **problems they were having with bonobos.'**

In commenting on this interview, I would firstly like to point out that there is strong evidence of bonobos favouring integrativeness in Barbara Bell's comment that the reason the bonobo troop attacked Brian was because **'he had absolutely no social culture'** and as a result **'they didn't consider him worthy of being in the troop'**. But more significantly, I should say that what is **'almost identical'** about the psychology of bonobos and humans is not that bonobos suffer from an instinct versus intellect type human condition, but that through love-indoctrination they, like humans, have developed a deep appreciation of love both instinctively and consciously and therefore, like humans, psychologically suffer when they are deprived of that love. In terms of how much nurturing bonobos have been able to develop and, as a result, how sensitive they are to the ideal, all-loving true world, Harry Prosen had this to say in the interview: **'I think what I found extremely interesting is that bonobos are a matriarchal society whereas chimpanzees are patriarchal and that makes for a lot of very interesting**

differences between the two species. I became interested because my background work has always been in empathy and very quickly…I realised that bonobos are extremely empathic and that really turned my interest on…Empathy is kind of the realisation of the feelings of somebody else…Bonobos are I think the most empathic creatures next to *Homo sapiens*…brain imaging has also shown that bonobos have empathic brain centres just as humans do.'

In terms of Harry Prosen's enthusiastic support of my work, I think this comment, also made in the interview, is particularly relevant: **'My background is that of a psychotherapist. I've been treating people in psychotherapy for many, many years and my original training was in dynamics therapy…by that I mean I have to understand where my patients are coming from, their background, which is why I wanted a history on Brian, and out of that I can build a picture—I think I can understand why many of the symptoms that we see are there. And once you understand then you can begin to design treatment programs or therapeutic programs.'** Yes, as Harry Prosen has often said to us at the WTM, what he values so highly about the explanation of the human condition that we are putting forward is that it supplies the **'understand**[ing]**'** of where all the pain in humans is **'coming from'**, which is the crucial understanding we need to **'begin to design treatment programs'** for the entire human race.

I might mention that Harry Prosen and his wife Yvonne have become very great friends of mine and of us all in the WTM. They stayed with us in Sydney in 2007 and I have spoken on the phone to Harry in America on average two or three times a month since he first responded to our documentary proposal in 2005 to the present time of writing, which is 2012, and throughout this time, he has been consistently enthusiastic in helping and encouraging us all. I should also say that Harry's recognition of the importance of the explanation of the human condition is no surprise given his life's work studying empathy closely parallels my own study of the human condition—after all, 'empathy' is simply mechanistic science's evasive word for 'love', for the consideration of others; so studying empathy means studying love, the effect of it and the effect of the lack of it, which is what study of the human condition boils down to. Harry is a most wonderful psychotherapist, capable of a truly extraordinary co-presence, and he has deep insight into human and animal nature, all of which is apparent if you listen to him in the 2012 radio interview that the above extracts are taken from. In fact, Harry is a denial-free, prophetic thinker, someone blessed with an ability to look *into* the human condition, and we in the WTM are so very, very fortunate to have his great love and support.

To return now to our comparative analysis of primates, the distressing situation of having been 'locked out of love', then to finally being allowed into the world of love, only to be thrown out of love once more, has also occurred in the lineage of orangutans.

What inhibited the development of love-indoctrinated integration in the lives of orangutans is the scarcity of food in their native forests of South East Asia. Orangutan infants are nurtured with love in a long infancy only to suffer being thrown out of love when, as

adults, they have to live mostly solitary lives due to shortage of food. Older orangutans have a reputation for being morose and bad-tempered and it makes sense that this 'outcast' existence would be the cause. In fact, an article published in 2006 in *Scientific American* described a study comparing orangutans living in the isolated, food abundant Kluet swamp in Sumatra with those cut off from the swamp and that abundant food supply by the wide Alas River. The Kluet orangutans are more social, outgoing and gregarious. They also show a greater propensity to innovate and use tools, presumably because the greater interaction allows for innovations to be shared, passed on and thus accumulated (*Scientific American*, Vol.16, no.2, 2006, pp.30-37).

Of the monkeys, in the case of baboons, as the quote from Shirley Strum's study of her Pumphouse Gang troop of baboons in Kenya that was included earlier indicated, the females of the species are beginning to contain competitive male sexual opportunism, which implies they have been able to develop some integration through love-indoctrination and mate selection. It was described how Peggy, who was an extraordinarily self-assured, strong-willed, authoritative, charismatic individual, successfully led the Pumphouse Gang for many years. In Strum's words: **'She** [Peggy] **was the highest-ranking female in the troop, and her presence often turned the tide in favor of the animal she sponsored. While every adult male outranked her by sheer size and physical strength, she exerted considerable social pressure on each member of the troop. Her family also outranked all the others…another reason for the contentment in this particular family was Peggy's personality. She was a strong, calm, social animal, self-assured yet not pushy, forceful yet not tyrannical'** (*Almost Human: a journey into the world of baboons*, Shirley C. Strum, 1987, pp.38-39 of 294). As with chimpanzees, gorillas and orangutans, the difficulty for baboons is that their natural environment is normally not one in which food is plentiful.

At this point, it would be interesting to look at the lives of some other monkey species.

The capuchins from South America have by far the largest brain to body size ratio and are considered much more intelligent than other monkeys—but they have not yet attained the level of consciousness where they have an awareness of the concept of 'I' or self and can recognise themselves in a mirror, as the great apes can. As has been briefly explained, love-indoctrination liberated consciousness, so the degree to which love-indoctrination can be developed in a species is the degree to which that species can become conscious. Capuchin females are extremely maternal and nurse their infants for a longer period than other monkeys, weaning them in their second year. Both male and female capuchins live for over 40 years compared to the 20 or so years managed by most other monkeys, possibly reflecting the drawn out stages of maturation mentioned earlier that may result from extending the infancy stage to allow for longer nurturing. Female capuchins decide when and with which individual to mate and have been observed forming successful coalitions against males. Male against male competition is less obvious amongst capuchins than in other monkeys and, like the bonobos, capuchins frequently engage in same-sex sexual interactions.

It should be mentioned that the weaning of offspring, which all species have to practice because offspring have to grow up and take their place in the adult world at some stage, is itself an example of having to be thrown out of love, of having to leave the love-indoctrinated state. Offspring typically don't like being weaned, they don't like being thrown out of love, and this resistance is evidence of the beauty and magnificence of the fully integrated maternal situation. Weaning for any species, especially for mammals who suckle their young and therefore develop a lot of love-indoctrinated integration, is akin to being thrown out of the all-loving situation into the hard reality of the animal condition.

The following descriptions of the endangered muriqui or woolly spider monkeys indicate that this species has also been able to develop some degree of love-indoctrination: **'Wrangham and Peterson suggest that a South American monkey, the muriqui, displays similar behaviours to the bonobo, with females being co-dominant, males less aggressive and females more sexual than other mammals'** (from website of Stuart Birk, senior lecturer at Massey University, New Zealand: see <www.wtmsources.com/196>). **'The mating system** [of the muriqui] **is polygamous, with individuals being promiscuous. Embracing is a behavior important to maintaining social bonds. There is very little aggression among group members. Males spend a large amount of time close together without aggressive encounters'** (references: Emmons & Feer 1997, Flannery 2000, Nowak 1999, from *Animal Info—Muriquis* on website <www.animalinfo.org>).

With regard to other animal species, dolphins and elephants, like the great apes, have also passed the mirror test and demonstrated the ability to recognise themselves, demonstrated that they have a sense of self-awareness, but obviously they are not as facilitated as primates to hold and look after a helpless infant and thus leave their infants in infancy for the protracted period necessary for training or indoctrination in unconditional selflessness or love to occur. However, every species *would* try to develop as much love-indoctrinated integration as their circumstances permit and the extended lifespan that larger size seems to permit has apparently allowed elephants and dolphins to leave their infants in infancy for a relatively long time, and thus to develop a degree of love-indoctrination. They are also nursing mammals, which means they have already established a bond between mother and offspring, which is the basis for love-indoctrination and thus rudimentary consciousness. Also, the size of elephants has greatly reduced the threat of predation thus allowing them to prolong infancy. (This lack of predators may also be relevant in the potential for dolphins to develop love-indoctrination.) And yes, elephants also have a trunk that they can use to cuddle, protect and reassure their young—and they do become psychotic and neurotic when they are not loved or when they are subjected to an extremely unloving situation, which suggests they have become aware of the all-magic, 'heavenly' world of love. It's no wonder then that we humans are especially drawn to elephants and dolphins, because they, and possibly whales, have at least broken part-way into the love-indoctrinated, all-loving, integrative true world, which we intuitively recognise.

To conclude this summary of the effects of love-indoctrination on non-human species, at the end of Part 3:11H it was stated that we have now at last presented the true story of the emergence of the human race—well, now that we have explained the animal condition and how love-indoctrination was able to variously liberate animal species from it, we can now also finally present the true story of the emergence of *all* species. We can explain and describe

where all animals are on the 'ladder' of integration—starting with the bonobos, which are by far the most advanced of all primates behind humans who, as will be summarised next in Part 8:4H, reached the top of the integration ladder some five million years ago. Since chimpanzees, gorillas and orangutans are still patriarchal or male-dominated they are less integrated than bonobos. And so it goes on; according to how much love indoctrination they can develop, other species are variously stranded down the rungs of that ladder. Yes, the full story of life on Earth can be, and has at last been, told!

It might be pointed out that in order to explain the origins of humans' moral nature and the human condition that it gave rise to, and to also explain the differences between other animal species in terms of how much integration they have been able to develop, the truth of Integrative Meaning and the unconditional selflessness or love needed to achieve it had to be discussed. As such, this whole presentation has been one long dissertation on love. Given mechanistic biology was living in such deep denial of any truths that brought the issue of the human condition into focus that it couldn't even recognise 'love' as a meaningful concept it is no wonder it hasn't been able to make any real sense of either human or animal behaviour—as mentioned in Parts 4:7 and 8:1, the linguist Robin Allott neatly summed up mechanistic science's attitude to love when he wrote that **'Love has been described as a taboo subject, not serious, not appropriate for scientific study'**! Much more will be said in Part 8:13 about mechanistic science's denial of the concept of love, but this extract (from Part 8:13) powerfully illustrates just how extremely insecure mechanistic science has been: 'In his 1989 book *Peacemaking Among Primates*, Frans de Waal records: **'For some scientists it was hard to accept that monkeys may have feelings. In** [the 1979 book] ***The Human Model…*** [authors Harry F.] **Harlow and** [Clara E.] **Mears describe the following strained meeting: "Harlow used the term 'love', at which the psychiatrist present countered with the word 'proximity'. Harlow then shifted to the word 'affection', with the psychiatrist again countering with 'proximity'. Harlow started to simmer, but relented when he realized that the closest the psychiatrist had probably ever come to love was proximity."'** Yes, without the defence for our corrupted human condition there have been *so* many truths that have been unbearable to confront, most especially the truth of the significance of love; it is no wonder that, to adopt Charles Birch's observation, biology had not made any real progress since Darwin!

Part 8:4H Humans' development of integration through love-indoctrination and mate selection

In the case of our ape ancestors, it is being suggested that love-indoctrination and mate selection of cooperativeness occurred for a sufficiently long period for cooperative integrativeness to become an instinctive part of their make-up, thus creating our 'moral sense'. It is important to remember, however, that this process involved an *indoctrination* or training in unconditional selflessness, not an *understanding* of it. The search for knowledge still had to take place, which is why the human-condition-producing clash between our instincts and intellect occurred.

To continue this explanation of our own species' path to integration, a comparative look at the physique of bonobos, the most integrated variety of primates, and the fossil evidence of our human ancestors is informative. 'Lucy', the 3.5 million year old *Australopithecus afarensis* fossil ancestor of humans discovered in the Rift Valley of Africa in 1974 by a team headed by the American paleoanthropologist Donald Johanson, shows an amazing similarity to the bone structure of the bonobo. The two are very similar in brain size, stature and in the length of the lower limbs, and are fairly similar in overall body proportions. Lucy's pelvis shows that she walked fully upright. The pelvis of a bonobo, while not quite as adapted to bipedalism/upright walking as Lucy's, is significantly more adapted than that of a chimpanzee. Interestingly, the finger bones of the australopithecines are more curved than those of chimpanzees (Stern and Susman, *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*, 60:279-313 1983, p.198). Since curved fingers are an adaption suited to climbing this may indicate that the australopithecines' immediate forebears were apes that frequently lived in trees, possibly like the bonobos, which are the most arboreal of the African apes. Possibly this arboreal aspect is related to jungle living as opposed to savannah life. And perhaps it was a similar food rich tropical environment to that which the bonobos benefit from that our ape ancestor also benefited from in terms of being able to develop love-indoctrination.

Left side: Bonobo skeleton. Right side: Early australopithecine, *Australopithecus afarensis*, skeleton. Drawing by Adrienne Zihlman from 'Pygmy chimps, people, and the pundits', *New Scientist,* 15 Nov. 1984.

I would now like to revisit the psychological stages of maturation that humans have progressed through from infancy to adulthood (that were initially outlined in Part 3:11), which, with understanding of the origins of our moral instincts and conscious mind, we can now fully understand. (This will also involve a comparative look at the level of psychological maturation that the bonobos have been able to achieve.)

In starting, I should reiterate that while we have not traditionally thought of humanity's maturation as progressing through the same stages we as individuals go through in our own lives, since all the members of a variety of early humans would have shared a relatively similar mental and psychological state it makes sense that each variety of early humans can also be described collectively by that shared mental and psychological state.

Individually, we each mature from 'infancy' to 'childhood' to 'adolescence' to 'adulthood'. To elaborate, infancy is when we develop sufficient consciousness to discover that we are at the centre of the changing array of experiences around us. We become aware of the concept of 'I' or self, which, as mentioned, is what bonobos and the other great apes are capable of. Childhood is when we begin to actively experiment or 'play' with the power of conscious free will, the power to manage events to our own desired ends. In the case of humanity, it was this experimentation in self-management that led to a conflict with our instincts and the emergence of the upset angry, egocentric and alienated state of the human condition. Adolescence is when we go in search of our identity, in search of who we are—in fact, go in search of understanding of our upset, corrupted human condition, for it was *only* understanding of why we became upset that could end our uncertainty about whether we were evil, worthless beings or not. Adulthood is when we finally gain understanding of ourselves, specifically understanding of why we became divisively behaved, and as a result are able to mature from insecure adolescence to secure adulthood and become upset-free conscious managers of our world. In short, infancy is 'I am', childhood is 'I can', adolescence is 'but who am I?' and adulthood is 'I know who I am'.

In the case of humanity, love-indoctrination took place in our species' infancy when we were trained in unconditional selflessness or love and became cooperative and integratively behaved. As briefly explained in Parts 8:4C and 8:4D, and as will be fully explained in Part 8:7B, infancy was also the period when that training in love liberated our consciousness. Since bonobos are approaching the state of complete integration and are exceptionally conscious or intelligent they are clearly approaching the end of the infancy stage; they are on the brink of 'childhood'—they are a species living on the threshold of the metaphorical 'Garden of Eden', 'Golden', totally integrated, cooperative, harmonious, peaceful state that our ape ancestors were able to develop and which our australopithecine ancestors inhabited. To further context where bonobos are in the journey negotiated by our human forebears: our ape ancestor was 'Infantman', who appeared some 12 million years ago with the emergence of apes and during whose time the nurturing, love-indoctrination process took place. Infantman gave rise to fully integrated, happy, untroubled, upset-free, playful 'Childman', the australopithecines, who emerged some 5 million years ago. Thus, bonobos are approaching where our human forebears were some 5 million years ago, as confirmed by the similarity between bonobo skeletons and the early australopithecine fossil skeleton known as 'Lucy'.

As described in Part 3:11, the first Childman was *Australopithecus afarensis*, who was 'Early Happy, Prime of Innocence Childman'. They evolved into *A. africanus* who was 'Middle Demonstrative Childman', who in turn developed into *A. boisei*, 'Late Naughty Childman'. At each stage consciousness was asserting itself more and more, from being intellectually demonstrative to being 'naughty' and challenging the instincts. As already explained, and this will be fully elaborated upon in Part 8:8, since we humans developed cooperative, loving, unconditionally selfless, 'moral' instincts, the confrontation with our instincts would have been extreme, much more than the basic conflict between instincts and intellect that the Adam Stork story describes. When *we* 'flew off course' in search of knowledge we weren't defying an instinctive orientation to a flight path, we were defying an instinctive orientation to integrativeness, to 'God' no less! When we became upset, angry and egocentric, these reactions didn't just contradict an instinctive flight path—they contradicted the integrative *ideals*, which means the guilt we felt from deviating from our instinctive orientation has been astronomical. The story of Adam Stork revealed that when Adam became conscious he became very upset as a result of defying his instinctive orientation to a flight path, but if *that* was upsetting then how much more upsetting must we humans have become from defying our instinctive orientation to behaving cooperatively. After all, we were in defiance of 'God'! We have been at war with the ideals of life!

To reiterate, we humans haven't just been defying an instinctive orientation—which, irrespective of the nature of the orientation, would make us feel guilty—we have been defying cooperative, loving, ideal-behaviour-demanding instincts, which means when we became angry and egocentric, which are divisive not cooperative behaviours, we were going to feel *doubly guilty*! Our human condition has been a diabolically upsetting situation to have to endure, which makes complete sense of why the human race has been as angry as described in Part 7:2, as egocentric as described in Part 7:3, as selfish as described in Part 7:4, and as alienated as described in Part 7:5.

To complete this description of our human journey, some two million years ago the australopithecines matured into fully conscious, thoughtful, troubled, extremely upset, human-condition-burdened and insecure 'Adolescentman', *Homo*, us. (The stages of development that *Homo* progressed through under the duress of the human condition were described in some detail in Part 3:11.) But, with understanding of our upset, human-condition-afflicted state now found humanity's insecure adolescent stage is finally brought to an end. The search for our species' identity, for understanding of itself, particularly for understanding of WHY we became divisively behaved, is over and so our species can now, at long last, enter its secure, fulfilled, peaceful adulthood. With understanding of the human condition now found we are

about to change from UPSET, ALIENATED ADOLESCENTMAN to TRANSFORMED, PEACEFUL ADULTMAN, and after only a few generations, to MATUREMAN, the fully secure UNIVERSAL BEINGS. How this wondrous TRANSFORMATION occurs will be explained shortly in Part 9.

These fossil skulls of our ancestors (see next image), along with the descriptions underneath, provide a summary of the different stages of maturation that our species has progressed through. In this picture chart, which was first presented in Part 3:11, you can clearly see the emergence of the large brain case that was needed to house the developing **'association cortex'** (where the association of information necessary for thinking takes place) that followed the nurturing infancy stage and triggered the breakout of the problem of the human condition. What happened was that the full emergence of the upset state of the human condition around two million years ago brought about the rapid development of our brain (as indicated by the sudden increase in brain case volume), because once the upset state of the human condition began *only* understanding could relieve that condition and to find that understanding required greater and greater intelligence. The race for answers was on—as Richard Neville said, it was **'a race between self destruction and self discovery'**. In recognition of this sudden change having taken place around two million years ago the name of our ancestors was, at that point in the chart of human evolution, changed by anthropologists from *Australopithecus* to *Homo*. (It should be mentioned again that more varieties of australopithecines and *Homo* have been found by anthropologists than those depicted here, however, these remain representative of the main varieties.)

Photographs by David L. Brill

Australopithecus afarensis	*Australopithecus africanus*	*Australopithecus boisei*	*Homo habilis*	*Homo erectus*	*Homo sapiens*	*Homo sapiens sapiens*
Fossil evidence from 3.9 to 3 million years ago	3.3 to 2.1 m y a	2.3 to 1.2 m y a	2.4 to 1.4 m y a	1.9 to 0.1 m y a	0.5 to 0.1 m y a	0.2 m y a to now
Brain Volume 400 cc average	450 cc	530 cc	650 cc	900-1100 cc	1350 cc	1400 cc
Early Happy Childman	Middle Demonstrative Childman	Late Naughty Childman	Distressed Adolescentman	Adventurous Adolescentman	Angry Adolescentman	Pseudo idealistic and Hollow Adolescentman

Human Condition Fully Emerges Here

The following two graphs were included and explained earlier in Part 3:11C, however, they are also worth including here because those parts of the graphs that encompass the period from 12 million years ago to 2 million years ago should be more easily understood now that we've explained at some length the love-indoctrination, mate selection process that eventually gave rise to us modern humans, *Homo*.

Fig. 2: The Development of Mental Cleverness
(Brain volume is used as a guide to mental cleverness)

Fig. 3: The Development of Integration

Part 8:4I A summary of how humans acquired our unconditionally selfless moral soul

It is clear that bonobos are exceptionally peaceful and cooperative animals. Indeed, all the evidence provided indicates that they are a relatively large, multicellular species that is well on its way to developing the fully integrated state where the reproducing individual members live together in complete harmony and cooperation. Bonobos are living proof that through the love-indoctrination, mate selection process Negative Entropy *did* find a way to integrate members of a large multicellular animal species, and therefore evidence that our ape ancestors *were* able to develop the totally integrated 'Garden of Eden', 'Golden', completely cooperative state that all our mythologies recognise we once inhabited.

Photograph by Manny Rubio

Drawing by Jeremy Griffith © 2006 Fedmex Pty Ltd

Bonobos Matata and her adopted son, Kanzi

(It might be mentioned that Matata and Kanzi, the bonobos pictured on the left in this wonderfully evocative photo of nurturing above, are famous participants in the ground-breaking studies of language development that was undertaken by the aforementioned biologist, ape-language researcher and author Sue Savage-Rumbaugh at the Great Ape Trust in Iowa.)

Yes, all the evidence points to the fact that it *was* through nurturing that we humans acquired *our* instinctive orientation to behaving in an unconditionally selfless, loving, cooperative way; that it was through nurturing that humans acquired our moral 'soul', the guiding 'voice' of which is our 'conscience'. As emphasised earlier, nurturing was the main influence or prime mover in human development—not tool use or bipedalism or language development or mastery of fire or any one of the other evasive explanations that denial-complying biologists have been putting forward in the mountain of books that have been published on human origins. Again, much more will be said about the whole problem of denial that surrounds the study of human evolution in Part 8:5, but imagine how different all the interpretations gathered through our studies of primatology and anthropology and even archaeology are going to be now that we have explained the human condition and can finally stop practicing denial—particularly denial of two of those six great previously unconfrontable

truths of the importance of nurturing in both the maturation of our species and the maturation of our own lives, and that we humans did once live in an unconditionally selfless, fully integrated, cooperative, harmonious, loving state. Imagine how our understanding of almost every aspect of human history will change when we are prepared to acknowledge our species' ever-increasing levels of alienation from an original state of innocence and soundness. Imagine how our ability to acknowledge that early humans were happy and altruistic and could think truthfully is going to change our perception of all the events that have led to the immensely upset state of humans today! Well, this whole presentation is witness to how much clarification of our history and behaviour is made possible by being truthful instead of dishonest.

The denial of truth has become a plague, preventing all access to truth—as Jonathan Wise's exceptionally honest comment, included in Part 5:1, recognised: **'if there really is hope beyond the human condition, then the Truth that leads to it has to have been established by someone beyond the human condition. Us humans are way too good at rationalizing truth into any shape that pleases us.'** Yes, this is so true—you couldn't look into the human condition from within it, the dishonesty going on within that old paradigm was far too rampant.

The truth is it *was* our ape ancestor's exceptional facility to develop nurturing that enabled us humans to acquire an instinctive orientation to behaving in an utterly cooperative, non-competitive, fully harmonious, unconditionally selfless, genuinely altruistic, truly loving way towards each other—but until we found understanding of the human condition this fact, that our human ancestors once lived in a fully cooperative state, could not afford to be admitted by denial-complying mechanistic science. It was only in our mythologies and through the words of a few brave thinkers that the truth of a wonderful 'Golden Age' of cooperative existence in our species' past survived.

Photograph by Frans Lanting

Indeed, this photo of bonobos certainly evokes the recognition that we too once lived in a 'Garden of Eden' state, and confirms that when our myth-makers spoke of our forebears

living in a 'Garden of Eden', fully cooperative, loving state they were not indulging in some romantic fantasy as E.O. Wilson accused Rousseau of doing, but describing an actual historical state that *did* once exist. And from the evidence provided we can establish that this love-indoctrination process started some twelve million years ago and was perfected about five million years ago, after which we lived in a fully cooperative state until the upset state of the human condition fully emerged some two million years ago.

In summary, all the evidence indicates that it was through nurturing, the process of love-indoctrination, and the accompanying mate selection of cooperativeness, that humans were able to develop an instinctive orientation to behaving unconditionally selflessly and, as a result, become a totally integrated multicellular species. The evidence shows that in our instinctive past, prior to our conscious mind becoming extremely upset and afflicted by the burden of the human condition some two million years ago, *all* humans were selfless and considered the welfare of the group above their own welfare. An instinctive memory within us of this upset-free, loving, cooperative, moral, innocent, alienation-free, all-sensitive, heavenly childhood state is what we have termed our 'soul', one expression of which is our 'conscience', the instinctive expectation within us that we behave morally—that is, selflessly, lovingly and cooperatively towards all of existence. These explanations and the evidence for them shows that humans *do* have genuinely altruistic instincts—that our selfless moral nature is *not* derived from the subtle form of selfishness that is reciprocity, but from an instinctive orientation to behaving in a truly unconditionally selfless way.

So, love-indoctrination enabled genetic refinement's seeming inability to develop unconditional selflessness to be overcome, and the love-indoctrinated development of unconditional selflessness allowed consciousness to emerge, and with the emergence of consciousness came the ability to support the love-indoctrination process by actively 'self-selecting' for cooperativeness by selecting more cooperative individuals with which to mate. If we add to that progression the emergence of the upset state of the human condition, and then the development of science, and then having to overcome our denial of any truths that brought the issue of the human condition into focus, <u>it was an absolutely extraordinary sequence of events that the human race has journeyed through</u>.

With the human condition now explained, we can finally understand and thus safely admit that nurturing, a mother's love, is what made us human; it is what gave our species its awe-inspiring moral sense. The female gender created humanity.

The following drawing summarises the development of humanity.

Flow chart of the journey that the human race has undergone to achieve full and permanent integration

Integrative Meaning

The integration of matter is the theme or purpose or meaning of existence, and unconditional selflessness is the main requirement, the 'glue', for integration. The first great tool for integrating matter was the gene-based information learning or refinement system, which developed a great deal of order of matter on Earth—what we term the great variety of life. (see Parts 8:1 and 8:2)

↓

Elaborating the reproducing individual

The problem for the gene-based refinement system was that since unconditionally selfless genetic traits tend to self-eliminate, the most integration that the gene-based refinement system could normally develop was the limited integration based on reciprocity. Reciprocity was the basis of the integration that occurred in ant and bee colonies, where the reproductive unit was effectively elaborated or enlarged through the workers subordinating their reproduction to the queen whose genes they share and who they then have to support to ensure the genes for their existence are reproduced. (see Part 8:3)

↓

Love-Indoctrination

While maternalism is a selfish trait, as it has to be to reproduce, in *appearance* it is unconditionally selfless behaviour, which means it has the potential to train or inscribe the developing brain of an infant in unconditionally selfless behaviour. Any species that can afford to prolong infancy for a protracted period of time and thus develop this training in unconditional selflessness, such as primates, can develop unconditionally selfless behaviour. (see Part 8:4)

↓

The liberation of consciousness

This training in selflessness had an accidental by-product: it produced brains trained to think selflessly and thus truthfully because, as mentioned, selflessness, not selfishness, is the theme or meaning of existence. Truthful-thinking brains enabled effective thinking and so the nerve-based refinement system of mental consciousness emerged. (see Part 8:7)

↓

Self-selection through mate selection

Gradually, as consciousness emerged as a by-product of the love-indoctrination process, it became possible to recognise the importance of selflessness and, as a result, actively select for it by consciously selecting integrative rather than divisive mates. This self-selection through mate selection greatly accelerated the development of full integration in our ape ancestors, giving rise to completely integrated human societies. (see Part 8:4D)

↓

The upset state of the Human Condition emerged

With the emergence of consciousness a battle broke out between our already established integratively-orientated instincts and our newer conscious mind that needed to find understanding of existence. Because instinctive *orientations* are not *understandings*, when the understanding-dependent conscious mind emerged it *had to* challenge the instincts, and the instincts then resisted the conscious mind's need to experiment in self-management. Then, unable to explain why we had to challenge our wonderfully integratively orientated instinctive self or soul, we had no choice but to attack the implied criticism from it, try to prove it wrong, and block its implied criticism from our minds. We unavoidably became angry, egocentric and alienated. The upset, corrupted state of the human condition emerged. (see Part 3:2)

↓

Amelioration of the Human Condition

With the finding of understanding of the human condition all the upset anger, egocentricity and alienation subsides, allowing the human race to return to a fully integrated state. (see Part 3:10)

Part 8:5 The denial of the nurturing origins of humans' moral nature has been leading humanity to terminal alienation

What now has to be described is how science, the designated vehicle for human enquiry, has evaded the unbearable truth of the importance of nurturing in the development of our species, and in our own lives, by inventing theories about our origins that are now so dangerously dishonest, they threaten the human race with extinction.

Part 8:5A 140 years of madness

The truth of our corrupted human condition and of the integrative meaning or purpose of existence were two extremely obvious truths that, until we found the compassionate explanation and understanding for both, were so unbearably exposing, condemning and confronting that we, the human race, had no choice but to live in complete denial of them. For exactly the same reason, the truth of the importance of nurturing in both the maturation of our species and in the maturation of our own lives that was described in Part 8:4 has been another extremely obvious truth that has had to be denied because it too was unbearably condemning of our present unloved and unloving, human-condition-afflicted lives. And as we will see in Part 8:7A, the nature of consciousness is a further obvious truth that has also been so unbearably condemning that it too has been fiercely denied, to the extent that our conscious mind—nature's greatest creation—has been deemed an inexplicable mystery.

In light of all this unavoidable denial, it is not surprising that these four great outstanding mysteries in science—of the explanation of the human condition, of the meaning of our existence, of the origin of our unconditionally selfless moral instincts, and of why we humans became conscious when other animals didn't—hadn't been solved. If you can't confront the human condition you are in no position to find the explanation for it; and if you can't admit to Integrative Meaning you obviously can't explain what the meaning of our lives is; and if you can't admit to the importance of nurturing you are in no position to explain the origin of humans' unconditionally selfless moral nature; and if you can't confront the truth of the nature of consciousness you are in no position to explain how it arose and what has prevented its development in other species.

Yes, the truth *cannot* be found from an evasive and thus dishonest position. Living in denial of the human condition and of any truths that bring it into focus means your search for truth and understanding is only ever going to end in a completely lost state of confused madness. For instance, as we saw in Part 4:12, mechanistic science initially tried to deny the existence of the human condition by dishonestly claiming that our selfish and competitive behaviour was a natural consequence of a supposed 'survival of the fittest' natural selection process, and that our selfless moral nature was actually a selfish strategy to help relatives

or kin reproduce our genes. But that extreme dishonesty was both contrary to and offensive of the fact that we humans do have unconditionally selfless, loving, moral instincts, and so, in response to that backlash, a much cleverer way was then concocted to deny our species' extreme sickness, its psychosis (as has been mentioned, the word psychosis literally means 'soul-illness'). This contrivance was E.O. Wilson's theory of Eusociality, which maintains there is no psychosis involved in the human condition, but that we simply have some unconditionally selfless instincts that exist alongside competitive, 'survival of the fittest' selfish ones, and that our human condition is the product of a conflict between those two instinctive states! Yes, the theory of Eusociality renders the human condition inconsequential, virtually benign—with the consequence of this extremely sophisticated denial being that the human race now faces terminal alienation, madness. Indeed, if this extreme dishonesty on the part of mechanistic science had not been exposed, as it has been through this presentation, then the stage *was* set for the extinction of our species.

In the case of humanity's denial of Integrative Meaning, it was explained in Parts 4:4B and 8:2 that the way the upset human race eventually found to eliminate *that* truth was by making the integrative theme or purpose of existence out to be a supernatural deity we termed 'God', a subject or realm that supposedly had no place in science—an outrageous display of dishonesty that has led to all manner of blind, purpose-*less*, ultimately unaccountable, ridiculous interpretations of the natural selection process. And—as we will see in Part 8:7—a similar fate has also befallen the study of consciousness, which has been so characterised by denial and dishonesty that it too has resulted in the human race becoming lost in a completely bewildered state of intellectual confusion about the all-important issues of what consciousness actually is and how it emerged. *And*, lastly, in the case of that other key issue that is so critical to our understanding of ourselves, namely the origins of our moral nature, what will be revealed in this Part is that the denial of the importance of nurturing in the maturation of our species and in the maturation of our own lives has seen the 140 years that have passed since the American philosopher John Fiske first presented the nurturing explanation for our moral nature *squandered* through the development of extremely dishonest, alienated, mad biological theories—a tragic journey that has now culminated in the immensely dangerous Social Ecological Model, and its latest incarnation, the Self-Domestication Hypothesis, for our species' altruistic instincts.

In short, what has just been outlined illustrates how, even though mechanistic science had no choice other than to practice denial of any truths that brought the issue of the human condition into focus until we found the true explanation of the human condition, such denial was an extremely dangerous practice. Yes, what has been described illustrates that, as necessary as they have been, the longer denials are practiced the more refined they become, so that in the end, after many decades of development, they inevitably become so sophisticated, so cleverly refined and so entrenched they effectively lock humanity onto a path to terminal alienation—to total derangement, death and extinction.

Part 8:5B John Fiske's 1874 recognition of the obvious truth that nurturing created our moral sense

Like the truths of our corrupted human-condition-afflicted state and of Integrative Meaning, the importance of nurturing in both the maturation of our own lives and in the maturation of our species *is* an obvious truth. While we have had to live in denial of it, we all intuitively know that a mother's love is crucial to the creation of a well-adjusted human and that we are *all* born with an instinctive expectation of receiving unconditionally selfless love from our mother. And it's *also* obvious that such powerful instincts to nurture with love and be nurtured with love can't have come from nowhere. To be so strong in us they must have played a significant role in our species' development. So yes, if we weren't living in denial of the importance of nurturing in human life, it wouldn't be hard to work out that our unconditionally selfless moral instincts were borne out of the mother-infant relationship. Charles Darwin, for example, who was a remarkably sound, secure, relatively denial-free, honest and thus effective thinker, could see that our **'social instinct'**—the **'most noble of all attributes of man, leading him without a moment's hesitation to risk his life for that of a fellow creature'**, as he described it—**'seems'** to be **'developed'** from **'parental' 'affections'**. While Darwin didn't develop the idea that nurturing created our moral sense, he did make the following two comments in his 1871 book *The Descent of Man, and Selection in Relation to Sex* that indicate the idea was apparent to him (again the underlinings are my emphasis): **'The feeling of pleasure from society is probably an extension of the parental or filial** [family] **affections, since the social instinct seems to be developed by the young remaining for a long time with their parents; and this extension may be attributed in part to habit, but chiefly to natural selection. With those animals which were benefited by living in close association, the individuals which took the greatest pleasure in society would best escape various dangers, whilst those that cared least for their comrades, and lived solitary, would perish in greater numbers. With respect to the origin of <u>the parental and filial affections, which apparently lie at the base of the social instincts</u>, we know not the steps by which they have been gained; but we may infer that it has been to a large extent through natural selection.'** And: **'The following proposition seems to me in a high degree probable—namely, that <u>any animal whatever, endowed with well-marked social instincts, the parental and filial affections being here included, would inevitably acquire a moral sense or conscience, as soon as its intellectual powers had become as well, or nearly as well developed, as in man</u>'** (ch.4 & 5). And although the renowned anthropologist Richard Leakey wasn't thinking honestly when he wrote that the **'bond between mother and infant'** occurs so that her infant can have a period of **'prolonged learning'** about its **'environment'** (the dishonesty of this thinking will be explained shortly), he *was* thinking truthfully when he then emphatically asserted that **'the basis of all primate social groups is the bond between mother and infant. That bond constitutes the social unit out of which all higher orders of society are constructed'** (Richard Leakey & Roger Lewin, *Origins*, 1977, p.61 of 264). In his acclaimed television series and accompanying book that was dedicated to explaining **'the ascent of man'**, the great science historian Jacob Bronowski also recognised that the **'real vision of the human being'**—of an unconditionally selfless, loving, sound, integratively behaved individual, which Christ so exemplified—is a direct product of the nurturing that takes place between a mother and her child, saying that **'But, far more deeply,** [a sound mind] **depends on the long preparation of human childhood…The real vision of the human being is the child wonder, the Virgin and Child, the Holy Family'** (*The Ascent of Man*, 1973, pp.319-320 of 352). It's true,

the **'family'**, especially the **'Virgin** [uncorrupted, soul-intact, innocent, psychologically sound and secure mother] **and child'**, *is* **'Holy'**; **'that bond'** *does* lie at the heart of what makes us, and made us as a species, truly human—namely loving and cooperative.

Yes, the crucial role played by the nurturing, loving **'bond between mother and infant'** in **'the ascent of man'** *is* a truth we are all intuitively aware of. That awareness is apparent when, for example, Africa is described as **'the cradle of mankind'**—Africa *is* where humanity was nurtured into existence. When the anthropologist Loren Eisely wrote that **'Man is born of love and exists by reason of a love more continuous than in any other form of life'** (*An Evolutionist Looks at Modern Man*, c.1959), he was recognising the truth that humanity *was* **'born of love'**.

In fact, the nurturing explanation for our extraordinary unconditionally selfless, all-loving, social, moral instinctive self or soul is so obvious that only three years after Darwin tentatively ascribed the origin of our **'social instinct'** to **'parental' 'affections'**, it was put forward as a developed theory by the aforementioned John Fiske in his 1874 book *Outlines of Cosmic Philosophy: based on the Doctrine of Evolution*. Indeed, if we were to prioritise the information that we humans need in order to understand our world and our place in it, the first item would be to explain the origins of the variety of life, which is what Darwin did with his idea of natural selection. The second would have to be to explain the origins of the particular variety of life that is the cooperative organism we call humanity, which is what Fiske did with his nurturing explanation for our species' original instinctive unconditionally selfless, loving, moral, social sense. *However*, while both these fundamentally important insights *were* made available to us way back in the mid-1800s, the only one I was taught at school and university was Darwin's idea of natural selection. It wasn't until 2004 that I happened upon a comment about Fiske that I learnt of his remarkable contribution—which was many years after I had worked out that nurturing was the obvious explanation for our moral instincts. (As I have already pointed out, I first presented the nurturing, love-indoctrination explanation that I described in Part 8:4B to the scientific community in 1983 in a submission to *Nature* magazine. I have submitted it elsewhere many times since, but to no avail, with each submission either rejected or ignored—something I will talk further about later in this Part.)

I would now like to describe the sequence of events that led me to Fiske's prior publication of the nurturing origins of humans' moral sense.

While researching scientists to whom to send the 2004 *Human Condition Documentary Proposal*, we at the WTM found a summary compiled by the aforementioned linguist Robin Allott of some current biological explanations for the origins of human love. (Allott's paper, 'Evolutionary Aspects of Love and Empathy', published in 1992 in the *Journal of Social and Evolutionary Systems* [Vol.15, No.4 353-370], can be viewed at <http://cogprints.org/3393/1/lovempat.htm>.) In his summary, Allott firstly noted mechanistic science's deep psychological denial of the subject of love, saying, as included earlier, that **'Love has been described as a taboo subject, not serious, not appropriate for scientific study.'** He then tried to define love but found it virtually impossible to find a definition for it. Allott then asked **'how did human love evolve?'**, answering perceptively that it must have evolved out of the **'mother/infant bond'**. In explaining this bond, Allott presented an explanation by the journalist Betty McCollister (which will also be put forward shortly in Part 8:13) in which she argues that given the size of our brain and, it follows, the size of our skull expanding, our human ancestors were forced

to give birth to increasingly premature offspring so that the infant's skull was sufficiently under-developed to fit through the pelvis, leaving the remainder of the skull's growth to be finished *after* birth. The result of this development, it is claimed, was that these increasingly 'unfinished' and helpless infants required increasingly intensive and extensive care. Allott and McCollister both argued that having been thus developed this nurturing care is now an instinctive expectation of infants and if not received leaves infants seriously psychologically distressed. As will be emphasised when the McCollister version of this explanation for the importance of nurturing is reviewed in Part 8:13, this account does not recognise the real significance of nurturing of training our infants in unconditional love. In Allott's paper, apart from recognising that **'Love then would become essential…insofar as the success of the group… depended on effective coherence of the group'**, the concepts of altruism, morality or training in cooperative, integrative selflessness are not mentioned—except for this one reference, in which Allott cites historian Dorothy Ross' biography of the American psychoanalyst Granville Stanley Hall: **'Amongst psychologists, Stanley Hall (see Ross, Dorothy, 1972, *G. Stanley Hall: The Psychologist as Prophet*) in the United States attracted a good deal of opprobrium** [abuse] **by making love a central topic…"altruistic love", he suggested, developed in the course of evolution from the necessities of maternity'** (p.262 of 482).

Continuing on the trail of this nurturing-of-love idea, Granville Stanley Hall (1844–1924) has been described as **'the founder of organized psychology as a science and profession, the father of child psychology, and as a national leader of educational reform in America'** (*PSI Cafe*—psychology resource site, and *Gale Encyclopedia of Psychology*). According to Ross, Hall was concerned with **'constructing a synthetic view of psychology along evolutionary lines'**—an undertaking he completed and presented in 1896. Relevantly, Ross revealed **'an important catalyst'** in Hall's endeavour **'was a more popular biological treatise, Henry Drummond's *Ascent of Man*, published in 1894 from his Lowell Lectures of the previous year'**. Ross wrote: **'Drummond presented evolution as "the final revelation of the unity of the world" which could…"explain everything by one great end." To Darwin's principle of natural selection by means of the struggle for survival, he added another principle that he considered far more important—"the Struggle for the Life of Others," or "altruistic Love," which developed in the course of evolution from the necessities of maternity. The human mother he regarded as virtually the highest product of evolution.'** Interestingly, in terms of the theme of existence of love having been acknowledged by other early scientists (unlike their contemporary counterparts), a footnote on page 262 of Ross' book states that **'Hall also knew Patrick Geddes and J. Arthur Thomson's, *The Evolution of Sex* (London: Walter Scott, 1889), which likewise described love as the universal dynamic in nature and altruistic love as the real law of evolution.'**

Henry Drummond (1851–1897) was a Scottish scientist, evangelist and author. In his 1894 book *The Ascent of Man*, his account of how **'altruistic love'** developed **'from the necessities of maternity'** is given in the chapter titled 'The Evolution of a Mother'. The following is a condensation of this chapter: **'The…pinnacle of the temple of Nature…is…The Mammalia, THE MOTHERS…**[it is] **That care for others, from which the Mammalia take their name…All elementary animals are orphans…they waken to isolation, to apathy, to the attentions only of those who seek their doom. But as we draw nearer the apex of the animal kingdom, the spectacle of a protective Maternity looms into view…**[the] **love of offspring…That early world, therefore, for millions and millions of years was a bleak and loveless world. It was a world without children and a world without Mothers. It is good to**

realize how heartless Nature was till these arrived…the ethical effect…of this early arrangement was nil… There was no time to love, no opportunity to love, and no object to love…Now, before Maternal Love can be evolved out of this first care…Nature must…cause fewer young to be produced at a birth…make them helpless, so that for a time they must dwell with her…And…she…dwell with them…In this [Mammal] **child…infancy reaches its last perfection. Housed, protected, sumptuously fed, the luxurious children keep to their Mother's side for months and years, and only quit the parental roof when their filial education** [in **love**] **is complete…**[these] **drawings together of parent and child are the inevitable preliminaries of the domestication of the Human Race…On the physiological side, the name of this impelling power is lactation; on the ethical side, it is Love. And there is no escape henceforth from communion between Mother and child…Mother teaches a Child, but in a far deeper sense it is the Child who teaches the Mother** [to be loving]**. Millions of millions of Mothers had lived in the world before this, but the higher affections were unborn. Tenderness, gentleness, unselfishness, love, care, self-sacrifice—these as yet were not, or were only in the bud. Maternity existed in humble forms, but not yet Motherhood. To create Motherhood and all that enshrines…required a human child…The only thing that remains now is…that they** [human mother and child] **shall both be kept in that school as long as it is possible to…give affection time to grow…No animal except Man was permitted to have his education** [in **love**] **thus prolonged…Why…<u>The question has been answered for us by Mr. John Fiske, and the world here owes to him one of the most beautiful contributions ever made to the Evolution of Man. We know what this delay means ethically—it was necessary for moral training that the human child should have the longest possible time by its Mother's side</u>—but what determines it on the physical side?…a human brain…**[where relatively speaking] **no storage of habit has been handed down from the past…the higher brain is comparatively a new thing in the world…**[and] **are in perfect order only after a considerable interval of adjustment and elaboration. Now Infancy…means the fitting up of this extra machinery within the brain…Childhood in its early stage is a series of installations…In the savage state, where the after-life is simple, the adjustments** [for life] **are made with comparative ease and speed; but as we rise in the scale of civilization the necessary period of Infancy lengthens step by step until in the case of the most highly educated man, where adjustments must be made to a wide intellectual environment, the age of tutelage extends for almost a quarter of a century. The use of all this to morals, the reactions especially upon the Mother, are too obvious…A sheep knows its lamb only while it is a lamb. The affection in these cases, fierce enough while it lasts, is soon forgotten, and the traces it left in the brain are obliterated before they have furrowed into habit** [Note here confirmation that the training in love wears off with age, which, as has been explained, is why there was selection for neotenising youth in the love-indoctrination process]**…To her [the human mother] alone was given a curriculum prolonged enough to let her graduate in the school of the affections…It may or may not be that the child will acquire its Mother's virtue. But unselfishness has scored; its child has proved itself fitter to survive than the child of Selfishness…A few score more of centuries, a few more millions of Mothers, and the germs of Patience, Carefulness, Tenderness, Sympathy, and Self-Sacrifice will have rooted themselves in Humanity…However short the earliest infancies, however feeble the sparks they fanned, however long heredity took to gather fuel enough for a steady flame, it is certain that once this fire began to warm the cold hearth of Nature and give humanity a heart, the most stupendous task of the past was accomplished. A softened pressure of an uncouth hand, a human gleam in an almost animal eye, an endearment in an inarticulate voice—feeble things enough. Yet in these faint awakenings lay the hope of the human race.** [And here Drummond quotes Fiske] **"From of old we have heard the monition, 'Except ye be as babes ye cannot enter the kingdom of Heaven'; <u>the latest science</u> now shows us—though in a very different sense of**

the words—that unless we had been as babes, the ethical phenomena which give all its significance to the phrase 'Kingdom of Heaven' would have been non-existent for us. Without the circumstances of Infancy we might have become formidable among animals through sheer force of sharp-wittedness. But except for these circumstances we should never have comprehended the meaning of such phrases as 'self-sacrifice' or 'devotion.' The phenomena of social life would have been omitted from the history of the world, and with them the phenomena of ethics and religion."'

Drummond acknowledges Fiske's **'beautiful contribution'** as the originator of the idea of the long infancy creating a sense of morality in humans, sourcing the remarkable quote that concludes the above extract to Fiske's 1874 *Outlines of Cosmic Philosophy: based on the Doctrine of Evolution* (Vol.IV, Part II, ch.XXII 'Genesis of Man, Morally', p.162).

To introduce him more fully, John Fiske (1842–1901) was an American philosopher, historian and author. In the preface to one of his books he wrote that **'The detection of the part played by the lengthening of infancy in the genesis of the human race is my own especial contribution to the Doctrine of Evolution'** (*Through Nature to God*, 1899). The following is a condensation of the 'Genesis of Man, Morally' chapter from *Outlines of Cosmic Philosophy*: **'There are two things, said** [Immanuel] **Kant, which fill me with awe…the starry heavens above us, and the moral law within us…in the study of the moral sense we contemplate the last and noblest product of evolution…it is well to state, at the outset, that the existence of a moral sense and moral intuitions in civilized man is fully granted…emotions, leading him to seek the right and avoid the wrong… actions deemed right are those which conduce to the fulness of life of the Community…We approve of certain actions and disapprove of certain actions quite instinctively. We shrink from stealing or lying as we shrink from burning our fingers…In short, there is in our psychical structure a moral sense which is as quickly and directly hurt by wrong-doing or the idea of wrong-doing…It is now time to propose an answer to the question…How did social evolution originate?…In the permanent family we have the germ of society…while the nervous connections accompanying a simple intelligence are already organized at birth, the nervous connections accompanying a complex intelligence are chiefly organized after birth. Thus there arise the phenomena of infancy…the period during which the nerve connections…are becoming permanently established. Now this period, which only begins to exist when the intelligence is considerably complex, becomes longer and longer as the intelligence increases in complexity. In the human race it is much longer than in any other race of mammals, and it is much longer in the civilized man than in the savage. Indeed among the educated classes…it may be…more than a quarter of a century…Throughout the animal kingdom the period of infancy is correlated with feelings of parental affection…The prolongation** [of infancy] **must… have been gradual, and the same increase of intelligence to which it was due must also have prolonged the correlative parental feelings, by associating them more and more with anticipations and memories. The concluding phases of this long change may be witnessed in the course of civilization. Our parental affections now endure through life…I believe we have now reached a… satisfactory explanation of… Sociality…The prolongation of infancy accompanying the development of intelligence, and the correlative extension of parental feelings…The prolonged helplessness of the offspring must keep the parents together for longer and longer periods in successive epochs… primeval…family groups…differ widely…from modern families…The sociality is but nascent: infants are drowned, wives are beaten to death…in modern families evanescent barbarism shows itself in internal quarrels…Savages are not unfrequently capable of extreme devotion and self-sacrifice when the interests of the tribe are at stake…But…savage virtues are, in general, confined to the clan. The…savage…is also capable of the most fiendish cruelty…toward the**

members of another clan…Fijis, are exceptionally ferocious…though the savage has the germ of a moral sense, which prompts him…to postpone his personal welfare to that of his clan, he can by no means be accredited with a fully developed moral sense…In asserting that we possess an instinctive and inherited moral sense, it is not meant that we possess, anterior to education and experience, an organic preference for certain particular good actions, and an organic repugnance to certain particular bad actions. We do not inherit a horror of stealing, any more than the Hindu inherits the horror of killing cattle. We simply inherit a feeling which leads us, when we are told that stealing is wrong, to shun it, without needing to be taught that it is detrimental to society…the civilized man surpasses the lowest savage by a far greater interval than that by which the lowest savage surpasses the highest ape; just as the gulf between the cerebral capacity of the Englishman and that of the non-Aryan dweller in Hindustan is six times greater than the gulf which similarly divides the non-Aryan Hindu from the gorilla…In this new suggestion as to the causes and the effects of the prolonged infancy of man, I believe we have a suggestion as fruitful as the one which we owe to Mr. Wallace.' The chapter then concludes with the quote Drummond used to end his dissertation—**'From of old we have heard the monition, "Except ye be as babes ye cannot enter the kingdom of Heaven"'**, etc (see end of Drummond's *Ascent of Man* quote above for the rest of this, **'Except ye be as babes…'**, passage).

Fiske was right in recognising the immense significance of the long infancy and the presence, therefore, of exceptionally maternal mothers as providing the basis for the development of a sense of morality in humans. In doing so, he recognised the basic elements of the love-indoctrination process. In 1874, which as emphasised was only 15 years after the publication of Darwin's *The Origin of Species*, we see that Fiske described his own work as **'the latest science'**. Dorothy Ross accurately recognised the full significance of Fiske's explanation when she recorded Drummond's 1894 assessment of it: **'To Darwin's principle of natural selection by means of the struggle for survival, he** [Drummond] **added another principle that he considered far more important—"the Struggle for the Life of Others," or "altruistic Love," which developed in the course of evolution from the necessities of maternity.'** In this assessment, Drummond recognised firstly that unconditional selflessness or **'altruistic Love'** is the very theme of existence with natural selection being less material as merely a means for its development, and secondly that the all-important unconditionally selfless **'altruistic Love'** was able to be **'developed in the course of evolution from the necessities of maternity'**.

Not long after Drummond's 1894 re-emphasis of Fiske's nurturing-of-love idea, Hall again brought it to the public attention's in 1896. BUT, following Hall's efforts, this **'latest science', 'one of the most beautiful contributions ever made to the Evolution of Man'** of the mechanism for developing the unconditionally selfless, **'altruistic Love'** that was a **'far more important' 'principle'** than Darwin's selfish, **'natural selection by means of the struggle for survival'**, was ignored and left to die—in fact, even by Hall's time it had already **'attracted a good deal of opprobrium** [abuse]**'**—to only now be independently re-admitted and resurrected, over a century after Fiske's admission of the concept in 1874. As emphasised, that ideas do keep resurfacing is what you would expect of a universal truth; further, the fact that such an *obvious* universal truth hasn't been frequently put forward is evidence of the extent of our denial of such a truth, which is in turn evidence of the magnitude of the problem of our human condition—our species' insecurity about its loveless state. As Allott said, love has become a subject that is **'not appropriate for scientific study'**.

Again, the fundamental necessity for accepting the nurturing hypothesis for human origins was that it be accompanied by the explanation of the human condition, because only when our inability to nurture our children was able to be understood would it be psychologically safe for humans to admit the importance of nurturing. Humanity needed the *whole* truth, all the explanations that make confronting the human condition possible delivered together, and that is what is being presented here. With the explanation of the human condition now found, the truth of Integrative Meaning, the truth of our unconditionally selfless moral soul, the truth of how nurturing created it, and all the other truths that humanity has been living in denial of, can finally be admitted.

There are deficiencies in Fiske's explanation of the origin of our morality, which is not surprising given the infancy of the field and the scarcity of scientific knowledge in his time. Firstly, **'Prolonged infancy'** didn't **'accompany the development of intelligence'**; rather, as will be explained in the coming Part 8:7B, 'How, why and when did consciousness emerge in humans?', prolonged infancy, and the nurturing of selflessness, *liberated* consciousness, which only strongly developed *after* the love-indoctrination process was well established. The large brain didn't develop until after the extended infancy and intense nurturing took place, as evidenced by bonobos, which do not have a very large brain but are intensely nurturing and already neotenous.

Secondly, how the trained love became instinctive is particularly unclear in the explanations put forward by both Fiske and Drummond. While Drummond is specific about how the instinct for strong nurturing affections of tenderness, self-sacrifice, etc, became instinctive in mothers, he doesn't say whether the selfless qualities become instinctive in the offspring. In fact, he said, **'It may or may not be that the child will acquire its Mother's virtue.'** On this matter, Fiske began by saying, **'We** [humans] **approve of certain actions and disapprove of certain actions quite instinctively. We shrink from stealing or lying as we shrink from burning our fingers'** and **'there is in our psychical structure a moral sense.'** However, he later stated that **'In asserting that we possess an instinctive and inherited moral sense, it is not meant that we possess, anterior to education and experience, an organic preference for certain particular good actions, and an organic repugnance to certain particular bad actions. We do not inherit a horror of stealing, any more than the Hindu inherits the horror of killing cattle. We simply inherit a feeling which leads us, when we are told that stealing is wrong, to shun it, without needing to be taught that it is detrimental to society.'** This last quote seems to imply that Fiske believed that the extent of our instinctive conscience didn't go beyond a kind of predisposition to acquiring a conscience, this despite having said, **'We approve of certain actions and disapprove of certain actions quite instinctively.'**

It is clear that both Fiske and Drummond had difficulty reconciling humans' current morality-defying, upset, corrupted state—the fact that people can be extremely brutal and aggressive—with the view that we have moral instincts. They attempted to resolve the problem by asserting that such instincts for love only emerged in relatively recent times within **'civilized'** people who have a fading, **'evanescent barbarism'**, despite the fact this theory does not allow anything like sufficient time for altruistic training to become instinctive. Drummond said: **'In the savage state, where the after-life is simple, the adjustments** [for life] **are made with comparative ease and speed; but as we rise in the scale of civilization the necessary period of Infancy lengthens step by step until in the case of the most highly educated man, where adjustments must be**

made to a wide intellectual environment, the age of tutelage extends for almost a quarter of a century.' Fiske similarly noted that infancy **'is much longer in the civilized man than in the savage. Indeed among the educated classes…it may be…more than a quarter of a century'**. He then proceeded to say: **'primeval…family groups…differ widely…from modern families…The sociality is but nascent: infants are drowned, wives are beaten to death…in modern families evanescent barbarism shows itself in internal quarrels…Savages are not unfrequently capable of extreme devotion and self-sacrifice when the interests of the tribe are at stake…But…savage virtues are, in general, confined to the clan. The…savage…is also capable of the most fiendish cruelty…toward the members of another clan…Fijis, are exceptionally ferocious…though the savage has the germ of a moral sense, which prompts him…to postpone his personal welfare to that of his clan, he can by no means be accredited with a fully developed moral sense.'**

Overall, what Fiske and Drummond were unaware of was what happened *since* we acquired an instinctive orientation to cooperative integration, namely the intervention of the immensely upsetting battle of the human condition; innocent, completely integrated man was the australopithecines who lived from five to two million years ago, but we needed understanding of what took place since, and who we became as a result.

And finally, Fiske's claimed moral superiority of **'civilized'** people, and **'cerebral capacity'** comparisons between the **'Aryan' 'Englishman'** and the **'Hindustan'** are false and morally abhorrent. As has been explained before, civility is the mask humans have used to conceal the full extent of our upset, human-condition-afflicted state. Indeed, to some degree, the more upset we have become, the greater need we have had for civility. As has been pointed out, there are very substantial differences in alienation between individual humans and indeed between races of humans as a result of their different encounters with the necessary and heroic, but upsetting, battle of the human condition—but no human, or race of humans, is 'better' than or 'superior' to another. Understanding of the necessary but upsetting battle of the human condition entirely eliminates the concept of 'good' and 'evil' from all conceptualisation of ourselves.

The outstanding question is, *why* did Fiske's fundamentally important explanation for the origins of our moral instincts that created **'humanity'—'one of the most beautiful contributions ever made to the Evolution of Man'**—virtually vanish from scientific discourse; *why* wasn't I taught the nurturing explanation for our altruistic moral nature at school, or when I studied biology at university; *why* did I have to work the idea out myself? *Why* was this **'altruistic' 'principle'** that was **'considered far more important'** than the **'principle of natural selection'**, and which Fiske explained was able to be developed in our forebears by **'the necessities of maternity'**, allowed to *so* disappear from biological discourse that in the 140 years that have elapsed since Fiske presented his explanation a veritable mountain of books have been published presenting all manner of unaccountable, dishonest theories for the origins of our species' extraordinary moral nature? *Why*, when we had the truth, has there been such a colossal amount of tragically misguided effort that, as we will see, has now resulted in the dangerously dishonest, misleading Social Ecological/Self-Domestication explanations for our moral soul? And *why*, in turn, has *this* nurturing, love-indoctrination explanation for our moral soul—and, indeed, *all* my work—not just been rejected and ignored, but (as I will document later) *so* ruthlessly attacked that I was made a pariah, and those helping disseminate these insights ostracised?

Incidentally, in a further illustration of how obvious the nurturing explanation for our moral soul really is, while writing this Part an internet search for references to John Fiske turned up an article that reveals that the love-indoctrination explanation was actually first put forward, albeit in a crude form, back in 1834, which is even prior to Darwin's publication of his theory of natural selection. In an essay titled 'On the Helpless State of Infancy', which is simply signed "V.F.", it says: **'Thus gracious hath Providence been to man, in rendering the ties of parental and filial affection so much more permanent in this His noblest work, than in any of His inferior creatures…on account of the helpless condition of man in his state of infancy and childhood; because this very helplessness, by demanding the constant and long-continued attention of parents, gives rise to, and renders habitual, the tender charities of domestic and social life'** (see Wesley Raymond Wells' paper 'An Historical Anticipation of John Fiske's theory regarding the value of infancy', *Journal of Philosophy*, 1922, Vol.19, No.8). So, the love-indoctrination explanation has indeed been continually found and continually left to die! *Why?*

Part 8:5C <u>The problem has been that the nurturing origins of our moral soul has been devastatingly, unbearably, excruciatingly condemning</u>

As explained in Part 4:4F, the answer to all these *why's* is that the nurturing explanation for our moral soul has been devastatingly, unbearably, excruciatingly condemning of humans' present inability to nurture children with the real, unconditional love that their instincts expect. Indeed, in his aforementioned 1992 paper, Allott noted that when the nurturing explanation for our moral instincts was put forward by Fiske, and supported by a few others, it **'attracted a good deal of opprobrium** [abuse]**'**. But as I also pointed out in Part 4:4F, since the upset state of the human condition emerged some two million years ago, *no* child has been able to be given the amount of love its instincts expect, and unable, until now, to explain the human condition and thus provide the explanation for why this provision of love has been so compromised, the human race has had no choice but to deny the role nurturing has played in the development of humanity and in the maturation of our own individual lives. The great difficulty we have admitting the importance of nurturing in human development is evident in the comment that **'The biggest crime you can commit in our society is to be a failure as a parent and people would rather admit to being an axe murderer than being a bad father or mother'** ('A Single Mum's Guide to Raising Boys', *Sun-Herald*, 7 July 2002).

In my 40 years of constant thinking and writing about the human condition I have assembled a collection of the rare occasions when the human-condition-avoiding, denial-practicing, dishonest world we live in momentarily dropped its guard and let some truth through. The following two quotes are cases in point—they are the most honest admissions I have come across of both the importance of nurturing in human life and the now dire inability of mothers to adequately nurture their children due to the corrupting effects of our species' heroic search for self-understanding. Firstly, consider this quote from the writer Olive Schreiner that featured in Part 6:5: **'They say women have one great and noble work left them, and they do it ill…*We* bear the world, and *we* make it. The souls of little children are marvellously delicate and tender things, and keep for ever the shadow that first falls on them, and that is the mother's or at best a woman's. There was never a great man who had not a great mother—it is hardly an exaggeration. The**

first six years of our life make us; all that is added later is veneer…The mightiest and noblest of human work is given to us, and we do it ill.'

Then there is this powerful extract from the anthropologist Ashley Montagu's extraordinarily honest 1970 paper 'A Scientist Looks at Love' (some of which was included earlier in Part 6:4): **'love is, without question, the most important experience in the life of a human being…One of the most frequently used words in our vocabulary…**[yet] ***love*** **is something about which most of us are still extremely vague…There is a widespread belief that a newborn baby is a selfish, disorganized wild creature who would grow into a violently intractable savage if it were not properly disciplined.** [However] **The newborn baby is organized in an extraordinarily sensitive manner…He does not want discipline…he wants love. He behaves as if he expected to be loved, and when his expectation is thwarted, he reacts in a grievously disappointed manner. There is now good evidence which leads us to believe that not only does a baby want to be loved, but also that it wants to love; all its drives are orientated in the direction of receiving and giving love. If it doesn't receive love it is unable to give it—as a child or as an adult. From the moment of birth the baby needs the reciprocal exchange of love with its mother…It has, I believe, been universally acknowledged that the mother-infant relationship perhaps more than any other defines the very essence of love…survival alone is not enough—human beings need and should receive much more…We now know that babies which are physically well nurtured may nevertheless waste away and die unless they are also loved. We also know that the only remedy for those babies on the verge of dying is love…The infant can suffer no greater loss than deprivation of the mother's love. There is an old Eastern proverb which explains that since God could not be everywhere he created mothers…maternal rejection may be seen as the "causative factor in…every individual case of neurosis or behavior problem in children."…Endowed at birth with the need to develop as a loving, harmonic human being, the child learns to love by being loved…To love one's neighbor as oneself requires first that one must be able to love oneself, and the only way to learn that art is by having been adequately loved during the first six years of one's life. As Freud pointed out, this is the period during which the foundations of the personality are either well and truly laid—or not. If one doesn't love oneself one cannot love others. To make loving order in the world we must first have had loving order made in ourselves… Nothing in the world can be more important or as significant…love is demonstrable, it is sacrificial, it is self-abnegative** [self-denying]**. It puts the other always first. It is not a cold or calculated altruism, but a deep complete involvement with another. Love is unconditional…Love is the principal developer of one's capacity for being human, the chief stimulus for the development of social competence, and the only thing on earth that can produce that sense of belongingness and relatedness to the world of humanity which is the best achievement of the healthy human being…Scientists are discovering…that to live as if to live and love were one is the only way of life for human beings, because, indeed, this is the way of life which the innate nature of man demands. We are discovering that the highest ideals of man spring from man's own nature…and that the highest of these innately based ideals is the one that must enliven and inform all his other ideals, namely,** ***love*****…Contemporary scientists working in this field are giving a scientific foundation or validation to the Sermon on the Mount and to the Golden Rule: to do unto others as you would have them do unto you, to love your neighbor as yourself…In an age in which a great deal of unloving love masquerades as the genuine article, in which there is a massive lack of love behind the show of love, in which millions have literally been unloved to death, it is very necessary to understand what love really means. We have left the study of love to the last, but now that we can begin to understand its importance for humanity, we can see that this is the area in which the men of religion, the educators, the physicians,**

and the scientists can join hands in the common endeavor of putting man back upon the road of his evolutionary destiny from which he has gone so far astray—the road which leads to health and happiness for all humanity, peace and goodwill unto all the earth' (*The Phi Delta Kappan*, Vol.51, No.9).

But while these quotes *are* incredibly honest, with understanding of the psychologically upset state of the human condition finally found (the explanation of which was presented in Part 3:2), we can at last explain what is, in fact, fundamentally wrong with what Schreiner and Montagu have said, which is that rather than loving our infants being **'the mightiest and noblest of human work'**, and of there being **'nothing in the world…more important'** than being loved, there has actually been a **'mightie**[r]**'** and **'more important'** task assigned to humans, which was to persevere with humanity's corrupting, love-destroying search for knowledge until we found the understanding of the human condition that liberates the human race from that condition.

So there has been a *very* good reason for why humans **'have literally been unloved to death'**, but until we could explain that reason we had no choice but to leave **'the study of love to the last'**. It is *only* now that we can explain the human condition, explain that humanity has had to be preoccupied with its corrupting, love-destroying, anger-egocentricity-and-alienation-producing heroic search for knowledge, and thus explain *why* we have been so alienated as parents that we have been unable to give our offspring anything like the alienation-free, sound, secure, unconditional love needed to create **'The real vision of the human being'** of the sound child, the **'child wonder'**. Yes, it is *only* now that we can afford to admit that the playwright Samuel Beckett was only slightly exaggerating the brevity today of a truly loved, soulful, happy, innocent, secure, sane, human-condition-free life when he wrote, **'They give birth astride of a grave, the light gleams an instant, then it's night once more'** (*Waiting for Godot*, 1955), or admit that R.D. Laing was right when he wrote that **'To adapt to this world the child abdicates its ecstasy'** (*The Politics of Experience* and *The Bird of Paradise*, 1967, p.118 of 156).

Such is the enormous paradox of the human condition: we humans appeared to be horribly bad but are, in fact, heroically wonderful—but until that reconciling biological understanding was found we had no choice but to be prepared to create and live in a world that was devoid of truth—and love! As the song *The Impossible Dream* described this predicament, we had to be prepared **'to march into hell for a heavenly cause'**. So what is really needed to balance Schreiner's and Montagu's honest but unfairly condemning revelations about how unloving parents have been, and, as a result, how hurt and alienated children have been, is an essay about how incredibly, amazingly, extraordinarily heroic *all* parents have been to have even had children while they were living under the horrific duress of the human condition. Yes, a balancing essay is needed about how the human race has had to live with two million years of unjust condemnation—about how every day humans have had to get out of bed and face a world that in effect hated them, that considered them horrible mistakes, blights on Earth, defiling, bad, awful, even evil, sinful creatures, when, as explained in Part 3, humans are nothing less than the heroes of the whole story of life on Earth!!

It follows then that there has been a justifiable reason for each of the *why's* that were listed earlier—*except* for the last one of why I and those advocating my work have been so thoroughly persecuted for presenting the nurturing explanation for our moral instincts. As emphasised, it was *only* when we could explain the human condition and thus finally understand our inability to nurture our offspring that it would be safe to admit the critically

important understanding of our species' nurtured origins and, as Montagu said, put **'man back upon the road of his evolutionary destiny from which he has gone so far astray'** and transform the human race, restore **'health and happiness for all humanity, peace and goodwill unto all the earth'**, and since it is precisely that explanation of the human condition that I have presented, inclusive of that nurturing explanation, there is *no* justification for the rejection, ostracism and persecution that I have been subjected to. Quite the reverse, in fact—such a response represents the very height of irresponsibility and an abuse of science's mandate to support endeavours that seek to understand and ameliorate the plight of man. The seriousness of this ill-treatment will be revisited at the end of this Part.

From the perspective, however, of mechanistic science, this need to deny the importance of nurturing in our human origins until we could explain the human condition has meant that biologists had to find some way of supporting this denial. And, as we are now going to see, *this* denial—like that which led to the corruption of Darwin's idea of natural selection into a 'survival of the fittest' process, through to the development of E.O. Wilson's theory of Eusociality—was achieved through the invention of the Social Intelligence Hypothesis. (Obviously, the entire need for denial should have been eradicated 30 years ago when I presented the nurturing explanation in accompaniment with the explanation of the human condition, but, again, this is an issue I will return to later.)

Part 8:5D To deny the importance of nurturing, the Social Intelligence Hypothesis was invented

Since humans are primates, the obvious area of research that has the most potential to shed light on our origins is the field of primatology, but it is in this most enlightening of subjects that some of the most dishonest thinking about the origins of our species' moral sense has been taking place. Despite John Fiske having presented the nurturing explanation for our moral nature way back in 1874, the great majority of primatologists have been so fearful of the truth of nurturing that they have been completely dishonest in their interpretations of primate behaviour. This is particularly apparent if we compare their studies with the work of the rare few honest primatologists who have dared to recognise the role nurturing is playing in primate society.

For instance, the obviousness—if you're not practicing denial—of the nurturing, love-indoctrination process, and how extremely confronting a truth it is, is apparent in Dian Fossey's study of gorillas. As described in the Part 8:4G, Fossey was an extraordinarily strong-willed woman for whom the universal practice of denial in mechanistic science held no sway. Few, if any, however, have been able to cope with the honesty of Fossey's studies, and, as a result, she has been misrepresented as merely a fanatical gorilla conservationist—such as in the 1988 film of her life, *Gorillas in the Mist*. A read, however, of her wonderfully insightful treatise on gorilla behaviour—the 1983 book *Gorillas in the Mist* upon which the film was unfaithfully based—shows just how courageous a scientist Fossey was. She watched the lives of troops of gorillas over many generations and gave a denial-free, honest account of what she saw, which was the whole love-indoctrination process at work. Fearlessly, she wrote that **'Like human mothers, gorilla mothers show a great variation in the treatment of their offspring…Flossie**

was very casual in the handling, grooming, and support of both of her infants, whereas Old Goat was an exemplary parent'. Old Goat's offspring, the **'exemplary parent**[ed]**' 'Tiger'**, **'was taking his place in Group 4's growing cohesiveness. By the age of five, Tiger was surrounded by playmates his own age, a loving mother, and a protective group leader. He was a contented and well-adjusted individual whose zest for living was almost contagious for the other animals of his group…**[However,] **The immigrant… menace…Beetsme…developed an unruly desire to dominate…I found myself strongly disliking Beetsme as I watched his discord destroy…**[the group's] **cohesiveness'**. On reading this, one can appreciate why the whole nurturing, love-indoctrination process has been so determinedly denied—Old Goat was an **'exemplary parent'** who created a **'well-adjusted'** offspring with a wonderful **'zest for living'**, while the **'menac**[ing]**'**, **'unruly'**, **'discord'**-creating, **'cohesiveness'**-**'destroy**[ing]**'**, non-**'loving'**, and by inference unloved, Beetsme was **'dislik**[able]**'**; the implication for humans being that if you don't love your child you're a bad person, and, as has been stated, humans **'would rather admit to being an axe-murderer to being a bad father or mother'**.

In his 1989 book, *Peacemaking Among Primates*, the primatologist Frans de Waal recounts a meeting that was held between an unnamed psychiatrist and Harry F. Harlow, a psychologist who, in the 1950s, studied the extremely damaging effect isolation and touch deprivation had on rhesus monkey infants; their discussion shows just how unbearable and confronting both the concept and the importance of nurturing love has been for those studying primates, and just how fearless Fossey was in her honesty: **'For some scientists it was hard to accept that monkeys may have feelings. In** [the 1979 book] ***The Human Model…***[authors Harry F.] **Harlow and** [Clara E.] **Mears describe the following strained meeting: "Harlow used the term 'love', at which the psychiatrist present countered with the word 'proximity'. Harlow then shifted to the word 'affection', with the psychiatrist again countering with 'proximity'. Harlow started to simmer, but relented when he realized that the closest the psychiatrist had probably ever come to love was proximity"'** (pp.13-14 of 294). Yes, humans' present human-condition-afflicted, unloved and unloving lives—where the **'closest'** the immensely upset human race has **'probably ever come to love'** is **'proximity'**—has meant that our ability to even acknowledge the existence of love, which is what nurturing essentially is, has been nigh impossible. No wonder mechanistic science practices the *extreme* dishonesty that Allot described in his aforementioned 1992 paper, when he reported that **'Love has been described as a taboo subject, not serious, not appropriate for scientific study'**—this despite, as Montagu acknowledged, **'love'** being **'One of the most frequently used words in our vocabulary'**!

It follows then that the bonobos—whose extraordinarily maternal, nurturing, loving treatment of their infants and the resulting remarkable integrative, loving behaviour they exhibit as adults was described at length in Part 8:4F—have been *extremely* exposing, confronting and condemning of the unloved and unloving human race. As I mentioned in Part 8:4F, the biologist, psychologist and bonobo authority Sue Savage-Rumbaugh has bravely admitted that nurturing is the focus of bonobo society; like Fossey, she has let the truth out of the bag that the cooperative behaviour of bonobos *is* a product of the infant-focused, nurturing of love, love-indoctrination process—writing, with the assistance of her co-author, the writer Roger Lewin, that **'Bonobo life is centered around the offspring. Unlike what happens among common chimps, all members of the bonobo social group help with infant care and share food with infants. If you are a bonobo infant, you can do no wrong…Bonobo females and their infants form the core of the group.'** But *also* like Fossey, Savage-Rumbaugh's honesty appears to have made her the target of the human-

condition-avoiding, nurturing-denying, mechanistic scientific establishment, because in 2012 a campaign was launched to discredit and marginalise her ground-breaking work with bonobos. I have been told by a scientist whom I respect and who knows Savage-Rumbaugh personally that she *has* become somewhat erratic, but if that is the case I strongly suspect the genesis of such instability would be years of unfair criticism from the mechanistic establishment.

So the question now is, how was denial of the obvious role nurturing plays in the lives of more developed/integrated/social mammals, especially primates, and most especially bonobos—which the studies of Fossey and Savage-Rumbaugh bear witness to, and which provide such powerful evidence for how we acquired our cooperative, unconditionally selfless, moral instincts—achieved? Clearly, such a denial wasn't going to be easy, but looking an obvious truth in the face and finding a way to deny it—such as finding a way to deny the extremely obvious truths of Integrative Meaning and of our corrupted human condition—is something we humans are masters at!

So yes, how did mechanistic science manage to look the obvious truth of the importance of nurturing in the face and deny it? There have been two ways. The first was to portray maternalism as nothing more than a mother providing her dependent offspring with food and protection. As was explained in Part 8:4B, the truth is that mothers' maternal instincts to nourish and protect their offspring *did* provide the base from which the love-indoctrination process was able to develop, however, in love-indoctrination, maternalism became about much more than a mother looking after her infant—it became a case of actively *loving* that infant. Significantly, we speak of 'motherly love', not 'motherly protection'. The problem, however, with this method of denying the nurturing, loving significance of maternalism is that in the case of the extremely exposing-of-the-truth, infant-focused, maternal bonobo society, their environment has historically been food-rich and competitor-and-predator-free, so it doesn't make sense to argue that their exceptionally maternal behaviour has been driven by the need to either source food or provide protection.

The second method used to deny the significance of nurturing in bonobo life, and, by inference, its significance in the lives of our ape ancestors, is the one Leakey referred to—that the extended infancies in primates is due to the infant's need for **'prolonged learning'** about their **'environment'**. A more complete rendition of this alleged explanation for the need for the nurturing that we see in the society of more developed mammals, particularly in bonobos and humans, is that **'The more sophisticated species also exhibit longer infant and juvenile stages, which are probably related to the time required for their more advanced mental development and their integration into complex social systems'** (*Encyclopedia Britannica*, cited on <https://pages.uoregon.edu/jschombe/glossary/primate.html>, accessed Feb. 2013). As will be explained in more detail in Part 8:7B, this so-called 'Social Intelligence Hypothesis' (sometimes referred to as the 'Machiavellian Intelligence Hypothesis'), and its more sophisticated version, the Ecological Dominance-Social Competition (EDSC) Model, essentially maintain that the long mother-infant association is needed to ensure the infant learns the skills necessary to manage **'complex social'** situations, and that it was this need that also led to **'more advanced mental development'**, ultimately the fully conscious, intelligent mind in humans. For example, as was mentioned in Part 8:4C, E.O. Wilson says in *The Social Conquest of Earth* that, **'to feel empathy for others, to measure**

the emotions of friends and enemy alike, to judge the intentions of all of them, and to plan a strategy for personal social interactions…the human brain became…highly intelligent' (2012, p.17 of 330).

However, as will be described in Part 8:7B when the truthful explanation of the origins of consciousness is presented, even human-condition-avoiding mechanistic scientists have raised serious concerns over the viability of both the Social/Machiavellian Intelligence Hypothesis (S/MIH) and the EDSC Model, but from the human-condition-confronting, truthful view of biology, some very obvious flaws with both models can be pointed out immediately—particularly in regard to their core argument that our fully conscious intelligent mind emerged as a result of having to learn to manage complex social situations, a process that supposedly required and explained the long infancy.

Social problem-solving is, of course, an obvious benefit of being conscious, but *all* activities that animals have to manage would benefit enormously from conscious intelligence—from the ability to reason how cause and effect are related, to understand change, to make sense of experience, to be insightful—so it is completely illogical to suggest that it wasn't until the need arose to manage complex social situations that consciousness developed. No, any sensible analysis of how and when consciousness emerged must be based on the question of 'what has *prevented* its development in other animals?' A lack of social situations doesn't explain why the fully conscious mind hasn't appeared in non-human species because there was ample need for a conscious mind prior to the appearance of complex social situations.

No, as was briefly explained in Parts 3:11 and 8:4C and will be fully explained in Part 8:7B, the only accountable explanation for the emergence of the fully conscious mind in humans and for what is blocking its emergence in other species is the nurturing, love-indoctrination explanation—which, to recap very briefly, states that the nurturing of selflessness *liberated* the fully conscious, intelligent mind from the block that exists in non-human species' minds against thinking selflessly and thus truthfully and thus effectively.

Another obvious flaw with both the S/MIH and the EDSC Model is that if it wasn't for the psychologically upset state of the human condition there would be no need to learn, and become intelligent enough to master, the art of managing **'complex social systems'**. Through the process of love-indoctrination, we humans became *so* instinctively integrated that there was no disharmony/conflict/discord/**'complex**[ity]**'** to have to manage. We lived instinctively as one organism. What did the Greek poet Hesiod say? **'Like gods they lived, with calm untroubled mind, free from the toils and anguish of our kind…They with abundant goods 'midst quiet lands, all willing shared the gathering of their hands.'** The pre-human-condition-afflicted, integrated, cooperative, social, Specie Individual state, such as that which largely exists in bonobo society today, simply wasn't a situation that called for infants to be skilled in social management techniques.

And the even more blatant flaw with the two arguments used to dismiss the important role nurturing played in the lives of our forebears, and continues to play in the development/integration/socialisation of other mammals, especially other primates, and most especially bonobos, is that they suggest nurturing is nothing more than a mother providing her dependent infant with food and protection, and that the long mother-infant association is needed only to allow the time to impart social skills. But, as stated earlier, humans can't have developed such powerful instincts to nurture our offspring with love, or such powerful expectations

of being unconditionally loved as children, if nurturing hadn't played a fundamental role in the history of our species' development—as I said, such instincts and expectations do not appear out of thin air. The response to this statement, however, from advocates of the S/MIH and the EDSC Model would be that mothers simply don't have powerful instincts to nurture their offspring with love, and children simply don't have expectations of being loved; rather mothers have powerful *instincts to teach* their offspring how to manage **'integration into complex social systems'**, and children have *instinctual expectations of being taught* such skills. In other words, it is not a case of instincts to love and be loved 'coming out of thin air', but a case of such instincts never existing in the first place. But that is absurd; indeed, it is offensively dishonest, because everyone actually does know that what Schreiner and Montagu wrote about infants' need for love is true. Yes, what an infant needs from its parents—and from its mother in particular—*is* unconditional love, *not* training in the management of complex social situations! Certainly, when the need for denial is critical any excuse will do, and the art of denial is to then stick to that excuse like glue, but that does *not* mean we are so unaware we are practicing denial that we are unable to recognise and admit the truth when that denial is no longer needed—which, with the human condition now explained, it no longer is.

We all do actually know that to achieve the **'loving order in the world'** that Montagu recognised, the cold, ruthlessly selfish, competitive, must-reproduce-your-genes 'animal condition' had to be overcome, and the only means by which that could be achieved was through the mother-infant, nurturing-of-love situation: the love-indoctrination process. As was emphasised in Part 8:4, the difficulty is that love-indoctrination is an extremely difficult process to develop and maintain to the point where the fierce competition to reproduce your genes is contained and integration achieved. Only our ape ancestors managed to develop love-indoctrination to the point where competition amongst males especially was contained and unconditional love and integration developed, something the fossil record is now confirming, as was described in Part 8:4E. Bonobos are well on their way, but all the other relatively developed/integrated/social mammals are still battling to develop love-indoctrination to the point where it has overcome selfish competition amongst males to reproduce their genes. But they *are* trying to do so, they *are* trying to indoctrinate their infants with love to the degree their circumstances allow. Reports from anyone who has worked with the relatively developed/integrated/social mammals and who is not under the control of the thought police—the truth-denying, mechanistic scientific constabulary—give accounts of the development of love through nurturing, such as this of the nurturing, loving behaviour of elephants: **'After years of research and scientific observation it has been shown that elephant's social structure and familial bonds are similar, if not deeper, than the bonds developed among** [present immensely psychologically upset] **human beings. There are deeply stirring accounts, by such scientists as Joyce Poole, Cynthia Moss and Dr. Dame Daphne Sheldrick, of elephants weeping and expressing grief at the loss of their calves…and other herd members. There are recorded behaviors of near spiritual proportion…Calves frequently die of heartbreak from the loss of their mothers and abuse by human beings…There are also great displays of affection and mutual respect rarely viewed in the social structure of humans. Joyce Poole, internationally known expert on elephants, states, "I have never seen (wild) calves 'disciplined'. Protected, comforted, cooed over, reassured and rescued, yes, but punished, no. Elephants are raised in an incredibly positive and loving environment"'** ('The Heart of Africa',

accessed Feb. 2013: see <www.wtmsources.com/102>). Note that Poole's comment that elephant calves are never **'disciplined'** echoes Savage-Rumbaugh's observation that bonobo infants **'can do no wrong'**. Revealingly, like elephant orphans, orphaned **'Gorillas and bonobos…just die. They see their mothers killed and they give up'** (Vanessa Woods, *Bonobo Handshake*, 2010, p.67 of 278)—because, as stated above, they suffer **'heartbreak'**; their emotional desire for, their instinctive expectation of receiving, and their attachment to, a loving true (Integrative-Meaning-compliant) world is so great they literally cannot survive without it. In Part 8:4F, a quote from Savage-Rumbaugh was included that described the rapturous joy expressed by the bonobos Matata and her adopted son Kanzi at their *loving* reunion. When the Friends of Bonobos charity designed their fundraising **'A Bonobo Mother's Love T-shirt'** to have a picture of a mother bonobo cradling her infant, they weren't 'anthropomorphising' or inappropriately humanising bonobos, as the mechanistic thought police would argue, they were unwittingly conveying the simple truth. Bonobo mothers aren't merely giving infants training in how to manage **'integration into complex social systems'**, that is an absurd suggestion—they are giving them **'love'**. But, again, when the need for denial is desperate, any excuse will do. The *truth* is that in the relatively developed/integrated/social species of mammals, nurturing *has* moved beyond the primitive 'must nourish and protect' maternal situation to the 'must love' maternal situation—they *are* attempting to develop love-indoctrination.

Part 8:5E Dismissing maternal love as training to manage complex social situations still left the extraordinarily cooperative lives of bonobos, and of our ape ancestors, to somehow be explained

While both the dishonest S/MIH and the EDSC Model have been relied upon to dismiss the mother-infant bond as being nothing more than a mother nourishing and protecting her offspring, and training them in the art of managing complex social situations, a big problem remained: how to account for the remarkable cooperative behaviour of bonobos, and our own unconditionally selfless moral instincts? So the question now is, what nurturing-of-love-denying 'explanation' did mechanistic scientists come up with to 'solve' this problem?

Initially, they tried to portray the competitive aggression and violence that can be found in all ape species (except bonobos) as evidence of what our ape ancestors were supposedly like. But when it was found that bonobos didn't fit this model, human-condition-avoiding mechanistic scientists tried to ignore the anomaly they represented. And *then*, when those scientists could no longer ignore the extraordinary integration that is so apparent in bonobo society, they conceded that bonobos are cooperative but found a way to explain how they became cooperative that did not invoke, or credit in any way, nurturing. (At this point, it should be stated that, just as our fear of the human condition and resulting denial of it has been so great that we, the upset human race, have hardly been aware that we are living in denial of it, our fear of the truth of the importance of nurturing in human development and resulting denial of it has also become *so* developed and entrenched in us that we are hardly aware that we are practicing it. It is almost instinctive in us now to avoid the significance of nurturing in human history, as though it's a rule we live by but with only a subliminal awareness that we are abiding by it.)

In regard to the initial strategy stated above—of relating our aggressive behaviour to that of apes—as was explained in Part 4:11, ever since Darwin presented his idea of natural selection, humans have been misrepresenting it as a 'survival of the fittest' process, and using that misinterpretation to support the reverse-of-the-truth-lie that, just like other animals, we humans have competitive, selfish and aggressive instincts that our intellect has to heroically control. Chimpanzees appeared to support this lie—they were obviously human-like, and so were used as a model for our ancestors, with anthropologists such as Raymond Dart and Robert Ardrey pointing to chimpanzees' intense and violent male competition, rape, infanticide and inter-group warfare as being indicative of the behavioural heritage of our ancestors. Dart argued for the **'predatory transition from ape to man'** ('The Predatory Transition from Ape to Man', *International Anthropological and Linguistic Review*, 1953, Vol.1, No.4), while Ardrey was even more emphatic, saying that **'Man had emerged from the anthropoid background for one reason only: because he was a killer'** (*African Genesis*, 1961, p.29 of 380). More recently, in 1999, a leading anthropologist and author of *Demonic Males*, Richard Wrangham, put forward the so-called Chimpanzee Violence Hypothesis, which claimed that **'selection has favored a hunt-and-kill propensity in chimpanzees and humans, and that coalitional killing has a long history in the evolution of both species'** ('Evolution of Coalitionary Killing', *Yearbook of Physical Anthropology*, 1999, Vol.42). Both theories were immensely popular obviously because the idea that our instincts are wildly aggressive made our intellect's supposed role as mediator seem all the more heroic. While it all amounted to a reverse-of-the-truth lie (because, as explained in Part 4:6, our instincts are loving while our intellect is the offending, divisive influence), it was, nevertheless, a very human-condition-relieving thesis.

Incidentally, even though we do now have fossil evidence supporting the love-indoctrination explanation for our moral instincts, without the living evidence that the bonobos provide, it would be very difficult to prove the nurturing of love explanation for our unconditionally loving moral nature. Thank goodness for bonobos!

Yes, with their peaceful and gentle society, the bonobos exposed this initial strategy for the lie it was, but in doing so exposed themselves to the wrath of mechanistic science as an unbearably exposing and confronting reminder of our now immensely angry, egocentric and alienated, unloving and unloved lives. So, as stated, mechanistic science's strategy to deal with *this* problem was to simply ignore the anomaly that bonobos represented. Indeed, this strategy was so successful that the first in-depth study of bonobos, which only occurred in 1954, was **'ignored and forgotten by the scientific community'** (Frans de Waal & Frans Lanting, *Bonobo: The Forgotten Ape*, 1997, p.11 of 210) because it dared to describe them as **'an extraordinarily sensitive, gentle creature, far removed from the demoniacal primitive force of the adult chimpanzee'** (E. Tratz & H. Heck, 'Der africkanische Anthropoide "Bonobo": Eine neue Menschenaffengattung', *Säugetierkundliche Mitteilungen*, Vol.2). In fact, it was this ongoing denial that led de Waal and the photographer Frans Lanting to title their 1997 collaboration, *Bonobo: The Forgotten Ape*. This book, which acknowledged rather than ignored the extraordinary sensitivity of bonobos, was, not surprisingly, vilified: **'De Waal's bonobo research came under sustained attack'** (Douglas Foster, *The Future of Bonobos: An Animal Akin to Ourselves*, accessed Sept. 2004 at: see <www.wtmsources.com/122>) from anthropologists such as Craig Stanford who wrote in a paper that **'It is clear that much of the research on these two intensively studied apes** [in the case of bonobos, I would argue 'superficially' studied] **remains fraught with untested assumptions'** and that **'reported differences have been inflated'** ('The Social Behavior of Chimpanzees

and Bonobos: Empirical Evidence and Shifting Assumptions', *Current Anthropology*, 1998, Vol.39, No.4). Responding to Stanford's criticisms, de Waal insightfully wrote that **'Two strategies have emerged to keep bonobos at a distance so as to preserve chimpanzee-based scenarios of human evolution, which traditionally emphasize warfare, hunting, tool use, and male dominance. The first strategy is to describe the bonobo as an interesting but specialized anomaly that can be safely ignored as a possible model of the last common ancestor (see Wrangham and Peterson 1996). The second strategy, adopted by Stanford, is to minimize the differences between the two *Pan* species: if bonobos behave, by and large, like chimpanzees, there is no reason to question the latter species' prominence as a model'** (ibid).

The problem that emerged with these dismissive strategies was that modern technology has increasingly made the bonobos more accessible, and their extraordinarily integrative behaviour, that is so different to chimpanzees, almost impossible to ignore. *Bonobos*, the French documentary that was referred to in Part 8:4F, is a case in point.

The fact is, with their extraordinarily loving behaviour, bonobos have represented an ever-growing thorn in the side of a mechanistic scientific fraternity that desperately wanted to avoid their significance. And since bonobos couldn't be ignored forever, something had to be done to at least minimise their confronting presence. What happened was that while their **'extraordinarily sensitive, gentle'**, peaceful, cooperative behaviour could not very well be denied (and, in any case, there was a growing desire among ideal-behaviour-emphasising-but-human-condition-avoiding left-wing biologists to be able to emphasise cooperativeness and gentleness), it was hoped that at least a way could be found to explain why bonobos were cooperative in a manner that still avoided acknowledging the unbearable significance of their remarkable nurturing, maternal behaviour. And the way that was found was through a theory known as the 'Social Ecological Model' that sought to explain social behaviour in terms of ecological factors that influence social interactions.

Before describing this Social Ecological Model it should be mentioned that mechanistic science has employed a similar strategy of evasion to dismiss fossilised evidence of our species' cooperative past.

Part 8:5F Fossilised evidence of our species' cooperative past has also been dismissed and then ignored by mechanistic science

Yes, just as the evidence provided by bonobos of our species' cooperative past has been denied by mechanistic science—first by claiming that our ancestors behaved competitively and aggressively 'like most ape species', and, when bonobos clearly didn't fit that model, by simply ignoring the anomaly of bonobos altogether—the fossilised evidence of our cooperative past has also been dismissed as irrelevant and, when that strategy became untenable, it too was simply ignored.

For instance, it was stated in Part 8:4E that the fossil record reveals that our ape ancestors had small canine teeth. Although it was explained there that the only accountable explanation for the reduction in canine size in our ape ancestors is that it was caused by female sexual selection against male mating aggression—that small canines are **'indicative of minimal social aggression'**—mechanistic scientists initially tried to avoid the implications of these small canines by maintaining that they were only a recent development, and that the fossil record would inevitably provide evidence of an aggressive heritage. For example,

in 1915 it was said, **'That we should discover such a race [a human race in which the canine teeth were pointed, projecting, and shaped as in anthropoid apes], sooner or later, has been an article of faith in the anthropologist's creed ever since Darwin's time'** (Sir Arthur Keith, *The Antiquity of Man*, 1925, p.459 of 519). However, as subsequent fossil discoveries pushed back, by millions of years, the age at which our ape ancestors still had small canines it became increasingly impossible to maintain this **'article of faith'** of an aggressive **'human race'**. As noted in Part 8:4E, other attempts to account for our ancestors' canine reduction that did not cite a reduction in aggression have also been rendered untenable by these ongoing discoveries, such as by what we now know of their diet.

So, through the recent discoveries of *Ardipithecus*, *Orrorin*, and the 7 million year old *Sahelanthropus*, and the conclusive evidence they provide of our species' cooperative heritage, it appears that human-condition-avoiding, mechanistic scientists have been cornered into simply ignoring this evidence. For example, Richard Wrangham published the Chimpanzee Violence Hypothesis in 1999, and yet failed to mention the discovery, only 7 years earlier, of *Ardipithecus*—a find that had confirmed the existence of small canines at least 4.4 million years ago. Similarly, E.O. Wilson's attempt in his 2012 book *The Social Conquest of Earth* to portray war as a **'universal and eternal'** presence in human history (a claim that was repudiated in Part 4:12I), makes no mention of the fact that small canines characterise our ape ancestors, despite Wilson discussing both *Australopithecus* and *Ardipithecus* in his book. In 2009 the popular science magazine *Scientific American* (a subsidiary of the leading journal *Nature*) failed to make a single reference to a suite of papers—which had been some 15 years in the making—on *Ardipithecus ramidus* that had been published in a 2009 special edition of *Science*, **'the most extensive special issue of *Science* since Apollo 11'** (Tim D. White, Letters, *Scientific American*, 2010, Vol.302, No.1). As Tim White, team leader of the *Ardipithecus* researchers, asked, **'How and why did the *Scientific American* editorial miss that story?'** (ibid). It is as if the fossil evidence of a cooperative past has become too strong to refute but the implications too daunting to acknowledge, rendering the majority of mechanistic scientists speechless. While a handful of scientists have broken the silence since the *Ardipithecus* discoveries were published, predictably most have done so in order to deny their cooperative implications on the only grounds left, which is by arguing that *Ardipithecus*, *Orrorin* and *Sahelanthropus* are not part of the human lineage, despite all the evidence indicating that they are.

Yes, mechanistic science's strategies for dealing with the fossil record's evidence of a cooperative past have followed a pattern similar to that which they employed to deal with the bonobos—first denounce the evidence as irrelevant on the false basis that our past is aggressive, and, when that position becomes untenable, simply ignore the evidence.

A further point of significance, and one that was also raised in Part 8:4E, is that the fossil record, particularly the 1992 discovery of *Ardipithecus*, clearly shows the physical and behavioural similarities between our pre-australopithecine ape ancestors and bonobos. But if bonobos themselves needed to be ignored, it follows that any evidence that links our ancestors to them will be treated the same way—as indeed it has. As Frans de Waal explains in his 2013 book, *The Bonobo and the Atheist*, **'a scientist on the Ardi** [*Ardipithecus*] **team…could think only of chimps as a comparison…**[despite] **The bonobo's body proportions—its long legs and narrow shoulders—seem**[ing] **to perfectly fit the descriptions of Ardi, as do its relatively small canines. Why was the bonobo overlooked?'** (pp.60-61 of 289).

Part 8:5G The Social Ecological Model

To return now to mechanistic science's determination to avoid the unbearable significance of bonobos' remarkable nurturing, maternal behaviour through the development of the theory known as the Social Ecological Model (SEM).

In essence, the SEM holds that the abundance of food available to the bonobos was what gave rise to their extraordinary harmony and cooperation. The model maintains that a plentiful supply of food meant that groups of bonobos no longer had to split up to feed, which gave females the opportunity to socialise more and, in time, to form coalitions to protect themselves against aggressive male competition for mating opportunities, thus forcing males to adopt more cooperative strategies. To quote from a description of the SEM in a 2001 paper by the anthropologists Richard Wrangham and David Pilbeam: **'The absence of gorillas made high-quality foliage more available for proto-bonobos than for chimpanzees. As a result, proto-bonobos experienced a reduced intensity of scramble competition compared to chimpanzees. Reduced scramble competition allowed more stable parties, which then made several forms of aggression more dangerous and costly, and less beneficial, to the aggressors. This change in the economics of violence led through various social consequences to female-female alliances, concealed ovulation, and reduced individual vulnerability to gang attacks. All these favored a reduction in the propensity for male aggressiveness'** ('African apes as time machines', *All Apes Great and Small: Volume 1: African Apes*, 2002, p.12 of 316). So, under the dictates of the SEM, bonobos were able to become, to quote Wrangham again, **'a species biologically committed to the moral aspects of what, ironically, we like to call "humanity": respect for others, personal restraint, and turning aside from violence as a solution to conflicting** [social] **interests'** (*Demonic Males*, 1997, p.230 of 350). Wrangham is also reported to have referred to **'those loving bonobos'** (Steve Sailer, 'Chimps and Chumps', *National Review*, 1999, Vol.51, No.18).

So this model claimed to explain bonobos' extraordinary **'respect for others'**, **'personal restraint'**, **'loving'**, **'moral',** cooperative nature without a single mention of the importance of nurturing! Its appeal, however, can be judged by its adoption, in one form or another, by almost all the leading bonobo researchers (including Alison and Noel Badrian, Ben Blount, Christophe Boesch, Barbara Fruth, Brian Hare, Gottfried Hohmann, Takayoshi Kano, Suehisa Kuroda, Toshisada Nishida, Amy Parish, David Pilbeam, Barbara Smuts, Randall Susman, Frans de Waal, Frances White and Richard Wrangham), and by the fact that it remains virtually uncontested since being put forward in the early 1980s. While not all these scientists necessarily agree with Wrangham that bonobos behave in a **'loving'** way—with some maintaining bonobos are capable only of reciprocal selflessness—all acknowledge that bonobos are extraordinarily cooperative and all use the SEM to explain it.

But while the SEM serves the purpose of denying the significance of nurturing in bonobo society, the mechanisms it uses to do so—namely that females have been able to form coalitions to counter male aggression, and that those coalitions are successful in dominating males—are, in fact, seriously flawed.

Firstly, with regard to bonobo females being able to form coalitions to protect themselves against male aggression, the SEM argues that the opportunity to spend more time together—which, in the case of bonobos, they say was made possible by an abundance of food—allowed bonobos to form **'stable parties'** that in time allowed the formation of **'female-**

female alliances' to protect themselves against **'male aggressiveness'** arising from competition for mating opportunities.

However, while it is not uncommon amongst mammals for situations to occur where **'stable parties'** are able to and do form, it is rare for such **'stable parties'** to lead to **'female-female alliances'** that have the power to prevent **'male aggressiveness'**—which is surprising because such an alliance would certainly seem beneficial since male aggression does come at a cost to females, as these quotes indicate: **'Sexual harassment has significant negative consequences for females even when it doesn't end up in coerced sex; it can increase stress and interfere with normal activities, reducing health, fitness and longevity. Some forms of harassment may even culminate in injury or death'** (Linda Mealey, *Sex Differences: Developmental and Evolutionary Strategies*, 2000, p.130 of 480); and **'Females in many mammalian species experience both sexual aggression and infanticide by males'** (Barbara Smuts & Robert Smuts, 'Male Aggression and Sexual Coercion of Females in Nonhuman Primates and Other Mammals: Evidence and Theoretical Implications', *Advances in the Study of Behavior*, 1993, Vol.22). If **'stable parties'** were all that were required to form **'female-female alliances'** that could stop **'male aggressiveness'** then such alliances would be common amongst mammals, but they aren't. In short, the formation of such alliances *do* occur within primate societies (especially among bonobos), but if the SEM is correct it should *also* be regularly occurring in non-primate mammals, but it isn't. To quote the anthropologists Barbara and Robert Smuts: **'the use of female coalitions to thwart aggressive males appears to be rare in other mammals compared with nonhuman primates'** (ibid).

The only conclusion for why the strategy of forging **'female-female alliances'** to prevent **'male aggressiveness'** is rare outside primate species is that the strategy is not genetically successful—in other words, it is not in the interest of the female's chances of reproducing her genes, otherwise natural selection would have 'discovered' it and the practice would be a common one amongst all mammals. As such, there has to be some other factor aside from **'stable parties'** enabling females to form these types of coalitions, and the regularity with which these alliances appear within primates compared with non-primate mammals suggests it is something unique to primates. But while the SEM cannot account for this peculiarity, the love-indoctrination explanation certainly does. As was explained in Part 8:4B, primates, whose arms are semi-freed from walking and are thus able to hold a helpless infant, are uniquely placed to develop love-indoctrination should conditions be favourable—and, as we've established, the bonobos have the most favourable environmental conditions amongst the primates and, as a result, *have* been able to develop the most love-indoctrinated integration.

Yes, it would appear that it is only amongst primate species, where more nurturing is able to be selected for and both males and females are able to be indoctrinated with unconditional selfless love, that the **'economics of violence'** changes enough for it to be possible to form **'female-female alliances'** to help rein in **'male aggressiveness'**.

So the differing degrees of success that the various primate species are having in forming female coalitions is a reflection of how favourable their environment is for developing love-indoctrination. For example, bonobos *do* live in a more food abundant environment than chimpanzees, something the SEM recognises, which is why bonobos have been far more successful in developing love-indoctrination and thus forming effective **'female-female alliances'** to stop **'male aggressiveness'**—but, as stated, the SEM does *not* account for why chimpanzees and bonobos are, to varying degrees of success, able to form female coalitions against

male aggression when that is a behaviour that **'appears to be rare in other mammals'**. No, only love-indoctrination explains why **'female-female alliances'** to stop **'male aggressiveness'** appears primarily in primates.

It should also be noted that even with love-indoctrination operating within primate species, the obstacles against forming successful female coalitions are significant, which accounts for why, without love-indoctrination, it **'appears to be rare in other mammals'**. For example, primate males are stronger than their female counterparts, which means that even if **'female-female alliances'** were to form, females would still likely be injured if they attempted to defy the males, so a better strategy would be to join a male coalition—**'a strategy that carries far less risk than 2 females attempting to retaliate against the aggression of a physically larger and socially dominant adult male'** (Nicholas Newton-Fisher, 'Female Coalitions Against Male Aggression in Wild Chimpanzees of the Budongo Forest', *International Journal of Primatology*, 2006, Vol.27, No.6). While there is less size difference between male and female bonobos than there is between male and female chimpanzees, bonobo males are, nevertheless, larger and stronger than females, and this dimorphism was probably more pronounced when the split with chimpanzees occurred between one and two million years ago, as indicated by the size disparity between male and female chimpanzees today.

Another factor working against the formation of female coalitions against male aggression is that temporary male alliances among chimpanzee males—a widely reported occurrence—are used for the purpose of moving up the male hierarchy, and it is recognised that **'males sometimes gang up on females'** (Barbara Smuts & Robert Smuts, 'Male Aggression and Sexual Coercion of Females in Nonhuman Primates and Other Mammals: Evidence and Theoretical Implications', *Advances in the Study of Behavior*, 1993, Vol.22), so there is a precedent of males forming coalitions, which could then be used to counter female coalitions.

Additionally, as further evidence that female coalitions in primate species are not forming simply in order to increase the females' genetic fitness but as a consequence of love-indoctrination, research shows that coalitions aren't the best response to infanticide; instead, **'where a female carries her offspring or is at least directly associated with them (all anthropoids, many prosimians) her best option is to get male protection for them. This can come from the male who sired the infant, or, in multi-male groups, from the most likely father'** (Elisabeth Sterck, David Watts, Carel van Schaik, 'The evolution of female social relationships in nonhuman primates', *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology*, 1997, Vol.41, No.5). As mentioned in Part 8:4F, there is no record of male bonobos committing infanticide, and it appears that groups of bonobos will even care for orphans, which is a further indication of how successful this species has been in developing love-indoctrination.

Secondly, in attempting to explain how male aggression could be quelled by **'female-female alliances'**, the SEM relies on the superficially persuasive but biologically flawed argument that biologists have desperately been resorting to more and more (especially left-wing biologists, who are wanting to promote cooperation and gentleness), which is that cooperation is more advantageous than competition and can, therefore, be selected for. This reliance is evident in Wrangham's argument that **'female alliances'** made male **'aggression more dangerous and costly, and less beneficial, to the aggressors'** and that **'turning aside from violence'** was **'a solution to conflicting** [social] **interests'**. While it may appear persuasive to suggest that males could stop competing

for mating opportunities once female coalitions formed—because aggression became more **'dangerous and costly, and less beneficial'** than cooperation, or simply because **'turning aside from violence'** is a **'solution to conflicting** [social] **interests'**—the biological reality is that, without love-indoctrination, genetic selfishness will see males *continue* to aggressively compete for any and all mating opportunities. This fact of life was pointed out by C. Owen Lovejoy when, in discussing our ape ancestors, he said, **'Loss of the projecting canine raises other vexing questions because this tooth is so fundamental to reproductive success in higher primates. What could cause males to forfeit their ability to aggressively compete with other males?'** ('Reexamining Human Origins in Light of *Ardipithecus ramidus*', *Science*, 2009, Vol.326, No.5949). The same **'vexing'** question arises in regard to bonobos, something that was pointed out by the anthropologist Gottfried Hohmann when he observed that **'The** [bonobo] **males, the physically superior animals, do not dominate the females, the inferior animals?…It is not only different from chimpanzees but it violates the rules of social ecology'** (Ian Parker, 'Swingers: Bonobos are celebrated as peace-loving, matriarchal, and sexually liberated. Are they?', *The New Yorker*, 30 Jul. 2007). Frans de Waal made a similar observation when he wrote about bonobos that **'dominance by the "weaker" sex constitutes a huge violation of every biologist's expectations'** (*Bonobo: The Forgotten Ape*, 1997, p.76 of 210).

This biologically flawed argument that cooperation can be selected for by natural selection because it is more advantageous than competition is, in fact, the same biologically flawed argument that E.O. Wilson relied upon in his theory of Eusociality. Recall in Part 4:12I how Wilson argued that a group comprised of selfless members who consider the welfare of the group above that of their own will be more cooperative and thus successful when competing against groups who have selfish, non-cooperative members, and therefore that competition between groups can lead to the selection of unconditionally selfless traits. Again, while it is superficially persuasive to suggest that a group with cooperative members will defeat a group with competitive members, the genetic reality is that whenever an unconditionally selfless, altruistic trait appears those that are selfish will take advantage of it, thus negating the establishment of a group of cooperators in the first place. Any selflessness that *might* arise through group selection will be constantly exploited by individual selfishness from *within* the group; as the biologist Jerry Coyne pointed out, **'group selection for altruism would be unlikely to override the tendency of each group to quickly lose its altruism through natural selection favoring cheaters** [selfish individuals]**'** ('Can Darwinism improve Binghamton?', *The New York Times*, 9 Sep. 2011).

The flawed reasoning of this second aspect of the SEM can be seen even more clearly in this description of it by the anthropologist Brian Hare: **'there are some species that outcompeted others by becoming nicer…**[because] **it's very costly to be on top. Often in primate hierarchies, you don't stay on top very long. Everyone is gunning for you. You're getting in a lot of fights. If you don't have to do that, it's better for everybody'** (Brandon Keim, 'Why Some Wild Animals Are Becoming Nicer', *Wired*, 7 Feb. 2012). While it is superficially persuasive to argue that **'it's better for everybody'** if **'you don't have to' 'fight'** to stay **'on top'**, the idea **'violates'** the fundamental fact about the gene-based natural selection process, which is that you do have to be constantly **'gunning'** to **'stay on top'** because if you are not others will be and you won't reproduce your genes. That's the reality of the 'animal condition': fierce competition exists between sexually reproducing individuals seeking to reproduce their genes.

It should be mentioned that advocates of the SEM argue that the bonobos' practice of **'concealed ovulation'** (to not give signs of their fertile period) and of making sex continually available have contributed to the reduction of male competition for mating opportunities, *however*, these practices can *only* develop once competition for mating opportunities has begun to subside because while ever competition to mate remains intense, if a female makes mating available to every male, and/or doesn't advertise she is ready for fertilisation, she can't ensure she mates with the strongest, most virile male and, therefore, that her offspring will be successful competitors. Making sex continually available and concealing ovulation could *assist* love-indoctrination, but not initiate the development of love/unconditional selflessness. No, these practices do not *lead* to a reduction in competition, rather they are a *result* of male competition having largely *been* contained, which, as explained, **'selection against aggression'** can't achieve.

So even though it is seductive to run the argument that cooperation can be selected for by natural selection because it is more advantageous than competition, it is so blatantly biologically incorrect that for biologists to employ it means they are deliberately lying—resorting to a desperate form of bluff—but such has been the extent of the need to avoid the nurturing explanation for bonobos' unconditionally selfless behaviour, and, by extrapolation, for humans' **'moral'** natures. And, as we will soon see, this now insatiable need to account for our moral instincts in a non-confronting way *has* led to the development of a somewhat more refined form of the SEM.

Given its significance, the **'rules of social ecology'** should be elaborated upon. Since males can produce enough sperm to fertilise an almost unlimited amount of females, they benefit from mating with as many females as possible; females, on the other hand, can only be fertilised once, and so benefit from being selective. The resultant tension between the sexes is described as **'virtually universal'** (Barbara Smuts, 'Male Aggression Against Women: An Evolutionary Perspective', *Human Nature*, 1992, Vol.3, No.1), and is naturally resolved in favour of the physically stronger sex, which in most species is the males because competition between males for mating opportunities leads to natural selection for size and strength. The **'violation'** of the **'rules of social ecology'** referred to earlier is that bonobo males, who are physically stronger than the females, do not dominate. (Incidentally, while it is true that there are some species, including a few mammals, where females are the dominant sex, further examination reveals their social situations, and the circumstances leading to the establishment of that matriarchy, to be very different to that of bonobos. For example, spotted hyenas are matriarchal, but the females are physically stronger than the males, and competition within the clans also remains rife, a situation that, again unlike that of the bonobo, is in accordance with the **'rules of social ecology'**.)

It follows that natural selection dictates that any male in this **'universal'** environment who refrains from using his strength to mate will be out-bred by more aggressive rivals, leading to the discontinuation of those less aggressive genes. The only way to minimise this costly aggression a little is through the establishment of a dominance hierarchy amongst the males, whereby conflict is reduced to only those occasions when an individual has the opportunity to move up the hierarchy. So, while comments such as Hare's—that **'it's very costly to be on top…You're getting in a lot of fights. If you don't have to do that, it's better for everybody'**—may be superficially persuasive, they are, in fact, blatant lies, because you *do* **'have to do that'** and **'be on top'** because if you aren't, genetics will inevitably find someone else who is.

As described in Part 4:12, outside of the love-indoctrination situation, the most superficially persuasive scenario that has ever been envisaged for cooperation to be able to defeat competition between sexually reproducing individuals and for fully cooperative, unconditionally selfless traits to be selected for lies in E.O. Wilson's argument that a group with cooperative members will defeat a group with non-cooperative members. HOWEVER, as stated, the biological reality is that individual self-interest makes it impossible for a cooperative group of sexually reproducing individuals to emerge in the first place. As the biologist George Williams states, **'Only by a theory of between-group selection could we achieve a scientific explanation of group-related** [selfless, consider-the-welfare-of-others] **adaptations. However, I would question one of the premises on which the reasoning is based'** (*Adaptation and Natural Selection*, 1966, pp.92-93 of 307). In describing that premise and the reason for his questioning of it, Williams wrote that **'group selection was not strong enough to produce…**[an] **adaptation…characterized by organisms' playing roles that would subordinate their individual interests'** (p.xii). His overall conclusion was that **'group-related adaptations do not, in fact, exist'** (p.93). (It should be noted that while Williams later changed his mind about group selection in regard to some very specific traits (namely instances of female biased sex ratios, and reduced virulence in disease organisms), he remained unconvinced about group selection's wider applicability, as the group selection advocate David Sloan Wilson concedes, **'In general, however, George retained his worldview and I didn't convince him about group selection'** ('Rest In Peace George C. Williams', *ScienceBlogs*, 10 Sep. 2010)). So, it must follow that if the situation where (outside of love-indoctrination) cooperation has the best chance of defeating competition, which is in the between-group selection situation, isn't possible, then cooperation is not going to defeat competition in *any* situation. So, unless they are love-indoctrinated, males are *not* going to stop competing for mating opportunities.

So yes, while Eusociality's cooperation beats competition theory for the emergence of unconditionally selfless cooperative traits is flawed, E.O. Wilson has at least recognised about that supposed explanation that an extraordinary force would be required to overcome subversion by selfish opportunists; in his case by proposing that group warfare was a strong enough force to enable selfless traits to emerge. In contrast, proponents of the SEM do not even acknowledge the seriousness of the challenge of overcoming genetic selfishness, which is revealed by their suggestion that stable parties simply *allowed* cooperation to evolve. That 'stable parties *allowed* cooperation' is an even weaker argument than Wilson's 'between-group selection' theory in that it doesn't even provide the equivalent of a powerful force to counter the problem of selfish subversion.

What has essentially happened is that unable to confront and thus recognise the truth of the nurturing explanation for bonobos, and our own original unconditionally selfless, all-loving state, biologists—especially selflessness-emphasising, left-wing biologists—have resorted to the desperate rationale that 'Well, bonobos are extraordinarily cooperative and we do have unconditionally selfless moral instincts, so these states must have emerged somehow, and it must be because of the reasoning we are putting forward—that cooperation *has to* have a genetic advantage over competition'! In other words, the biologists aren't completely aware that they are avoiding the significance of nurturing; in this sense they are not deliberately lying. As explained earlier, their denial of the role of nurturing is so entrenched they do it unwittingly, which does leave them thinking that stable parties *can* allow alliances against male aggression to occur, and that cooperation *must* somehow have a genetic advantage over competition.

It should be emphasised again here that, as explained in detail in Part 4:12D, the seductive but patently untrue argument that cooperation is more advantageous than competition and can therefore be selected for has a long history of use by cooperation-not-competition-supporting, selflessness-not-selfishness-emphasising, human-journey-to-find-knowledge-opposing left-wing biologists. For example, in 1880, the zoologist Karl Kessler said that **'the progressive development of the animal kingdom…is favoured much more by mutual support than by mutual struggle'** (Address titled *On the law of mutual aid* to the St Petersburg Society of Naturalists, Jan. 1880). Even up to the 1960s this so-called 'naive' misrepresentation of natural selection as being socialistic rather than individualistic was still occurring, with, for instance, the behaviourist Konrad Lorenz writing frequently of *behaviour* having **'a species-preserving function'** (there are many mentions of this phrase in his 1963 book *On Aggression*). As was explained in Part 4:12D, the development of species *is* part of the integrative process, but the *behaviour* of a species is characterised by extremely selfish competition between its sexually reproducing members. In fact, it was George Williams' exasperation with this misrepresentation of natural selection as not being a selfish process that motivated him to write his famous 1966 book *Adaptation and Natural Selection*—a publication that laid the foundations for the selfishness-justifying, right-wing theory of Sociobiology/Evolutionary Psychology. When, as described in Part 4:12G, however, this theory was dishonestly used to misrepresent our cooperative, moral instincts as being nothing more than a product of kin-selection-based selfish reciprocity (only assisting others who share your genes in order to propagate your own), left-wing biologists initially tried to maintain that we do have unconditionally selfless moral instincts by arguing that they are derived from by-products of natural selection—what the biologist Stephen Jay Gould described in 1979 as **'a lot of** [building] **cranes'** acting in conjunction with **'natural selection'**. However, when Gould and his colleagues were unable to specify what the particular by-products/cranes were that achieved this feat of creating our genuinely moral instincts (the by-product was nurturing but they couldn't confront and admit that truth), the left-wing was left with nowhere to go but back to the now highly discredited 'cooperation is more advantageous than competition and can therefore be selected for', group-selection-type argument. As described in Part 4:12H, in 1994, despite the situation where **'group selection has been regarded as an anathema by nearly all evolutionary biologists'** (Richard Lewontin, 'Survival of the Nicest?', *The New York Review of Books*, 22 Oct. 1998), the biologist David Sloan (D.S.) Wilson desperately tried to **'re-introduce group selection…as an antidote to the rampant individualism we see in the human behavioral sciences'** (David Sloan Wilson & Elliot Sober, 'Re-Introducing Group Selection to the Human Behavioral Sciences', *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 1994, Vol.17, No.4). In fact, it was D.S. Wilson's theory of Multilevel Selection that argued that natural selection operated at the group level as well as the individual level that (as described in Part 4:12I) E.O. Wilson commandeered to re-assert the right-wing emphasis on selfishness by claiming that even though multilevel selection supposedly confirmed we have unconditionally selfless instincts derived from group-level selection, it still allowed for the existence within us of selfish instincts derived from individual-level selection.

Clearly, avoiding the nurturing explanation for our moral instincts meant that neither the right-wing nor the left-wing were ever going to provide an accountable explanation of our moral instincts. While the selflessness-emphasising-but-human-condition-avoiding left-wing had to rely on the patently dishonest 'cooperation beats competition' group-selection-type argument, the selfishness-emphasising-but-still-human-condition-avoiding right-wing had the advantage of being able to truthfully emphasise that natural selection is a selfish process. Basically, what happened was that since both the right and the left were avoiding the human condition and therefore denying Integrative Meaning, it wasn't possible to explain that even though the gene-based natural selection process is dedicated to developing the order of matter it couldn't, outside of the love-indoctrination scenario, select for the self-eliminating, unconditionally selfless traits that would allow full integration. In their inability to access this reconciling explanation of the paradoxical nature of the gene-based natural selection process, two positions emerged: the right-wing position, which stressed the fact that genes are selfish, which led to the selfishness-justifying theories of Social Darwinism ⟶ Sociobiology/ Evolutionary Psychology ⟶ Multilevel Selection/Eusociality; and the idealism-stressing left-wing position, which attempted to stress the greater truth that natural selection is an integrative process—the journey of these two positions was described in detail earlier in Part 4:12. Of course, without the reconciling explanation of these two, right-wing and left-wing positions, both were bound to become sillier and sillier, and, in the end, completely mad—and, as is being described, that is what happened: the right-wing ended up developing the extremely mad and dangerous theory of Eusociality, while the left-wing ended up developing the extremely mad and dangerous theory of the SEM.

Significantly, in relation to the two mechanisms employed by the SEM to explain bonobo behaviour—that stable parties allowed bonobo females to form coalitions to counter male aggression for mating opportunities, and that those coalitions are successful in dominating males and eliminating aggression—in 2009 the leading architect of the SEM, Richard Wrangham, admitted that **'The circumstances in which females are able to form effective alliances among each other, and the frequency and effectiveness of this strategy, remain important** [unexplained] **problems for detailed examination in bonobos, chimpanzees, and other primates'** (*Sexual Coercion in Primates and Humans*, 2009, p.464 of 504). So the whole basis of the SEM, of the **'circumstances in which females are able to form effective alliances among each other'**, and the **'effectiveness of this strategy'** in stopping male aggression, is being undermined by its leading architect and proponent! This is somewhat like E.O. Wilson conceding there were serious problems with his theory of Sociobiology when he moved on to develop his theory of Eusociality! But where else could nurturing-avoiding biologists go in their efforts to explain bonobos? Nowhere—so, despite its **'important problems'**, support of the SEM continued. What will now be described is how nurturing-avoiding, mechanistic biologists tried to make the SEM more accountable of bonobos', and our ape ancestors', extraordinarily integrative, moral behaviour.

Part 8:5H The Self-Domestication Hypothesis

In terms of providing a nurturing-avoiding, human-condition-escaping explanation for bonobo behaviour, the problem with the SEM is that it only offers a supposed explanation for bonobos' *lack* of aggression, and so still falls well short of being able to provide a supposed explanation for bonobos' extraordinary **'personal restraint'**, **'respect for others'**, **'loving'**, **'moral'**, cooperative, harmonious, gentle state. There is a *big* difference between not being aggressive and being loving. Given this shortfall, nurturing-avoiding, mechanistic biologists clearly needed to come up with a more sophisticated version of the SEM, one that could supposedly account for the bonobos' extraordinary cooperative, gentle, peaceful, loving nature. This supposed solution was provided in 2012, with the presentation of the so-called Self-Domestication Hypothesis (SDH) by anthropologists Brian Hare, Victoria Wobber and Richard Wrangham (one of the originators of the SEM) in a paper titled 'The self-domestication hypothesis: evolution of bonobo psychology is due to selection against aggression' (*Animal Behaviour,* 2012, Vol.83, No.3).

The first point to note is the use up front in this title of the paper of the idea that the **'evolution of bonobo psychology is due to selection against aggression'**, as if being able to **'select… against aggression'** is a normal, acceptable biological principle, a fait accompli, when it isn't. As emphasised, genes are selfish; outside of the love-indoctrination situation they don't allow for **'selection against aggression'** between sexually reproducing individuals. What is being put forward is the superficially persuasive but biologically flawed 'cooperation is more advantageous than competition and therefore cooperation can be selected for' argument that the SEM relies on, but to be putting it up front in their title is an outrageous bluff, a desperate deception, an all-out effort to create the illusion that **'selection against aggression'** is sound, acceptable biology.

Another point that should be made before looking at the soundness or otherwise of the SDH is that its proponents suggest that it not only explains bonobo cooperation but potentially human morality as well by concluding their 2012 paper with the statement: **'The self-domestication hypothesis is therefore a potentially powerful tool for understanding the processes by which selection shapes both psychological and other seemingly unrelated traits, including those in humans.'** (Incidentally, the **'psychological' 'traits'** they refer to are *behaviours*, such as tolerance and playfulness, *not a psychosis*—so like the theory of Eusociality, the SDH does not address the psychology of the human condition, rather it is another desperate attempt to deny it.)

Which brings us to the accountability of the SDH. Supposedly inspired by research into domestic dogs and the experiments of the Russian scientist Dmitri Belyaev in domesticating silver foxes for the fur industry, the SDH proposes that **'selection against aggression'** inadvertently involves selection for youthfulness or juvenileness, so that adults in subsequent generations end up retaining juvenile traits. Hare, Wobber and Wrangham's paper describes these juvenile traits as being the **'pro-social'** behaviours of '**increased tolerance'**, **'increased adult play'**, a **'decrease in predatory motivation'**, and **'decreased xenophobia** [fear of outsiders]**'**, and says they are accidental or **'correlated by-products'** of the original SEM-derived **'selection against aggression'** process. Because this cascade of juvenile **'by-products'** resulting from an original **'selection against aggression'** is also thought to account for changes between wild animals and their domestic descendants, such as changes between wolves and dogs, it is also known as the **'domestication syndrome'**.

Essentially, when the proponents of the SDH say that **'In addition to showing less severe forms of aggression compared to chimpanzees, bonobos show differences…that appear analogous to the domestication syndrome'** (ibid), what they are claiming is that the increase in **'pro-social'** behaviour that characterises the **'domestication syndrome'** bridges the gap between the mere **'lack of aggression'** that the SEM could only hope to account for, and bonobos' extraordinary **'personal restraint'**, **'respect for others'**, **'loving'**, **'moral'**, cooperative, harmonious, gentle behaviour. However, juvenile **'pro-social'** behaviour *does not* replace or override the selfish genetic need to aggressively compete for the fundamental biological needs of food, shelter, territory and mates. In fact, species that have been domesticated, like dogs and foxes, still aggressively compete for food, territory and mating opportunities, something that is almost entirely absent in bonobo behaviour. So the SDH's claim to bridge the gap and explain bonobos' selfless, loving behaviour is simply another giant bluff. The truth is that without the involvement of love-indoctrination to first establish unconditionally selfless love in the system, retarding stages of maturation alone can't create a state of unconditionally selfless love.

Certainly, as will be more fully described below, we humans have domesticated dogs and even silver foxes by selecting for tamer and more social juvenile characteristics, the effect of which has been to retard the development of these animals so that they retain the tamer, more tolerant and more **'pro-social'** behaviour of juveniles into adulthood—with the juvenile physical characteristics of floppy ears, more neotenous faces, etc, also carrying through into adulthood. However, while retarding development does bring the tamer, more tolerant, more **'pro-social'** characteristics of the juvenile stages to adulthood, it doesn't free the genes from their need to be selfish, and so doesn't eliminate selfish competition and aggression—*only* love-indoctrination can do that. Juvenileness is a form of more 'friendly' and tolerant socialness but it isn't a selfless state. In fact, as stated, dogs and foxes who have been 'puppyfied' still aggressively compete for the resources of food, territory and mating opportunities, behaviour that lies in stark contrast to bonobos' selfless and loving behaviour. Being more friendly, prepared to mingle and socialise—like domesticated dogs—is an improvement on the SEM's reduced aggression theory for bonobo behaviour, but the truth is it still falls well short of being able to account for bonobos' unconditionally loving behaviour.

A brief summary of the love-indoctrination process that was described in Part 8:4 may help clarify this failure of both the SEM and the SDH.

The love-indoctrination process states that by selecting for longer infancies (which primates, with their arms semi-freed from having to walk on all fours, were able to do because they could hold a helpless infant), and for more maternal mothers, all within an ideal nursery environment of ample food and few predators, an infant's brain is able to be inscribed or indoctrinated with unconditionally selfless love, thus allowing it to grow up to behave selflessly. An accidental, but fortuitous, side-effect of this indoctrination or training of a mind in selfless, truthful, effective thinking, however, was the emergence of consciousness, for once liberated, the conscious mind could then support the development of selflessness by consciously favouring (especially in mate selection) more selfless individuals, thus greatly speeding up the development of selflessness. Since the training in selfless love tended to wear off with age, selection for selflessness became, to a degree, a selection for youthfulness, resulting in more youthful, neotenous characteristics in adults. Both the SEM and the SDH, in

effect, describe this process *but without* the key element of the involvement of the nurturing of unconditional selflessness; they omit the whole process of love-indoctrination—a glaring omission that created two problems. First, it necessitated the development of the flawed, dishonest **'selection against aggression'** argument to attempt to explain how selfless cooperation could emerge without love-indoctrination. And, second, since this **'selection against aggression'** could not, in fact, create unconditionally selfless love, only a supposed reduction in aggression, it could *only* ever lead to less aggressive, tamer, more tolerant, more social characteristics in adults. The point is, unconditionally selfless love is not produced by the situation espoused by either the SEM or the SDH, whereas love-indoctrination *does* produce love, which *can* then be actively selected for. So neither the SEM or the SDH explain the extraordinary **'personal restraint'**, **'respect for others'**, **'loving'**, **'moral'**, unconditionally selfless, cooperative, harmonious, gentle behaviour we see in bonobos and in our own moral instincts. The delaying of the onset of adult competitiveness and aggression that the SEM and the SDH describe does *not* produce an unconditionally loving individual; to produce that you have to be selecting for individuals that have been nurtured with love, but that is a process neither the SEM or the SDH recognise.

To suggest that selecting for juvenileness can lead to less aggressive juvenile **'psychology'** being carried through to adulthood to the point of eliminating selfishness was simply a deception—another bluff—by the proponents of the SDH. In interviews Hare has conducted about the SDH we can see him trying to bridge this gap between the extraordinarily cooperative, gentle, peaceful, unconditionally selfless, **'loving'** behaviour that bonobos display, and what the SDH is able to supposedly explain, namely **'pro-social'** traits such as tameness and **'increased tolerance'**, when he describes bonobos as **'peaceful'** (Claudia Dreifus, 'Why Bonobos Don't Kill Each Other', *The New York Times, Science*, 5 Jul. 2010) and **'kind'** creatures (Brian Hare speech at Poptech 2010: see <www.wtmsources.com/139>) who **'absolutely are upset if there is any hint of aggression in the group'** ('Bonobos – Making Love Not War', *Catalyst*, ABC-TV, 20 Sep. 2007), and who find **'joy in working with others'** (Virginia Morell, 'Dogged', *Smithsonian* mag. Oct. 2007)—as if those traits and emotions are what his hypothesis is able to explain the origins of.

This attempt by Hare to bridge the gap between the extraordinarily cooperative, selfless behaviour that bonobos display, and what the SDH is allegedly able to explain, is very similar to Wrangham's earlier claim that the SDH is able to account for bonobos' extraordinary (and these are his words) **'personal restraint'**, **'respect for others'**, **'loving'**, **'moral'** behaviour. Furthermore, it was also described earlier how, in their 2012 paper, Hare, Wobber and Wrangham said their **'self-domestication hypothesis is…a potentially powerful tool for understanding the…psychological…traits…in humans'**—**'a potentially powerful tool for understanding'** the origin of our unconditionally selfless moral nature no less! Hare has also proposed that **'bonobos display… what might be thought of as our better angels'** (Seth Borenstein, '"Hippie chimp" genome may shed light on our dark side', *Science* on NBCNews.com, 13 Jun. 2012), which again is our unconditionally selfless moral nature!

The truth is, domestication or juvenilisation cannot *create* this type of behaviour without there having been love-indoctrination, it can only stymie the growth of adult types of behaviour, and so Hare and Wrangham are having to exaggerate its effect to account for bonobos' love and gentleness. Yes, it is only as *part* of the nurturing, love-indoctrination process that juvenilisation can produce real **'loving'**, **'moral'**, **'peaceful'**, **'kind'**, **'joy'** in cooperation, **'personal restraint'**, and **'respect for others'**, and an abhorrence **'of aggression'**.

All my publications have included a description of the love-indoctrination, mate selection process, with an account of humans' domestication of dogs appearing in my 1988 book *Free: The End of the Human Condition* (see <www.humancondition.com/free-love-indoctrination>), and a description of humans' domestication of both dogs and foxes appearing in the 2009 edition of my book *The Great Exodus* (see <www.humancondition.com/exodus-mate-selection>). (I should note that Wrangham was sent *Free* in 1988, and in 2005-2006 all three SDH authors were sent another of my publications, *The Human Condition Documentary Proposal*, which also contains a description of the love-indoctrination, mate selection process (see <www.humancondition.com/doco-maternalism>)). The reason I referred to how **'domesticated dogs are derived from their common ancestral wild type by neoteny—retarding development at some juvenile stage'** (*Free: The End of the Human Condition*, p.142 of 228) was because the domestication of dogs and foxes does dramatically illustrate some of the aspects involved in the love-indoctrination, mate selection process, particularly how powerfully effective conscious selection can be in producing a change (it **'Explains** [the] **speed of human development'** (ibid. p.142)), and how the development of stages of maturation is retarded by selecting for youthfulness (it **'is a marvellous illustration of the development of neoteny'** (ibid. p.141)). However, I explained that **'self-selection'** (as I termed the process that bonobos and our ape ancestors employed to assist in the development of unconditionally selfless behaviour) differs to the selection we employed to domesticate dogs and foxes in that without love-indoctrination to create the unconditionally selfless love that could then be selected for, **'self-domestication'** (or, again, as I originally termed the process in all my books, **'self-selection'**) can *only* achieve tamer, more tolerant and more social characteristics in adults, *not* unconditionally selfless, love. As I emphasised in *Free*, **'On their own genes could not develop selflessness but once there was love-indoctrination** [they could]**'** (p.47).

An illustration of the difference between the effects of love-indoctrination and the effects of domestication put forward by the SDH, which is merely selecting against aggression, can be seen in the work of the famous 'dog whisperer' Cesar Millan. As mentioned in Part 8:4D, Millan is forever informing dog-owners that the mistake they are making in trying to control their dogs is that they are attempting to love them into behaving less aggressively when what they have to do to achieve control and reduce aggression is impose dominance. Millan is, in effect, recognising that domesticated dogs haven't overcome the 'animal condition' of selfishly having to ensure their genes reproduce, which is why they are still highly competitive for food, shelter, territory and a mate—a competitiveness that can only be partially overcome through the imposition of a dominance hierarchy, where each individual accepts its position in a hierarchy that is determined according to the competitive strengths of the various individuals involved. Dog owners try to, as it were, fill the heads of their dogs with love, try to train them in selfless love, try to nurture them into behaving integratively, in fact, try to love-indoctrinate them, but our selection of dogs has only been for juvenile tameness, not for unconditional selfless love, which can't be selected for unless the love indoctrination process has established it in the system in the first place. Incidentally, this is why the taming/domestication of dogs and even foxes has been able to be achieved in a relatively short time, a much shorter time than it takes to achieve love-indoctrination, which, as has been explained, is a difficult, time-consuming process because it has to overcome the powerful intrinsic selfishness of genes. The fact is, there is a huge difference between the

love-indoctrination supported by mate selection process and our domestication of dogs and foxes. Domesticated dogs and foxes are still 'locked out' of the fully integrated, 'heavenly', unconditionally selfless, all-loving state. As Millan teaches, dogs are competitively trying to dominate all the time. Real love, giving away a competitive advantage, is not a consideration of theirs. **'Pro-social'** or **'tolerant'** behaviour and love *are* very different.

The following extract from my first book, *Free: The End Of The Human Condition* (1988), describes how humans have been able to select for both more friendly, social behaviour and cute, neotenous features in dogs: "There is a marvellous illustration of the development of neoteny in an article that appeared in the April 1982 edition of the *Smithsonian* magazine titled 'Livestock-guarding dogs that wear sheep's clothing'. The authors, Lorna and Raymond Coppinger, **'believe the many breeds of domesticated dogs are derived from their common ancestral wild type by a process of neoteny—retarding development at some juvenile stage'**. The authors divide the maturation of a puppy into four stages. The first stage is characterised by such behaviour as the puppy licking its mother's face to stimulate food delivery, some fighting over spoils with litter mates and the tendency to scurry for the den yelping if threatened. Second stage pups play with objects. The third stage is characterised by 'stalking' behaviour, pouncing and short chases to cut ('head') off a litter mate's retreat. In the fourth, pre-adult, stage the pups start following a parent ('heeling') and may even participate in a hunt. The authors argue that cattle driving dogs or heelers such as Welsh Corgis and Australian Blue Heelers have had their mental and anatomical development retarded at the fourth stage. For instance, they have the pricked ears characteristic of this stage in wild dogs. Collies that muster or round up sheep belong to the third 'heading' stage and have the characteristic half pricked or 'tulip' ears. Most pet breeds fall into the second stage: flop-eared, broad-headed, object players, chasers of sticks and balls. Hounds, retrievers and spaniels are retarded or 'stuck' in this stage. Shaggy 'livestock [sheep]-guarding' dogs that stay with the flock day and night to protect them from predators are of the first type. They have the looks of mop-eared fluffy puppies. They play with each other and ignore sticks and balls. They lick the faces of the sheep and their behaviour towards the sheep are the responses of a puppy in 'loose association' [integration] with the rest of its litter. Their apparent aggressiveness—their barking—is derived from that first-stage adverse reaction to novelty and change. The article says that **'In a relatively short period of time, perhaps as little as 10,000 years, the dog has adopted many shapes. Breeders continue to change these shapes and behaviour by speeding up or slowing down (retarding) the developmental rate.'**"

Alongside a bookmark containing the words 'Explains speed of human development', I continued in *Free: The End Of The Human Condition* with the following reference to the work of Jacob Bronowski: "To reveal how important self-selection was in human development what has been said above about the speed of the development of breeds of dogs can be compared with a statement made by Jacob Bronowski in the book, *The Ascent of Man* (1973), which accompanied his TV series of the same name: **'We have to explain the speed of human evolution over a matter of one, three, let us say five million years at most,'** Bronowski stated. **'That is terribly fast. Natural selection simply does not act as fast as that on animal species. We, the hominids, must have supplied a form of selection of our own; and the obvious choice is sexual** [mate] **selection.'**" Yes, Bronowski was right, **'Natural selection simply does not act as fast'** as the changes that took place in **'human evolution'**, and therefore **'We, the hominids, must have supplied a form**

of selection of our own; and the obvious choice is sexual [mate] **selection.'** As emphasised, **'sexual selection'** did greatly assist and **'speed'** up the development of the love-indoctrination process—as Bronowski said, **'human evolution'** occurred **'over a matter of one, three, let us say five million years at most'**—but that speed was nothing like as fast as our domestication of dogs and foxes has been, which, as has been explained, was a lot easier, albeit a less integrative, process.

For brevity's sake, I didn't include in *Free: The End Of The Human Condition* the following diagram from the *Smithsonian* article, but it is so revealing of the neotenising process that it should be included here.

Diagram of the neotenising of dogs from the April 1982 *Smithsonian* magazine

As mentioned, humans have not only domesticated dogs by neotenising them, we have also employed the process to domesticate foxes. As described in the 2009 version of my book *The Great Exodus*, on 5 November 2000 I saw and taped a 1998 documentary titled *The Secret Life of the Dog* about the domestication of dogs, which also described the domestication of silver foxes for the Russian fur industry. (Note, this documentary directed and produced by David Malone and David Paterson, is not the similarly titled documentary that was directed and produced in 2010 by Dan Child.) Attempting to explain how wolves were transformed into dogs, the documentary reported researchers postulating that **'By choosing the cutest looking and friendliest puppies we inadvertently helped the dog evolve to be better at exploiting us.'** The commentary continued: **'No one really knows if domestication of the dog was simply a matter of it becoming more friendly, could it really be that simple? This mystery has been solved by an astonishing 40-year long experiment on domestication. Zoologist Dr Liudmilla Trut and colleagues at an experimental farm in Central Siberia have…transformed wild silver foxes, a cousin of the dog, which…are usually aggressive and afraid of people and can't respond to human affection…into not just a tame animal but**

one that actually is domesticated. To mimic evolution the experiment was simplicity itself. Only those that didn't bite would be allowed to breed the next generation…These tame ones are the result of 40 generations but the original aggression disappeared after only three or four generations. After that the experiment tried to increase the positive reactions. After five generations they created foxes that had lost the worst of their fear and aggression, but they were still a long way from being domesticated… After 10 generations the wild fox had been transformed from a creature afraid of humans to one like the dog which craved human contact…The first physical changes happened in parallel with profound behavioural changes. It was only after the tenth generation that they began to have these physical changes [such as white markings, floppy ears and curly tails]**…they finally had not just tame foxes but truly domesticated foxes. Animals that were themselves born childlike in their openness and playfulness. For wild foxes the period of friendly socialisation stops when they are two months old…In the tame foxes this friendly period never does end, they stay playful and never do become fearful. The Russian experiment had proved that simply breeding for friendliness they could tap into the deepest level of the fox's brain, unhinging the animal's natural adult instincts and kept it forever young, trapped in a playful childlike state'** (*Equinox*, Channel 4 in assoc. with Discovery Channel; aired on ABC-TV 5 Nov. 2000). Since watching that 1998 documentary I have seen many similar reports on the Russian fur breeders' experiment in 'taming' foxes.

Again, humans have been able to **'domesticate'** dogs and even foxes by selecting for the juvenile characteristics of **'tameness'**, less **'aggression'**, more **'openness and playfulness'** in dogs and foxes, the effect of which has been to retard the development of some dogs and foxes so that they retain these **'tame'** and tolerant characteristics into adulthood—in addition to the juvenile, neotenous physical characteristics of floppy ears, curly tails, etc. However, while retarding development *does* bring the more tolerant juvenile stages into adulthood, it won't free the genes of their need to be selfish—only love-indoctrination can do that. Juvenileness is a more tolerant state but it isn't in itself selfless—in fact, dogs and foxes who have been **'kept…forever young'** still aggressively compete for resources such as food, territory and mating opportunities. So yes, while the domestication of dogs and foxes does illustrate some of the aspects involved in the love-indoctrination, mate selection process—particularly how powerfully effective in producing change conscious self-selection can be, and how the development of stages of maturation is retarded by selecting for youthfulness—it is *not* the same as the love-indoctrination training in selflessness practiced by our ape ancestors and by some primates today, especially bonobos.

With regard to domestication occurring in the wild through **'self-selection against aggression'**, Hare, Wobber and Wrangham suggest that not only does the SDH account for bonobos' evolution, it also raises **'the possibility that self-domestication has been a widespread process in mammalian evolution'**. They suggest that self-domestication may operate in at least three other situations: in urban ecosystems where greater tameness could allow an animal such as the Florida Key deer an advantage over less tame individuals (in a similar way to how proto-dogs evolved from wolves); in highly competitive, densely populated habitats like islands where animals such as the Central American spiny rat have been observed to be less aggressive than their mainland brethren; and lastly, they suggest that self-domestication might account for the relatively high level of tolerance Sulawesi macaques display compared with other species of macaques.

While populations in the first two situations may exhibit relatively less aggression, using them to support the explanation for bonobos' highly cooperative society is irrelevant and misleading, because in both cases the selection for less aggressive traits is being driven by environmental factors, or natural selection, rather than by sexual selection, which is what is occurring in bonobos, where female individuals are dictating mate selection. Tamer deer and rats are not proactively selecting for tame partners, rather those individuals who happen to be tamer are better able to exploit a new niche (in the case of deer), or aren't wasting energy defending an undefendable territory (in the case of island rats), and so are at a fitness advantage compared with other individuals, and hence more likely to survive. As we have seen, a fundamental flaw of the SEM and the SDH is that they claim sexual selection is able to reduce mating aggression between individuals, and, outside of the love-indoctrination scenario, it isn't. There may be particular circumstances in nature, as in the species cited, and in dogs and domesticated foxes, where natural selection may favour a slight reduction in aggression, or increase in tameness, but it has nothing to do with sexual selection by females against aggressive males. Natural selection against aggression can only occur to the degree that individuals retain a competitive fitness advantage—and so individuals still need to aggressively compete for food, shelter, territory and mates. Species in these environments do not begin to show any tendency toward the love or selflessness so readily apparent in bonobo society.

On the other hand, it is possible that the third example given by the SDH authors, Sulawesi macaques, including the Tonkean macaque, have actually begun the love-indoctrination process and so do show characteristics similar to bonobos, but, importantly, not because of 'self-domestication'. As described in Part 8:4B, being semi-upright as a result of their tree-living, swinging-from-branch-to-branch, arboreal heritage meant primates' arms were largely freed from walking and thus available to hold dependents. This means that primates are particularly well placed to increase maternalism where conditions are conducive, and as the Tonkean macaques **'have no non-human primate competitors or strong predators'** (B. Thierry, et al, 'Tonkean macaque behaviour from the perspective of the evolution of Sulawesi macaques', *Current Primatology, Vol. 2: Social Development, Learning and Behaviour*, 1994, pp.103-117) it is likely that they have begun the love-indoctrination process, which would explain their tolerance.

It should be mentioned that in addition to claiming that the SDH explains bonobos' cooperative **'psychology'**, self-domestication also claims to account for the emergence of consciousness. As Hare puts it, **'we would not have evolved the kind of intelligence we have…if we hadn't had a shift in temperament…Controlling one's fears, paying attention to others, finding joy in working with others—that's the path to intelligence…whether for dogs, apes or humans'** (Virginia Morell, 'Dogged', *Smithsonian* mag. Oct. 2007), or more succinctly, **'Humans got their smarts only because we got friendlier first'** (Brian Hare & Vanessa Woods, 'Out of Our Minds: How did *Homo sapiens* Come Down from the Trees and Why Did No One Follow?', *What's Next? Dispatches on the Future of Science* , ed. Max Brockman, 2009, p.180 of 237). What is, in effect, being argued is a more sophisticated version of the Social/Machiavellian Intelligence Hypothesis where complex social situations were said to give rise to conscious intelligence. As was explained earlier, social problem solving *is* an obvious benefit from being conscious, but *all* activities that animals have to manage would benefit enormously from a conscious mind's ability to reason how cause and effect are related, to understand change, to

make sense of experience, to be insightful, so it is completely illogical to argue that it wasn't until the need to manage complex social situations that consciousness developed, whether that was enabled by tolerance towards others or not. As explained earlier, the nurturing of selflessness liberated the fully conscious, intelligent mind from the block that exists in non-human species' minds against thinking selflessly and thus truthfully and thus effectively.

A comparison between the predictions made by the SDH and those made by the love-indoctrination process further highlights the limitations of the former. Because the self-domestication hypothesis uses aspects of the truth, such as the fact that female bonobos do select for more cooperative mates, and that bonobos are neotenised, it does account for certain aspects of bonobo morphology and behaviour. But its limitations are made very clear by what it does *not* account for. For example, self-domestication cannot account for the fact that nurturing and infants are the primary focus of bonobo society; it does not account for the expectation of nurturing that is instinctive in bonobos infants, and why they are so distressed when they don't receive it that they die; it does not account for bonobos' increased length of infancy; it does not account for the reliance of males upon their mothers throughout their lives; it does not account for bonobos' more prominent breasts; and it does not account for why bonobos are more bipedal than chimpanzees. As Part 8:4 shows, all of these traits can be accounted for by the love-indoctrination process, as they are all adaptations that have occurred either to facilitate nurturing or as the result of it.

In summary, there is a quantum difference between the claimed reduction in aggression that both the SEM and the SDH can supposedly produce and the very real love we see in bonobos. Neither the SEM or the SDH *begin* to offer an accountable explanation of that species' extremely loving behaviour, whereas the nurturing, love-indoctrination explanation *fully* accounts for it. Although genes are a tool for developing order, they are limited in the sense that they can't normally develop unconditional selflessness, which means that genetics is a selfish, cold, loveless process; it is not going to produce bonobos' warm, gentle, cooperative, loving behaviour—unless the love-indoctrination path is taken, for it alone has the power to superimpose love on an essentially selfish system. As Drummond said of nurturing love, it was only **'once this fire began to warm the cold hearth of Nature and give humanity a heart, the most stupendous task of the past was accomplished'**. In contrast, the SEM and the SDH are desperate and hopelessly flawed attempts to explain bonobo behaviour and the origins of our moral nature without admitting the critical role of nurturing.

Having now analysed the mechanisms of both the SEM and the SDH, we now need to describe the immense danger they present to the human race.

Part 8:5I <u>End play for the human race</u>

As stated at the beginning of Part 8:5A, the great danger of the practice of denial is that, in the end, it becomes so entrenched and sophisticated that it locks humanity onto a path to terminal alienation; to total madness and extinction. The development of the denial of the truth that nurturing created humanity, firstly in the form of the SEM, and in its most recent and most sophisticated incarnation, the SDH, dramatically illustrates this great danger.

The bonobos offer the most powerful evidence of the nurturing origins of our unconditionally selfless moral soul, but the SEM and, to an even greater extent, the SDH attempt to not only deny that evidence but bury it with seductive yet totally false explanations for their gentle, loving, cooperative nature. Misappropriating aspects of the truth about bonobos, such as their extraordinarily loving cooperation, their neoteny, and even burgeoning intelligence, and using them to evidence the SDH, is a very sophisticated way of giving credibility to the lie that nurturing had no role to play in the development of our moral soul. But to bury such evidence of the origins of our unconditionally selfless moral soul that created the cooperative, integrative state that is humanity, is to threaten the human race with permanent estrangement from the truth about our all-loving true self or soul, which is the truth we need if we are to properly understand and, by so doing, heal our psychologically alienated condition. Burial of the truth about our soul stands in the way of us ever gaining an honest, ameliorating understanding of ourselves—of our origins, our present condition and future potential.

Further, to deny the importance of nurturing is to deny the importance of the main activity we need to practice if we are to produce humans who are sound and secure in self. At the practical level, it is *only* through the nurturing of our offspring that the human race can hope to become healthy and integrated/cooperative/social once again—to, as Montagu said, put **'man back upon the road of his evolutionary destiny from which he has gone so far astray'** and transform the human race; restore **'health and happiness for all humanity, peace and goodwill unto all the earth'**.

Yes, if we refuse to admit the critical role nurturing has played in the emergence of humanity and, as a direct result of that heritage, in the sound upbringing of humans today, then levels of alienation will only increase and terminal alienation *will* soon destroy the human race. Like E.O. Wilson's Eusociality denial of the true nature of the human condition, the SEM's and the SDH's denial of the importance of nurturing is such an alienating lie that it *will* lead the human race into a state of irretrievable madness.

Indeed, as if the danger just described wasn't enough, the even greater threat posed by the SEM/SDH is that it is being developed into another denial of the true nature of the human condition that is even more seductive and thus dangerous than Wilson's because it appears to take into account the most crucial evidence we have about human origins from our closest relatives, the bonobos! As the lead author of the SDH, Brian Hare, has said, **'They** [bonobos] **have done something in their evolution that even humans can't do. They don't have the dark side we do… If we only studied chimps, we'd get a skewed view of human evolution'**, and **'bonobos display…what might be thought of as our better angels'** (Seth Borenstein, '"Hippie chimp" genome may shed light on our dark side', *Science* on NBCNews.com, 13 Jun. 2012). So, according to Hare, chimpanzee-like instincts in humans account for our **'dark side'**, while the instincts allegedly accounted for by the SEM/SDH, as demonstrated by the bonobos, gave rise to our goodness, our unconditionally selfless moral instincts, our **'better angels'**. This argument presents a model for our 'good and evil'-afflicted human condition that is similar to that provided by Wilson's Eusociality account, except that our 'good' instincts are supposedly derived from factors espoused by the SEM/SDH, rather than cooperation forged through warring with other groups, as Wilson suggested. As was

emphasised about the Eusociality 'explanation' for the human condition, we humans *do* have unconditionally selfless, loving, 'good' instincts but they were derived from the nurturing love-indoctrination process that bonobos are developing; and we *do* practice divisive, 'bad' behaviour, but, again, that is derived not from genetic competitiveness but from a psychosis that emerged when our conscious mind was liberated by the love-indoctrination process, and, once liberated, rapidly developed to challenge our *completely* loving (not partially loving and partially selfish) 'good' instincts for the role of managing our lives. So, what Hare, Wobber and Wrangham are doing is precisely what Wilson was doing with his theory of Eusociality, which was to bring the human condition to our attention, but only in order to trivialise it; basically to subvert the truth about the all-important issue of our psychologically troubled condition!

This is all overwhelming; there are so many dangers associated with the SEM/SDH that it hardly bears thinking about. With E.O. Wilson's Eusociality's all-out atomic bomb attack on the truth about the human condition, and now Hare, Wobber and Wrangham's no-holds-barred asteroid attack on the best evidence we have for the origins of our moral soul, and also on the truth about the human condition, the honesty and resulting insight needed to save the human race is being buried at the bottom of the deepest, darkest ocean trench that has been filled with reinforced concrete for good measure. It's truth-hating behaviour of the highest order. Basically, mechanistic science has become completely deranged—and since science is the facility charged with delivering us from the human condition, this state of affairs represents end play for the human race!

Without the exposé being presented in this book all hope for humanity would be lost. But this exposé still has to be recognised by the scientific establishment—a recognition that, as will now be described, has so far not occurred; indeed, for 30 years now all it has received from the scientific establishment is obscenely irresponsible, stone-wall resistance.

Part 8:5J *The* great obscenity

I and the 50 founding members of the World Transformation Movement (the organisation I established in 1983 to research and promote understanding of the human condition because mechanistic science wouldn't approach this all-important subject) have been trying to interest the scientific community in the world-saving insights into the human condition that are being presented in this book for a full 30 years now, but, save for a handful of supportive scientists and some positive responses from other eminent scientists and thinkers, it has so far all been to no avail. All our submissions have been either ignored or rejected by the scientific establishment. In fact, the situation is much, much worse than this, for instead of attracting interest, debate and support, I and the World Transformation Movement (WTM) have been so ferociously attacked by the two biggest, left wing (dogmatic, pseudo-idealistic, 'let's pretend there's no human condition and the world should just be ideal', dishonest) media organisations in Australia, including its national public broadcaster, that I was made a pariah and the WTM completely marginalised. We endured this situation until, after 15 years of emotionally exhausting, and, for such a small group, financially taxing, defamation actions taken by us (which, we've been told by legal experts, involved the then biggest defamation

case in Australia's history), we finally managed to right the extremely serious wrong. Our monumental struggle against persecution—which has been so great that we have had to forgo having children to ensure we have sufficient resources of time, energy and funds to effectively resist the persecution and maintain our efforts to ensure these ideas lead to the transformation of the human race—is documented at <www.humancondition.com/persecution>. After all that we have been put through, the fact that our little, but mighty, band of brothers and sisters supporting these human-race-liberating insights are still standing on our feet and able to mount this further assault on the citadel of denial/lying (mechanistic science) to try to crack it open and free the human race, *is* an absolute miracle.

Yes, this denial—this ignoring, rejecting and persecuting—has been completely and utterly unjustified; in fact it has been *totally* irresponsible, *obscenely* irresponsible. *Certainly* all these world-saving insights bring the historically unbearably confronting issue of the human condition into stark focus, *but all the insights are presented within the framework of the compassionate explanation of the human condition, which means the need for denial of them has been removed*. As emphasised from the beginning of this book, the human race has always lived in hope, faith and trust that one day the redeeming explanation of our psychologically distressed and insecure human condition would be found, and the most fundamental reason of all for freedom of expression to be maintained in the world is to keep the door open to that possibility. Science especially, having been charged with that greatest of responsibilities of finding these human-condition-liberating insights, must remain open to human-condition-confronting-and-explaining insights. *Science holds the ultimate responsibility to consider, not ignore, or worse, persecute, scientific analysis of the human condition!* What has been happening *has* been obscenely irresponsible.

So you can imagine our shock when, in 2012, we learnt that the three leading anthropologists responsible for putting forward the SDH, Wrangham, Hare and Wobber—all of whom, as has been mentioned, were made aware many years ago of my love-indoctrination explanation for the origins of our and the bonobos' moral instincts—had made no acknowledgement or even mention of my synthesis in their 2012 paper, despite acknowledging the work of many other researchers in a detailed section on **'evolutionary explanations for reduced aggressiveness in bonobos relative to that in chimpanzees'**. Worse, it would appear that since they were each informed of my synthesis (in the case of Wrangham, on four separate occasions, the earliest being in 1988), what they have done is take virtually all the elements from my synthesis—such as the bonobos' ability to throw light on our origins, and specifically the origins of our morality; that their social groups are much more stable than those of chimpanzees; the role of females in taming male aggression; the liberation of consciousness; the role of self-selection; the neotenising, juvenilisation process; the use of the domestication of dogs and foxes as an illustration of the neotenising, juvenilisation process; the significance of ideal ecological conditions; the use of sex as a device to reduce tension; the reduced dimorphism between the sexes; the reliance of males on their mothers for social standing; the lack of aggression between groups of bonobos; the lack of routine hunting by bonobos, etc, etc—and, leaving out anything to do with nurturing, presented it as **'A new hypothesis'** (Ed Yong, 'Tame Theory: Did Bonobos Domesticate Themselves? A new hypothesis holds that natural selection produced the chimpanzee's nicer cousin in much the same way that humans bred dogs from wolves', *Scientific American*, 25

Jan. 2012). While it is *extremely* irresponsible to ignore and reject world-saving insights into the human condition, it is so, so much worse to actually take those insights and wantonly subvert the truth they contain. If that is indeed the case, and we believe there is no other plausible interpretation, then that is the very greatest of crimes against humanity.

What must be clear to the reader overall is that the obscenely irresponsible treatment of these world-saving insights simply must stop. The obscenity of the situation was made dramatically clear when in December 2012 it was announced that an American billionaire had pledged $200 million to Columbia University's **'accomplished scholars whose collective mission is both greater understanding of the human condition and the discovery of new cures for human suffering'** (*The Educated Observer*, Winter 2013); and, on 2 April 2013, the President of the United States, Barack Obama, announced a **'Brain Initiative'**, giving **'$100 million initial funding'** (*The Sydney Morning Herald*, 4 Apr. 2013) to mechanistic science to also find **'the underlying causes of…neurological and psychiatric conditions'** afflicting humans in order to **'develop effective ways of helping people suffering from these devastating conditions'** (US National Institutes of Health, accessed Apr. 2013 at: <https://braininitiative.nih.gov/>). The mechanistic scientific paradigm, including all of its universities, have proved completely incapable of adopting a denial-free approach and addressing the human condition, and yet now, when the world is absolutely on its knees and desperate for the neurosis-and-psychosis-addressing-and-healing real insight into the human condition, that same mechanistic paradigm has been given *$US300 million* to turn around and do what it can't, but what I and the WTM have already done! And, I might add, we have done this, 40 years of work in all, without *any* outside financial support—from academic institutions or from public or private benefactors. We have funded the whole effort from our own self-sufficient initiatives, efforts, and contributions. Indeed, as has been mentioned, rather than receiving any encouragement or financial support from the world at large, we have been *attacked* by the establishment and had to generate the wherewithal ourselves to fight and defeat that enormously powerful institution-backed attack! For example, as I have mentioned already, the principal media attack against us was carried out by the Australian Broadcasting Corporation, a body which receives over a billion dollars annually in government funding. We have never been invited to participate in any major scientific or public forums, or been given a wage or grant by an academic institution to investigate any of the subjects that we have so effectively studied; quite the reverse—we've been brutally ostracised and forced to sustain and pay our own way to carry on our work and to fight the massive forces opposing it. Talk about David and Goliath! And it is not as though these huge financial initiatives that are now, in desperation, being made to specifically investigate the human condition can be oblivious to our existence and work because, for one thing, the WTM has the domain name **'humancondition.com'** and any planned attempt, such as these, to supposedly properly address the human condition would, one would assume, have to be aware of our existence. So the mechanistic paradigm is saying it is finally going to bring **'greater**

understanding of the human condition', but has not changed tack at all and acknowledged those who have done just that! The hypocrisy and obscenity of what is going on is astronomical.

A summary of the 30 years' worth of submissions to the scientific establishment of these world-saving insights into the human condition, into the origins of our moral nature and conscious mind, and into the integrative meaning of existence is described next in Part 8:6, while the full presentation can be read at <www.humancondition.com/full-history-of-rejection>. (Incidentally, both provide details of the presentations of the whole synthesis, including the nurturing explanation for our moral soul, that have been made to Hare, Wobber and Wrangham.) These documents represent an *extraordinarily* long and determined yet futile effort—in fact, the ill-treatment they document is horrific, truly obscene—to have all these fully accountable insights properly considered by the scientific establishment and conveyed to the wider world. As has been emphasised, in the case of the origins of our moral instincts, there has been 140 years of dishonest biological thinking on this issue, mountains of books written and oceans of wasted effort since Fiske first solved the problem with the nurturing explanation—and 30 years now since I presented the nurturing answer to the problem in accompaniment with the explanation of the human condition, which is 30 years of terrible human suffering and acts of atrocity that have occurred on Earth from a lack of self-understanding in humans that should never have happened!!!

History certainly teems with examples of those who have been persecuted for telling the truth, for daring to defy the great denial blanketing our planet—what's that rhetorical question in the Bible: **'was there ever a prophet** [a denial-free thinker] **your fathers did not persecute'** (Acts 7:52)—HOWEVER, when all the truth about human existence is accompanied by the greater, dignifying, compassionate, redeeming and rehabilitating full truth of the explanation of the human condition, *that denial is no longer justified*. And of course that denial is so habituated—our fear of the truth has soaked into our bones—but, nevertheless, that door to the possibility of understanding the human condition *must be kept open*. There *has* to be sufficient strength of character, soundness, left on Earth for the full truth to be recognised and supported when it emerges, which—as has been fully evidenced—it now has, because if there isn't then all is lost.

Since the great achievement of life on Earth has been the development of consciousness, it follows that for those charged with the responsibility of overseeing its maturity to enlightenment and sanity—namely the scientific establishment—to abuse that responsibility is the greatest of obscenities; worse, it is a spear through the very heart of all of life and meaning on Earth. It is the meanest, most bitter, most selfish, most bloody-minded, most hateful of the truth, most unnecessary behaviour this planet has ever witnessed. Our efforts at the WTM to have these world-saving ideas recognised by the scientific establishment are continuing and our hope is that those efforts will be successful.

Part 8:6 Summary of the history of efforts to seek support for—and the subsequent rejections, vilification and lack of acknowledgment of—the biological explanations for the human condition, for the origins of our moral soul and conscious mind, and for the truth of the integrative meaning of existence that are contained in this book

(Note: The full presentation of this history can be found at <www.humancondition.com/full-history-of-rejection>.)

- In 1983 I wrote to Sir David Attenborough and Professor Stephen Jay Gould, presenting these insights, but received no real response.
- Later in 1983, when the full synthesis of explanation of the human condition—including the explanation of our moral soul and the explanation of the origin of our fully conscious mind—was completed, I travelled to England to personally submit an 8,000 word summary of this all-problems-of-the-human-race-solving breakthrough synthesis to John Maddox (1925-2009), later Sir John Maddox, who was the then editor of *Nature* magazine, which at the time was considered the world's leading science journal—this submission can be read at <www.humancondition.com/nature>. I responsibly took the answers that save the world to the person in the world in charge of the search for it—but he initially refused to even see me! It was only after I wrote an offended letter of protest saying I had come **'half way around the world to see you'** and Maddox had made me feel like **'a piece of mud that had been scraped off on your doorstep'** that Maddox granted me an audience. However, when I began the meeting by trying to convince him of the foundation truth of Integrative Meaning, Maddox became animated in his denial of it, saying to me twice that the concept of Integrative Meaning arising from negative entropy **'is wrong'** (from audio recording of the 15 Dec. 1983 meeting), terminating the meeting soon after. While in England I also personally submitted my synthesis to Colin Tudge, the then Features Editor of *New Scientist* magazine. Both Maddox and Tudge declined to publish the article.
- In 1988, 800 copies of my first book *Free: The End of the Human Condition*, which contains all the insights being presented in this book, were sent as part of a first-rate publicity package to every relevant scientist and journal in the world for review, including Richard Wrangham and 70 other key primatologists. Commendations were received from pre-eminent philosopher Sir Laurens van der Post, archaeologist, geologist and prehistorian Professor Henry de Lumley, conservationist Dr Ian Player and Professor John Wren-Lewis but apart from Sir Laurens' support, which included an appeal to his publishers to publish *Free*, and Wren-Lewis becoming a strong supporter of the ideas and a number of excellent book reviews, there was no real response. The cover letter that accompanied their copy of *Free* stated: **'I think you might find the work of special interest. The book interprets our human development in terms of what was happening to us psychologically as a species. In so doing many insights become accessible such as the prime mover in human development of "love-indoctrination" or nurturing. The concept accounts for so many aspects of our development such as our neoteny, why it was the primates that developed consciousness, why and when we learnt**

to walk upright and the role of matriarchy in our past. Love-indoctrination and material relating to the pygmy chimps is introduced on page 46 and in full later on page 138.' *Free* explained in detail how **'self-selection was to play a part'** (p.47) in early human development; how **'the mind also began to support the process [of selection]. We self-selected integrative traits by seeking mates who were loving'** (p.141); **'how important self-selection was in human development'** (p.142); and discussed the neotenisation of wild dogs into the domestic breeds we see today (on page 142)—issues highly relevant to the Social Ecological Model and Self-Domestication Hypothesis theories that claim to explain many elements of bonobo, and by inference human, behaviour.

- In 1989 Professor Wren-Lewis presented *Free* to 10 science journals including *Nature*, *New Scientist* and *Endeavour*, but for no response.
- In 1989 a booklet summarising the explanation of the human condition titled *Reconciliation* was circulated to 600 scientists, scientific journals (again including Richard Wrangham) and other relevant parties, for little response.
- In 1991 over 1,000 copies of my second book *Beyond The Human Condition*, with first-rate publicity packages, were circulated to scientists, journals, universities, relevant institutions and media. *Beyond* reiterated the importance of self-selection for less aggressive males, for example, **'females were first to self-select for integrativeness by favouring integrative rather than competitive and aggressive mates'** (p.142). I also met with and received some supportive commendations from several notable scientists, including biologists Professor Charles Birch and Professor John Morton, anthropologist Professor Colin Groves, physicist Professor Paul Davies and Professor John Wren-Lewis. There was however little response from the scientific establishment.
- In 1992 I travelled to Africa to launch *Beyond* at the National Museum of Kenya; gave over 70 copies of *Beyond* to eminent scientists and influential people, with many of whom I held meetings, including Dr Meave Leakey, Dr Shirley Strum, Dr Iain Douglas-Hamilton, Dr Cynthia Moss, Dr Joyce Poole, Dr Mark Stanley-Price, Dr Ros Aveling, Prof Simiyu Wandibba, Dr Pieter Kat, Dr Kathy Alexander, Dr Kay Holekamp, Dr Susanne Abildgaard Anderson, Allan Root, Annette Lanjouw, Simon Trevor and Tom Sambrooke. Professor Phillip Tobias invited me to give a lecture at the University of the Witwatersrand, but unfortunately due to timing problems the lecture didn't go ahead. Shirley Strum invited me to visit her group of study baboons in Northern Kenya and report back to her which I did with a written report; and I was also invited to spend time at the Jane Goodall Chimpanzee Rehabilitation Centre in Burundi which I did. Although many of these scientists were enthusiastic about these insights, no lasting support eventuated.
- I should mention that also in 1992, Professor Wren-Lewis, one of the few scientists who had been supportive of my work (he had provided this commendation for use on the back cover of *Beyond*: **'At the core of Jeremy Griffith's argument lies a brilliantly original insight into the basic nature of human conflict'**, and even had become a director of the Foundation for Humanity's Adulthood—now the WTM), published a paper in which he plagiarised it, claiming the insights were his own! Redress was achieved and Wren-Lewis ceased his involvement.

- In 1993 I again travelled to England and the USA to promote these insights and made enquiries about a possible publisher and/or distributor for *Beyond* in the UK and USA. In total 76 first-rate publicity packages with copies of *Beyond* were sent to all the leading literary agents and publishers in the world for no acceptance, with one publisher revealingly saying, **'I find your theories fascinating, but I also find your arguments elusively receding from my mind as soon as I stop reading them. I can understand that this is totally a failing on my part'** (Marianne Velmans, Doubleday Publishing, UK). Whilst in the UK I met with Sir Laurens van der Post; and returned to Australia via the USA where I met with Professor Adrienne Zihlman and tried to meet with Professor Donna Haraway, but she was unable to at short notice, and wildlife photographer Frans Lanting, who was interstate.
- In 1995, two highly defamatory publications—an Australian Broadcasting Corporation (ABC) television program; and a full page *Sydney Morning Herald* newspaper article—were made about me, my work and its supporters which resulted in a 15 year legal action that eventually exonerated us. A detailed description of the legal action and our eventual stunning victory can be read at <www.humancondition.com/persecution>.
- In 2002, my third book, *A Species In Denial* was completed, and in an attempt to have the book published, 70 copies of the manuscript were sent to the leading literary agents in the world, and another 70 copies to the major international publishers, but all declined to represent or publish the book. While one found it **'far too dense and in parts incomprehensible'** (Gail Winston, Executive Editor, HarperCollins, USA, 12 Jun. 2002), and another was **'not convinced that there is a cohesive argument there'** (Tim Whiting, Commissioning Editor, Time Warner Books, UK, 25 Jun. 2002), others found it presented **'a formidable work synthesizing philosophical, historical, religious, scientific and cultural currents'** (Anne Jump, Andrew Wylie, UK, 26 Mar. 2002), and was **'extraordinarily rich and well researched'** (Roland Philipps, Publishing Director, Hodder & Stoughton, UK, 1 Jun. 2002), and **'an original and carefully conceived idea and the writing is clear and accomplished'** (Sebastian Godwin, David Godwin Associates, UK, 15 Apr. 2002). The extraordinary range of contradictory comments strongly suggests that it was not the merit of the book that was the problem but that publishers and literary agents were variously confronted by the content. The comment that the material is **'far too dense and in parts incomprehensible'** is a classic 'deaf effect' response (see Part 3:13).
- In 2003, a further 800 copies of *A Species In Denial*, with first-rate publicity packages, were circulated to scientists, journals, universities, relevant institutions and media, once again containing explanation of the origins of human morality, for example, **'It was through nurturing, the process of love-indoctrination and the accompanying self-selection of cooperativeness or selflessness, that humans were able to develop an instinctive orientation to behaving unconditionally selflessly and as a result become an utterly integrated cooperative, selfless, loving species'** (p.110). Despite a foreword by Professor Charles Birch, a commendation by Professor John Morton, and becoming a bestseller in Australia and New Zealand where it sold more than 10,000 copies, the scientific community all but failed to respond.
- Between 2004 and 2006, 2,500 copies of a documentary proposal on the human condition (a 76-page synopsis and DVD video presenting these ideas illustrated with chimpanzee and bonobo footage, which can be viewed at <www.humancondition.com/doco-proposal>) were

sent to scientists, scientific publications and organisations, philanthropic organisations, filmmakers and eminent figures. This presentation again contained all the insights contained in this book: for example the four Parts of the documentary proposal were titled 'God: The Question of God, Meaning and Purpose – and the Human Condition', 'Soul: The Question of the Existence of Moral Instincts in Humans – and the Human Condition' (which posed—and answered—the questions, **'How could a species selfishly driven only by the need to survive create notions of selfless morality? How does the 'selfish gene' theory reconcile with evidence of good in humans? How could a selfish motor create within us a sense of caring, selfless concern for others?'** (p.15)), 'Consciousness: The Question of Consciousness, What Is It and How did it Emerge – and the Human Condition' (which concluded, **'In summary, the processes of nurturing love-indoctrination and the selection by females of non-aggressive, cooperative males as mates not only gave us our moral, instinctive orientation to behaving cooperatively—our soul—it also liberated consciousness in our forebears'** (p.61)), and 'The Human Condition: The Question of How to Reconcile and Ameliorate Our Estranged, Alienated Human Condition'.

- The proposal did receive over 100 endorsements from leading scientists and thinkers, but, apart from Professor Harry Prosen, no substantial follow up interest has resulted. Relevantly, copies (and follow-up emails) were sent to all three Self-Domestication Hypothesis (SDH) authors: Brian Hare, Victoria Wobber (who was a student under Hare at the time) and Wrangham (who supervised Hare's PhD); *Animal Behaviour* journal, publisher of their paper; and *Scientific American* and *Discover* magazines, both of whom ran detailed publicity stories on the SDH in 2012. *Animal Behaviour* Managing Editor, Dr Angela Turner, replied saying, **'the Executive Editors and Presidents of the societies are the people you need to contact about this matter. I see from your email that you have sent this appeal to them already so I suggest you await a reply from them'**, and *Scientific American* Editor in Chief, Dr John Rennie, replied saying **'Thank you for your offer to contribute to Scientific American. I regret to say that the piece you propose is not suited to our somewhat limited editorial needs.'** While *Discover*, Wobber and Wrangham did not reply at all, Hare, and his then communication coordinator, now wife and fellow primate researcher Vanessa Woods, did respond, saying **'Brian is interested in participating'**, then subsequently Hare himself responded saying: **'I too share your enthusiasm for sharing with others the importance of research on human evolution'**, and in a further communiqué: **'good luck with the project!'**
- In addition, all the primatologists mentioned in Part 8:5G who endorse the SEM were sent a copy of the documentary proposal; David Sloan Wilson was also sent it; and every relevant scientific journal and organisation received it including *International Journal of Primatology*, *American Journal of Primatology*, *Folia Primatologica*, *Primates*, *Evolution and Human Behavior*, *Human Nature*, *Science*, *Nature*, *Animal Behaviour*, *Scientific American*, *Discover Magazine*, American Anthropological Association, American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS), Max Plank Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology, Jane Goodall Institute, Leakey Foundation, Wenner-Grenn Foundation, Smithsonian, MacArthur Foundation, John Templeton Foundation, Carnegie Institution, Alfred P. Sloan Foundation, Nuffield Foundation and Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation.

- In 2005 I submitted a proposal to present a symposium, titled 'The Citadel Of The Darwinian Revolution—The Biology Of Our Human Condition—At Last Explained', at the AAAS Annual Meeting titled *Grand Challenges, Great Opportunities* in February 2006, however the proposal was rejected by the Program Committee who stated that it was **'Not appropriate…Needs extensive revision…Unclear how it will be integrated with other views.'**
- Also in 2005 I also submitted an abstract of a paper titled 'Nurturing as the Prime Mover in Primate Development and Human Origins' for presentation at the International Primatological Society's (IPS) 2006 Congress in Uganda (the submission and subsequent correspondence can be viewed at <www.humancondition.com/ips-2006-congress>), but it was rejected on the grounds that **'Both reviewers felt this abstract presents no data nor a testable hypothesis'**. This is the absurd rebuttal that was also used against Darwin's theory of natural selection when the geologist and bishop Adam Sedgwick, amongst others, said that it was **'based upon assumptions which can neither be proved nor disproved'** (Sedgwick in a letter to Darwin, 24 Nov. 1859). Despite pointing out that my nurturing, love-indoctrination explanation for humans' moral instincts **'contains a great deal of supportive evidence in the form of many summaries of data-supported studies of bonobos and other primates by leading primatologists'**, and **'is an entirely testable, validatable hypothesis, as the evidence just described about bonobos shows'**, and submitting this protest to the President and 38 members of the IPS Congress Committee (who were all either Officers of the IPS (including Richard Wrangham in his capacity as President of the IPS), or Editorial Board members of the *International Journal of Primatology*), the rejection was upheld!
- In 2006, in a similar refusal to tolerate presentation of the nurturing explanation of both humans' and bonobos' moral nature, Jo Sandin was unable to include a reference to my nurturing explanation for human and bonobo moral behaviour in my 2007 book about the bonobos at the Milwaukee County Zoo, *Bonobos: Encounters in Empathy*. This despite the request of Professor Harry Prosen who is highly respected at the Zoo for being such an effective psychiatric consultant for all their social animals, and despite wanting to herself. My work was mentioned in the concluding chapter of Sandin's book, but the key reference to **'the nurturing explanation for empathy and altruism'** wasn't included.
- In 2006 my book *The Great Exodus: From the horror and darkness of the human condition* was published online. Despite a publicity campaign, including personal emails to many of the scientists who had responded positively to the documentary proposal, including self-domestication hypothesis author Brian Hare, and a condensed version of the book being included as a chapter in the 2006 book *Living a Life of Value* by Jason Merchey (see <www.humancondition.com/great-exodus-essay>, there was no response from the scientific community.
- By 2008 it had become apparent that presenting the biology of the human condition alone, as the documentary proposal had done, is not enough—the problem of confronting the human condition has to be addressed, as does the problem of coping with the exposure

of our less-than-ideal condition that understanding of the human condition brings. To cover these additional aspects, in 2008 the WORLD TRANSFORMATION MOVEMENT began production of videos explaining the breakthrough understanding of the human condition and the TRANSFORMED life for humans that it makes possible (see <www.humancondition.com>). Despite becoming available on our website in 2009, and in the highly accessible format of video, there has been little response from the scientific establishment to these introductory videos.

- In 2009 *Freedom Expanded* was published online, to no real response.
- In 2011 *The Book of Real Answers to Everything!* was published online but has so far failed to attract significant support from the scientific community.
- In 2012 Wrangham, Hare and Wobber published their paper 'The self-domestication hypothesis: evolution of bonobo psychology is due to selection against aggression', making no acknowledgment or even mention of my love-indoctrination synthesis, despite, as is detailed above, each being previously informed of it (in the case of Wrangham on four separate occasions)—even appearing to subvert and misappropriate virtually all the elements of my synthesis, while leaving out anything to do with nurturing.
- In 2014, despite the explanation of the human condition that is presented in my books being the fulfilment of the core vision of Geelong Grammar School of cultivating the sensitivity needed to achieve that specific, all-important-if-there-is-to-be-a-future-for-the-human-race task, the school chose *not* to include an essay on my life's work that was commissioned by its publishers for possible inclusion in its Corio anniversary book *100 Exceptional Stories* which **'celebrates the lives of 100 exceptional past students'**—see <www.humancondition.com/100-exceptional-stories>.
- From July to September in 2014 a special edition of my new book *FREEDOM: The End Of The Human Condition* that was orientated to scientists (it was even given its own title that focused on the very serious plight of the world: *IS IT TO BE Terminal Alienation or Transformation For The Human Race?*) was sent to 930 leading science organisations, scientists and science commentators in the English-speaking world, including the scientists involved with the main Brain Initiatives. But despite each copy being accompanied by a personal appeal for support for the book's insights from Professor Harry Prosen, and undertaking two trips to the US and UK to discuss the book with interested scientists and commentators, the situation in early 2015 is that while there has been a few positive responses from individual scientists, our publishers are still waiting for appreciative responses from the scientific establishment.

(Note again that the full presentation of this history can be found at <www.humancondition.com/full-history-of-rejection>.)

Part 8:7 Consciousness

Part 8:7A What is consciousness?

The subject of consciousness and how we have had to live in denial of what it means was briefly discussed in Part 4:4C—the contents of which will be used again here to commence this more complete description of the nature of consciousness.

Anyone who has searched the term 'consciousness' will have found it to be a subject cloaked with mystery and confusion, but there is a *very* good reason for this, and it is not because consciousness is an impenetrably complex subject, as we are often told—it is because it raises the unbearable issue of the human condition.

The truth is, the subject of consciousness brings our mind *so* quickly into contact with the unbearably depressing issue of the human condition that 'consciousness' has become synonymous with—indeed code for—the problem of the human condition. Indeed, in his book *Complexity*, the science writer Roger Lewin described the great difficulty humans have had trying to **'illuminate the phenomena of consciousness'** as **'a tough challenge…perhaps the toughest of all'** (1993, p.153 of 208). To illustrate the nature and extent of the difficulty, Lewin relayed the philosopher René Descartes' own disturbed reaction when he tried to **'contemplate consciousness'**: **'So serious are the doubts into which I have been thrown…that I can neither put them out of my mind nor see any way of resolving them. It feels as if I have fallen unexpectedly into a deep whirlpool which tumbles me around so that I can neither stand on the bottom nor swim up to the top'** (p.154). Yes, consciousness has indeed been a fearful subject to face!

As mentioned, there have been two very good reasons why the subject of consciousness raised the unbearable issue of the human condition and therefore why examination of it led to such a fearful, all-our-moorings-taken-from-under-us, **'deep whirlpool'** of terrible depression for humans.

The first reason is that trying to think about consciousness meant trying to understand what—when we humans are the only fully conscious, reasoning, intelligent, extraordinarily clever, 'can-get-a-man-on-the-Moon' animal—is so intelligent and clever about being so competitive, selfish and aggressive, in fact, *so* ruthlessly competitive, brutal and even murderous, that human life has become all but unbearable and we have nearly destroyed our own planet?! Even beginning to vaguely contemplate the nature of our human situation has been too dangerous for upset humans; indeed, merely asking the obvious initial question of 'What makes humans unique?' has been a 'no-go zone' because clearly what is so unique about us humans is that we are conscious, but thinking about *that* was a slippery slope as it quickly raised the depressing question: 'Well, if we are such a clever species why do we treat each other and our planet so appallingly?'

Any thinking about the nature of our conscious intellect invariably brought us into contact with the unbearable conclusion that it was the most destructive force the world has ever known. Yes, that our fully conscious, reasoning, intelligent, insightful, aware, knowing, understanding human mind has, it seems, unconsciously, irrationally, unintelligently, unthinkingly, indifferently, uncaringly and stupidly almost destroyed the whole planet we live on, and also brought human existence to a state of unbearably lonely, alienated, egocentricity-

crazed, aggressive, hateful dysfunctionality, has been an *extremely* confronting matter to think about. No wonder, as it says in Genesis in the Bible, having taken the **'fruit' 'from the tree of… knowledge'** (3:3, 2:17) that was **'desirable for gaining wisdom'** (3:6)—that is, having become fully conscious, thinking, knowledge-finding beings—we humans became so destructively behaved, so apparently lacking in **'wisdom'**, that we seemingly deserved to be condemned and **'banished… from the Garden of Eden'** (3:23) as defiling, unworthy, evil beings! While our intellect is surely the culminating achievement of the grand experiment in nature that we call life, it also appeared to be the most destructive and thus seemingly evil force to ever have appeared on Earth. Our conscious mind appeared to be to blame for all the devastation and human suffering in the world! Instead of being wonderful, our conscious mind appeared to be the plague of the planet! *That* is how **'serious are the doubts'** that thinking about consciousness produced within us!

Our previous inability to explain the dichotomy of being the most clever and brilliant but also the most apparently destructive and stupid animal on the planet has meant that we humans have understandably been *extremely* insecure and defensive about our supposedly wonderful intellect.

The second reason why the subject of consciousness has been so unbearably depressing to confront was because thinking about the nature of consciousness quickly brought us into contact with the unbearably depressing truth of Integrative Meaning. The explanation of what consciousness actually is will reveal the problem, because as we will see, while consciousness itself is actually a simple and obvious phenomenon to explain, its *meaning* has very confronting implications.

Humans can be distinguished from other animals by the fact we are fully conscious; that is, sufficiently able to understand and thus manage the relationship between cause and effect to wrest management of our lives from our instincts—and even to reflect upon our existence, specifically the problem of our immensely upset human condition that wresting management from our instincts brought about.

This consciousness is a product of the nerve-based learning system's ability to remember, for it is memory that allows understanding of cause and effect to develop. To elaborate, nerves were originally developed as connections for the coordination of movement in multicellular animals. An incidental by-product of the development of nerves was that of memory. The actual mechanism by which nerves are able to store impressions is not yet fully understood although we know it involves chemical processes. What is important is that nerves do have the capacity for memory because once you have memory you have the ability to develop understanding of cause and effect.

Nerves have the ability to remember past events, compare them with current events and identify regularly occurring experiences. This knowledge of, or insight into, what has commonly occurred in the past enables the mind to predict what is likely to occur in the future and to adjust behaviour accordingly. Thus, the nerve-based learning system (unlike the gene-based learning system) can *associate* information, *reason* how experiences are related, learn to *understand* and become CONSCIOUS of the relationship of events that occur through time.

In the brain, nerve information recordings of experiences (memories) are examined for their relationship with each other. To understand how the brain makes these comparisons, think of the brain as a vast network of nerve pathways onto which incoming experiences

are recorded or inscribed, each on a particular path within that network. Where different experiences share the same information, their pathways overlap. For example, long before we understood the force of gravity we had learnt that if we let go of an object it would invariably drop to the ground. The value of recording information as a pathway in a network is that it allows related aspects of experience to be physically related. In fact, the area in our brain where information is related is called the 'association cortex'. Where parts of an experience are the same they share the same pathway, and where they differ their pathways differ or diverge. All the nerve cells in the brain are interconnected, so with sufficient input of experiences onto a nerve network of sufficient size, similarities or consistencies in experience show up as well-used pathways, pathways that have become highways. (It has been found that in the vast convolutions of our brain's cortex there are about eight billion nerve cells with ten times that number of interconnecting dendrites which, if laid end to end, would stretch at least from Earth to the Moon and back.)

An 'idea' represents the moment information is associated in the brain. Incoming information could reinforce a highway, slightly modify it or add an association (an idea) between two highways, dramatically simplifying that particular network of developing consistencies to create a new and simpler interpretation of that information. For example, the most important relationship between different types of fruit is their edibility. Elsewhere the brain has recognised that the main relationship connecting experiences with living things is that they appear to try to stay alive, at least for a period of time. Suddenly it 'sees' or deduces ('tumbles' to the idea or association or abstraction) a possible connection between eating and staying alive which, with further experience and thought, becomes reinforced as 'seemingly' correct. 'Eating' is now channelled onto the 'staying alive' highway. Subsequent thought would try to deduce the significance of 'staying alive' and, beyond that, compare the importance of selfishness and selflessness. Ultimately the brain would arrive at the truth of Integrative Meaning.

The process of forgetting would also play a part in understanding the relationship between experiences. Since duration of nerve memory is related to use, our strongest memories will be of those highways, those experiences that have the greatest relativity. Our experiences not only become related or associated in the brain, they also become concentrated because the brain gradually forgets or discards inconsistencies or irregularities between experiences. Forgetting serves to cleanse the network of less consistently occurring information, preventing it from becoming cluttered with meaningless (non-insightful) information.

Our language development took the same path as the development of understanding. Commonly occurring arrangements of matter and commonly occurring events were identified (became clear or stood out). Eventually all the main objects and events became identified and, as language emerged, named. For example, we named those regularly occurring arrangements of matter with wings 'birds' and what they did as 'flying'.

Once insights into the nature of change are put into effect, the self-modified behaviour starts to provide feedback, refining the insights further. Predictions are compared with outcomes, leading all the way to the deduction of the meaning of all experience, which is to order or integrate matter.

Thus consciousness is the ability to understand the relationship of events sufficiently well to effectively manage and manipulate those events. For example, chimpanzees demonstrate consciousness when they effectively reason that by placing boxes one on top of the other they can create a stack that they can then climb upon to reach a banana tied to the roof of their cage. Consciousness is when the mind becomes effective, able to understand how experiences are related. It is the point at which the confusion of incoming information clears, starts to fit together or make sense and the mind becomes master of change.

It should be pointed out that it is one thing to be able to stack boxes to reach bananas—to manage immediate events—but quite another to manage events over the long term, to be secure managers of the world. In fact, as explained in Part 3:11, infancy is when we develop sufficient consciousness to recognise that we are at the centre of the changing array of experiences around us. We become aware of the concept of 'I' or self, which is what bonobos and the other great apes are capable of. Infancy is also when we discover conscious free will, the power to manage events. Childhood is when we revel in this free will, 'play' or experiment with it, while adolescence is when we encounter both the sobering responsibility of free will and the agonising identity crisis brought about by the dilemma of the human condition, the question of whether or not we are meaningful beings.

As has been pointed out, consciousness has been a difficult subject for humans to investigate, not because of the practical difficulties involved in understanding how our brain works, as we're often told, but because we did not want to know how it worked. While we couldn't explain our upset state of the human condition we had to avoid admitting too clearly how the brain functions because admitting information could be associated and simplified—admitting to insight—was only a short step away from realising the *ultimate* insight, which is the integrative theme or meaning or purpose or direction of existence, which in turn immediately confronted us with our own inconsistency with that meaning.

Yes, to admit to Integrative Meaning meant having to face the fact that our competitive and aggressive behaviour is seemingly totally at odds with the integrative direction of life, no less. The development and maintenance of the order of matter requires that the parts of developing wholes cooperate *not* compete. *Integrative* meaning confronts us squarely with our *divisive* human condition. Better to evade the existence of purpose in the first place by avoiding the possibility that information could be associated, refined and simplified. It is the same reason we sidestepped the term 'genetic refinement' for the process of the genetic refinement of the integration of matter on Earth, preferring instead the much vaguer term, 'genetics'. We had to evade the possibility of the refinement of information in *all* its forms because admitting that information could be simplified or refined was admitting to an ultimate refinement or law, confronting us with our inconsistency with that law, namely with the law of Integrative Meaning.

In fact, we have avoided not only the idea of meaningfulness but also any deep, meaningful thinking that might lead to confrontation with Integrative Meaning, against which we had no defence. Ensuring deeper insights remained elusive saved us from exposure but in the process buried the truth. As a result, we became extremely superficial in our thinking, masters of not thinking; in short, alienated beings.

Demonstrating our masterful evasion of the nature of consciousness we used words like 'conscious', 'intelligent', 'understanding', 'reason' and 'insight' regularly without ever actually identifying what we are conscious of, intelligent about, understanding, reasoning or having an insight into, which is how events or experiences are related. The conventional obscure, evasive definition of intelligence is **'the ability to think abstractly'**. The other imprecise, obscure, evasive phrase used whenever we wanted to refer to the uniqueness of our intelligence without actually saying what our conscious, understanding, insightful intelligence is, was to say that 'We are the species that is able to reflect upon itself.' So to name the area of the brain that associates and simplifies information as the 'association cortex' was, in fact, a slip of our evasive guard. Of course, when we weren't 'on our guard' against exposure few would deny that information can be associated, simplified and meaning found. In fact, most of us would say we do it every day of our lives—if we didn't, we wouldn't have a word for 'insight'. That is the amazing aspect about our denial of anything that brings the dilemma of the human condition into focus: it is not unusual for us humans to accept an idea up to a point, but as soon as it starts to lead to a confronting conclusion, pretend it doesn't exist—and do so without batting an eyelid.

We see this practice of admitting a truth up to a point then evading it at work with the issue of the human condition as a whole. For instance, we recognise that most illnesses are psychosomatic, and we talk a great deal about people's psychoses without allowing ourselves to consider what we are actually admitting. As explained in Part 3:8, **'psychosis'** literally means **'soul-illness'**, derived as it is from *psyche* meaning **'soul'**, and *osis*, which means **'abnormal state or condition'**. Similarly, **'psychiatry'** literally means **'soul-healing'**, derived as it is from *psyche* meaning **'soul'** and *iatreia*, which means **'healing'**. In using these terms, we are actually admitting that our soul has been hurt or upset by our intellect, because the only aspect that has changed in our species to cause us humans to become psychotic or soul-destroyed is our conscious reasoning state. The elements involved in the human condition are in our language yet, as was documented in Parts 4:6 to 4:9, we have mostly failed to recognise them.

To illustrate how we avoided acknowledging the fundamental ability of the brain to associate and reduce information to essentials (and thus be forced to deduce the integrative meaning or theme or purpose in experience), take the following case from my files of a *Newsweek* magazine cover story (7 Feb. 1987). While the title and subject of the nine-page article raised the crucial question of 'How the brain works', the author referred to the association capability of the brain in such a garbled way it was effectively buried: **'Productive thought requires not just the rules of logic but a wealth of experience and background information, plus the ability to generalise and interpret new experiences using that information.'** The **'ability to generalise'** is the ability to associate information, but the meaning is all but lost in the sentence.

In case it is thought this 'garbled' description may have been due to poor expression rather than deliberate evasion on the part of the author, it should be pointed out that apart from a mention of **'chunking or grouping of similar memories together'** and one unavoidable mention of the **'association cortex'**, there is no other reference to the brain's fundamental ability to associate information. The entire nine-page article, on how our brain works, hangs on this one inept sentence. If we are not intending to be evasive then it is not difficult to clearly describe the mind's ability to associate information, as demonstrated in the next paragraph.

Our ability to evade the truth has never been completely successful—if we looked long and hard enough it would always slip out from under our guard somewhere. (Indeed, this whole book is illustrated with quotes from people who momentarily exposed the truth. While each of these quotes was undoubtedly only intended as a bearable flash of honesty, I have hauled them all out and assembled them together as an avalanche of truth to evidence the *full* truth, now that it has been safely found.) For instance, in a one-page *Newsweek* article (9 Aug. 1982) that dealt with a slightly less sensitive (that is, less confronting) subject than the human brain and was possibly therefore not written as cautiously as the aforementioned cover story, the guard was dropped and the truth exposed. Referring to the development of a 'superbrain' mechanical computer (sometimes referred to as the fifth generation computer), the article stated the following (the underlinings are my emphasis): **'We'll be trying to set up in the machine an <u>associative</u> memory like the one in the human brain…Instead of giving each piece of information a numerical address in the computer's memory, the new system would tag it with an equation that shows its <u>relationship</u> to other pieces of information…The objective is a machine that can memorise images and store them <u>by association</u>…Our ideal…is to create a computer that programs itself…that will have the capacity to "learn" on its own…to <u>organise</u> that knowledge for its own use** [like the human brain can]**.'** Remember Rod Quantock's comment that **'Thinking can get you into terrible downwards spirals of doubt'**? Well thinking about thinking could do that too.

Incidentally, should such an information-relating computer be developed, it would soon deduce the theme of integration in changing events. Indeed, its operation would be based upon integration and the development of order. If the biological understanding of the human condition was not found before this occurred humans would have been left dangerously exposed to criticism of our divisive state. To quote another *Newsweek* story on computers: **'Mankind has long been…frightened by the prospect of creating machines that think'** (4 July 1983).

Our evasion and denial is often obviously false and yet we believed it, because we had to. For instance, in the case of Integrative Meaning, we are surrounded by examples of integration everywhere—every object we look at is a hierarchy of ordered matter, testament to the development of order of matter—and yet we deny it. Just like mechanistic science couldn't even provide a definition for two of humanity's most commonly used and important words/concepts—'love' and 'soul'. The hypocrisy inherent in denial is palpable yet understandable.

<u>In summary</u>, 'insight' was the term given to the nerve highways, the correlation our brain made of the consistencies or regularities it found between events through time. Once humans could deduce these insights—these laws governing events in time past—we were in a position to predict or anticipate the likely turn of events. We could learn to understand what happened through time. Our intellect could deduce or distil the purpose to existence or the design inherent in change in information; it could *learn* the predictable regularities or common features in experience.

This description of consciousness is so obvious and straight forward it really does beg the question: 'Why was it not explained to us by science, why weren't we taught this at school?' As now explained, there were two very good reasons: firstly, the issue of our conscious intelligent mind raises the unbearable self-realisation, 'Well, if I'm so cleverly insightful why do I have to be so destructively selfish, angry, egocentric, competitive and aggressive; if I'm

so smart that I can manage cause and effect why can't I manage it in a way that is not so mean and indifferent to others; why, if I am such a brilliantly intelligent person, am I such an angry, distressed and self-absorbed monster?' The second reason we have been so insecure about consciousness was because explaining the nature of consciousness quickly brought us into contact with the unbearably depressing truth of Integrative Meaning.

An appropriate definition of 'consciousness' is 'the ability to make sense of experience'. Applying such a definition, however, immediately highlights the problem with the issue of consciousness, for due to the depressing implications humans haven't wanted to 'make sense of experience', in particular recognise the truth of Integrative Meaning. To ask people to look into the issue of consciousness was to expect them to confront the issue of their own less than ideal, human-condition-afflicted state. The issue of consciousness is tantamount to the issue of the human condition, which humans have found virtually impossible to accept and confront. Indeed, as has been mentioned, 'consciousness' has become a relatively safe, 'keep-at-arms-length' code word for the issue of the human condition.

It was such a short step from thinking about how consciousness is concerned with making sense of experience to thinking about having to make sense of our own behaviour and life, that it was far better to leave the whole issue of what consciousness actually is completely alone. Again, when Descartes tried to **'contemplate consciousness'** it caused him such fearful depression that he said, **'It feels as if I have fallen unexpectedly into a deep whirlpool which tumbles me around so that I can neither stand on the bottom nor swim up to the top'**! In his book *Complexity*, Roger Lewin records an interview he conducted with the philosopher Colin McGinn in which McGinn said, **'an understanding of consciousness is beyond the reach of the human mind…complete cognitive openness is not guaranteed for human beings and it should not be expected…an understanding of** [consciousness] **is simply closed to us…because consciousness fundamentally is a subjective experience'** (p.167). As explained, mechanistic science is *not* holistic, it cannot deal with the **'subjective experience'**, namely the experience of the human condition. The biologist Charles Birch referred to the effects of this limitation when he said, '[mechanistic] **science can't deal with subjectivity…what we were all taught in universities is pretty much a dead end'**. Yes, mechanistic science has presented us with virtually no truthful analysis of what our most distinguishing characteristic, which is our fully conscious intelligent state, actually is and yet, as we have seen, the explanation is both simple and obvious. R.D. Laing acknowledged both the importance of the issue of consciousness (the human condition), and how truly difficult a **'realm'** it has been for humans to study when he wrote, **'The requirement of the present, the failure of the past, is the same: to provide a thoroughly self-conscious and self-critical human account of man…Our alienation goes to the roots. The realization of this is the essential springboard for any serious reflection on any aspect of present inter-human life** [pp.11-12 of 156] **…We respect the voyager, the explorer, the climber, the space man. <u>It makes far more sense to me as a valid project—indeed, as a desperately urgently required project for our time—to explore the inner space and time of consciousness</u>. Perhaps this is one of the few things that still make sense in our historical context. We are so out of touch with this realm** [so in denial of the issue of the human condition] **that many people can now argue seriously that it does not exist. It is very small wonder that it is perilous indeed to explore such a lost realm** [p.105]**'** (*The Politics of Experience* and *The Bird of Paradise*, 1967).

Just as the debate over the question of God, meaning and purpose became evasively focused away onto the irrelevant issue of whether God has been destroyed by science's ability to explain the origins of the universe, the debate about consciousness has likewise become evasively focused away onto spurious questions like *'How do we know we are conscious?'* and *'How do we know other people are conscious?'* The inhibiting subjective issue of the human condition aside, surely the real questions about consciousness are, *'What is consciousness?'* and *'Why and how did it develop in humans?'*

In Part 3:8, when the concept of Resignation was explained, it was described how when upset humans were around 14 years of age they tried to face down the issue of the imperfection of their behaviour—the issue of the human condition—and found it a suicidally depressing exercise. As Carl Jung said, **'When it** [our **'shadow'**, the negative aspects of ourselves] **appears…it is quite within the bounds of possibility for a man to recognize the relative evil of his nature, but it is a rare and shattering experience for him to gaze into the face of absolute evil.'** To avoid subjecting themselves to that **'shattering experience'** ever again, adolescents decided to resign themselves to never revisiting the issue. In fact, every moment thereafter was spent carefully avoiding any encounter with the subject. And not only did adolescents avoid the issue of the human condition when they resigned, they also contrived a positive way of viewing themselves. Unable to refute the negative they could only counter it, by focusing on, emphasising and developing whatever positive view of themselves they could find, create or develop. They found a way to not only avoid confronting—a way to block out or deny—the issue of the human condition, but *also* a way to convince themselves that they were the opposite of flawed and corrupted and seemingly **'the face of absolute evil'**. The upset human race became ego-centric, consciously centred or focused or preoccupied with finding ways to reinforce themselves, ways to feel good about themselves.

We can visualise the situation by imagining a room, with one end containing all manner of depressing truths about the lives and world of resigned humans, and the other end a few positive aspects about themselves. Well, not surprisingly, resigned humans chose to live entirely at the end of the room where they could be surrounded by those few positives. And not only did they stay jammed right up against the wall at that positive end, as removed as humanly possible from any negative truths, they made sure they stood with their nose flat against the wall so they couldn't even *see* the other side of the room. That is how narrow and limited the existence of a resigned human has been. The upset, resigned mind has been fixated on a few positives about themselves while blocking out a whole 'room'—in fact, a whole universe—of subjects and thoughts and awarenesses. In this light, we can appreciate the accuracy of Plato's analogy of humans living imprisoned deep underground in a cave where all they could see were shadowy illusions of the real world. As mentioned in Part 3:11B, Resignation is a form of autism, a form of extreme detachment from the real, true world; recall Winnicott's description of autism as **'a highly sophisticated defence organization. What we see is *invulnerability*…The child carries round *the (lost) memory of unthinkable anxiety*, and the illness is a complex mental structure insuring against recurrence of the conditions of the unthinkable anxiety.'**

This 'jammed-down-one-end-of-the-room' description of how the upset, resigned human race has had to live in denial of the whole issue of the human condition also applies to the aspect of the human condition that involves our species' apparently mean, selfish, aggressive and destructive, reasoning, self-managing conscious intelligence. Unless we were exceptionally free of upset behaviour, exceptionally loved and nurtured in our infancy and childhood and thus secure in self, thinking truthfully about what consciousness is was only ever going to raise the question of why aren't we cognisant of change and insightful enough to behave in an ideal way? To avoid raising those depressing questions the upset, resigned-to-living-in-denial-of-the-human-condition human race avoided any truthful analysis of what consciousness actually is. And not only that, we shifted our focus entirely away from the issue of what consciousness is onto any positives we could muster up about our intellect. We focused on telling ourselves that our intellect is a brilliant talent, capable of inventing a machine to take man to the Moon. To cope with the whole issue of the goodness or otherwise of our intellect we maximised all the positive aspects about our intellect and minimised all the negative aspects, with the best method of minimising the negatives being simply not to think about and acknowledge what the nature of conscious intelligence really is. We learnt to just say 'I'm smart' and not allow our thinking about the nature of intelligence to travel beyond that assertion.

For instance, we measured people for their level of mental cleverness with IQ tests and formed societies for the most mentally clever, such as Mensa. We created game shows that glorified those with the best memories for mundane, superficial facts or for successfully spelling words or completing sums. We only allowed people into university who had high IQs and could pass exams that tested for a person's intellectual brilliance, never for their soulful soundness. We tested children for their ability to remember endless streams of ridiculously superficial and meaningless facts such as Queen Isabella the 5th married King Arnold the 12th in 1522 and together they fought The War Of The Old Donkey Poo In Outer Mongolia in 1591, or something like that, etc, etc—never asking the *real* questions of why there were kings and queens and poor people—selfishness, inequality and indifference to others—and why humans fought and killed others in wars. Ours was an escapist, evasive *intellectual* world, not a sound, soulful *instinctual* world. The emphasis was entirely on intellectual brilliance, not on soulful soundness. We never measured people for how alienated, mentally dead they were, or for the speed at which their minds could block out confronting truth, or the speed at which they could override their instinctive moral sense and exploit others, or for how mentally insecure and thus egocentrically self-preoccupied and thus indifferent to others they were. Nor did we measure for how non-upset or innocent or sound or alienation-free people were. We only stressed how smart we were, never how corrupted and destructive our intellect was. And it wasn't as though we didn't know who was soul-corrupted, upset and alienated and who was relatively innocent; to ignore, deny, repress and, in the extreme, persecute to the point even, in the case of Christ, of crucifying innocence, as we have done because we found their honest, truthful innocent soundness too confronting, we had to first be able to recognise it. It would have been as easy—indeed, probably much easier—to design exams that tested a person's level of alienation or soundness or soulfulness quotient, their SQ, than it was to design exams that tested their intelligence quotient, or IQ.

The truth is, our intelligence has been an extremely insecure and defensive entity. It has been an instrument of dishonest denial, not an instrument of honest thoughtfulness. It has been preoccupied with escapist, superficial, alienated intellectualism, not with confronting, penetrating, truthful, thoughtful instinctualism. Such has been the human condition—a mess of mental lies, delusions and artificiality, a trash heap of superficiality, where everyone has lived jammed into a tiny dark corner of the real world, unable to go anywhere near that real and true world that radiates in every direction away from that dark corner. Plato's analogy is even better—he had us living deep underground in a dark cave, hidden away from a whole world of flooding sunlight.

In approximately 1601 the playwright William Shakespeare summed up the core dilemma of our species' condition when he had his character Hamlet honestly exclaim, **'What a piece of work is a man! how noble in reason! how infinite in faculty! in form and moving how express and admirable! in action how like an angel! in apprehension how like a god! the beauty of the world! the paragon of animals! And yet, to me, what is this quintessence of dust? man delights not me'** (*Hamlet*, Act 2 Scene 2). Yes, we have been **'like a god'** in our intellectual capacity for **'apprehension'** (which is our capacity to consciously understand cause and effect and be insightful) and yet we have also been capable of behaving in such an 'un-Godly' way as to be an **'**[un]**delight**[ful]**'**, **'quintessence of dust'**, nasty **'piece of work'**. If we substitute the personal 'I' for the general 'man' in Shakespeare's quote it becomes very clear why we haven't gone down the road of thought that Shakespeare so honestly travelled—*'What a piece of work am I! how noble in reason! how infinite in faculty! in form and moving how express and admirable! in action how like an angel! in apprehension how like a god! the beauty of the world! the paragon of animals! And yet I am this quintessence of dust. I don't take any delight in myself at all.'* In essence, 'I really am a nasty piece of work.'

Thank goodness we can at last explain the human condition and bring all this terribly debilitating denial to an end forever.

Part 8:7B Why, how and when did consciousness emerge in humans?

While the explanation of why, how and when consciousness emerged in humans was very briefly presented in Parts 3:11 and 8:4C, a much more detailed explanation of this very important series of questions now needs to be given.

We can begin the explanation by asking 'Why haven't other animals become fully conscious?' As mentioned in Part 8:5D since consciousness occurs at a certain point in the development of a mind's efficiency in associating information, and since conscious intelligence, the ability to reason how cause and effect are related, to understand change, to be insightful, would obviously be a great asset for any animal to acquire, one would assume fully developed consciousness would have been actively selected for as soon as animals were able to develop a reasonably elaborate central nervous system, and thus would have appeared in many species. Despite this being an obvious assumption, the conventional explanation for the emergence of consciousness in humans is that it occurred because of the need to manage complex social situations—for example, in *The Social Conquest of Earth*, E.O. Wilson says that **'to feel empathy for others, to measure the emotions of friends and enemy**

alike, to judge the intentions of all of them, and to plan a strategy for personal social interactions…the human brain became…highly intelligent' (2012, p.17 of 330). This is the so-called 'Social Intelligence Hypothesis' (sometimes referred to as the 'Machiavellian Intelligence Hypothesis'), of which a more sophisticated version is known as the Ecological Dominance-Social Competition Model (EDSC), both of which were introduced in Part 8:5D. Social problem solving *is* an obvious benefit from being conscious, but *all* activities that animals have to manage would benefit enormously from being able to understand cause and effect, so it is completely illogical to argue that it wasn't until the need to manage extremely complex social situations that consciousness developed. Any sensible analysis of the question of the emergence of consciousness must be based on the question of what has *prevented* its development in other animals? It is such a powerful asset for an animal to have that something must have stopped it being selected for in other species. The lack of social situations doesn't explain why the fully conscious mind hasn't appeared in non-human species. There was ample need for a conscious mind prior to the appearance of complex social situations. The reason this obvious and sensible analysis hasn't taken place is because the explanation for how and why consciousness emerged in humans depends on—as we are about to see—being able to acknowledge many previously unbearable human-condition-confronting truths, such as Integrative Meaning and the significance of selflessness in that integrative process, and how humans developed selfless moral instincts through nurturing. Unable to acknowledge these truths and thus think truthfully about consciousness, arguing that we were the only species to develop consciousness because of our supposed unique need to manage extremely complex social situations provided a convenient, albeit dishonest, way of eliminating the question of the origin of consciousness. The evasive, denial-based human mind simply avoided thinking about the problem deeply enough to see how illogical what was being put forward was.

Interestingly, since writing this paragraph I have learnt that both the Social/Machiavellian Intelligence Hypothesis (S/MIH) and the EDSC Model, are being challenged by human-condition avoiding, mechanistic scientists. The S/MIH is being challenged on the basis that there are highly social species such as meerkats and hyenas that haven't developed intelligence beyond that of less social species. Studies are finding **'that no association exists between sociality and encephalization** [brain size in proportion to body size] **across Carnivora** [which include meerkats and hyenas] **and that support for sociality as a causal agent of encephalization increase disappears for this clade** [group]**'** (John Finarelli & John Flynn, 'Brain-size evolution and sociality in Carnivora', *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 2009, Vol.106, No.23, pp.9345-9349). And the EDSC Model, which holds that a species must first somehow overcome or dominate its environment before the S/MIH can apply, is being challenged by mechanistic, human-condition-avoiding scientists on the basis that brain sized increased in our ancestors *before* they became ecologically dominant, as this study points out: **'a great deal of encephalization** [brain size relative to body size] **occurred before humans were dominant…The EQ** [encephalization quotient] **of the first instance of *Homo*, *Homo habilis*, had already doubled relative to our nearest relatives today, chimpanzees (*Pan troglodytes*). These hominins were still largely foragers, scavengers (not yet organized hunters), and prey for more powerful predators'** (R.D. Horan, J.F. Shogren & E.H. Bulte, *A Paleoeconomic Theory of Encephalization*, Selected paper presented at the annual meetings of the American Economic Association, San Francisco, Jan. 2009). So I don't know where dishonest thinking will go now for an explanation for consciousness!

It is true that other animal species have been able to develop all manner of extraordinary mental abilities, many superior to our own, yet never full consciousness. (I will go through the evidence for other animals not having developed full consciousness shortly.) For instance, in the United States the nutcracker bird buries around 30,000 nuts throughout the summer months, each in a different location, but come winter and the cover of snow it can recall the location of 90 percent of them. The goby fish can memorise the topography of the tidal flats at high tide so that when the tide retreats it knows the exact location of the next pool to flip to when the one it is in evaporates. And then there is the male common canary, which has a specific part of its brain that expands dramatically every spring in order to learn new mating songs, only to shrink again once the mating season ends. So again the question is, if other animals have been able to develop such extraordinary mental abilities, what's stopping them from developing full consciousness?

The explanation begins by re-stating what was pointed out in Part 8:2, 'The brief history of the development of matter in Earth', which was that one of the limitations of the gene-based learning system is that it normally can't select for unconditionally selfless, altruistic, self-sacrificing behaviour because altruistic traits tend to self-eliminate—they tend not to carry on and so normally can't become established in a species. The effect is that the gene-based learning system actively resists altruistic behaviour.

For instance, whenever a female kangaroo comes into season, the males pursue her relentlessly. Despite both parties almost falling with fatigue, the chase continues. It is easy to see how this behaviour developed. If a male relaxed his efforts he would lose his opportunity to reproduce. Self-interest is fostered by natural selection with the result that genetic selfishness has become an extremely strong force in animals. It is clear then that there would be no chance of a variety of kangaroo that considered others above itself developing. Unless, of course, they could develop love-indoctrination, but while a kangaroo can look after a joey in its pouch, the pouch is more an external womb, allowing little behavioural interaction between mother and infant. It is the selfless treatment—the active demonstration of love—that trains the infants in selflessness or love. Also, because grass is not very nutritious marsupials have to spend most of their time grazing, which leaves relatively little time for social interaction between mother and infant and thus limited training in love.

Genetic refinement normally acts against any inclination towards selfless behaviour because selflessness disadvantages the individual that practices it and advantages the recipients of the selfless treatment—such is the meaning of selflessness. Selflessness normally can't be reinforced by genetic refinement; indeed, it is emphatically resisted by it.

<u>It follows then that in terms of the development of consciousness, the gene-based learning or refinement system was, in effect, totally opposed to any altruistic, selfless thinking. In fact, genetic refinement developed *blocks* in the minds of animals to prevent the emergence of such thinking. And it is this block against truthful, selflessness-recognising-thinking in the minds of almost all animals that prevents them from becoming conscious of the true relationship or meaning of experience</u>.

To explain more fully how these blocks against selflessness-recognising-thinking developed, an example of how genes resist self-destructive behaviour will be helpful. In what are termed 'visual cliff' experiments, newborn kittens are placed on a table and while they

will venture towards the edge of the table, they won't allow themselves to go beyond the edge and fall—a sheet of glass is actually placed over the table to prevent them from accidentally slipping off the edge, but the point is the glass is unnecessary because the kittens instinctively know not to travel beyond the table's edge. Presumably, this instinctive orientation against doing so evolved because any cat that did venture too close to a precipice invariably fell to its death, leaving only those that happened to have an instinctive block against such self-destructive practices. Natural selection or genetic refinement develops blocks in the mind against behaviour that doesn't tend to lead to the reproduction of the genes of the individuals who practice that behaviour.

Just as surely as cats were eventually selected for their instinctive block against self-destruction, most animals have been selected with an instinctive block against selfless thinking because such thinking also tends not to lead to the reproduction of the genes of the individuals who think that way. The effect of this block was to prevent the developing intellect from thinking truthfully and thus effectively.

As pointed out when Integrative Meaning was explained in Part 8:1, selflessness or love is the theme of existence, the essence of integration, the meaning of life. While the upset, alienated human race has learnt to live in denial of this truth of the selfless, loving, integrative meaning of existence, it is in fact an extremely obvious truth and one that is deduced very quickly if you are able to think honestly about the world. As mentioned, we are surrounded by integration. Every object we look at is a hierarchy of ordered matter, witness to the development of order of matter. It follows then that if you aren't able to recognise and thus appreciate the significance of selfless, Integrative Meaning you are not in a position to begin to think straight and thus effectively; you can't begin to make sense of experience. All your thinking is coming off a false base and is therefore effectively derailed from the outset from making sense of experience. As Arthur Schopenhauer said, **'The discovery of truth is prevented most effectively…by prejudice, which…stands in the path of truth and is then like a contrary wind driving a ship away from land'**. You can't think effectively with lies in your head, especially with such important lies as denial of selflessness-dependent Integrative Meaning. Your mind is, in effect, stalled at a very superficial level of intelligence with little ability to understand the relationship of events occurring around you.

To elaborate, any animal able to associate information to the degree necessary to realise the importance of behaving selflessly towards others would have been at a distinct disadvantage in terms of its chances of successfully reproducing its genes. It follows then that those animals that *don't* recognise the importance of selflessness are genetically advantaged, which means that eventually a mental block would have been 'naturally selected' to prevent the emergence of the ability to make sense of experience, to prevent the emergence of consciousness. At this point in development, genetic refinement favoured individuals that were not able to recognise the significance of selflessness, thus ensuring animals remained incognisant, unconscious of the true meaning of life.

Having denied the truth of Integrative Meaning and the importance of selflessness, it is not easy for the alienated human race to appreciate that conscious thought depends on the ability to acknowledge the significance of selflessness/love/Integrative Meaning. However, our own mental block or alienation is, in fact, the perfect illustration of and parallel for this

block in the minds of animals. Unable to think truthfully about the selfless, loving integrative theme of existence, all our thinking has also been coming off a false base and, as a result, we too have been unable to think effectively. Alienation has rendered us almost stupid, incapable of deep, penetrating, meaningful thought.

Wallace & Gromit by Nick Park and
Bob Baker, produced by Aardman Animations

When it comes to thinking truthfully and thus soundly, humans are now almost as mentally incognisant as animals—a state of affairs that is played on in the popular animated cartoon *Wallace & Gromit* (pictured above). In the series, Wallace is a lonely, sad—alienated—human figure whose dog Gromit is very much on an intellectual par with him in his world. Both wear the same blank, stupefied expression as together they muddle their way through life's adventures.

Elaboration on this point of how alienation has stopped humans today from thinking effectively

One of the themes of this book is how our human-condition-produced alienation has deliberately kept the human mind ignorant, unable to recognise many obvious and very important scientific truths. The ability to think and find knowledge is not dependent on how clever a person is, how high their IQ is, as all our learning institutions stress. As mentioned, the average IQ of humans today is quite adequate for finding knowledge. The critical factor is how free of denial/alienation a person is, not how high their IQ is. Consider how many insights into our human situation have already been presented in this book by not having to avoid human-condition-confronting truths. There have been breakthrough insights in almost every paragraph—and it should be emphasised that now that no one has to avoid the issue of the human condition *all* humans will be able to think honestly and thus effectively. The truth is the all-important liberating explanations in this presentation, in particular the explanation of the integrative meaning of existence, of how the nurturing, love-indoctrination, mate-selection-for-cooperativeness process gave us our integratively orientated moral soul and, as is about to be explained, liberated consciousness, and of how the battle between this emerged

conscious intellect and our already established instinctive moral soul produced the upset state of our human condition, are not clever discoveries but sound, denial-free revelations in the sense that these ideas consider subjects and truths all humans are aware of, but have been living in deep fear and denial of.

Although some of the following quotes have been included before, they need to be included again here because they emphasise just how seriously alienation has prevented the human mind from thinking effectively.

Firstly, in his remarkably insightful book *Thinking about Children*, the psychoanalyst D.W. Winnicott described how when in denial of a subject that subject **'cannot be remembered because of its being associated with painful feeling or some other intolerable emotion. Energy has to be all the time employed in maintaining the repression, and…there is relatively little energy left for a direct participation in life'** (1996, p.9 of 343). This inability to properly **'participate in life'** infers an inability to think freely about life. As described in Part 4, mechanistic science has fully conformed with humanity's very necessary strategy of denial so that while it prided itself in being rigorously objective it has, in fact, been rigorously biased in its approach, determinedly avoiding any truths that brought the human condition into focus.

Plato recognised the destructive effect our denial-compliant intellect has had on our capacity to think effectively, stating: **'when the soul** [our integratively orientated original instinctual self] **uses the instrumentality of the body** [uses the body's intellect with its preoccupation with denial] **for any inquiry…it is drawn away by the body into the realm of the variable, and <u>loses its way and becomes confused and dizzy, as though it were fuddled</u>** [drunk]**…But when it investigates by itself** [free of human-condition-avoiding, intellectual denial]**, it passes into the realm of the pure and everlasting and immortal and changeless, and being of a kindred nature, when it is once independent and free from interference, consorts with it always and strays no longer, but remains, in that realm of the absolute** [Integrative Meaning]**, constant and invariable'** (*Phaedo*, tr. H. Tredennick). He also spoke of the need to **'put sight into blind eyes'** and identified what was required to end our historic **'confused'**, **'dizzy'**, **'fuddled'** state of denial: **'this capacity** [of **a mind…to see clearly**] **is innate in each man's mind** [we are born with an instinctive orientation to Integrative Meaning]**, and that the faculty by which he learns is like an eye which cannot be turned from darkness** [the upset state of living in denial] **to light** [the truth] **unless the whole body is turned; in the same way the mind as a whole must be turned away from the world of change until it can bear to look straight at reality, and at the brightest of all realities which is what we call the Good** [Integrative Meaning or God]**'** (*The Republic*, tr. H.D.P. Lee, 1955, p.283 of 405). Humans had to stop living in denial of Integrative Meaning, **'the Good'**, if they were to begin to think effectively. Explaining the human condition and ending the need to live in denial—having our mind **'turned from darkness to light'**—is the objective of this whole presentation and of the WORLD TRANSFORMATION MOVEMENT.

While our capacity to see is, as Plato said, **'innate'**, denial and its alienating effects came about through our encounter with the upset, human-condition-afflicted, corrupt world. Since this encounter began at birth and continued throughout our lives, so the extent of our insecurity about our corrupted state and associated block-out or alienation also increased throughout our lives, until eventually we were walking around free of criticism but totally in the dark in terms of our access to truth and meaning—which, as described in Part 3:11H, was the 'closing-of-the-human-mind'-end-state that the ever-increasing stripping of criticism and its guilt pseudo

idealistic, left-wing process led to. It follows then that we are least alienated from truthful, effective thinking when we are young—as the following quotes so vividly illustrate. Recall Sigmund Freud's observation: **'What a distressing contrast there is between the radiant intelligence of the child and the feeble mentality of the average adult'** (*The Freud Reader*, ed. P. Gay, 1995, p.715). Christ also recognised the mental integrity of the young when he said, **'you have hidden these things from the wise and learned, and revealed them to little children'** (Matt 11:25). Albert Einstein famously said, **'every child is born a genius'**, while Richard Buckminster Fuller acknowledged that **'There is no such thing as genius, some children are just less damaged than others'** (NASA Speech, 1966), and that **'All children are born geniuses. 9999 out of every 10,000 are swiftly, inadvertently de-geniused by grown-ups'** (*Education for Human Development: Understanding Montessori*, by Mario M. Montessori Jr., Paula Polk Lillard & Buckminster Fuller, 1987, Foreword). R.D. Laing also said that **'Each child is a new beginning, a potential prophet** [denial-free, truthful, effective thinker]**'** (*The Politics of Experience* and *The Bird of Paradise*, 1967, p.26 of 156) and pointed out that **'Children are not yet fools, but** [by our treatment of them] **we shall turn them into imbeciles like ourselves, with high I.Q.'s if possible'** (ibid. p.49). Many exceptionally creative people have made statements to the effect that genius is the ability to think like a child. For example, as one of the most accomplished artists of all time, Pablo Picasso, famously said about his struggle to paint well, **'It's taken me a lifetime to learn to paint like a child.'**

In Part 3:8 it was explained how, historically, when children reached the age of approximately 15 they went through a process of resigning themselves to a strategy of living in denial of the depressing issue of the human condition. It further explains that once they adopted this denial they lost the ability to think truthfully and thus effectively; they became alienated from the truth. Only pre-resigned children, or the very rare adult who was sufficiently nurtured and sheltered from upset in their upbringing to not have had to become resigned to a life of denial, can think effectively.

The extent of the alienation in adult humans today was made very clear in this quote from the writings of R.D. Laing: **'We are born into a world where alienation awaits us. We are potentially men, but are in an alienated state** [p.12 of 156] **…the *ordinary* person is a shrivelled, desiccated fragment of what a person can be. As adults, we have forgotten most of our childhood, not only its contents but its flavour; as men of the world, we hardly know of the existence of the inner world** [p.22] **…<u>The condition of alienation, of being asleep, of being unconscious, of being out of one's mind, is the condition of the normal man</u>** [p.24] **…between *us* and It** [the Godly, ideal state and the issue it raises of our inconsistency with it] **there is a veil which is more like fifty feet of solid concrete. *Deus absconditus*. Or we have absconded** [p.118] **…The outer divorced from any illumination from the inner is in a state of darkness. We are in an age of darkness. The state of outer darkness is a state of sin—i.e. alienation or estrangement from the inner light** [p.116]**'** (*The Politics of Experience* and *The Bird of Paradise*, 1967). In another of his books Laing spelt out the consequences of alienation: **'We are dead, but think we are alive. We are <u>asleep</u>, but think we are awake. We are dreaming, but take our dreams to be reality. We are the halt, lame, blind, deaf, the sick. But <u>we are doubly unconscious</u>. We are *so* ill that we no longer feel ill, as in many terminal illnesses. We are mad, but have no insight'** (*Self and Others*, 1961, p.38 of 192). The term **'asleep'** was also used by the English poet Percy Bysshe Shelley (1792–1822) to describe humans' current state: **'Our boat is asleep on Serchio's stream / Its sails are folded like thoughts in a dream'** (*Shelley: The man and the poet*, Desmond King-Hele, 1960, p.335 of 390). (The Serchio is a river in Italy); as did William Wordsworth in his poem, *Intimations of Immortality from Recollections of Early Childhood*. In describing our

species' loss of innocence—he wrote **'of something that is gone…the visionary gleam…the glory and the dream'**—Wordsworth summarised that **'Our birth is but a sleep and a forgetting.'**

For a written description of the confronting horror of the human condition we had Nikolai Berdyaev's reference to **'a deadly pain in the very distinction of good and evil, of the valuable and the worthless'**, Søren Kierkegaard writing of **'the sickness unto death, this tormenting contradiction, this sickness in the self; eternally to die, to die and yet not to die'**, and, in Part 8:13 the psychologist Arthur Janov is also included, saying, **'there is unspeakable tragedy in the world…each of us being in a mad scramble away from our personal horror'** (*The Primal Scream*, 1970, p.389 of 446). For an artist's depiction of the alienated state of the human condition that is as honest as anyone has ever managed to write about it we can go to the paintings of Francis Bacon that were included in Part 7:5, in particular his *Study for Self Portrait* (reproduced again in next image), which features one of his characteristic twisted, smudged, distorted—alienated—human faces, which in this case happens to be his own, a nuance that significantly adds to the honesty of the painting. The figure's arms appear tied behind his back while his entire body—knot in the belly, eyes asleep and all—is confined to a box. The painting represents the human predicament under the duress of the human condition and is reminiscent of Plato's analogy in which humans are confined in chains to a cave-like prison of deathly alienation.

Our alienated intellectual self is committed to avoiding and blocking out the truthful, beautiful, natural world to which our intuitive, instinctual self has clear access. Thus to think truthfully and thus effectively, to access all the truth and beauty the world has to offer, to create and behave naturally without inhibition or distortion, requires freedom from the intellectual state of living in deep denial and alienation. Necessary as it has been, alienation has massively thwarted humans' real potential. Arthur Schopenhauer recognised this when he wrote: **'The unpremeditated, unintentional, indeed in part unconscious and instinctive element which has always been remarked in the works of *genius* owes its origin to precisely the fact that primal artistic knowledge is entirely separated from and independent of will, is will-less'** (*Essays and Aphorisms*, tr. R.J.

Hollingdale, 1970, p.158 of 237). Genius requires freedom from the alienated intellect, as indicated in the aforementioned quotes about the creative powers of a child's mind.

Laing described how humans are so alienated and our capacity to think so limited that only **'an intensive discipline of un-learning'** can reconnect us with the true world: **'Our capacity to think, except in the service of what we are dangerously deluded in supposing is our self-interest, and in conformity with common sense, is pitifully limited: our capacity even to see, hear, touch, taste and smell is so shrouded in veils of mystification that an intensive discipline of un-learning is necessary of *anyone* before one can begin to experience the world afresh, with innocence, truth and love'** (*The Politics of Experience* and *The Bird of Paradise*, 1967, p.23 of 156). As is emphasised throughout this book, this **'un-learning'**, this dismantling of alienation, depended on finding the greater dignifying understanding of the human condition.

In the Bible, the prophet Isaiah described the extent of humans' alienation when he said, **'"You will be ever hearing, but never understanding; you will be ever seeing, but never perceiving." This people's heart has become calloused** [alienated]**; they hardly hear with their ears, and they have closed their eyes'** (Isa. 6:9, 10, footnote). The Russian philosopher George Gurdjieff described the alienated state truthfully when he wrote: **'It happens fairly often that essence dies in a man while his personality and his body are still alive. A considerable percentage of the people we meet in the streets of a great town are people who are empty inside, that is, they are actually *already dead*'** (*In Search of the Miraculous*, P.D. Ouspensky, 1950, ch.8, p.164).

That humans have been prepared to pay the price of such deadening alienation, as these quotes reveal, offers clear insight into just how painful the dilemma of the human condition has been. Deep, meaningful thinking has been so painful for humans we have learnt to avoid all but superficial thoughts, as the aforementioned Australian comedian Rod Quantock pointed out when he said, **'Thinking can get you into terrible downwards spirals of doubt'** ('Sayings of the Week', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 5 July 1986). Nobel Laureate Albert Camus wasn't exaggerating either when he wrote that **'Beginning to think is beginning to be undermined'** (*The Myth of Sisyphus*, 1942); nor was Bertrand Russell when he said, **'Many people would sooner die than think'** (quoted in Antony Flew's *Thinking About Thinking*, 1975). Aldous Huxley also summarised the situation of our refusal to make sense of the world when he wrote, **'We don't know because we don't want to know'** (*Ends and Means*, 1937, p.270). T.S. Eliot was also acknowledging this truth when he wrote that **'human kind cannot bear very much reality'** (*Burnt Norton*, 1936). In short, mindlessness saved us from depressing mindfulness.

While adults will readily intellectually focus on a safely sectioned-off area of inquiry or activity—such as solving a maths equation, or mastering a computer problem, or debating whether God has been destroyed by the big bang theory of the origins of the universe, or ordering our wardrobe, or polishing our car, or making a cake, or even sending man to the Moon—we won't go beyond those safety limits and risk encountering anything to do with the issue of 'self', the depressing subject of the human condition. We will even read a book such as this one that is full of world-saving insights into the all-important issue of the human condition only to then write a review dismissing it on the basis of such extraneous complaints as **'bad grammar'**, **'unnecessary underlining emphasis in quotes'**, **'the "canary's brain" doesn't "expand" during the mating season, only one small area of it does'** (this 'fault' has now been rectified), **'it is a hodge-podge of incoherent, impenetrably dense repetition and hyperbol'**, **'there is nothing new in it'**, **'this book must be some sort of religious propaganda** [because it dares to demystify such concepts as God

and prophets]', **'who is funding all this bad, pseudo science?'** etc, etc (from WTM records)—basically be, as Christ said, **'blind guides…**[who] **strain out a gnat** [small insect] **but swallow a camel'** (Matt. 23:24). The result of all this evasion is an immense disparity between our superficial intellectual outer world and the miles-deep inner world that we won't go near. As 'Albert the alligator' in the old Pogo comic strip said, **'The inner me? Naw, got no time fer him…he goes his way, Ah go mine'** (mentioned in Charlton Heston's autobiography, *In The Arena*, 1995).

Yes, the *real* frontier is not outer space but inner space. This extraordinary, indeed mad, situation was well summarised by General Omar N. Bradley when he said, **'The world has achieved brilliance…without conscience. Ours is a world of nuclear giants and ethical infants'** (Armistice Day Address, 10 Nov. 1948, *Collected Writings of General Omar N. Bradley*, Vol.1). As described in some detail in Part 3:11H, we will apply all our vigour to protesting an environmental cause or the rights of an indigenous race or the demand for peace, or any one of a number of other politically correct causes, but we will *not* look at the nightmare of angst in ourselves, the *real* devastation and issue of our own condition and beyond that, the human condition that needs to be addressed if we are to bring about a caring, equitable and peaceful world—because the fact is no matter how much we try to restrain and conceal our upset eventually our world *will* become an expression of ourselves and thus as devastated as we are. To fix the world we have to first fix ourselves. The truth is that the main function of politically correct causes has been to allow upset humans to feel that they are doing good when they are actually *avoiding* what is required to make a difference—namely confronting the issue of the human condition. Human life has been preoccupied with maintaining the many delusions and false ways of making us feel good about ourselves and with all manner of escapisms from reality rather than with meaningful thinking and progressive actions as we claim it is. In short, the human condition is the all-important issue that had to be looked at to free ourselves from our condition, yet it is the one issue we refused to look at. As the psychoanalyst Carl Jung recognised, **'Man everywhere is dangerously unaware of himself. We really know nothing about the nature of man, and unless we hurry to get to know ourselves we are in dangerous trouble'** (*Jung and The Story of Our Time*, Laurens van der Post, 1976, p.239 of 275). The human condition is the elephant in our living rooms that we pretend not to see, the all-important issue that we assiduously practice denying. As R.D. Laing said, **'Our alienation goes to the roots…We are mad, but have no insight** [into the fact of our madness]**.'**

Schopenhauer's point about **'The discovery of truth is prevented most effectively…by prejudice, which…stands in the path of truth and is then like a contrary wind driving a ship away from land'** is so true. The greatest **'prejudice'** of all in our upset human situation has been our prejudice against any truths that brought the issue of our corrupted human condition into focus and the most important of all those confronting truths is the truth of Integrative Meaning and its theme of selflessness. Humans' current immensely alienated, superficial, virtually mentally dead state is a result of having blocked from our minds so many important truths, in particular the real significance of selflessness or love in our world.

So, the point is, when it comes to thinking truthfully and thus soundly, humans *are* now almost as mentally incognisant as animals.

It should be emphasised that all these descriptions of just how alienated the human race has become and how lacking in ability to think truthfully and thus effectively—how consciously dead the human race has become—are *extremely* confronting, but it has to be

remembered that we can all access THE TRANSFORMED WAY OF LIVING that completely solves the problem of 'exposure day' or 'judgement day'.

Return to the description of how consciousness emerged

The point is that the human mind has been alienated from the truth twice in its history: once when we were like other animals, instinctively blocked from recognising the truth of selflessness, and then again in our species' current adolescent state, during which we have become insecure about our divisive nature with no choice but to live in Plato's dark cave of denial of the significance of the selfless, loving integrative meaning of existence.

While humans have gradually retreated from consciousness into virtual unconsciousness because of our insecurity about our non-ideal, soul-corrupted, 'fallen', human-condition-afflicted state, we were, to our knowledge, the first animals to become fully conscious. So, the next question is, how were our ape ancestors (and other primates today, such as bonobos, chimpanzees, gorillas, orangutans and even baboons) able to overcome this block that exists in the minds of almost all other animals and become capable of making sense of experience, become conscious?

Understanding how the nurturing love-indoctrination process was able to develop selfless, moral instincts in our ape ancestors (and in some other primates today) allows us to answer this crucial question. The reason we were able to become fully conscious is that, quite by accident, the nurturing of selfless instincts breached the block against thinking truthfully by superimposing a new, truthful, selflessness-recognising mind over the older, effectively dishonest, selfless-thinking-blocked one. Since our ape ancestors could develop an awareness of cooperative, selfless, loving meaning, they were able to develop truthful, sound, effective thinking and so acquired consciousness, the essential characteristic of mental infancy.

To use a comparative example, chimpanzees are currently in mental infancy—they have the conscious mental powers of, approximately, a two-year-old human—and demonstrate rudimentary consciousness, making sufficient sense of experience to recognise that they are at the centre of the changing array of events they experience. They are beginning to relate information or reason effectively. Experiments have shown that they have an awareness of the concept of 'I' or self and, as mentioned in the previous Part, are capable of reasoning how events are related sufficiently well to know that they can reach a banana tied to the roof of their cage by stacking and climbing upon boxes.

In the case of bonobos, as mentioned in Part 8:4, evidence suggests that they are now the most intelligent or conscious animals next to humans. This level of intelligence or consciousness is evident in this quote: **'Everything seems to indicate that** [Prince] **Chim** [a bonobo] **was extremely intelligent. His surprising alertness and interest in things about him bore fruit in action, for he was constantly imitating the acts of his human companions and testing all objects. He rapidly profited by his experiences…Never have I seen man or beast take greater satisfaction in showing off than did little Chim. The contrast in intellectual qualities between him and his female companion** [a chimpanzee] **may briefly, if not entirely adequately, be described by the term "opposites"** [p.248 of 278] **…Prince Chim seems to have been an intellectual genius. His remarkable alertness and quickness to learn were associated with a cheerful and happy disposition which made him the favorite of all** [p.255] **…Chim also was even-tempered and good-natured, always ready for a romp; he seldom resented by word or deed unintentional rough**

handling or mishap. Never was he known to exhibit jealousy…[By contrast] **Panzee** [the chimpanzee] **could not be trusted in critical situations. Her resentment and anger were readily aroused and she was quick to give them expression with hands and teeth** [p.246]**'** (*Almost Human*, Robert M. Yerkes, 1925).

So how did the process of nurturing overcome the instinctive block? It makes sense that at the outset the brain was relatively small with a limited amount of cortex, the matter in which information is associated. These brains had instinctive blocks preventing the mind from making deep meaningful/truthful/selflessness-recognising perceptions. At this stage, however, these small, inhibited brains were being trained in selflessness, so although there was not a great deal of unfilled cortex available, what was available was being inscribed with a truthful, effective network of information-associating pathways. The mind was being taught the truth and given the opportunity to think clearly, in spite of the existing instinctive blocks or 'lies'. While at first this truthful 'wiring' would not have been very significant due to the small size of the brain, it had the potential for much greater development. Further, as was explained in Part 8:4B, with this selfless training of the brain occurring over many generations, the selfless 'wiring' in the brain would have gradually become instinctive or innate. Genes would inevitably follow and reinforce any development process—in this they were not selective. The difficulty lay in getting the development of unconditional selflessness to occur, for once it was regularly occurring it would naturally become instinctive over time, which it did—our instinctive moral soul, the 'voice' of which is our 'conscience', was formed. We are born with a brain that has instinctive orientations that incline us to behave unconditionally selflessly, and to expect to be treated in the same way. A graphic example of this moral instinct in us that guides us to behave in an unconditionally selfless way was given in a 1983 *Sports Illustrated* magazine article that described how, just before plunging into a Louisiana pond and drowning in an attempt to rescue two boys, Joe Delaney, a professional footballer, said, **'I can't swim good, but I've got to save those kids'** ('Sometimes The Good Die Young', 7 Nov. 1983). This is but one example, but no doubt we have all heard, seen, or read of similar situations.

Thus, the mind was trained or programmed or 'brain-washed' or 'indoctrinated' with the ability to think in spite of the blocks working against such training; it had, at last, been stimulated by the truth. Of course, it must be remembered that in this early stage of development the emphasis was on training in *love*, not on the liberation of the conscious ability to *think*, which was incidental to Negative Entropy's push for our forebears to become an integrated group of multicellular animals. While the development of conscious thought greatly assisted the love-indoctrination process by allowing for the conscious selection of less aggressive mates, its development would have only been gradual. As evidenced by the picture of the skulls of our ancestors, the association cortex didn't develop strongly until thinking took on a critical role in humanity's adolescence when we had to find understanding in order to defend ourselves against ignorance. As explained in Part 3:11B, adolescence is the time when the search for identity takes place and in the case of the human race, this identity crisis was centred on the need to understand itself, particularly understand why it was divisively rather than cooperatively behaved. It is not surprising then to learn that the large association cortex is a characteristic of Adolescentman *Homo* who emerged around two million years ago.

Incidentally, there would also not have been a strong call for language until the adolescent state emerged some two million years ago when the battle of the human condition developed and, with it, alienation. The australopithecines, or Childman, lived from five million years ago to two million years ago and were instinctively coordinated and instinctively empathetic with little need for language. It was only when we became variously alienated in self and thus variously alienated from each other that a strong need to try to justify and explain ourselves to one another arose. Anthropological evidence supports this assertion that language emerged with the onset of *Homo* two million years ago. According to Richard Leakey and Roger Lewin, the study of brain cases in fossil skulls for the imprint of Broca's area (the word-organising centre of the brain) suggests **'*Homo* had a greater need than the australopithecines for a rudimentary language'** (*Origins*, 1977, p.205 of 264).

As part of this explanation for language, is it not likely that infants stopped being silent when mothers stopped being able to properly respond to them because of their now two million years in development alienated condition? For instance, even the infants of relatively innocent, less alienated races of humans today, such as the Matabele of South Africa and the Australian Aborigine, rarely cry. Also, is it not likely that motherese language developed as a way for alienated humans to try to pacify their distressed innocent infants?

Historically (meaning, for the purposes of this book, 'during the time when humans had to find ways of denying confronting truths'), the long primate infancy was said to have developed so infants could be taught survival skills; that is, have time enough to have passed onto them learnt traditions or culture imperative to their survival. Evidence, however, indicates that learning wasn't strongly required nor promoted until adolescence—*after* the extended infancy. The long infancy was solely for the development of integration. Moreover, the 'need to learn survival skills' argument implies that survival was an issue, but for the training in love to develop there had to be ideal nursery conditions, which in itself translates to an environment free of survival pressures. For instance, selfless training and consciousness are more developed in bonobos than in the chimpanzees as a result of the extra comfort and security of the bonobos' natural environment.

The following quote about the comparative comfort of the bonobos' environment appeared in Part 8:4B but is included once more here with a slightly different emphasis: **'we may say that the pygmy chimpanzees historically have existed in a stable environment rich in sources of food. Pygmy chimpanzees appear conservative in their food habits and unlike common chimpanzees have developed a more cohesive social structure and elaborate inventory of sociosexual behavior. In contrast, common chimpanzees have gone further in developing their resource-exploiting techniques and strategy, and have the ability to survive in more varied environments. These differences suggest that the environments occupied by the two species since their separation by the Zaire** [Congo] **River has differed for some time. The vegetation to the south of the Zaire River, where *Pan paniscus*** [bonobo] **is found, has been less influenced by changes in climate and geography than the range of the common chimpanzee to the north. Prior to the Bantu (Mongo) agriculturists' invasion into the central Zaire basin, the pygmy chimpanzees may have led a carefree life in a comparatively stable environment'** (*The Pygmy Chimpanzee*, ed. Randall L. Susman, ch.10 by Takayoshi Kano & Mbangi Mulavwa, 1984). This observation would seem to indicate that chimpanzees, having to live in more variable and less food-rich environments,

have the greater need for intelligence. Only nurturing, however, can liberate that intelligence, and, as has been described, bonobos are the more conscious or intelligent of the two species.

Regarding the work of Allott, Drummond, Fiske (see Part 8:5B), and Betty McCollister (whose work will be mentioned in Part 8:13), all four believed our increased intelligence and the emergence of our large brain *accompanied* the extended infancy and increase in nurturing. However, it can now be understood that both came *after*, and not during, the longer infancy, nurturing phase of our development.

An understanding of how consciousness and the large brain emerged depends firstly on being able to recognise the truth of Integrative Meaning and its theme of unconditional selflessness—and from there why animals would have developed blocks in their minds preventing selfless, truthful, effective thinking and thus consciousness—and from there how the nurtured training of selflessness in humans would have liberated truthful thinking and thus consciousness—and from there how the emergence of consciousness would have led to its battle with our instinctive self—and from there how the alienation of our human condition that resulted from the battle would have demanded a more developed, intelligent, bigger brain in order to both understand and defend ourselves. Incidentally, what has been described here is clear evidence of how, if you are living in denial of truth, you have no chance of making sense of our world and place in it—as is evidenced by the mountain high pile of books that have been written about consciousness without ever managing to penetrate the subject.

In summary, the processes of nurturing love-indoctrination and the conscious selection by females of non-aggressive, cooperative males as mates not only gave us our moral, instinctive orientation to behaving cooperatively—our soul—it also liberated consciousness in our forebears. As already pointed out, since nurturing is largely a female role and females controlled the selection of cooperative mates, it is true to say that the female gender created humanity.

As explained in Part 8:4, throughout humanity's infancy and childhood, a period of time that lasted from 12 to 2 million years ago, nurturing played the most important role in the group. It was a matriarchal society in which males had to support this focus on nurturing and protect the group from external threats. As also explained earlier, humanity's matriarchal structure came to an end when the threat of ignorance from our instinctive self emerged during its adolescence and males, in their role as group protectors, went out to tackle the threat. At this point, the patriarchal society came into being.

Incidentally, another consequence of love-indoctrination was that it freed our hands to hold tools and carry out innumerable tasks. In Part 8:4 it was explained that the more love-indoctrination developed and the longer infants were kept in infancy and the more dependent they became, the more we had to stay upright in order to hold and care for them. This freedom of our hands from walking proved extremely useful later when the intellect needed to assert itself, because it could direct the hands to manipulate objects. A fully conscious mind in a whale or a dog would be frustrated by its inability to implement its understandings.

As was also explained in Part 8:4, it appears that the love-indoctrination process was also a contributing factor in humans having a relatively long life, which has been instrumental in the accumulation of knowledge. If we only lived to 30, which is considered a long life for many animals, instead of the 70 plus years we do, we would likely not have had sufficient time to properly assimilate and manage in our minds all the difficult nuances of the human condition.

It can be seen that love-indoctrination was an extremely fortuitous development.

Incidentally, people wonder how we can know that other species aren't fully conscious like we humans are—for instance, I have often even read and heard claims that other animals, such as dolphins and elephants, are just as intelligent as humans. The fact is, as all good animal trainers—such as horse and dog 'whisperers'(who seem to have such an uncanny ability to control those animals that it is as though they are 'whispering' instructions to them)—know, the secret to managing and training non-human animal species, of both sexes, is to recognise that their great preoccupation is in achieving dominance, moving up the 'pecking order' whenever possible. Once you think about their behaviour from that basis you are then in a position to effectively interpret and thus manipulate their behaviour. Humans' fundamental preoccupation, however, is with being loved (treated with unconditionally selflessness) and giving love, a preoccupation we mistakenly project onto other animals, especially our pets, resulting in all the problems we have in effectively managing other animals. As explained in Part 8:4D, because animals are still victims of the 'animal condition', controlling them requires dominance. Other large animal species are still essentially driven by a preoccupation with competitive dominance whereas humans are essentially driven by a very deep appreciation of cooperative love (despite the recent overlay of our upset angry, egocentric and alienated state), and the only way to have overcome the competitive, each-for-his-own limitation of genetics that still controls the lives of other animal species and become orientated to unconditional selflessness or love, as we humans clearly have, and through that orientation become fully conscious, is to have been able to develop the nurturing, love-indoctrination process. If other animal species had achieved full consciousness they would not still be stranded in a world preoccupied by selfish, competitive dominance hierarchy but would be preoccupied by giving love and being loved as we humans fundamentally are.

In terms of presenting the denial-free account of the biological origins of the human condition, the integrative meaning of existence has now been explained—as has the emergence of the variety of life on Earth; how we humans became instinctively orientated to behaving in an unconditionally selfless, fully integrative way; and how that orientation to selfless cooperation liberated our brains to become fully conscious. To complete the story of the development of the upset state of our human condition, it now needs to be explained how the emergence of our fully conscious state in the presence of our particular instinctive orientation to cooperative ideality greatly compounded the upset we experienced from defying that instinctive orientation.

Part 8:8 How our particular instinctive orientation greatly compounded our upset

It is now necessary to return to the imaginary example of our conscious bird, Adam Stork, who unavoidably became upset when he challenged his instinctive orientation, and consider what actually happened when humans became fully conscious. As has now been explained, our original instinctive orientation was to behaving in a completely integrated, unconditionally selfless, fully cooperative, harmonious, loving, Godly, moral, ideal way.

Having this particular instinctive orientation meant that when we humans became upset from searching for knowledge—that is, angry, egocentric and alienated—that response in itself offended our instinctive self, greatly compounding our upset. When our imaginary fully conscious bird Adam flew off course from his instinctive flight path and became angry, egocentric and alienated that upset behaviour wasn't at odds with his instinctive flight path; however, when *we* humans began searching for knowledge and became angry, egocentric and alienated that upset behaviour *was very much at odds* with our particular cooperative, selfless, loving instincts. Not only have we humans been condemned for defying our instincts, we have *also* been condemned for responding in a way that further offended our instincts, making them even *more* critical of our behaviour. *Worse still*, our upset response wasn't at odds with just any instinctive orientation: we were challenging the actual integrative meaning or purpose or theme of existence itself, since that is what our particular instincts' cooperative, loving behaviour is consistent with. Metaphorically speaking, we were defying God! Yes, as initially pointed out in Part 3:4, when we humans set out in search of knowledge we encountered a situation that was much worse than that faced by our imaginary Adam Stork, we were faced with a *diabolically* upsetting situation.

What this situation meant overall was that from an initial state of upset we humans then had to contend with a sense of extreme guilt and it was this heightened sense of extreme guilt that very greatly compounded our insecurity and frustration, making us immensely angry and egocentric and very much needing to live in denial of any confrontation with the problem of our corrupted condition. We had to live totally separated or alienated from our true situation, (metaphorically) hidden deep in a dark cave where no exposure of ourselves was possible—as Plato so accurately described our terrible predicament.

Extrapolate this situation over the *two million years* since our species became fully conscious and the struggle against our perfectly orientated but ignorant instinctive self emerged and it is not hard to comprehend how much hurt, frustration and anger has developed in humans. Indeed, imagine living just *one* day with the injustice of being condemned as evil, bad and worthless when you intuitively knew—but couldn't explain—that you were actually the complete opposite, namely awesomely wonderful, good and meaningful. How tormented and furious—how upset—would you be by the end of that day? So yes, extrapolate that experience over *two million years* and you will begin to get some appreciation of just how much anger there must actually be inside ourselves! While we have, as will be described shortly, learnt to significantly restrain and conceal our phenomenal amount of upset—'be civilised' as we term it—it follows that we must, under the surface, be boiling mad with anger, and that sometimes, when our restraint can no longer find a way to contain it, that anger must express itself. We can now, at last, understand humans' capacity for astounding acts of aggression, hate, brutality and atrocity.

At this point, a whole book could be included to evidence humans' capacity for atrocity, but that is really unnecessary because we all know that propensity too well. Instead, the brief description of how angry we became that was provided in Part 7:2, and the following passage will suffice—it is an account of some of those killed during World War I: **'The flowing blood of these murdered men, ten million gallons of steaming human blood could substitute for a whole day the gigantic water masses of the Niagara…Make a chain of these ten million murdered murderers, placing them head to head and foot to foot, and you will have an uninterrupted line measuring ten thousand miles, a grave ten thousand miles long'** (*Roumania Yesterday and To-day*, Mrs Will Gordon, 1918, p.251 of 270). In more recent history, we have been witness to extreme examples of humans' capacity for inhumanity in the attempted genocides that took place in Rwanda and Bosnia in the 1990s. And, as we can now understand, *this capacity for inhumanity exists in us all*—as the Australian author Morris West so bravely acknowledged in his memoir, *A View from the Ridge*: **'brutalise a child and you create a casualty or a criminal. Bribe a servant of the state and you will soon hear the deathwatch beetles chewing away at the rooftrees of society. The disease of evil** [now able to be understood as upset] **is pandemic; it spares no individual, no society, <u>because all are predisposed to it</u>. It is this predisposition which is the root of the mystery** [of evil that is now explained]**. I cannot blame a Satan, a Lucifer, a Mephistopheles, for the evils I have committed, the consequences of which have infected other people's lives. I know, as certainly as I know anything, that the roots are in myself, buried deeper than I care to delve, in caverns so dark that I fear to explore them. I know that, given the circumstances and the provocation, I could commit any crime in the calendar'** (*A View from the Ridge: The Testimony of a Pilgrim*, 1996, p.78 of 143).

Clearly it is an understatement of the grandest proportions to say that thankfully the **'caverns so dark'** where the **'mystery'** of our grotesquely upset human condition lies have at last been **'explore**[d]**'** and the greater dignifying, liberating, ameliorating explanation for that condition found.

To restate the fundamentals of the all-important understanding: the inherent problem was that our instincts had no sympathy for our pursuit of knowledge and would have stopped that search if possible. But the reality was that we had no choice but to defy our perfectly integratively orientated, 'Godly', all-sensitive instinctive self or soul, the voice of which was our conscience, and suffer its unjust and thus upsetting criticism, massively compounding as that upset was of our conscience. The poet Alexander Pope acknowledged the pain of the criticism emanating from our conscience when he wrote, **'our nature** [conscience—is]**…A sharp accuser, but a helpless friend!'** (*An Essay on Man*, Epistle II, 1733). It was a sentiment echoed by William Wordsworth in his great poem, *Intimations of Immortality*: **'High instincts before which our mortal Nature / Did tremble like a guilty thing surprised.'** Albert Camus was another who felt the pain of the criticism from the naive, ignorant, innocent state when he wrote, **'**[can] **innocence, the moment it begins to act…avoid committing murder** [?]**'** (*L'Homme Révolté*, 1951, [pub. in English as *The Rebel*, 1953]).

Considering then how unjustly hurtful our instinctive self or soul's world has been it is little wonder we learnt to psychologically block it out, deny and bury it to the point where we now refer to it as 'the child within' and the 'collective unconscious'. Sir Laurens van der Post wrote about the repression of our soul when he acknowledged that **'Human beings know far more than they allow themselves to know: there is a kind of knowledge of life which they reject, although it is born into them: it is built into them'** (*A Walk with a White Bushman*, 1986, p.142 of 326). Our conscious,

intellectual self banished our soul to our subconscious where it only now occasionally bubbles up in dreams and on other occasions when our conscious self is subdued, such as when praying or meditating. As Carl Jung wrote, **'The dream is a little hidden door in the innermost and most secret recesses of the psyche** [soul]**, opening into that cosmic night which was psyche long before there was any ego consciousness'** (*Civilization in Transition* (*The Collected Works of C.G. Jung*), Vol.10, 1945).

The truth is, there is *immense* upset within us humans from living for so long with the injustice of being condemned as evil when we intuitively knew we weren't but couldn't explain why we weren't. The length of time we have had to live with the injustice is critical because the more we searched for knowledge the more we offended our instincts and the more they criticised us and the more upset we became by that criticism and the more that upset angry, egocentric and alienated response fuelled the criticism from our instincts etc, etc. It was an ever-escalating situation that could only be resolved by finding the relieving, ameliorating, dignifying understanding of the reason for why we became upset in the first place.

For two million years our conscious intellect has been seen as the villain of the piece and our soul the epitome of goodness, but the truth that we can finally explain turns out to be the exact opposite in the sense that it was our instincts' unjust criticism that caused us to become upset. As mentioned in Part 3:5, this paradoxical turn of events in which our 'good side' is revealed to have been the 'bad side' is the theme of Agatha Christie's famous play *The Mousetrap*. First performed in 1952, *The Mousetrap* is just another 'whodunnit' murder mystery and yet it has become the longest running play in history and is still going strong to this day. All enduring myths and stories contain truths that resonate. In the case of *The Mousetrap*, the police inspector involved in the murder investigation, held up as the pillar of goodness and justice throughout the play, is revealed at the very end to be the culprit. This is the essential story of humanity where the apparent ideals of the soul's selfless, loving world are revealed, at the very last moment, to have been the unjustly condemning villains. As with so many aspects of the human condition, *the truth was not as it appeared*. We discover at the very end of our journey to enlightenment that conscious humans, immensely corrupt as we are, are good and not bad after all. In fact, not only are we good, we are the heroes of the whole horrible tragedy.

In G.K. Chesterton's 1908 book *The Man Who Was Thursday*, a policeman representing the 'good' side has to infiltrate and expose the sinister members of a quintessentially corrupt organisation, but consecutively each of the apparently corrupt members are also revealed to be forces for good commissioned to fight evil. Again, it is a story of the essential paradox of the human situation: that which was apparently 'bad'—humans in our competitive and divisive state—turns out to be 'good', and that which was 'good' turns out to be the cause of our 'sin'.

As initially emphasised when the explanation of the human condition was first presented, while the underlying elements involved in the battle that produced our upset human condition of our instinct and intellect have long been recognised within our mythologies and by profound thinkers, it is only through the insights that science has found in the last century about the different ways the gene and nerve based learning systems process information—specifically, that genes can give species orientations but only nerves can understand experience—that the clarifying, dignifying, ameliorating explanation of *why* our intellect had to challenge our instinct was made possible. Only *understanding* could liberate us from

the sense of guilt that has plagued humanity for two million years, and caused us to have to live in an extremely angry and egocentric state and dwell in a dark, truth-denying and soul-oppressing, effectively dead, cave-like state of denial, delusion and alienation.

The historic 'burden of guilt' has finally been lifted from the human race by science. Although science has been evasively mechanistic—dangerously so lately—its practice of painstakingly investigating and accumulating knowledge about the mechanisms of the workings of our world *has* finally liberated humanity from the ignorance of our instincts. Of course, the greater truth is that science is only the peak expression of *all* humans' courageous struggle to defy and ultimately defeat ignorance. In reality, it is 'on the shoulders' of eons of human effort that our species' freedom has finally been won.

Science has made it possible for all humans to win the freedom they have fought so valiantly for two million years to achieve. We can at last understand that there was a sound (that is, integrative) biological reason for why humans became divisively behaved and soul-corrupted. Sir Laurens van der Post made the essential point about our predicament when he said, **'how can there ever be any real beginning without forgiveness?'** (*Venture to the Interior*, 1952, p.16 of 241). Forgiveness was the key but it had to be forgiveness at the most profound, deepest level of our psychosis; forgiveness found through understanding of the dilemma of our human condition—understanding that would allow all humans to know that while we are all variously upset we are all fundamentally good and not bad or evil.

Part 8:9 Summary of our journey to enlightenment

As emphasised, science has finally made clarification of the human condition possible. By doing so, all our anger and egocentric need for validation has been satisfied, our upset can now subside. Our need to live estranged and alienated from our beautiful soul, with all the horror that such a destructive, dishonest and shallow existence entailed can also end. We can return to the non-upset ideal state we've longed for, be it Heaven, Paradise, Eden, Nirvana, Utopia, Shangri-La or whatever term we ever-hopeful humans ascribed to it. The difference is where we were once, as it says in Genesis, **'in the image of God'**, instinctively orientated to Integrative Meaning, this time we'll return in a knowing, conscious state and thus be **'like God, knowing** [understanding] **good and evil'**. We will be upset-free managers of the world. As T.S. Eliot wrote, **'We shall not cease from exploration / And the end of all our exploring / Will be to arrive where we started / And know the place for the first time'** (*Little Gidding,* 1942).

With understanding of the human condition found a peace and happiness that we have hardly dared to dream of can now come to Earth. Indeed, as we emerge from our dark cave where we have been incarcerated and stand at last in the warm, healing sunlight of reconciling knowledge, we are going to be staggered by the beauty of this world. As William Blake famously prophesised in his appropriately titled poem, *The Marriage of Heaven and Hell*, **'When the doors of perception are cleansed, man will see things as they truly are. For man has closed himself up, till he sees all things through narrow chinks of his cavern'** (1790). Buddhist scripture accurately describes what form humans will take once the ameliorating understanding of the human condition arrives and is absorbed—the time, in the words of the scripture, when humans **'will with a perfect voice preach the true Dharma, which is auspicious and removes all ill'**. Of that time

the scripture says, **'Human beings are then without any blemishes, moral offences are unknown among them, and they are full of zest and joy. Their bodies are very large and their skin has a fine hue. Their strength is quite extraordinary'** (Maitreyavyakarana, tr. Edward Conze, *Buddhist Scriptures*, 1959, pp.238-242).

At the conclusion of *Cry, the Beloved Country*, the author Alan Paton alluded to humanity's dream of one day finding understanding of the human condition and, by doing so, freeing itself from our terrible **'bondage of fear'** of that condition. He wrote: **'But when that dawn will come, of our emancipation, from the fear of bondage and the bondage of fear, why, that is a secret'** (1948). Our hope and faith has always been that one day we would be able to explain the paradox of the human condition, and thus liberate ourselves from our sense of guilt. And thankfully that day is now within reach when all the horror and suffering that resulted from the human condition *will* end; yes, that great day when we will be free of the human condition is now within reach. The human journey to enlightenment *can* have the happy ending we always trusted it would: **'The happy ending is our national belief'** (Mary McCarthy, *On the Contrary*, 1961).

Humanity's journey thus far has been astonishing. In fact, the greatest, most heroic story ever told is our own, however, the journey and its need for courage and heroism is not quite over. While we at last have the means to ameliorate the human condition there remains one last great problem to overcome, and that is the difficulty of having to face the truth about ourselves. Thankfully, this last great hurdle *can* be overcome through adoption of the all-exciting and all-relieving TRANSFORMED LIFEFORCE WAY OF LIVING. This wonderful, post-human-condition new way of living for the human race was introduced in Part 3:10, and will be fully explained next in Part 9. (Further explanation and description of the TRANSFORMED LIFEFORCE STATE can also be found in *Freedom Expanded: Book 2 The Transformation*.)

Before commencing Part 9, however, it needs to be explained that with the ending of the battle of the human condition that made nurturing of our children as much as their love-indoctrinated instincts expect such an impossible task, nurturing can and will now become our priority once more.

Part 8:10 Nurturing now becomes a priority

Some of the material discussed in this Part has already been included in Part 8:5, but is worth re-including here. With understanding of the human condition we can now at last explain and appreciate why the nurturing of our children became so compromised and neglected during the last two million years of humanity's insecure adolescence, the time in which the human race was fighting desperately to establish its goodness and worth against all the indications that it was an evil blight on the planet. Since fighting and loving are opposing forces, nurturing was always going to suffer under the duress of the human condition, BUT, as emphasised in Part 7:1, if humanity didn't fight for self-understanding it would have self-destroyed from perpetual ignorance and resulting terminal upset, in particular ever-increasing and ultimately intolerable levels of alienation. As explained, the best possible strategy while the upsetting battle raged was to leave one of the sexes relatively free from having to undertake that fight so that they could retain some innocence to nurture the next generation, but that inevitably left women, the designated sex, struggling to appreciate the upsetting consequences of carrying out the fight. Women have tended to be soul-sympathetic

rather than ego-sympathetic, which left men unjustly condemned by women with all the awful consequences that that condemnation entailed, as described in the previous Part. *All* the horrors that occurred during humanity's struggle through its insecure adolescent stage over the last two million years have, in truth, been so dreadful they are unthinkable and unspeakable—but thankfully that terrible existence can now be brought to an end and the nurturing of our children can again be given the priority it once enjoyed.

As has been emphasised, the importance of nurturing in the maturation of humanity and in our own lives (for our own maturation follows or recapitulates the path our species is undergoing) has been one of the six unconfrontable truths that humans have had no choice but to live in denial of. With the immense importance of nurturing now explained we can see that failing to nurture our children was tantamount to killing them, and although we haven't been able to explain or acknowledge the importance of nurturing, the truth is, *all* humans have intuitively known how important it is. Clearly, while we had no means of explaining to ourselves or others why we were unable to adequately nurture our children—why we were, in effect, killing them—we had no choice but to deny the truth of the importance of nurturing. No wonder, as was quoted earlier, **'people would rather admit to being an axe murderer than being a bad father or mother'**. But now that we can finally explain the reason why we haven't been able to adequately nurture our children we can finally admit how important nurturing is; moreover, as part of the rehabilitation of humanity, that admittance *can* and *must* take place.

Despite our historic need to deny the importance of nurturing, a number of books and articles have been released over the years that have attempted to broach the truth of the extent of the damage we caused our children by not nurturing them as much as their instincts expected. Understandably, these attempts have very often been met by a 'deaf' public, by parents unable to cope with the condemnation and guilt triggered by that truth. However, now that we can and have to acknowledge the truth of the importance of nurturing, quotes from these books and articles can serve to resurrect that truth.

One book that has met with some public acceptance is Jean Liedloff's 1975 book *The Continuum Concept*. This partial acceptance is no doubt due to the fact that Liedloff largely avoids the morality issue associated with the ideal state of altruistic, integrative, cooperative love involved in nurturing, stating simply that we need to give infants the caring treatment **'which is appropriate to the ancient continuum of our species inasmuch as it is suited to the tendencies and expectations with which we have evolved'** (p.35 of 168) in order for them to have **'a natural state of self-assuredness, well-being and joy'** (<https://continuumconcept.org/summary>).

It should be mentioned, however, that in *The Continuum Concept* Liedloff *does* recognise how the ever-increasing levels of alienation/psychosis/neurosis in humans (an escalation that was described in Part 3:11) have overwhelmed our natural instincts for nurturing, writing that **'We have had exquisitely precise instincts, expert in every detail of child care, since long before we became anything resembling *Homo sapiens*. But we have conspired to baffle this longstanding knowledge so utterly that we now employ researchers full time to puzzle out how we should behave toward children, one another and ourselves'** (p.34).

As described in Parts 6:4 and 8:5C, anthropologist Ashley Montagu was exceptionally brave in his admission of the importance of nurturing in human development. For example, in his profoundly honest paper titled 'A Scientist Looks at Love', he wrote **'love is, without**

question, the most important experience in the life of a human being…One of the most frequently used words in our vocabulary…[yet] ***love*** **is something about which most of us are still extremely vague… There is a widespread belief that a newborn baby is a selfish, disorganized wild creature who would grow into a violently intractable savage if it were not properly disciplined.** [However] **The newborn baby is organized in an extraordinarily sensitive manner…He does not want discipline…he wants love. He behaves as if he expected to be loved, and when his expectation is thwarted, he reacts in a grievously disappointed manner. There is now good evidence which leads us to believe that not only does a baby want to be loved, but also that it wants to love; all its drives are orientated in the direction of receiving and giving love. If it doesn't receive love it is unable to give it—as a child or as an adult. From the moment of birth the baby needs the reciprocal exchange of love with its mother…It has, I believe, been universally acknowledged that the mother-infant relationship perhaps more than any other defines the very essence of love…survival alone is not enough—human beings need and should receive much more…We now know that babies which are physically well nurtured may nevertheless waste away and die unless they are also loved. We also know that the only remedy for those babies on the verge of dying is love…The infant can suffer no greater loss than deprivation of the mother's love. There is an old Eastern proverb which explains that since God could not be everywhere he created mothers…Criminal, delinquent, neurotic, psychopathic, asocial, and similar forms of unfortunate behavior can, in the majority of cases, be traced to a childhood history of inadequate love…Show me a murderer, a hardened criminal, a juvenile delinquent, a psychopath, or a "cold fish" and in almost every case I will show you the tragedy that has resulted from not being properly loved during childhood…maternal rejection may be seen as the "causative factor in…every individual case of neurosis or behavior problem in children."… Endowed at birth with the need to develop as a loving, harmonic human being, the child learns to love by being loved…To love one's neighbor as oneself requires first that one must be able to love oneself, and the only way to learn that art is by having been adequately loved during the first six years of one's life. As Freud pointed out, this is the period during which the foundations of the personality are either well and truly laid—or not. If one doesn't love oneself one cannot love others. To make loving order in the world we must first have had loving order made in ourselves…Nothing in the world can be more important or as significant…love is demonstrable, it is sacrificial, it is self-abnegative** [self-denying]**. It puts the other always first. It is not a cold or calculated altruism, but a deep complete involvement with another. Love is unconditional…The nature of love has perhaps never been more beautifully described than by the Elizabethan dramatist George Chapman…"I tell thee, Love is Nature's second sun, Causing a spring of virtues where he shines"…From the evidence which is thus far available, it seems clear that love is indispensably necessary for the healthy development of the individual. Love is the principal developer of one's capacity for being human, the chief stimulus for the development of social competence, and the only thing on earth that can produce that sense of belongingness and relatedness to the world of humanity which is the best achievement of the healthy human being…Genuine love can never harm or inhibit; it can only benefit and create freedom and order…Scientists are discovering at this very moment that to live as if to live and love were one is the only way of life for human beings, because, indeed, this is the way of life which the innate nature of man demands. We are discovering that the highest ideals of man spring from man's own nature…and that the highest of these innately based ideals is the one that must enliven and inform all his other ideals, namely, *love*…Contemporary scientists working in this field are giving a scientific foundation or validation to the Sermon on the Mount and to the Golden Rule: to do unto others as you would have them do unto you, to love your neighbor as yourself…In an age in which**

a great deal of unloving love masquerades as the genuine article, in which there is a massive lack of love behind the show of love, in which millions have literally been unloved to death, it is very necessary to understand what love really means. We have left the study of love to the last, but now that we can begin to understand its importance for humanity, we can see that this is the area in which the men of religion, the educators, the physicians, and the scientists can join hands in the common endeavor of putting man back upon the road of his evolutionary destiny from which he has gone so far astray—the road which leads to health and happiness for all humanity, peace and goodwill unto all the earth' (*The Phi Delta Kappan*, 1970, Vol.51, No.9, pp.463-467). As has been emphasised, the reason **'We have left the study of love to the last'** is because we humans **'have literally been unloved to death'**, rendered horrifically upset, angry, egocentric and alienated, and until we could explain *why* that happened, *why* we have been so alienated as parents we have been unable to give our offspring anything like the alienation-free, sound, secure, unconditional love needed to create a sound human being, we couldn't afford to admit the importance of love in human development. Clearly, *only* when we could explain the human condition could we face the truth of how upset we humans have become and thus unable we have been to nurture our infants that we could admit to the importance of nurturing in human development and put **'man back upon the road of his evolutionary destiny from which he has gone so far astray'** and restore **'health and happiness for all humanity, peace and goodwill unto all the earth'**.

As referred to earlier, one of the most truthful and courageous acknowledgments of the importance of nurturing can be found in an article titled 'The Social Necessity of Nurturance', written by the journalist Betty McCollister and published in the January 2001 edition of the *Humanist* journal. The following is an extract from this right-thinking, yet extremely confronting article: **'the United States—a nation with 5 percent of the world's population but 25 percent of its prison population. We can somehow find money for jails but not for measures that could give our babies and children a good start in life and thus drastically reduce the need for such institutions… Will the nation follow California's lead, as it so often does, and ultimately spend more on jails than on education?…Is there no other option?**

Of course, there is. To find it we must first learn two fundamental things about our species: how we evolved into the large-brained Homo sapiens we are; and the nature of a mother's role as primary caregiver. Once we understand these two factors we will be better able to determine how best to support her during pregnancy and lactation and how to enable her to give more of herself to her infant at least during the crucial first year, when the child's brain doubles in size, and preferably for the first five years, while the brain trebles in size to attain three-fourths of its final growth. How did we become human? What brought our ancestors to the threshold between our animal ancestors and our hominid selves, which we crossed about four million years ago? We can't even begin to solve in any meaningful way our multiple, interlocking social pathologies except from the perspective of our evolution…evolution is the unifying principle that…explains how we descended from our ape ancestors. It offers us clues as to what is going amiss and why…

Our ancestors lived in closely-knit tribes in which cooperation and loyalty were essential. It was within that matrix—with devoted infant care and strong interpersonal links—that the brain enlarged from the size of a chimpanzee's to double that in Homo erectus and quadruple that in…ourselves… Clearly, then, leaving mothers to cope entirely on their own flouts everything inherent to our nature and risks disastrous results.

A look at our hominid past helps us to understand our pathological present. About four million years ago, one line of apes assumed bipedal posture. This freed the hands, with their opposable thumbs, for grasping, which brought eye-hand coordination which led to larger brain development, for which nature selected. However, because the birth canal could dilate only so far and the pelvic girdle not at all in bipeds, the skull had to mature after birth. The hominid solution was to bear increasingly unfinished infants who required increasingly intensive and extensive care. Lacking instincts to make them self-sufficient, the young required assiduous nurture. This pattern continued with the resultant cycle of increased helplessness; need for more care, more social interaction, more communication; formation of more complex and larger brains; demand for even more nurture.' McCollister has made a grand effort to get to the bottom of the fundamental question of how we became human; however, the prolonged infancy and exceptional need for nurturing wasn't a result of the increased brain size and birth canal limitations forcing infants to be born early, rather it was a result of the love-indoctrination process. The large brain didn't develop until *after* the extended infancy and intense nurturing took place as evidenced by bonobos, which don't have a very large brain but are intensely nurturing and already neotenous. Also, as explained in Part 8:7A, 'What is consciousness?', what promoted a conscious, intelligent, larger brain wasn't the availability of hands to manipulate the world, but love-indoctrination training of the brain in selflessness.

McCollister continues: **'Thus we became a species whose helpless newborns must have others on hand for them twenty-four hours a day, preeminently the mother due to her ability to breastfeed…the bonding between mother and child…lays the foundation for future growth…Our evolution has resulted in a species whose infants can't thrive without continual, loving attention. Here, then, is the clue to raising fewer unhappy, alienated, violent youth for jail fodder…Every human infant must have unconditional love; without it, an infant's health and growth will be stunted…Anthropologists, neurologists, child psychiatrists, and all other researchers into child development unequivocally agree and have sought for decades to alert society.**

For example: …Ashley Montagu (anthropologist): "The prolonged period of infant dependency produces interactive behavior of a kind which in the first two years or so of the child's life determines the primary pattern of his subsequent social development." Alfred Adler (psychiatrist): "It may be readily accepted that contact with the mother is of the highest importance for the development of human social feeling…" Selma Fraiberg (child psychologist): A baby without solid nurturing "is in deadly peril, robbed of his humanity."…George Wald (biologist): "We are no longer taking good care of our young…" Ian Suttie (psychoanalyst): "…The infant mind…is dominated from the beginning by the need to retain the mother—a need which, if thwarted, must produce the utmost extreme of terror and rage."…James Prescott (neuropsychologist): Monkey juveniles "deprived of their mothers were at times apathetic, at times hyperactive and given to outbursts of violence [is this not the equivalent of Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder?]**…showed behavioral disturbances accompanied by brain damage…" Richard M. Restak (neurologist): "Scientists at several pediatric research centers across the country are now convinced that failure of some children to grow normally is related to disturbed patterns of parenting." Sheila Kippley (La Leche League): "It is obvious that nature intended mother and baby to be one…"**

In the face of such overwhelming, unanimous testimony, can we doubt that we are failing our children? The dismal truth is that, on the whole, babies received more and better care 25,000 years ago, 250,000 years ago, even 2.5 million years ago, than many do today…To correct this, we must first recognize that, while both parents play vital roles in an infant's development, the mother—like it or not—is the

primary caregiver. Biologically, that's how the system works. And such an immeasurably important task cannot be sustainably carried out in her "spare time."…Humanity was geared for females to cherish offspring in the womb, bond with them at birth, and lavish love on them at the breast. It isn't sexist to esteem motherhood. It is sexist to trivialize it [as the feminist movement has frequently done]**…Grasping the connection between negligent infant care and adolescent violence…we are obliged to act…Alienated, with low self-esteem, pessimistic about the future, in schools that don't educate, the children who should be our hope for the future instead drink, smoke, take drugs, get pregnant, commit suicide, and commit crimes which land them in our awful jails.'**

For all her exceptional sensibility and right-thinking, McCollister hasn't delved to the bottom of the problem and asked the question screaming to be addressed: 'But why have humans stopped loving their infants?' There may be a legitimate reason for why and without that reason understood all efforts to properly nurture children may be futile. And in fact, as has been emphasised, there *is* a legitimate reason why nurturing has been so compromised, and appreciating that reason, namely the *unavoidable* and *necessary* battle between intellect and instinct that emerged during humanity's adolescence, is the *only* way the disrupting battle can subside and nurturing can be given the proper consideration it requires and deserves. Over the years numerous movements have emerged identifying the lack of nurturing as the cause of society's problems and calling for greater emphasis on nurturing, such as the Touch the Future organisation, the Leidloff Continuum Network and the Natural Child Project; however, while the deeper issue of *why* humans have been unable to nurture was left unaddressed and unanswered it was impossible to bring about any *real* change to the problem of the inadequate nurturing of children.

Of course, the imposition of the battle between our instinct and intellect had repercussions beyond that of impairing a mother's ability to focus on the nurturing of her infants. Since this battle only emerged some two million years ago, and only became extreme towards the end of those two million years, the great majority of human history—from the australopithecines through to the advent of *Homo sapiens sapiens*—was spent living cooperatively. This means infants now enter the world firstly expecting it to be one of gentleness and love, and secondly with almost no instinctive expectation of encountering a massively upset, embattled world. It is the *extreme contrast* between our species' instinctive memory of a harmonious, happy, secure, sane, all-loving and all-sensitive matriarchal world, and our species' more recent massively embattled angry, egocentric and alienated patriarchal world, that makes the shock infants must experience entering the world now so psychologically damaging. We have been living in denial of both the truth that our ancestors lived in a state of total love and that we are currently living in a state of near complete corruption of that ideal instinctive world of our soul. As a result of these two denials we haven't been aware of how devastating it must be for infants to encounter our world. The whole issue of the extreme innocence of children and extreme lack of it in adults needs to be taken into account when thinking about childhood. Playwright Samuel Beckett was only slightly exaggerating the brevity today of a truly soulful, happy, innocent, secure, sane, human-condition-free life when he wrote, **'They give birth astride of a grave, the light gleams an instant, then it's night once more'** (*Waiting for Godot*, 1955). To describe the shock effect of innocence's encounter with our human-condition-afflicted, upset, corrupt, alienated, neurotic, selfish, angry, false world, R.D. Laing borrowed words

from the nineteenth century French poet Stéphane Mallarmé: **'L'enfant abdique son extase', 'To adapt to this world the child abdicates its ecstasy'** (*The Politics of Experience* and *The Bird of Paradise*, 1967, p.118 of 156). In *Intimations of Immortality from Recollections of Early Childhood*, William Wordsworth spoke of **'something that is gone / …Whither is fled the visionary gleam? / Where is it now, the glory and the dream? // Our birth is but a sleep and a forgetting'**. The contrast between what a child's innocent, love-saturated instincts expect and what the child encounters in our human-condition-afflicted, massively upset, soul-butchered world is so great it is akin to a sunflower finding itself having to grow in a dark cesspit. No wonder as adults we turned out as gnarled thornbushes, ready to stunt the next generation. Thank God the human condition can now end!

It should also be pointed out that except for one reference to **'unconditional love'**, McCollister's account of the importance of nurturing makes no mention of the training in altruism and resulting morality that is the true purpose and significance of nurturing. The love-indoctrination process is not recognised; it is, in fact, being blatantly denied for it is an insight readily deduced from the information presented. Such is the extent of the denial/alienation in the human make-up now. As novelist Aldous Huxley said about the insecurity of our human condition, **'We don't know because we don't want to know'** (*Ends and Means*, 1937, p.270).

Again, without the understanding necessary to ameliorate that insecurity, it has been psychologically unsafe to acknowledge the importance of nurturing as both an instinctive expectation, and as the creator of our sense of morality. Admitting to our inability to adequately relate to and be affectionate with our children, as McCollister bravely does, is in itself confronting enough, let alone having to face the truth of the integrative, cooperative ideal state that children's instinctive selves expect. There is guilt enough in just attempting to be a loving parent without also having to face the truths of Integrative Meaning, our integratively-orientated, ideal-world-aware soul, and our own corrupted condition. The purity and innocence of children has the potential to expose us terribly. Referring to children as 'kids' was really a dismissive, derogatory, retaliatory 'put down', a way of holding their confronting innocence at bay. The quotes included in this Part about the importance of nurturing are amongst the bravest that exist on this subject and even they comply with this position of avoiding the real significance of nurturing, which is the training of altruism. But as mentioned, with the arrival of understanding of the human condition those brave books that did at least acknowledge the importance of nurturing will prove especially useful in learning as much as we can about nurturing.

(Note, before presenting the following material that evidences the importance of nurturing, it should be mentioned that the subjects of the codependency of children to the silent, resigned adult world and of the causes and nature of autism and Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD) that are about to be described here were also included in Parts 6:4 and 6:5 when evidencing how the human race has been approaching terminal levels of alienation. The purpose of including the description and analysis of childhood codependency, and of autism and ADHD, again here is to evidence how the nurturing of our infants will be one of the most important activities of the post-human-condition world. While these two descriptions of these phenomena do contain similar material to Parts 6:4 and 6:5, there are significant differences, so the fullest analysis of the codependency of children and of autism and ADHD will be gained from reading *all* these presentations.)

One particular example of a work that discusses the importance of nurturing and the psychological impact of the failure to do so is the 1996 book *Thinking About Children*, a posthumous publication of some of the papers of the renowned British paediatrician, child psychiatrist and psychoanalyst D.W. Winnicott, who is described on the book's dust jacket as someone **'increasingly recognized as one of the giants of psychoanalysis'**. In this book Winnicott states: **'There are certain difficulties that arise when primitive things are being experienced by the baby that depend not only on inherited personal tendencies but also on what happens to be provided by the mother. Here failure spells disaster of a particular kind for the baby. At the beginning the baby needs the mother's full attention…in this period the basis for mental health is laid down** [p.212 of 343] **… the essential feature** [in a baby's development] **is the mother's capacity to adapt to the infant's needs through her healthy ability to identify with the baby. With such a capacity she can, for instance, hold her baby, and without it she cannot hold her baby except in a way that disturbs the baby's personal living process** [p.222]**.'**

In 1967 the psychologist Bruno Bettelheim wrote an honest book about autism, titled *The Empty Fortress*, in which he argued that autism resulted from the interaction between overwhelmingly negative parents and susceptible infants during critical early stages in the latter's psychological development. He coined the term 'refrigerator mothers' for the cold-heartedness of what we can now understand is essentially *all* humans' unavoidable-after-two-million-years-of-struggle, human-condition-afflicted, immensely alienated, neurotic state. Of course, while humanity hasn't been able to explain upset, denial has been the only way of coping, and the denial of choice for masking our inability to nurture our offspring was to blame genes, and sometimes chemicals, for the effect that inadequacy has had on our children. As mentioned earlier, genes are blamed for every kind of ailment—for depression, drug addiction, violence, obesity, delinquency, learning and sleep disorders, suicide, divorce, sex addiction, paedophilia, homosexuality, and almost every other human malaise and abnormality, including Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD), and those more extreme forms of ADHD, namely autism and schizophrenia. Although we haven't been able to admit it, we all intuitively know that our malaise are, in the main, the result of the psychological struggles we humans have as a result of our variously upset, insecure, human-condition-afflicted upbringings and lives. The truth is, our psychoses and their many physical manifestations are *not* about our genes, but the death of our soul. As stated, the word 'psychiatry' literally means 'soul healing', coming as it does from the Greek words *psyche*, meaning soul, and *iatreia*, meaning healing. In the case of autism, a 2006 *TIME* magazine feature article about this particular childhood disorder acknowledged the rapidly increasing levels of autism in the western world in particular, quoting that **'According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), about 1 in 166 American children born today will fall somewhere on the autistic spectrum. That's double the rate of 10 years ago and 10 times the estimated incidence a generation ago'** (Claudia Wallis, 15 May 2006). The article then reported that **'most researchers believe autism arises from a combination of genetic vulnerabilities and environmental triggers'**. Nowhere in the feature article was lack of love cited as a possible cause, but again how could parents possibly cope with having to accept such an explanation—they **'would rather admit to being an axe murderer than being a bad father or mother'**. Blaming genes has been infinitely more bearable than blaming our alienation from our true, natural selves and our resulting inability

to adequately nurture our children. As emphasised on a number of occasions already, the problem with this extreme dishonesty is that it has meant there has been no effective analysis of what is truly going on in our human world. We were no longer learning anything about ourselves. Lying is a form of madness, insanity, stupidity, ultimately of self-destruction. As Berdyaev was quoted as saying in Part 4:7, **'knowledge requires great daring'**. If we want to stop the **'doubl**[ing] **rate'** every **'10 years'** of the **'incidence'** of childhood disorders and resulting adult dysfunction in the world we all have to get real/honest—and what makes such honesty possible for everyone now is that in being able to explain the human condition we can understand and accept that being alienated/neurotic was not a criminal state, something to be ashamed of, but an unavoidable end result of humanity's necessary, heroic search for knowledge. Yes, we all have to get real/honest and now, because the evidence is stacking up against us: since the CDC report of 2006, cited in the *TIME* piece above, further research been released by the same body indicating that as of 2012 autism prevalence amongst U.S. children has risen 78 percent in the last ten years, with 1 in 88 now indicating an autism spectrum disorder (press release *CDC Releases New Report on Autism Prevalence in U.S.*, John Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health. Accessed 13 Apr. 2012 at: <https://www.jhsph.edu/news/news-releases/2012/lee-autism-prevalence.html>).

The truth about this spiralling increase in the incidence of ADHD, autism and schizophrenia in society is that it is a direct reflection of the levels of alienation in society having risen to extreme levels. The exponential increase of upset and alienation in the last 200 years was explained and documented in some detail in Part 3:11H, but the truth is, levels of alienation in society today are such that pretty well all humans are but cardboard cut-outs of what they would be like free of the human condition. While adults aren't aware of their immensely embattled, upset, alienated—virtually dead—condition, because they are living in denial of it, new generations of children arriving into the adult world who have yet to adopt adults' strategy of denial are painfully aware of the difference between the original, ideal, innocent instinctive state and the immensely upset alienated state and somehow have to cope with the distress it causes them. Both Part 3:8 on Resignation and the 'Resignation' chapter in *A Species In Denial* describe how adolescents go through an agonising process of adopting humans' historic strategy for coping with the human condition of resigning themselves to a life of living in denial of it and any truths that bring it into focus, but until a young person has adopted this defence they remain exposed and vulnerable to the full horror of the dilemma of the human condition. Having not yet adopted this denial children have always struggled mightily with the imperfection of the upset world that surrounds them but with the gulf between humans' original innocent state and our current *immensely* upset, alienated state now so great, new generations are finding the gulf almost unbearable—and for increasing numbers of children it *is* unbearable. The truth is, ADHD and its more extreme states of autism and schizophrenia are varieties of childhood madness, but as R.D. Laing famously said, **'Insanity is a perfectly rational adjustment to an insane world'** (Larry Chang, *Wisdom for the Soul: Five Millennia of Prescriptions for Spiritual Healing*, 2006, p.412). D.W. Winnicott provided this unevasive analysis of autism in his book *Thinking About Children*: **'Autism is a highly sophisticated defence organization. What we see is *invulnerability*…The child carries round *the (lost) memory of unthinkable anxiety*, and the illness is a complex mental structure insuring against recurrence of the conditions of the unthinkable anxiety** [pp.220, 221 of 343]**…It might be asked, what did I call these cases before the word autism turned**

up? The answer is…"infant or childhood schizophrenia" [p.200]**'**. Revealingly, the word schizophrenia literally means 'broken soul'; to quote R.D. Laing again, **'Perhaps we can still retain the now old name, and read into it its etymological meaning: *Schiz*—"broken"; *Phrenos*—"soul or heart"'** (*The Politics of Experience* and *The Bird of Paradise*, 1967, p107 of 156).

What has made it especially difficult for new generations trying to cope with our corrupted adult world is that adults have been unable to admit to being corrupted in soul, in fact, as pointed out, adults haven't even been aware that they are corrupted—if they *were* aware they were corrupted and alienated they wouldn't be alienated, they wouldn't have blocked out and thus protected themselves from the truth of their upset condition. With new generations able to clearly see the extent of the corruption and alienation in the world around them, this lack of any honesty by adults, their complete silence on the subject of our immensely corrupted human condition—in effect, their denial that there is anything wrong with them or their adult world—left children dangerously prone to blaming themselves for the dysfunctionality of their environment. In encounters between the relatively innocent and the alienated, where the alienated act as if there is nothing wrong with them or their world, in the innocents' instinctive state of total trust and generosity they are left believing there must be something wrong with them, that in some way or another they must be at fault. In their immense naivety about the upset, alienated world, together with their great love, trust and generosity, innocents question their own view, not the view being presented by the alienated. The innocent do not know people lie because lying simply did not exist in our species' original innocent instinctive world. In short, their trusting nature made them *codependent* to the alienated, susceptible to believing the alienated were right rather than accepting and fighting to uphold their own view of the situation. The destructive effect upon others of lying was once called 'addiction via association' but, as just mentioned, it is now known as the problem of codependency, **'the dependency on another to the extent that independent action or thought is no longer possible'**. Children come from such an innocent, wholesome, trusting, loving, generous, integrative instinctive world that they all too readily blame themselves in situations where they are faced with a denial. Then, when they decide they must be at fault, their sense of self-worth and meaning is completely undermined and to cope with that **'unthinkable anxiety'**, as Winnicott accurately described it, they have no choice but to psychologically split themselves off from the perceived reality, adopt a state of **'invulnerability'**. Dialogue from the 1993 film *House of Cards* features this honest take on the situation: **'People say about the following categories that these kids have a problem or are disabled, or psychologically dumb, etc, but really they are children, through hurt or some kind of trauma, that have held onto soul, and not wanted to partake in reality—retarded, autistic, insane, schizophrenic, epileptic, brain-damaged, possessed by devils, crocked babies.'** We can see here another reason why the truth of an utterly integrated, loving, all-sensitive past and present instinctive soulful state in us was now such a confronting and exposing truth and why adults were so much more comfortable believing that our species' instinctive past was a brutish and aggressive one. Again, the 'Resignation' chapter in *A Species In Denial* describes in some detail how much adults' dishonesty and silence about the truth of their corrupted condition has devastated children. As also mentioned, the devastating effects of children's codependency to adults was also described in Part 6:4 when the extreme egocentricity of men was discussed. Thankfully, the adult world can now tell

children the truth about their immensely upset condition and that honesty alone will make an enormous difference to the psychological wellbeing of future generations.

Just one of the unhealthy repercussions of not being able to be truthful about the real cause of childhood madness is that treatment of it can be, and has been, dangerously misdirected. A 2006 report about the disturbing increase in childhood disorders, in Australia this time, found that **'Truly alarming evidence from pharmaceutical prescriptions for Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD) drugs shows that in 2005 one in 25 children in many poorer areas of Australia suffer from ADHD'** (*The Daily Telegraph*, 13 June 2006). Another article emphasised that **'Because it is so convenient and guilt-relieving to be able to attribute a child's difficult behaviour to a neurochemical problem rather than a parenting or broader social one, there is a risk that this problem will become dangerously over-medicalised'** (*The Australian*, 8 Dec. 1997).

In his extremely brave 1970 book *The Primal Scream*, Arthur Janov, a world-leading psychologist, dealt head-on with the consequences of parents' inability to love their children with anything like the amount of love children received before the intruding battle of the human condition emerged. Note the acknowledgment of the extent of denial that sets in to cope with becoming extremely corrupted: **'Anger is often sown by parents who see their children as a denial of their own lives. Marrying early and having to sacrifice themselves for years to demanding infants and young children are not readily accepted by those parents who never really had a chance to be free and happy** [p.327 of 446] **…neurotic parents are antifeeling, and how much of themselves they have had to cancel out in order to survive is a good index of how much they will attempt to cancel out in their children** [p.77] **…<u>there is unspeakable tragedy in the world…each of us being in a mad scramble away from our personal horror</u>. That is why neurotic parents cannot see the horror of what they are doing to their children, why they cannot comprehend that they are slowly killing a human being** [p.389] **…A young child cannot understand that it is his parents who are troubled…He does not know that it is not his job to make them stop fighting, to be happy, free or whatever…If he is ridiculed almost from birth, he must come to believe that something is wrong with him** [p.60] **…Neurosis begins as a means of appeasing neurotic parents by denying or covering certain feelings in hopes that "they" will finally love him** [p.65] **…a child shuts himself off in his earliest months and years because he usually has no other choice** [p.59] **… When patients** [in primal therapy] **finally get down to the early catastrophic feeling** [the 'primal scream'] **of knowing they were unloved, hated, or never to be understood—that epiphanic feeling of ultimate aloneness—they understand perfectly why they shut off** [p.97] **…<u>Some of us prefer the neurotic never-never land where nothing can be absolutely true</u>** [the postmodernist philosophy described in Part 3:11H] **<u>because it can lead us away from other personal truths which hurt so much. The neurotic has a personal stake in the denial of truth</u>** [p.395]**'**.

It is worth re-including the following quote to illustrate how this extreme **'personal stake in the denial of truth'** has manifested in mechanistic science. In his 1989 book *Peacemaking Among Primates*, Frans de Waal records: **'For some scientists it was hard to accept that monkeys may have feelings. In** [the 1979 book] ***The Human Model…***[authors Harry F.] **Harlow and** [Clara E.]

Mears describe the following strained meeting: "Harlow used the term 'love', at which the psychiatrist present countered with the word 'proximity'. Harlow then shifted to the word 'affection', with the psychiatrist again countering with 'proximity'. Harlow started to simmer, but relented when he realized that the closest the psychiatrist had probably ever come to love was proximity."'

In the child psychologist Oliver James' 2002 book, *They F*** You Up: How to Survive Family Life*—one of the books that have been, as James wrote in his Preface, **'devoted to making accessible the scientific evidence that early parental care is crucial in forming who we are'**—he acknowledges that **'Our first six years play a critical role in shaping who we are as adults'**, and says, **'<u>One of our greatest problems is our reluctance to accept a relatively truthful account of ourselves and our childhoods</u>, as the polemicist and psychoanalyst Alice Miller pointed out'**. James also says that **'<u>believing in genes</u>** [as the cause of psychoses] **<u>removes any possibility of "blame" falling on parents</u>'** (p.3, 7, 9, 13 of 370).

The following dialogue from the 1989 film *Parenthood* uses humour to illustrate how our near total inability to be honest has impaired any advance in science: Counsellor: **'He's a very bright, very aware, extremely tense little boy who is only likely to get tenser in adolescence. He needs some special attention.'** Karen: **'It's because he was first.'** Counsellor: **'Hm?'** Karen: **'It's because he was our first. I think we were very tense when Kevin was little. I mean, if he got a scratch, we were hysterical. By the third kid, you know, you let him juggle knives.'** Counsellor: **'On the other hand, Kevin may have been like this in the womb. Recent studies indicate that <u>these things are all chemical</u>.'** Gil: '[points at Karen] **She smoked grass.'** Karen: **'Gil! I never smoked when I was pregnant…Will you give me a break?'** Gil: **'But maybe it affected your chromosomes.'** Counsellor intervening: **'You should not look on the fact that Kevin will be going to a special school as any kind of failure on your part.'** Gil: **'Right, I'll blame the dog.'**

The aforementioned quote from Frans de Waal mentioned the work of <u>Harry F. Harlow</u>, an American psychologist who, in the 1950s, studied the effect of isolation and touch deprivation on rhesus monkey infants using surrogate mothers fashioned from wire and cloth. While these experiments did show the importance of affection and nurturance on psychological development, they were unethical and if it wasn't for our inability to confront and acknowledge truths that we all actually know, in this instance the critical importance of nurturing, there would never have been the need to go to such extreme measures to provide such stark evidence for the importance of nurturing. Through these trials, Harlow found that a new-born monkey raised on a bare, wire-mesh cage floor survived with difficulty, if at all, during its first five days of life. In an even more extreme experiment, he found that monkeys raised in total isolation in a small metal chamber, which he called the 'pit of despair', developed the most extreme symptoms of what we know as human depression and schizophrenia and, as adults, were unable to raise offspring. Around the same time at Yerkes Primate Centre in Atlanta, Georgia, a psychologist named <u>Richard Davenport</u> was rearing baby chimpanzees alone in small boxes for two years at a time. The isolated chimps soon developed stereotypies such as rocking and head banging.

The following photo is of a monkey Harlow raised in partial isolation from birth to six months, which developed severe behavioural abnormalities; for instance, the photo shows the fully-grown animal biting itself at the photographer's approach.

As mentioned in Part 8:1, in an address titled *The Nature of Love*, delivered by Harlow in 1958 on the occasion of his election as President of the American Psychological Association, Harlow made this opening observation which reinforces what was said earlier about science's inability to consider the issue of love: **'Psychologists, at least psychologists who write textbooks, not only show no interest in the origin and development of love or affection, but they seem to be unaware of its very existence. The apparent repression of love by modern psychologists stands in sharp contrast with the attitude taken by many famous and normal people. The word "love" has the highest reference frequency of any word cited in Bartlett's book of *Familiar Quotations*'** (first pub. in *American Psychologist*, 1958, 13, pp.573-685). Robin Allott's statement that **'Love has been described as a taboo subject, not serious, not appropriate for scientific study'** ('Evolutionary Aspects of Love and Empathy', *Journal of Social and Evolutionary Systems*, 1992, Vol.15, No.4 353-370) summarised science's inability to deal with the whole issue of love, as did the report that **'more than 100,000 scientific studies have been published on depression and schizophrenia (the negative aspects of human nature), but no more than a dozen good studies have been published on unselfish love'** (*Science & Theology News*, Feb. 2004).

The last word on the importance of nurturing is best left to Olive Schreiner who, in *The Story of an African Farm*, wrote: **'They say women have one great and noble work left them, and they do it ill…*We* bear the world, and *we* make it. The souls of little children are marvellously delicate and tender things, and keep for ever the shadow that first falls on them, and that is the mother's or at best a woman's. There was never a great man who had not a great mother—it is hardly an exaggeration. The first six years of our life make us; all that is added later is veneer…The mightiest and noblest of human work is given to us, and we do it ill'** (p.193 of 301). This quote calls to mind a line from the 1996 TV-movie *An Unexpected Family*, when the judge involved in the drama says, **'every problem we have in this world is because a child wasn't loved'**. Like Schreiner's quote, this comment lays all the blame for the ills of the world on the lack of nurturing children receive, but the truth is that the origin of **'every problem we have in this world'** is the upsetting battle that broke out between our conscious self and instinctive self and that the **'mightiest and noblest'**, the most important, of **'human work'** has actually been to defeat the ignorance of our instinctive self as to the fact of our species' fundamental goodness. It was this battle, which men were largely responsible for, that unavoidably relegated nurturing to a secondary position of importance in human endeavours. Not only were men preoccupied with their fight, women had to help men and also take on a role of inspiring them with their image of innocence, their object beauty. As emphasised in Part 7:1, women have had to inspire love when they were no longer innocent, 'keep the ship afloat' when men crumpled—all the while attempting to nurture a new generation while oppressed by men who could not explain why they were dominating, or why they were so upset and angry. This was an altogether impossible task, yet women have done it as best they could for two million years.

To reiterate, the never before acknowledged, explained but all-important, guilt-lifting reason *why* women have only been able to **'do'** the task of nurturing **'ill'** is the *unavoidable* and *necessary* intrusion of the battle of the human condition. But with the human condition thankfully now solved our species' priority can return to the nurturing of our infants; in fact, it now becomes a matter of great urgency that it does so.

We can see from this presentation of the importance of nurturing that while the human condition has now been explained and we *can* therefore acknowledge the importance of nurturing, it remains a very confronting truth to have to face—it is a shock. It is, in fact, an example of how the arrival of understanding of the human condition also brings with it the long feared exposure day or confrontation day or 'judgment day'. BUT, as has been emphasised throughout this presentation, the answer to this problem of fearful exposure is the all-exciting and all-relieving TRANSFORMED LIFEFORCE WAY OF LIVING. This wonderful, post-human-condition new way of living for the human race was introduced in Part 3:10 and will now be fully explained in Part 9.

BLANK PAGE

Part 9
The Transformation of the Human Race

Part 9:1 The TRANSFORMED LIFEFORCE STATE

In this presentation we have progressed through a litany of terrifying truths to have to face, specifically the terrifyingly exposing and confronting truth of the extent of, and differences in, upset in humans now; of Integrative Meaning; of the fact that the human race once lived in an upset-free, innocent state; of the truth that nurturing has been all-important in the maturation of both the human race and in our lives individually; and of the truth that left-wing ideology was based on human-race-threatening dishonesty.

However, while our upset, corrupted state is now explained and defended and all these truths are no longer condemning, having the extent of our corrupted state suddenly exposed remains a frightening prospect. Alvin Toffler described the problem of the sudden change that comes with the arrival of the all-exposing truth day or honesty day or 'judgment day' when he wrote that **'Future shock…**[is] **the shattering stress and disorientation that we induce in individuals by subjecting them to too much change in too short a time'** (*Future Shock*, 1970, p.4 of 505).

To use the original analogy—if, on the first day of the emergence of the battle of the human condition, Adam Stork could have sat down on a limb with his instinctive self and explained why he had to fly off course, then all the upset could have been avoided. Now, two million years later, we have finally found the explanation that Adam Stork needed but there is, as a result of spending those two million years denying any confronting truths in order to cope, an absolute mountain of truth to suddenly have to confront.

How then is the upset human race going to cope with the arrival of this all-exposing, long-feared **'day of judgment'** (Bible, Matt. 10:15, 11:22, 24, 12:36; Mark 6:11; 2 Pet. 2:9, 3:7; 1 John 4:17), **'the Day of Reckoning'** (*The Koran*, ch.56) when **'Your nakedness will be exposed'** (Bible, Isaiah, 47:3) and **'not one secret of yours** [will be] **concealed'** (*The Koran*, ch.69)? The Abyss of Depression in the Abyss drawing (reproduced again below) is too terrifying to enter, and yet our freedom from the human condition depends on acknowledging all the truths in that abyss. So how are we to cope with having the blinds drawn on our false world? As Enrico, a reader of my books, put it, '**Diving into a sea of truth where everything is completely transparent one can't but ask, "how will anybody cope with this; how in the world can anybody cross such darkness to reach light?!"'** (WTM records, 24 Feb. 2011).

Also, how are we to suddenly let go our old false ways of living that we are so used to and familiar with? With the finding of the explanation for why we became upset the need to validate ourselves, prove that we are good and not bad, is over. Our goodness has been established at the most fundamental level. This means that all our old superficial ways of finding relief from the insecurity of our condition of gaining power, fame, fortune and glory are now obsolete, but we are so habituated to our old superficial ways of finding relief from the human condition that we find it difficult to stop persisting in those old insecure, selfish, egocentric, 'I-have-to-prove-

I'm-good-and-not-bad', 'I'm-a-legend', ego-castle-building habits. We are told to 'stop scoring goals, leave the field, have a shower and cool off', but all we know is the battle that we have been waging 'on that football field' of life under the duress of the human condition.

Drawing by Jeremy Griffith © 2008 Fedmex Pty Ltd

Humanity's Situation: the Sunshine Highway to Freedom, the Abyss of Depression, our Cave-like Dead Existence and the Spiralling Pit of Terminal Alienation

For these two reasons, of having to confront unbearably exposing truths about ourselves and having to let go an habituated egocentric way of living, people typically find themselves in what I referred to in Part 6:1 as a 'Mexican Standoff' with this information—they recognise the information is true and don't want to deny it, yet they don't want to accept its confronting and ego-castle-obsoleting implications. They can't go forward and yet they can't go back.

So what is the human race to do? We can't just stay stranded in the 'cave-like dead existence' on the narrow strip of land between The Abyss of Depression and The Spiral down into Terminal Alienation. If we remain where we are the human race will, very soon, go down the gurgler, into The Spiral of Terminal Alienation. The human race is already at that end play, end game point where it is about to plunge into that pit of perpetual darkness of terminal alienation.

Thankfully there is a solution, and it is both an easy solution to take up and an incredibly relieving and utterly exciting solution to live with. We take up the TRANSFORMED FREE WAY OF LIVING, LIFEFORCE STATE. There are a number of people here at this presentation who know how this TRANSFORMED LIFEFORCE STATE works and you can watch them give their own personal description of that way of living and state at <www.humancondition.com/affirmations>. (Note, these Affirmations can also be read in Section 3 of *Freedom Expanded: Book 2*.)

The answer to the problem of how are we to cope with the mountain of defended yet extremely exposing and confronting truth about ourselves is that we don't try to confront it. Once you have investigated these understandings sufficiently to know that they have explained the human condition you don't actually need to know any more than that. You don't need to know all the truth it reveals about human existence, or about how it reveals and explains everything about your own particular upset life. In fact, if you study this information more than your particular level of security of self can cope with you risk becoming overly self-confronted and exposed and depressed. The human race has been coping by maintaining extreme levels of denial of many, many truths so obviously the human race can't hope to dismantle all these denials overnight. In fact, it will take generations to confront, dismantle and repair all our species' psychoses and neuroses—with 'psychoses' being our 'soul repressions' ('psych' means soul, our instinctive self) and 'neuroses' being our 'conscious denials' ('neuro' means nerves). As emphasised, it takes time to digest understandings and by so doing ameliorate or heal old habituated false and distorted ways of thinking and coping. But this doesn't mean we can't support the truth while this digestion and healing is taking place—*as long as we don't overly confront the truth while this absorption process is taking place*. According to each person's level of upset there will be a limit to how much truth each person can cope with, but that doesn't mean all people can't immediately live in support of the truth. The main thing to remember is once you know that this information has explained the human condition then you know that all the upset in the world and all the upset in you is now also explained and defended.

In the case of making sense of your own life, it is true that you could use the explanation to retrace and analyse all the hurtful events in your life and replace all the defensive denials that you have had to employ with truthful, compassionate understanding of them—why your mother and father were preoccupied and unable to give you the reinforcement your instincts expected during your infancy and childhood, etc, etc. But to undertake such psychological therapy and dismantle all your psychosis and neurosis would require a great deal of time and supportive counselling, and, apart from extreme cases of psychosis and neurosis, it is not necessary. Instead, you can leave the issue of all your upsets/corruptions behind as being understood, explained and defended now, and, rather than use time and energy being preoccupied with the past, simply take up support of the understandings of the human condition as the focus for your life. You can, as it were, put the issue of all your upsets/corruptions in a suitcase and attach a label to it saying 'everything in here is now explained and defended' and simply leave it behind at the entrance to what we call the Sunshine Highway and set out free and unencumbered into the new, human-condition-free world on the Sunshine Highway that takes you safely over the top of the Abyss of Depression. You join the Sunshine Army on the Sunshine Highway to the World In Sunshine.

Once you know this information is true, that the human condition—including your own corrupted condition—has been explained and defended at the fundamental level, you can leave the issue of your own and the world's corruption behind as effectively dealt with and preoccupy yourself with disseminating this information throughout the rest of the world and to a fresh generation, and preoccupy yourself with supporting all the projects that must be undertaken now to free and rehabilitate the world from the effects of two million years of living under the duress of the human condition.

Now that we have the truth up all that matters is that it is kept alive and that it is disseminated to all people, because it alone can heal the human race and save the world. All everyone must do now is support the truth about the human condition and it will achieve everything everyone has ever dreamed of. If we look after this information it in turn will look after the world. That is the mantra of the new world that understanding of the human condition brings about.

Having grown up in 'the dark', without understanding of the human condition, the priority of existing generations is to get these insights to new, fresh generations so that they won't have to adopt all the artificial ways of coping with the human condition—all the dishonest denials, all the egocentric means of seeking compensation for the injustice of being unfairly condemned, and all the angry retaliations needed against the unjust condemnations—that existing generations have had to employ. We, the existing generations, are now the conduit generations: the generations who will connect the old dead world to the new living world.

If children and pre-resigned adolescents can access these understandings they won't have to resign themselves to a life of living in denial of the human condition as their only means of coping with it. Not having to grow up with all the dishonesties, denials, delusions, artificialities and superficialities that present generations have had to endure, they will be like a new species of beings. They will have a freedom that is almost unimaginable to those who grew up without understanding of the human condition.

You can know now that all the upset in ourselves and in the world from two million years of humanity's heroic journey through ignorance is explained and defended. With that knowledge we are now free to leave the issue of all that upset behind as being dealt with and focus all our attention on developing a human-condition-free new world. The relief of being able to leave the issue of our upset state behind as dealt with and the excitement of knowing a human-condition-free new world is coming and that we can all fully participate in bringing that about is so absolutely incredibly relieving and exciting it will TRANSFORM all humans. From being a human-condition oppressed and depressed alienated person all humans can and will now be TRANSFORMED into Redeemed, Liberated from the Human Condition, Exhilarated, Ecstatic, Enthralled-with-Existence, Transfigured, Empowered, World-Transforming Lifeforces. This description can be distilled down to Liberated from the Human Condition, Transformed and Empowered Lifeforces, which can be further distilled down to Transformed Lifeforces. This Exhilarated, Ecstatic, Enthralled-with-Existence aspect is the 'Life' in 'Lifeforce'; and the Empowered, World-Transforming aspect is the 'force' in 'Lifeforce', so Lifeforce covers the personal benefit and the benefit to the world in one word.

Very importantly, while we each should investigate these understandings of the human condition sufficiently to verify to our own satisfaction that they are the understandings of the human condition, we shouldn't investigate them to the extent that we start to become overly exposed and confronted by the truths they are revealing. Having lived without any real understanding of the world it is natural to want to keep studying these explanations that finally make sense of the world around us, but, as emphasised, this can lead to becoming overly exposed, confronted and depressed by the extent of your own corrupted state. The more intelligent and/or more educated in the old denial-based paradigm, who pride themselves on their ability to think, will initially be especially tempted to study these understandings beyond what their varying levels of security of self can cope with, but it won't be long before everyone learns that such an approach is both psychologically dangerous and irresponsible.

When Christ anticipated a time when **'the meek…inherit the earth'** (Matt. 5:5), and when **'many who are first will be last, and many who are last will be first'** (Matt. 19:30, 20:16; Mark 10:31; Luke 13:30), he was anticipating this time when understanding of the human condition would arrive and instead of the more intelligent and intellectual leading the way, as has been the case in almost every situation, the more innocent and sound, the more soulful and instinctual, will do so. Throughout the two million year battle to find understanding our instinctive self or soul was being repressed because of its unjust condemnation of our intellect but when understanding of the human condition is finally found this process is reversed, soul becomes sought after. Our soul, soundness, has to lead us back home to soundness. It makes sense. As Christ described it, **'The stone the builders rejected has become the capstone'** (Ps. 118:22; Matt. 21:42; Mark 12:10; Luke 20:17; Acts 4:11; 1 Pet. 2:7). Sir Laurens van der Post referred to this biblical analogy when he too anticipated this new situation, writing, **'It is part of the great secret which Christ tried to pass on to us when He spoke of the "stone which the builders rejected" becoming the cornerstone of the building to come. The cornerstone of this new building of a war-less, non-racial world, too, I believe, must be…those** [more innocent] **aspects of life which we have despised and rejected for so long'** (*The Dark Eye in Africa*, 1955, p.155 of 159).

This situation where you only investigate the truth to the degree you are sound enough to do so presents another difficult truth for the old resigned, denial-based world to accept, but again with honesty it is a proposition that can be reasonably understood and accepted.

It is the more secure in self, or the least alienated, who have to develop these understandings of the human condition. If you are not sound enough to study these ideas to any great depth and you try to do so, you will end up in a state of fearful depression, or worse still, mad.

Also, if you do become overly confronted by the information your natural reaction will be to try to attack and deny it in order to protect yourself, in effect try to take humanity back into Plato's dark cave of denial. You will become defensive and angry and retaliatory toward the information, and the effect of such a response will be to sabotage the efforts of all the humans who have ever lived to bring the human race to this dreamed of moment of its liberation. We in the WTM have endured years and years of this furiously angry defensive reaction towards this information, attacks that were ultimately fruitless because this information is true and won't be intimidated or oppressed. It is too precious to allow that.

The effects of overly studying this information, studying it more than your degree of security of self can cope with, can be both dangerous to you and dangerous to the human race, and no one should want nor risk either of those outcomes.

In the old denial-based world, academia limited those who could be involved in the pursuit of knowledge to the more intelligent, those with a high IQ (intelligence quotient). To enter university you had to pass entrance exams that tested your IQ level. Obviously to have the most appropriate people studying complex subjects like higher mathematics and physics you needed people with the highest IQ. If you didn't have an adequate IQ you would make little progress in studying such subjects. In the human-condition-resolved new world we similarly need the most appropriate people to study its information, which are those with a high SQ, soul or soundness quotient. If you don't have an adequate SQ you simply won't be able to make any progress with the information involved. With understanding of the human condition we can understand that everyone is necessarily variously upset/unsound but that upset/unsoundness is not something bad, just as in the old denial-based world those who lacked IQ weren't considered bad people, just not as able to think effectively about complex subjects. As just mentioned, Christ anticipated this change of emphasis in leadership that occurs when understanding of the human arrives when he said, **'The stone the builders rejected has become the capstone.'**

So everyone has to measure and limit how much they can study these human-condition-confronting understandings against how much self-confrontation they can cope with. Again, the human race cannot have lived in the darkness of both ignorance and denial for some two million years and then suddenly be able to face all the truth about themselves individually. That is simply not a reasonable expectation. Everyone has to expect a limit to how deeply they can afford to look into this information.

Thankfully and most importantly, no one *has to* overly confront their old upset self—everyone *can* leave that behind as dealt with and simply live for the new world and all its

potential. Although existing generations who grew up without these understandings will still suffer the effects of the human condition, they are effectively completely FREE of the human condition because they no longer have to live preoccupied with it. Future generations are the ones who will be in the best position to further these understandings of the human condition because among current generations there are very, very few individuals who remain secure enough in self to confront and develop them.

You only have to study these understandings sufficiently to verify to your own satisfaction that they have explained the human condition, after which all that is required is to support the understandings.

The second problem of the Mexican Standoff, of finding it difficult to let go of your old resigned, egocentric power-and-glory-seeking ways of living only presents a problem initially. The first people to encounter these liberating understandings of the human condition will find it difficult letting go their old false ways of reinforcing and sustaining themselves, but once the strategy of letting go that way of living catches on and a critical mass of support develops for the new TRANSFORMED LIFEFORCE WAY OF LIVING, it will carry all before it and everyone will take it up.

Another transitional problem is what we in the WTM term 'pocketing the win'. The first people to discover the truth of all this information about the human condition will tend not to appreciate the importance and need of taking up the new TRANSFORMED LIFEFORCE WAY OF LIVING. They will naturally tend to 'pocket the win', which means using the information's ability to make sense of the world around them to empower them, allow them to be more effective winners of power, fame, fortune and glory. For people to finally understand what has been going on in the world and in their own lives is incredibly relieving and empowering, and the initial inclination is to just enjoy and use that insight as an advantage, a tool, a way to be an even more effective operator in the old resigned, competitive, power-and-glory-seeking way of living. You 'pocket the win' by exploiting the information rather than responding responsibly to its magnificence by letting go your now obsoleted, unnecessary and highly destructive resigned competitive way of living and taking up the new TRANSFORMED LIFEFORCE WAY OF LIVING.

Again, these problems of studying the information to the point of becoming overly self-confronted and of 'pocketing the win', will pass as people become more aware of how this human-condition-resolved new world for humans works. And once everyone is living selflessly at last in the TRANSFORMED LIFEFORCE STATE all the inequality, suffering and destruction resulting from our old insecure, egocentric, extremely selfish way of living will be quickly repaired—as will be described shortly in Part 9:3.

The new TRANSFORMED LIFEFORCE STATE is not only all-powerful in its ability to heal the world, it is also all-exciting. When yesterday the prospects for the world looked hopeless, suddenly—and I have said this in every major document I have ever written—from one end of the horizon to the other an army in its millions will appear to do battle with human suffering, its weapon understanding, and its outcome world reparation.

Part 9:2 The TRANSFORMED LIFEFORCE STATE metamorphoses the human race

It should now be emphasised that the new TRANSFORMED LIFEFORCE STATE is fundamentally different to religion in that it is all about knowledge, not dogma—knowledge that brings about a complete change, in fact a metamorphosis of the human race from an insecure human-condition-afflicted state to an entirely TRANSFORMED human-condition-free state. As explained in Part 3:11G, religions were a means of containing the upset human condition while the search for understanding of that condition was being carried out. The WORLD TRANSFORMATION MOVEMENT is concerned with what happens *after* that liberating understanding is found, which is the metamorphosis—the complete progression and change of the human race—from a human-condition-afflicted state of psychosis and neurosis to a state free of that terrible condition.

When it comes to the core issue of our immensely upset human condition we no longer have to live in hope and faith that it will one day be able to be resolved, for it now is resolved, and this resolution of the human condition gives the human race the ability to at last understand and ameliorate or heal its upset condition. Dogma can't heal upset, only understanding can do that. So this is the end of hope and faith that understanding of the human condition would one day be found and the beginning of knowing about the human condition—it is the end of faith and the beginning of knowing. And there is no deity involved, or deference to anyone, no focus on a personality, or worship of any kind.

Best of all, there is no involvement or emphasis on guilt, for guilt has been eliminated forever with the reconciling understanding of the human condition. And it is eliminated in a way that makes humans healthy, not sick. We saw in Part 3:11H how the development of pseudo idealistic causes eliminated guilt using ever increasing degrees of dishonesty/lies/denial/delusion—ultimately, in postmodernism, by simply saying there is no such thing as truth!! Such extreme dishonesty/denial is extreme alienation/separation from the truth, which in turn represents extreme neurosis/mind sickness and psychosis/soul death. Lying/denial as a way of escaping guilt/self-confrontation only leads to even greater sickness, ultimately to total dysfunctionality, complete neurosis and psychosis—Thomas Nagel made this point when, in the quote included in Part 3:11H, he said, **'The capacity for transcendence brings with it a liability to alienation, and the wish to escape this condition…can lead to even greater absurdity.'** With the arrival of understanding of the human condition we get rid of guilt without having to use dishonesty/delusion/denial/alienation/neurosis/psychosis/sickness/dysfunctionality. In fact, it *eliminates* neurosis/psychosis/sickness/dysfunctionality. With understanding of the human condition, guilt—the accusation, insinuation, implication that a human is not worthy/good—completely disappears. We can now understand that after a horrifically upsetting two million year heroic battle to overthrow ignorance all humans are naturally variously upset from that great and necessary battle but all humans are equally good. In fact, with understanding of the human condition the concepts of good and bad, superior and inferior, disappear from our conceptualisation of ourselves.

The fundamental differentiation between religion and this new TRANSFORMED LIFEFORCE WAY OF LIVING lies in the fact that where religions were based on deferring to, and living through support of the *embodiment of the ideals* in the form of the soundness and truth

of the prophet around which the religion was founded, this new TRANSFORMED LIFEFORCE WAY OF LIVING is based on deferring to and living through support of first-principle-based *understandings of the ideals* and of our species' historically unavoidable lack of compliance with those ideals. So while religion and the human-condition-resolved TRANSFORMED LIFEFORCE WAY OF LIVING both involve letting go living through your corrupted self and deferring to something else, that is where the similarity ends.

To explain more fully the significance of this difference I should begin by describing and explaining St Paul's human-condition-relieving-but-not-human-condition-resolving discovery of the beauty of Christianity. Acts 8 and 9 of the Bible relate Saul's (as St Paul was known before his conversion experience) journey to Damascus where he planned to persuade the authorities to destroy the fledgling group of Christians, such was his fury towards the truth about the human condition that Christ, through his sound words and life, had dared to reveal and which this small group were living in courageous support of. However, while riding along on his donkey in a seething, **'murderous'** (Acts 9:1) rage towards Christ and his followers, Saul had an epiphany, the effect of which was so incredible that it was to change the world and save the human race.

With an appreciation now of what the human condition is, we can explain and understand what happened to Saul. The human condition is a terrifyingly confronting subject and to cope with that terror all the upset human race has been able to do was live in denial of it, try and block out the whole issue of the imperfection in our lives. We attacked, denied and attempted to prove wrong any exposing criticism of our corrupted state. This did relieve our condition but there was of course a significant downside—a life of extreme anger, alienation and egocentricity, very unpleasant behaviours and states. In one sense our retaliation against the threat of exposure of our corrupted condition made us feel even more condemned. Defensive retaliation as a strategy for coping with the human condition, while relieving, also fuelled feelings of self-loathing. That was Saul's predicament—his anger was very great and so was the level of self-loathing he would have felt deep within himself for being such a brutally angry person. The whole issue of Christ's soundness that was making him *so* angry was also, at another level, making him extremely distressed and unhappy about himself. At a moment of full engagement in his mind with the horror of both sides of his situation, a thought occurred to him: *'If this man Christ is so truthful and sound that he is producing in me such anger, what would happen if I was to flip the situation around and instead of attacking him I supported him? Wouldn't I suddenly be a force for enormous good—because I would be supporting someone who is the absolute opposite of my immensely corrupted and angry-with-soundness, truth-hating-and-denying self. I would be a force for good in the world, instead of a self-loathing monster. Wow, that's turning my life around, isn't it!'* And, at that moment, as the metaphorical account goes, Saul fell off his donkey and was struck blind for three days—basically he was overwhelmed by the sudden freedom he was feeling from all the pain of his human-condition-afflicted life. Through his support of Christ, the agony of the human condition had been lifted from his shoulders and he was able to live again. By siding with Christ, he was able to resurrect the truthful, soulful side of himself; he had been **'born again'** (John 3:3); **'he has crossed over from death to life'** (John 5:24). As Christ authoritatively said, **'I am the resurrection and the life** [through me, your soulful true self, can live again]**'** (John 11:25).

One way of measuring how much upset humans are preoccupied with, and how oppressed they are by the insecurity caused by the human condition, and thus how incredibly relieving it is to not have to be preoccupied with the human condition, is to consider what happens when someone has a Near-Death Experience. For instance, mountain climbers who survive falls that they were convinced would be fatal (they were saved, perhaps, by landing in a snow drift) often report that during those near-death moments they experienced a state of extraordinary euphoria in which the world suddenly appeared utterly beautiful and radiant and that they were flooded with a feeling of ecstatic enthrallment. With understanding of the horror of the human condition we can appreciate how in such cases the mind gives up worrying, and all facades—in particular the denial that they adopted at Resignation—become meaningless. If death is seemingly imminent, there is no longer any reason to worry or to pretend, at which point the struggle and agony of having to live under the duress of the human condition ceases and the true world of our all-sensitive soul suddenly surfaces. You suddenly discover what it is like to be free of the human condition. You suddenly have access to all the real beauty that exists in the world. You discover another seemingly magic world that is all-radiant and magnificent. This is the freedom that Saul experienced when he abandoned his struggle with the human condition and deferred to Christ. He was 'born again' from a state of near death. All his embattled posturing to get a win out of life, all his focus on egocentrically building a castle, an edifice, a representation of glory around himself, all his strategising every minute of every day to try to find a way to compensate for feeling bad about himself, suddenly ceased. To gain some measure of just how relieving the new TRANSFORMED LIFEFORCE STATE that has let go the old human-condition-embroiled, have-to-prove-yourself existence is, watch the Affirmations of the TRANSFORMED LIFEFORCE STATE at <www.humancondition.com/affirmations>, or read Section 3 of *Freedom Expanded: Book 2*. You can especially sense the relief of the TRANSFORMED STATE in Doug Lobban's affirmation.

Realising the magnificence of this new way of living, this **'way to be saved'** (Acts 16:17) from an effectively dead, alienated state (Christianity was actually originally called **'the Way'** (Acts 9:2, 19:9, 23, 22:4, 24:14, 22)), Saul took his breakthrough, life-saving idea to the four corners of the known world, and was thereafter known as Paul the Apostle, and following his canonisation, St Paul.

Leaving your baggage, your 'suitcase' of human-condition-embattled strategies and posturing behind by giving yourself to Christ was a marvellous solution to the problem of the horror of the human condition, but it meant giving up your battle to prove yourself, giving up your particular participation in humanity's heroic struggle to overthrow the ignorance of our original instinctive state. While supporting the soundness of Christ ensured the battle to find knowledge continued indirectly through him, you personally had given up the battle. To use the Adam Stork analogy, you had stopped searching for knowledge and were flying 'back on course'.

In *The Simpsons* cartoon series the character Ned Flanders is a Christian, someone who has deferred to, and lives through, Christ. His neighbour Homer Simpson, on the other hand, is still living out the corrupting battle to overthrow the implication that we humans aren't fundamentally good. In one episode, Ned lends Homer his lawnmower, which Homer wrecks without remorse. Rather than getting angry or defensive, Ned simply accepts Homer's

behaviour—he is the 'goody-goody' while Homer is one upset Adam Stork, living out the battle to the full, massively angry, egocentric and alienated. If Homer could explain the situation he would say to Ned: 'Listen Ned, you love Christ and he loves you, and you're a goody-goody, and I'm one upset, corrupted dysfunctional dude, but Ned, I'm still out there doing it, I'm still participating in humanity's heroic battle, so I'm a legend and you are a wimp.'

The new TRANSFORMED LIFEFORCE STATE, where you leave all your upset baggage behind in favour of supporting these understandings of the human condition, offers a similar all-relieving and all-exciting, 'near-death-experience'-like, 'fall-off-your-donkey', 'go-blind-for-three-days'-type freedom from the human condition that Christians experienced when they deferred to Christ. But—and this is a *very*, *very* important difference—unlike Christianity or any other religion, this does not involve abandoning the battle because the battle is now won. It is not an act of irresponsibility or weakness to let go the battle now, it is an act of strength, because with the battle won the illogical and thus irresponsible and thus weak thing to do would be to continue the battle.

So, if we return to the Homer and Ned example and imagine that Ned had taken up the new TRANSFORMED LIFEFORCE STATE, Homer would have no grounds to criticise Ned. With the battle to find knowledge, ultimately the understanding of the human condition, now won, there is no longer any good reason to keep living out the battle. In this scenario, the tables are turned: Ned would be in the position to criticise Homer.

Religions were a way of avoiding living out your upset when you became overly upset, but it meant giving up directly participating in the battle to find the knowledge needed to save the human race. Religions were a weak abandonment of the battle that still had to be fought. With the TRANSFORMED LIFEFORCE WAY OF LIVING there is no weakness involved because the battle is now won. In fact, taking up the TRANSFORMED LIFEFORCE WAY OF LIVING is the only strong course of action for a human to take now. What is weak is *not* taking it up. This is a very important difference—and it is a most profound difference—between Religion and the TRANSFORMED LIFEFORCE WAY OF LIVING.

It is this fact that there is no longer any reason to keep living out the battle to champion the ego that causes the world to change so rapidly from a world of conflict and suffering to a world of peace and happiness. As emphasised in the Introduction to this whole presentation, the explanations being presented are all rational, there is no dogma or mysticism or abstract concept involved. As such we can know if what is being presented is accountable and true or not, and since this information does explain the human condition there is no longer any justification for continuing the upsetting battle to champion the ego, so it follows then that no one can argue against taking up the TRANSFORMED WAY OF LIVING, and when everyone then does take up that way of living our world will be completely TRANSFORMED. We are rational creatures, and so when all the rationale, all the logic says there is only one response we can make, namely the TRANSFORMED STATE, then that is the response the human race will take.

This is not a revolution dogmatically imposed by others upon us, as has pretty much always been the case with revolutions in the past, this is a revolution imposed by logic, by understanding, by information. Once someone is given this information there is only one outcome in the end and that is that they take up the TRANSFORMED STATE. Initially people will find it difficult absorbing and taking in these explanations because of the 'deaf effect',

the historical denials in the human mind to so many of the ideas being put forward, but once enough people have overcome that 'deafness', and after that the Mexican Standoff, and their enthusiasm for this fabulous free way of living demonstrates to others that it is worthwhile persevering with the information until they can 'hear' it, the tidal wave of support for the information, and with it the TRANSFORMED STATE, *will* sweep the world.

As I said, Homer has no argument against Ned, 'no leg to stand on', when Ned takes up support of this information and its TRANSFORMED LIFEFORCE WAY OF LIVING. In the Third Proposition in the Main Introduction I said that 'the change that is coming will be so quick and complete it will seem instant, as if one day the human race is living in a state of immense turmoil, confusion and despair and the next day it's all over, an entirely new peaceful world has emerged'. The world for humans is suddenly TRANSFORMED from darkness into light. It really is as if the light switch in the room in which we have been staggering around in the dark has suddenly been switched on—everything becomes illuminated. As mentioned in the Introduction, we humans had this awesome computer put in our heads, our fully conscious, thinking brain, but we weren't given the program for it and instead were left to wander this Earth searching for the program in a terrifying darkness of confusion and bewilderment. Well, from that terrifyingly cold darkness we now emerge into the warm sunshine of dignifying, redeeming, relieving and TRANSFORMING understanding.

There is another very important difference between religions and the TRANSFORMED LIFEFORCE STATE, and that is <u>there is no delusion involved in the TRANSFORMED STATE</u>. To use the Homer and Ned analogy again: Ned has a 'goody-goody', self-satisfied, 'I-occupy-the-moral-high-ground' attitude. This drives the still-human-condition-embroiled Homer crazy with frustration because he intuitively knows Ned is deluding himself in thinking he has the moral high ground, is the more together, sound person and is on the right track, but he can't explain why Ned is so extremely deluded and totally dishonest in his view of self. Homer can't explain and thus reveal the truth that real idealism and the truly on-track, moral high ground lay with continuing the upsetting battle to find knowledge, and that Ned had become so upset, so unsound, he had to abandon that all-important battle and leave it to others to have to fight, including Homer. Worse, by effectively condemning those still upset and fighting the battle, Ned was basically siding against those still trying to win the battle, adding substantially to the opposition they had to overcome. In fact, it was the delusion and dishonesty that made giving up the battle particularly dangerous because its maintenance required constantly persuading yourself, and others, that you weren't being dishonest and deluded in what you were doing. The shrill fanaticism of the idealistic left-wing was suffocating of honesty and freedom.

<u>While religion was by far the least dishonest of all the forms of pseudo idealism</u> that upset humans could take up—because of the honesty involved in acknowledging the truthful, sound life and words of the founding prophet—<u>it still involved substantial dishonesty and delusion</u>. In near total contrast to this situation, the <u>TRANSFORMED LIFEFORCE STATE involves no delusion and virtually no dishonesty</u>. By not fully confronting the extent of the upset within yourself and avoiding looking too deeply into all the truth about the human condition, you are practicing some dishonesty, but the compassionate full truth about the upset state of the human condition means you aren't deluded about the fact of being an upset human. In fact,

you have to recognise and embrace that truth (which you can now safely do because the upset state is defended) to effectively be able to adopt the TRANSFORMED LIFEFORCE STATE.

As was mentioned in Part 3:11G, possibly the best sales pitch ever given for Christianity was one delivered by St Paul, as documented in the Bible in 2 Corinthians: **'Now if the ministry that brought death, which was engraved in letters on stone** [Moses' Ten Commandments that were enforced by the threat of punishment]**, came with glory** [because they brought society back from the brink of destruction from excessively upset behaviour]**…fading though it was** [there was no sustaining positive in having discipline imposed on you]**, will not the ministry of the Spirit** [the positive mental state from being at last aligned with truth and soundness through your support of someone free of upset and alienation] **be even more glorious? If the ministry that condemns men** [through punishment] **is glorious, how much more glorious is the ministry that brings righteousness!** [that allows you to be part of the ideal state] **For what was glorious has no glory now in comparison with the surpassing glory. And if what was fading away came with glory** ['fading' because it's hard to maintain attachment to a system merely out of fear of punishment]**, how much greater is the glory of that which lasts!** [compared with the relative ease of maintaining an attachment to a system that makes you feel that you are at last on the side of what is good, ideal and right]**'** (2 Cor. 3:7–11).

If Christianity was considered the **'surpassing glory'** to living in fear of punishment, then the TRANSFORMED LIFEFORCE STATE is the surpassing of all surpassing glories. It is the best solution the upset human race has ever had by an immense, stupendous, incredible, absolutely wonderful degree—because while we are still living in a deferential state, we are only a few generations away from completely eradicating the human condition from the human race—and there is very little dishonesty and no irresponsibility, no weakness, no delusion, no deity, no worship, no focus on a personality, no faith, no dogma, no guilt of any sort involved in the process. What we have now is so relieving and so exciting that when this way of living catches on it is obviously going to sweep the world.

As initially pointed out, the WORLD TRANSFORMATION MOVEMENT is not a religion, we are a metamorphoser, a movement that brings about a complete progression, in fact a metamorphosis of the human race from a horrible human-condition-afflicted state to a completely liberated, human-condition-free state. Humanity is TRANSFORMED from a state of insecure adolescence where we searched for understanding of ourselves, to a state of secure adulthood where we finally achieve understanding of ourselves. Religions were only a way of coping with the horror of the human condition while the search for the liberating understanding of it was being carried out. The WORLD TRANSFORMATION MOVEMENT is concerned with what happens after that liberating understanding is found, which is the metamorphosis, the complete progression and change of humanity from a state of psychosis and neurosis to a state completely free of psychosis and neurosis.

Finally, it should be emphasised that religions aren't being threatened by the arrival of dignifying understanding of the human condition—rather, they are being fulfilled. The whole objective of religion was to be the custodians of the ideal state while the search for the liberating understanding of humans' 'fallen' condition was underway. Buddha, for instance, looked forward to the arrival of the amelioration of the human condition when he said that **'In the future they will every one be Buddhas** [meaning in the future everyone will be free of psychosis] / **And will reach Perfect Enlightenment / In domains in all directions / Each will**

have the same title [there will be no more distorting alienation] / **Simultaneously on wisdom-thrones** / **They will prove the Supreme Wisdom'** (Buddha [Siddartha Gautama] 560–480 BC, *The Lotus Sutra*, ch.9; tr. W.E. Soothill, 1987, p.148 of 275). In the Bible Moses similarly anticipated a time when we **'will be like God, knowing'** (Gen. 3:5). Christ also looked forward to the time when **'…another Counsellor to be with you forever—the Spirit of truth** [first-principle-based, scientific understanding]**…will teach you all things and will remind you of everything** [all the denial-free truths] **I have said to you'** (John 14:16, 17, 26). Christ also said he looked forward to the time when, instead of being restricted to **'speaking figuratively'**, we **'will no longer use this kind of language but will** [be able to] **tell you plainly about my Father** [be able to explain the world of Integrative Meaning in denial-free, human-condition-reconciled, compassionate, understandable, first principle, scientific terms]**'** (John 16:25). The same anticipation of our species' liberation from the human condition is expressed in Revelations in the Bible where it states that **'Another book** [will be]**…opened which is the book of life** [the human-condition-explaining and humanity-liberating book]**…**[and] **a new heaven and a new earth** [will appear] **for the first heaven and the first earth** [will have]**…passed away…**[and the dignifying full truth about our condition] **will wipe every tear from…**[our] **eyes. There will be no more death or mourning or crying or pain** [insecurity, suffering or sickness]**, for the old order of things has passed away'** (Rev. 20:12, 21:1, 4). The human race has always hoped and believed that, as Tim Macartney-Snape said and Olive Schreiner was quoted as writing at the beginning of this talk, **'some day, some where, some time'** humanity's heroic search for and accumulation of knowledge would lead to the finding of understanding of the human condition, at which time every aspect of human life that was seemingly so inexplicable would suddenly make sense, and we can now see how true that hope and belief was. From an overwhelmingly complex and problematic existence a simple and totally effective, extremely-rapidly-repairing-of-human-life-and-the-Earth, way of living for humans emerges.

Part 9:3 How the TRANSFORMED LIFEFORCE STATE will quickly repair the world

To complete this Introduction to the WORLD TRANSFORMATION MOVEMENT I want to include this very brief summary of how the TRANSFORMED LIFEFORCE STATE actually repairs the world.

The fact is we can *easily* repair both humanity and our world now by everyone living selflessly for the human race through their support of the dignifying truth about our species, rather than having to live in the 'cave' of denial of the truth about ourselves where the only relief available to temporarily appease our corrupted, apparently bad condition was to continually try to prove we are good and not bad, which was an extremely self-preoccupied, selfish existence. Earlier in Part 5:1 I talked about the influence Sir James Darling's extraordinary soul-rather-than-intellect-emphasising, Platonic education system had on myself and others in the WTM, including my brother Simon and Tim Macartney-Snape. In one of many of his extraordinary speeches Sir James said, **'selfishness is, as it has ever been, the ultimately destructive force in a society, and there are only two cures for selfishness—the regimented state which we all profess to dislike, and the change of heart, which we refuse to make. That is the choice, believe me, for**

each one of us, and we have not much time in which to make it. The need for decision [to have a **'change of heart'** and live selflessly] **is serious and urgent, and the sands** [of time] **are running out'** (GGS Speech Day address in 1950, *Light Blue Down Under*, by Weston Bate, 1990, p.219 of 386).

Sir James has, in this passage, identified selfishness as **'the ultimately destructive force'** and stated that historically there have only ever been **'two cures for selfishness—the regimented state which we all profess to dislike, and the change of heart, which we refuse to make'**. The **'regimented state'** is obviously a reference to the dogmatically imposed and strictly enforced selfless, cooperative, communal, social state of socialism/communism. As has been emphasised, being fully conscious, self-managing beings, having to subordinate our thinking mind to dogma was never going to work. De-braining ourselves was no real solution to our problems. Ultimately we needed brain food, not brain anaesthetic. Our thinking mind needed understanding—specifically, understanding of why we humans are fundamentally good and not bad, evil, worthless beings. In short, we needed the dignifying, redeeming and TRANSFORMING understanding of the human condition. But what Sir James also recognised in this passage was that, despite the urgency, we would **'refuse to make'** the **'change of heart'** from living selfishly to living selflessly until humanity achieved that breakthrough. And he was right—until the liberating understanding of why humans are fundamentally good and not bad was found we *had no choice* but to keep on trying to achieve some relief from the insecurity of our condition by finding superficial ways to prove we are good and not bad, such as through winning power, fame, fortune and glory. We had no choice but to be 'ego-centric'—we had no choice but for our conscious thinking self (which is how the *Concise Oxford Dictionary* defines **'ego'**) to be focused or 'centred' on trying to prove it/we are not bad, worthless and meaningless. It is *only now* with the fundamental, trustable, knowable, first-principle-based, dogma-free biological understanding of why we humans are not bad that we can afford to stop trying to prove we are not bad all the time—that we can stop being egocentric; let go of being so self-worth-preoccupied; live for the human-condition-understood world FREE of that old insecure existence; TRANSFORM from being selfish to selfless; have the **'change of heart'** that Sir James recognised was so **'serious and urgent'**.

In the episode 'The Fallacies of Hope', from his acclaimed 1969 BBC television documentary series, *Civilisations: A Personal View by Kenneth Clark*, the British historian Kenneth Clark (1903-1983) mentioned that **'People who hold forth about the modern world often say that what we need is a new religion. It may be true but it isn't easy to establish.'** Saying we need a new religion is really another recognition of the fundamental need for the human race to have a change of heart, a change from living selfishly to selflessly, if we are to solve the world's problems. And saying 'but it won't be easy to establish a new religion' is really, deep down, a recognition that what is needed for this change of heart to occur is for the daunting issue of the human condition to be confronted and solved. As explained in Part 9:2, the human-condition-ameliorating WORLD TRANSFORMATION MOVEMENT is not a religion but, like a religion, it does bring about a change from living selfishly for yourself to living selflessly for something beyond self—so Clark's acknowledgment that we need a new religion was about as close as the old denial-based world could come to saying we needed to solve the human condition.

Plato understood this great TRANSFORMATION from living in the cave of denial, self-preoccupied trying to prove we are good and not bad all the time through winning power, fame, fortune and glory, to living FREE from all of that now obsoleted insecure, old-world 'baggage' in *selfless* support of the liberating understanding of why we humans are fundamentally good and not bad, when he postulated: **'Will our released** [cave] **prisoner hanker after these prizes or envy this power or honour? Won't he be more likely to feel, as Homer says, that he would far rather be "a serf in the house of some landless man", or indeed anything else in the world, than live and think as they** [the power and glory hungry] **do?'** (*Plato The Republic*, tr. H.D.P. Lee, 1955, p.281).

Since materialistic luxuries, like glittering dresses, sparkling diamonds, bubbling Champagne, huge chandeliers, silver tea sets, big houses, swimming pools and shining, pretentious cars gave us the fanfare and glory we knew was due us, but which the world in its ignorance of our true goodness would not give us, materialism was one of the important means by which we could sustain our sense of self-worth while the upsetting search for the liberating understanding of why we are good and not bad was being carried out. In fact, when we only had our ability to win power, fame, glory and fortune (and, with that fortune/money/wealth/capital, acquire materialistic luxuries) to sustain our sense of self-worth while the upsetting search for understanding of our worth was being carried out, those relieving artificial forms of reinforcement were the only engines driving the old insecure world—the *only* rewards sustaining the all-important search for self-understanding (which is why socialism, which sought to replace the engine of greed with the idealism of selfless cooperativeness before we had found self-understanding, couldn't and didn't work). So, this egocentric, self-centred, individualistic, selfish, greedy, competitive, power-fame-fortune-and-glory-seeking existence *was also a 'constructive force'* as well as the inequality-producing, human-suffering-causing, Earth-destroying **'destructive force'** that Sir James so aptly described it as. Yes, there was truth indeed in the saying **'Greed is good.'** The demonstrations against greed and capitalism that we have been witness to in 2011 and 2012 are in truth naive, pseudo idealistic, make-yourself-feel-good-but-don't-solve-anything protests against the reality of the insecurity of life under the duress of the human condition. Of course, this constructive and destructive, 'good and bad' aspect of our behaviour is the core paradox of the human condition that we are now at last able to explain and understand.

Nevertheless, while the **'selfishness'** of the old egocentric, self-centred, individualistic, selfish, greedy, capitalistic, competitive, materialistic way of living was the driving force that kept the all-important search for the relieving understanding of why we humans are good and not bad going, and was thus a 'constructive force', it was, as Sir James said, the **'ultimate' 'destructive force in a society'** because in the end *only* a selfless way of living works. *Ultimately* selfishness *is* destructive. No matter how much you try to control and regulate it, a society operating from a basis of selfishness will ultimately become dysfunctional. There was a limit to how long we could keep going under the drive of selfish greed. For human civilisation to survive, selflessness *had to* become the driving force in the world; *ultimately, there had to be*, as Sir James said, **'a change of heart'**. As many people have recognised and said over the years, **'it's not that humans lack the ability to fix the world, it's that they lack the will'**, which is the **'change of heart'**, the preparedness to live selflessly that Sir James recognised was needed.

So despite its precious contribution to the human race's progress towards finding understanding of ourselves, the ultimate truth is that selfishness, especially insatiable materialistic, capitalistic greed, was poised to destroy the world. It was 'insatiable' because, as an artificial form of reinforcement, materialism was never going to genuinely make us feel we were good and not bad—*only* understanding of our fundamental goodness could and now does achieve that. Mahatma Gandhi was really making this point about the insatiability of trying to make yourself feel good by surrounding yourself with material luxury when he famously said, **'Earth provides enough to satisfy every man's need, but not every man's greed.'** Yes, and when F. Scott Fitzgerald wrote in *The Great Gatsby* that **'Living well is the best revenge'** (1925) he too was recognising that while we lacked the real **'revenge'** for the injustice of the human condition, namely reconciling understanding, materialism *was* **'the best revenge'** we had. So, it is going to be an enormous relief now for the planet and for humankind—in fact, it is going to make *all* the difference—that, through the finding of understanding of why we humans are good and not bad, we can finally let go of our selfish, egocentric, have-to-prove-our-worth, materialistic, power-fame-fortune-and-glory-seeking way of living and take up the TRANSFORMED, human-condition-liberated, selfless existence; again, have that **'change of heart'** Sir James recognised we had to have.

Just to illustrate the change that is going to come to our old materialistic way of living, in front of me is a teaspoon—well, the monetary value of all the human-glorifying, egocentric content and effort that has gone into its ornate, embellished design, extravagant silver plating and competitive salesmanship and marketing to sell it to me, etc, etc, could feed a starving person for a week! Almost everything I see in front of me—my extravagant watch, my fancy shirt, my sophisticated pen—is in truth obscenely extravagant in a human-condition-free world. I should re-design all these items so they are not so extravagant, and it won't be long before I and everyone else in the world will be doing just that. In fact, I idealistically once designed and manufactured a full range of wooden furniture that was free of embellishment and artificial content before realising that for such integrity to be tolerated the human condition needed to be explained (see <www.humancondition.com/griffith-tablecraft>). Imagine if all the car makers in the world were to sit down together to design one extremely simple, embellishment-free, functional car that was made from the most environmentally-sustainable materials, how cheap to buy and humanity-and-Earth-considerate that vehicle would be. And imagine all the money that would be saved by not having different car makers duplicating their efforts, competing and trying to out-sell each other, and overall how much time that would liberate for all those people involved in the car industry to help those less fortunate and suffering in the world. Likewise, imagine when each house is no longer designed to make an individualised, ego-reinforcing, status-symbol statement for its owners and all houses are constructed in a functionally satisfactory, simple way, how much energy, labour, time and expense will be freed up to care for the wellbeing of the less fortunate and the planet.

Again, while we *needed* the individualistic, materialistic world to sustain our sense of self-worth while we couldn't establish it through understanding, now that we have established it that old way of living is obsoleted. In his Affirmation of the TRANSFORMED STATE in Section 3:4 of *Freedom Expanded: Book 2*, you will see how Doug Lobban's only desire is to fix the

world, starting with his shower curtain! He had let go of his egocentric mindset when he became TRANSFORMED. The finding of understanding of the human condition naturally brings about a whole new way of living. There's no dogma involved, like there was in socialism—this is about the *end* of dogma and also of faith, and the *beginning* of understanding.

It will certainly take time, in fact, a few generations, for us humans to sufficiently absorb the understanding of the human condition for our underlying insecurity to be fully ameliorated or healed and thus the need for some artificial reinforcement from materialism, etc, etc, to completely disappear, but once you adopt the TRANSFORMED STATE, while you haven't eliminated the insecure state of the human condition within yourself, you have completely changed your mind's focus from living an ego-embattled, selfish life to living selflessly—you have had that **'change of heart'**, the fundamental change of direction, that Sir James recognised was so urgently needed to fix the world.

Importantly, the more this **'change of heart'** TRANSFORMATION catches on, the easier it will be for people to move from the old insecure, ego-centric way of living to the new, secure, ego-less way of living. The old egocentric way of living has had such a powerful hold on humans because while there was no understanding of the human condition all we had was the superficial reinforcement we gained from seeking power, fame, fortune and glory, but once that relieving understanding is found, as it has been, that old egocentric way of living quickly loses its power—so quickly, in fact, that everyone will be amazed by how quickly their need for the old artificial forms of reinforcement falls away.

So, what I have been talking about is the TRANSFORMATION from living a selfish, egocentric, have-to-prove-that-I-am-good-and-not-bad existence to the new, selfless, egocentricity-obsoleted, don't-have-to-prove-that-I-am-good, Liberated, Exhilarated and Empowered, TRANSFORMED LIFEFORCE STATE or way of living—or simply the TRANSFORMED LIFEFORCE STATE—that the current, transitional generations will take up. Of course, when future, fully secure and integrated, human-condition-extinct generations of 'UNIVERSAL BEINGS' appear there will be even greater relief for the human race and for our planet. But the point is the great **'change of heart'** is on! Imagine when we no longer have to dress to impress, deceive and disguise—especially when women no longer have to be preoccupied with being sex objects—how much freedom that is going to unleash, and how much time, energy and resources it will save? Imagine when communication technology is used only to spread reconciling truth rather than truthless, alienated, escapist, superficial drivel, as it is currently doing—how much relief that is going to bring to humans and thus our world? End the human condition and you end all the big problems of the world—and thus all the little problems too.

So there are degrees of selflessness that we will now be capable of as we move from the old egocentric world, to the egocentricity-obsoleted, TRANSFORMED LIFEFORCE STATE, to eventually arriving at the future human-condition-extinct existence—however, it is the fundamental change of direction, and the rapid change that will accompany it, that is all-important. The point overall is the immense power of cooperative selflessness to solve *all* our problems. If we were all selfless we could solve the AIDS epidemic literally overnight because all it would take would be for everyone to agree to be tested for the AIDS virus and those who tested positive to agree to not have sexual relationships with anyone who doesn't have the virus. When everyone is selfless we will be able to solve the greenhouse gases, global warming

problem almost overnight by everyone agreeing to hold every third breath or something—that's obviously not going to work, but the point is we will be able to do whatever it takes! Actually, the most effective control mechanism we have available to us is our ability to curb our numbers by not reproducing as much, at least until we have stabilised all the threats to our world. In fact, we in the WTM have already employed this device to defend the new world. As mentioned in Part 2:4, we decided not to have children so that we would have all the resources that we could possibly muster to ensure these precious understandings of the human condition would survive the expected initial onslaught of vilification, persecution and attempted repression for daring to address the issue of the human condition. Certainly our tiny band of 50 people would not have been able to undertake the legal actions we had to take against two of the biggest media organisations in Australia to redress their ferociously vilifying publications about us if we had children to look after and support. It is the capacity to be selfless that has been missing from the human situation. Basically, as soon as humans no longer have to be preoccupied with themselves by having to artificially try to relieve themselves of the insecurity caused by their human condition through winning as much power, fame, fortune and glory as they possibly can, and are thus at last able to be concerned about the wellbeing of others, all the suffering in the world will be able to be brought to an end. That is the key rehabilitating effect for humanity and our planet that the transition from living selfishly to living selflessly brings through the finding of understanding of the human condition.

Understandably, this power of selflessness has not been something we humans wanted to acknowledge or think about because it has been too confronting of our present massively embattled, ego-hungry, desperately-needing-self-gratification-and-glorification, selfish, greedy, materialistic existence. We have *had to* live an alienated, escapist, materialistic life because we haven't been able to live a secure, honest, spiritualistic life, but now, with the human condition explained, we can. As has already been mentioned in Part 4:12, we can gain an insight into the power of selfless cooperation by looking at ant and bee colonies—truly, as King Solomon advised, **'Go to the ant…consider its ways and be wise'** (Proverbs 6:6). The 2004 award-winning documentary *Ants—Nature's Secret Power* admitted the power of selfless cooperation when it concluded that **'The secret of ant societies is their cooperation…**[it's what has enabled them to] **act as a superorganism…**[and become] **nature's true world power'** (produced by Adi Mayer Films, ORF Austrian Broadcasting Company with Docstar and WDR). In his book *The Soul of the White Ant*, Eugène Marais wrote that **'the termite…never rests or sleeps'** (1937, p.61 of 154). Bees' extreme selflessness was also made apparent in a documentary on bee colonies, which reported that **'when bees become sick they sacrifice themselves and leave the hive to die to prevent infecting the rest of the colony'**, and how **'in the summer, the workers only live around 30 days because they literally work themselves to death'** (*Silence of the Bees*, produced by Partisan Pictures, Inc. and Thirteen/WNET for National Geographic Channel, 2007). I'm not suggesting that we will ever go beyond self-sacrifice to self-elimination as a strategy for solving problems, however, these examples do make it clear how powerful selflessness is as a force for solving problems. The main point is that our ability now to leave behind the insecure, self-preoccupied, ego-centric, selfish state of the human condition makes possible the *true* reparation of our whole world; it is us self-adjusting, conscious humans who—now that we no longer have to live an insecure, selfish existence and can live a selfless, cooperative existence—will now become **'nature's true world power'**.

As I have previously said, the main reward for members of the WORLD TRANSFORMATION MOVEMENT is the anticipation and the excitement of being effectively free of the human condition—the joy and happiness of being liberated from the burden of your insecurities and self-preoccupations; the awesome meaning and power of finally being aligned with the truth and participating in the magic true world; the wonderful empathy and equality of goodness and fellowship that understanding of the human condition now allows you to feel for your fellow humans; the freedom now to effectively focus on repairing the world; and, above all, the radiant aliveness from the optimism that comes with knowing our march through hell has finally ended.

This WORLD TRANSFORMATION MOVEMENT has a slow beginning because humans initially find it difficult even taking in or 'hearing' discussion about the human condition, but it won't be long before our website is discovered and then word of it and what it offers every human and the world will spread like wildfire—as Teilhard de Chardin said, **'The Truth has to only appear once…for it to be impossible for anything ever to prevent it from spreading universally and setting everything ablaze'** (*Let Me Explain*, 1966; trs René Hague & others, 1970, p.159 of 189). Before long we will be marketing our own human-condition-free, world-saving products, providing our own all-exciting and meaningful, denial-free, honest, human-condition-understood films, documentaries and books, launching our own TV station—and our website will be the biggest in the world, bigger than Google or any other existing site. And all this is not deluded hubris, or wild guessing, it is simply the logical truth of what happens when the dignifying, redeeming and healing understanding of the human condition is finally found—as all the quotes from prophets, songwriters and poets included earlier testify.

The bottom line truth is that *only* the finding of the reconciling understanding of the human condition and the **'change of heart'**, TRANSFORMED STATE for humans that it finally makes possible can save the human race. The WORLD TRANSFORMATION MOVEMENT provides the *only* path forward for humankind. All else is ever-increasing, excruciating, unthinkable suffering and ultimately doom for our species. So, become a MEMBER of the WORLD TRANSFORMATION MOVEMENT!

This completes the Introduction to the WORLD TRANSFORMATION MOVEMENT. The key element to appreciate is that there is no path out of humanity's doomed situation other than via this human-condition-ameliorated TRANSFORMATION pathway.

In conclusion, the following are the original propositions for your consideration: will the understanding of the human condition TRANSFORM yours and everyone else's life and the world for its complete betterment; will it bring complete hope to what seemed hopeless; will it give rise to a movement that will sweep the world; will it introduce a new paradigm of understanding around which all knowledge can be integrated; and will it explain and thus reconcile all the opposites in the human situation, such as of 'good' and 'evil', instinct and intellect, the innocent and the upset, young and old, women and men, religion and science, left-wing and right-wing, socialism and capitalism?

I strongly urge you all to watch the Affirmations on our website at <www.humancondition.com/affirmations>, which feature numerous people talking about the all-wonderful TRANSFORMED LIFEFORCE STATE. You can also read more about the TRANSFORMED LIFEFORCE STATE and what is going to happen in the new TRANSFORMED world in *Freedom Expanded: Book 2*.

Part 10
The Nature and Role of Denial-Free Thinking

Part 10:1 Abraham, Moses, Plato and Christ

I would like to talk about Abraham, Moses, Plato and Christ because a better understanding of them will help the reader appreciate just how impossible it has been to address and then explain the human condition from a position of denial. An understanding of the minds of denial-free thinkers or prophets will greatly help appreciate how differently they view the world, in particular how they are able to see where the real threats to humankind are and how well focused they are on solving those problems, and how their denial-free thinking minds are able to solve them.

I have at times described Christ as 'that cleanest of thinkers', which is true in the sense that he obviously had an absolutely exceptional denial-free thinking mind, however in terms of being the cleanest of *all* thinkers that description is not true because Moses and Plato both had absolutely exceptional denial-free thinking minds.

We have seen how extraordinarily sound Plato was in his thinking, throwing as much light as was possible in his pre-scientific times upon every aspect of the human condition. As this book has progressed through issue after issue about the human condition, at virtually every stage it has been possible and appropriate to include an extremely insightful quote from Plato to illustrate the point being made, such as his deeply penetrating charioteer and pair of winged horses analysis of the human condition mentioned in Part 4:6.

A look at the work of Moses will show that he was equally sound and thus insightful in his thinking. Moses is without doubt the author of the first five books of the Bible, which in volume represents approximately one-sixth of the Bible. I have said 'without doubt' because some scholars have argued that Moses couldn't have written the fifth book, Deuteronomy, because it reports his own death, however when it is understood what Moses was doing in writing the five books it becomes obvious that he would have organised for the report of his death to be added to what he had already written to ensure those books provided a complete history-of-the-world-and-of-humanity and tradition-establishing account of events up to the end of his life. Christ would have understood that in writing the first five books of the Old Testament Moses was setting out an ordering and contexting denial-free history of humanity for lost, alienated humans; he certainly made comments to that effect, such as **'have you not read in the book of Moses'** (Mark 12:24—see similar references: Matt. 19:7-8, 22:24; Mark 7:10; Luke 24:44).

To explain Moses' absolutely extraordinary undertaking and achievement it is necessary, at first, to briefly look at the whole history of humanity since we humans became fully conscious, self-managing beings.

Humanity's journey from its original state of innocence some two million years ago to its current state of extreme upset was explained in Part 3:11. However, to provide a

brief summary, what happened was that as humanity's corrupting search for knowledge progressed different strategies needed to be developed to contain humans' ever-increasing levels of upset. To use the Adam Stork analogy, the more Adam defied his instincts in order to search for knowledge the more upset he became and the more he needed to find ways to contain his ever-increasing levels of upset behaviour if he was to maintain a semblance of order and functionality.

We humans developed four main ways or strategies to help contain our ever increasing levels of upset. The first strategy we developed was SELF DISCIPLINE, in response to the realisation that we had to try to contain our upset anger, egocentricity and alienation—curb its expression. This first management mechanism for upset started so long ago in our species' past that we now take our capacity for self-constraint for granted as being a natural part of our adult behaviour, nevertheless there was a time in our distant past when we had to learn the rudiments of being, as we say, 'civilised'. Humans now don't normally attack someone the moment they become angry. There is a great deal of self-control in adult humans now. The upset angers and frustrations are in us but for the most part we don't let them show.

But as upset increased and self discipline could no longer contain the levels of upset in our society, we were forced to develop the strategy of IMPOSED DISCIPLINE, which involved everyone agreeing to abide by certain laws or rules about what was acceptable behaviour under threat of punishment.

As upset continued to develop the next strategy devised to contain it was RELIGION. With religion, instead of living through yourself with all the associated overly upset angers, egocentricities and denials, you decide to defer to someone exceptionally free of upset, namely one of the denial-free thinking, integrative-ideals-or-God-recognising, innocent prophets that the great religions have been founded around. You decided to live through supporting the soundness and truth of their life and words rather than adhering to what your overly upset self wanted to do and say.

As upset reached a crescendo during the last 200 years a problem with religion arose, which was that the truthful lives and thoughts of their founding prophets became unbearably confronting and condemning of those who are extremely upset, at which point GUILT-FREE EXPRESSIONS OF IDEALISM needed to be found to support and defer to. These expressions took two forms. Firstly, you could defer to less guilt emphasising forms of religion where, say within Christianity, rather than following a denomination that focused on the study and acknowledgment of the integrity of the words and life of the founding prophet, you selected one that emphasised worship, adoration and ceremony, such as Catholicism, or even euphoric Evangelical varieties of Christianity. Or you could associate yourself with religious groups that focused on simple dogmatic obedience to the teachings of one of the religions, becoming a more fundamentalist and literalist interpreter and practitioner of a faith. Or you could find a religion that avoided focusing on acknowledging your corrupted condition and instead focused on practices such as meditative extinction of the trauma of the human condition. Buddhism in particular was, as one Buddhist convert said, **'non-judgemental, there's no notion of sin, there's no notion of good and evil, you don't embrace negativity'** (from *Light at Edge of the World: Science of the Mind of Buddhism*, National Geographic Channel, 2006).

The second form of more guilt-free expressions of idealism to support and live through were religion-avoiding and in some cases atheistic, God-denying pseudo idealistic causes like communism or socialism, politically correct postmodernism, environmentalism, feminism, multiculturalism, aboriginalism, etc, etc—basically any idealistic cause you could find that allowed you to avoid having to think about and deal with the real issue behind all the destruction and imperfection in the world, namely your own and everyone else's corrupted condition. *Real* idealism involved confronting not escaping the issue of the human condition, an escapism that this aforementioned quote about environmentalism recognised, **'The environment became the last best cause, the ultimate guilt-free issue.'**

Since these management devices could never fully contain the ever-increasing levels of upset in the world, there was clearly going to come a time when upset would destroy the human race, the terminal level of alienation that has been described previously in this book. Only the arrival of the dignifying and thus liberating understanding of the human condition could end the plunge towards destruction—as Richard Neville summarised earlier: **'We are locked in a race between self destruction and self discovery.'**

With this overview we can return to looking at the contribution of Moses, and that of both Christ and Plato. What we will see is that Moses gave humanity the most effective form of Imposed Discipline with his Ten Commandments, that Christ gave humanity the strongest possible corruption-and-denial-countering Religion, and that Plato provided humans with the best possible orientation and assistance on the main task of actually explaining the human condition—as Whitehead was quoted earlier as saying, the history of philosophy is merely **'a series of footnotes to Plato'**, with 'philosophy' being **'the study of the truths underlying all reality'**. Between these three men the human race was given the best possible chance of eventually freeing itself from the human condition. Without these three key influences of a well thought out and effective form of Imposed Discipline, a strong corruption-and-denial-countering Religion, and a profound, denial-free, penetrating orientation for the main task of finding understanding of the human condition, civilisations eventually foundered; they lost their way—in particular, their people became excessively corruption-adapted, cynical and alienated. Civilisations invariably followed this path to decadence but these three influences slowed down the progression, at least long enough for other fresh, still-relatively-innocent peoples and their civilisations to take what knowledge they had been able to find and, employing the same three containing and orientating influences, add to the knowledge until understanding of the human condition was finally found. In this way, wave after wave of groups of humans and their civilisations threw themselves heroically at that wall of ignorance that is the human condition until finally the human race crashed through to the liberating enlightenment of our condition, which has now finally occurred. In fact it is on the shoulders of all the efforts of all the humans who have ever lived that our species' liberation has been achieved.

With the human condition now safely understood and the upset state of humans no longer condemned as bad or evil, we can afford to recognise Moses, Christ and Plato as the three men who led humanity out of the wilderness of death-like alienation to its freedom from the human condition, and that the essential characteristic of each was that they had absolutely exceptional denial-free thinking minds.

Denial-free thinkers have played an all-important role in human history and yet virtually nothing has been known of the kind of people they were: how they thought, which was so very different to the way everyone else was thinking, the significance of having a fully nurtured infancy and childhood and, as a result, not having become resigned to a life of denial in their adolescence, etc, etc. Appropriately, one of the best-selling books of the twentieth century, Bruce Barton's 1925 book about Christ, was titled *The Man Nobody Knows*. Virtually all we have known of the great denial-free thinkers is that some of them became recognised as 'prophets', said to be inspired by God and able to perform miracles—some were even called deities, all of which makes them seem like they weren't human when of course they were. Now at last we can learn about these key people in history, and we obviously need to if we are to properly understand humanity's history. As initially mentioned, the life and work of prophets needs to be demystified. There have been mountains and mountains of books written, and zillions and zillions of words said in pulpits, in seminaries, in schools and universities, on the street and in homes about prophets and their words, but now, finally, for the first time, here in these pages, they and their work will be fully explained.

To commence, now that we can acknowledge the extent of the corruption of humans under the duress of the human condition it becomes possible to understand what the few, extremely rare, denial-free thinkers or prophets who have existed in recorded history would have encountered as they grew up. Firstly, each had to survive the agonising mystery of the extremely upset behaviour of all the humans around them—an agony made so much worse by the denial, the total silence, of the upset about being upset, indeed their deluded and arrogant pretence of being totally secure, confident masters of life. The denial-free thinkers or prophets also had to survive the persecution that their confronting truthful words and life would have attracted—as demonstrated by this rhetorical question from the Bible: **'was there ever a prophet your fathers did not persecute?'** (Acts 7:52). And even if they did manage to survive these difficulties, and many wouldn't have, they would have been left in a position of extreme distress by the plight of their society. To someone not upset and not living in denial of the human condition everyone else appears to be running around very much like chickens with their heads cut off, behaving in an extremely corrupt, destructive, chaotic, mad way. Able to clearly see all the madness and fully feel all the suffering the human condition was causing, denial-free thinkers would have become deeply concerned and focused upon thinking about how to, if not stop, at least contain the horrifically destructive behaviour and the terrible suffering it was bringing about. The rest of the human race, who are deeply mentally preoccupied with all manner of upset as a result of their encounters with humanity's heroic but upsetting battle against ignorance (in particular encountering insufficient nurturing and love in their infancy and childhood) and having to employ a great deal of denial to cope, can no longer see how corrupt their and others' behaviour is, or feel how much suffering it is causing. However, for someone not so preoccupied and not living in denial they can clearly see the full extent of all the corruption and feel the full extent of all the suffering. The innocent of upset are not immune like everyone else is to the truth of the extent of the horror of the human condition, and being so aware they become extremely concerned for the deeply traumatised society they find themselves in.

When extreme upset develops in a society an endless series of outbursts of upset anger and selfish egocentricity and resulting retaliatory anger and selfish egocentricity occurs. What the extremely concerned, clear seeing, fully feeling and clear thinking denial-free thinkers or prophets eventually realise is that for a semblance of peace to occur they have to find a way to bring an end to these endless rounds of payback warfare, or so-called 'blood feuds'. They then realise that the only way to do that (short of explaining the human condition which, prior to the development of science, they couldn't do) is to introduce strongly enforced laws or rules to contain the behaviour. They realise Discipline needs to be Imposed and throughout history that is exactly what prophets have done, and none better than Moses.

For example, by the time Europeans arrived in North America a grand union of American Indian tribes, known as the Iroquois Confederacy, had been established by two Indian denial-free thinkers or prophets who had emerged from within the tribes. Recognised and described by their people as **'prophets'**, these two American Indians, named Hiawatha and 'The Great Peacemaker', with all their sensitive feeling and clarity of thought, were able to realise that the endless rounds of payback warfare between and within the tribes could only be prevented by everyone agreeing to a set of restraining rules that were enforced by punishment. The resulting Imposed Discipline proved so effective that the Confederacy quickly emerged as one of the strongest forces in north-eastern North America during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. This quote is included to confirm what has just been said: **'The Iroquois Confederacy was established before European contact, complete with a constitution known as the…"Great Law of Peace"…The two prophets, Ayonwentah** [Hiawatha]**…and Dekanawidah, The Great Peacemaker, brought a message of peace to squabbling tribes…Once they ceased infighting, they rapidly became one of the strongest forces in seventeenth and eighteenth century north eastern North America'** (*The Iroquois Confederacy and the Founding Fathers*, Accessed Sept. 2009: see <www.wtmsources.com/113>). Exactly the same scenario had played out some 3,000 years earlier when Moses brought order to the Israelite Nation through the Ten Commandments that he had etched on stones.

As mentioned, Moses wrote the first five books of the Bible. The first ten chapters of the first book, Genesis, are very important but before looking at those opening chapters an appreciation of Moses' life and ancestors from Abraham onwards will help reveal the greater history-of-the-world-and-of-humanity and tradition-establishing significance of those chapters.

Abraham, who lived some 4,000 years ago, was a very great denial-free thinker or prophet. He was a **'Hebrew'** (Gen. 14:13), one of the tribes of the Semitic race of people who were originally herders and who colonised parts of the Middle East from their homeland somewhere on the Arabian Peninsula or possibly North Africa. He is regarded as the founder of monotheism, the belief in one God. The pharaoh and great denial-free thinking prophet Akhenaton, who ruled Egypt from approximately 3,350 to 3,335 years ago, also recognised that there was only one God but it was through Abraham and the prophets who followed him that monotheism became firmly established in the world.

Abraham is also regarded as the common denominator in the establishment of Islam, Christianity and Judaism. His eldest son Ishmael is considered the father of the Arabs who produced the exceptional denial-free thinker or prophet Muhammad who founded the religion of Islam around 1,400 years ago. Abraham's second son Isaac is considered the father of the

Israelites, amongst whom came the denial-free thinkers or prophets Jacob, Joseph, Moses, the other prophets of the Old Testament of the Bible, and Jesus Christ. Moses, who lived some 3,500 years ago, is the central prophet in the Jewish religion of Judaism, while Jesus Christ created the religion of Christianity just over 2,000 years ago.

The significance of Abraham's recognition of monotheism or belief in one God and his ability to **'walk before me** [God] **and be blameless'** (Gen. 17:1) and to be **'blessed' 'in every way'** by God (Gen. 24:1) and to accept God as his **'shield'** (Gen. 15:1) needs to be explained. Put simply, Abraham was secure enough to not have to resign himself to a life of living in denial of the issue of the human condition and any truths that bring that issue into focus—in particular the truth of integrative meaning which, as will now be explained, is what the concept of 'God' means. It was explained in Part 8:1 that biological processes are not random and directionless as we have been evasively taught, but are in fact concerned with the Negative Entropy driven development of the order or integration of matter. Of all the truths about our world this truth of integrative meaning is the most confronting for corrupted humans because the development and maintenance of the order of matter requires that the parts of developing wholes cooperate *not* compete. An *integrative* direction or meaning confronts upset, corrupted humans squarely with their angry, competitive and selfish *divisive* human condition. For the upset and corrupted to accept the truth of integrative meaning without the explanation for their and our species' lack of integrative behaviour meant facing suicidal depression. It could not be done. *Only* the fully loved and nurtured and thus secure could face integrative meaning with impunity. Before we had the understandings that science has given us of the physical laws of the universe, in particular the law of Negative Entropy, it wasn't possible to explain what or who 'God' is, but now, with the advances of science we can explain that the all-pervading, omnipotent (all-powerful), omnipresent (all-present) and omniscient (all-knowing), and-seemingly-all-condemning-of-us-humans force in the world is Negative Entropy. We can also explain what the real meaning of the word 'love' is. Unconditional selflessness, the capacity to consider the welfare of the whole above our own welfare, is the glue that holds wholes together, and it is the real meaning behind the word 'love'. Indeed the old Christian word for love is **'caritas'**, meaning charity or giving or selflessness (see Col. 3:14, 1 Cor. 13:1-13, 10:24 & John 15:13), therefore it is true that **'God is love'** (1 John 4:8, 16), or selflessness—in fact not just selflessness but *unconditional* selflessness, the capacity to, if required, make a full, self-sacrificing commitment to the maintenance of the larger whole. Christ articulated the unconditionally selfless significance of the word 'love' when he said, **'Greater love has no-one than this, that one lay down his life for his friends'** (John 15:13). Of the biblical references to love given above, Colossians 3:14 perfectly summarises the integrative significance of love: **'And over all these virtues put on love, which binds them all together in perfect unity.'** 'God' then is the personification of the negative-entropy-driven integrative, cooperative, loving, unconditionally selfless, order-bringing ideals, purpose, meaning and theme of life.

Again the problem is that to admit to integrative meaning and the importance of unconditional selflessness is to leave all but the exceptionally sound unbearably condemned. We can now understand that Abraham *needed to be* **'blameless'**, **'blessed' 'in every way'** to be able to confront or **'walk before'** God. He had to be free of upset to confront the truth of integrative meaning. Further, we can understand that living in a world so apparently blameful and

unblessed and practicing so much denial, Abraham would have had to struggle to overcome his codependent attachment to all the dishonesty and pretence he found himself surrounded by. Still living in the upset-free, all-loving, all-giving and all-trustable authentic world of our species' original integratively-orientated instinctive self or soul means that relatively innocent people are so very trusting, so when everyone else is so silent about their corruption, so determinedly refusing to admit it, it is incredibly hard for an innocent to believe that what they are thinking is right and what the rest of the world is saying and doing is not. It is self-evident to the alienated that they are being dishonest but it is a complete mystery to an innocent person. It is hard for the corrupted and alienated to appreciate how difficult it is for someone free of upset, someone innocent, to stand up against all their dishonesty and still trust in what they are thinking, namely that what everyone else is doing is corrupted and what everyone else is saying is in effect a lie. How do you believe yourself when everyone around you whom you trust so much is saying the opposite? What Abraham did that was so difficult was that he defied all this intimidation and learnt to trust his truthful self that was recognising the integrative, cooperative, loving, unconditionally selfless ideals, purpose and meaning of life; he learnt to accept God, the integrative ideals, as his **'shield'** against all the lies and falsehoods that were trying to seduce him—but his journey to do so, to defy the whole world around him, would not have been easy. As it says in Genesis, the integrative ideals or **'God tested Abraham'** (Gen. 22:1); he had to be able to put his love for the truth of another integrative ideal world before all his innocent, codependent trust in the world that he was falsely being presented with as true and authentic. Metaphorically he had to be prepared to **'sacrifice'** his own **'son'** (Gen. 22:2), 'son' being the ultimate expression imaginable of his attachment or codependency to the world around him, and in Genesis 22 it describes how he passed this test; how he put the truth/God first; **'not withheld'** (Gen. 22:12) anything from the truth/God; not allowed himself to be seduced at all. Thankfully the test didn't end up requiring he actually kill his son.

In essence, Abraham's access to and love of the true, integrative world of our soul had to be stronger than his codependent love of the resigned, false, integrative-meaning-and-soul-denying world around him. Because of their familiarity with them, a prophet's family were the least able to recognise the extraordinary, denial-free-thinking person they were. The greater the distance in time and space we have from any exceptionally gifted person the easier it is to acknowledge their gifts. Our egos don't feel as oppressed and threatened by their ability and success, and we have the benefit of perspective to appreciate their extraordinariness. The more extraordinary and exceptional the gift the truer this is and the most extraordinary and exceptional of all gifts is that of the unresigned prophetic mind. When Christ for example said he would **'rise again'** after he died (see Matt. 20:19, 27:63; Mark 8:31, 9:31, 10:34; Luke 18:33, 24:7, 46; John 11:24, 20:9) he was recognising that the wider public acknowledgment of his extraordinary soundness would occur after his death. While everyone found it very difficult acknowledging Christ's extraordinariness during his lifetime, none found it harder than members of his own family and town, for reasons just mentioned. As the Bible records: **'Jesus left there and went to his home town, accompanied by his disciples. When the Sabbath came, he began to teach in the synagogue, and many who heard him were amazed. "Where did this man get these things?" they asked. "What's this wisdom that has been given him, that he even does miracles! Isn't this the carpenter? Isn't this Mary's son and the brother of James, Joses, Judas and Simon? Aren't his sisters here with us?" And they took offense at him.**

Jesus said to them, "Only in his home town, among his relatives and in his own house is a prophet without honour." He could not do any miracles there…And he was amazed at their lack of faith' (Mark 6:1-6).

It should briefly be explained that the difference between the appreciation displayed by Christ's family compared with his disciples, who were also very familiar with him, was that his disciples were open to his teaching whereas his family and townsfolk who had known him since childhood were not. The disciples were with Christ specifically because they had been attracted by the truth of what he said. Their access to his extraordinariness was not prejudiced by any history of familiarity. They were open and receptive to learning from him from the beginnings of their encounters with him, and from there the more time they spent with Christ the greater their appreciation of his denial-free thinking grew. Nevertheless, even Christ's disciples would have had their ability to appreciate him limited to some extent by their familiarity with him. It is no coincidence that of all Christ's immediate followers, St Paul, who never met Christ, was the most able to recognise and acknowledge Christ's extraordinariness, for it was he, more than anyone else, who sold Christianity to the world.

'Amazed at their [his family's] **lack of faith'**, as Christ was, he had to be strong enough to defy their cynicism; moreover, because he would have naturally loved his own family more than anyone else in the world it would have been the most difficult test of all to stand by the integrative true world of his soul against their dismissive treatment of his extraordinary powers of thought that came from his alignment to the integrative true world. He had to be strong enough to carry on his work without his family's support. David, another very great prophet in the Bible, also had to pass this test of being stronger than the scornful cynicism he experienced during his lifetime, especially from his own family. David complained and then rallied himself thus: **'Those who hate me without reason outnumber the hairs of my head; many are my enemies without cause, those who seek to destroy me…O God of Israel** [the integrative ideal truth]**. For I endure scorn for your sake, and shame covers my face. I am a stranger to my brothers, an alien to my own mother's sons; for zeal for your house consumes me, and the insults of those who insult you fall on me'** (Psa. 69:4-9).

We can see that the story of Abraham having to metaphorically sacrifice his son—be stronger than his love for those closest to him—was a very great test of his soulful strength and because he was able to pass the test he was clearly an exceptional denial-free thinker or prophet. And when it is appreciated that there was no legacy or history for him to draw on or take inspiration from the recognition of a single all-important and all-pervading truth or God, as all those around him were instead worshipping a multitude of gods, Abraham must have been absolutely extraordinarily sound to be able to recognise on his own and champion the existence of the one great truth or God.

Abraham was born in Ur in Babylonia around 4,000 years ago and migrated to Canaan, a region encompassing modern-day Israel, Lebanon, the Palestinian territories, plus adjoining coastal lands and parts of Jordan, Syria and north-eastern Egypt. He was sound and clear-sighted enough to not only recognise the existence of monotheism but to stand by, defend and uphold the truth and importance of that one great integrative truth or God that everyone else was not living in accordance with and was trying to deny. And he not only defended the existence of God or integrative meaning he also advocated people defer to and live in support of that one true God. He began a Religion based around the acknowledgment of God. His other extraordinary achievement was to recognise the importance of establishing

a tradition that his descendants could identify with, hold on to and draw inspiration from. As part of establishing that all-important identifying and bonding tradition based securely around recognition of, and obedience to, one true God, Abraham introduced the practice of circumcision (see Gen. 17:10) of his male offspring and the notion that Canaan was a chosen land for his descendants (see Gen. 12); and that his followers would be a people with a great destiny if they abided by his instructions (see Gen. 12). In short, Abraham gave his progeny a Religion, an identity, a home and a vision. These initiatives by Abraham were so brilliant in fact that they, as we will see, created the foundations for a successful future for humanity. As Moses predicted, **'all peoples on earth will be blessed through you** [Abraham]**'** (Gen 12:3).

Thus, while Moses strongly reinforced these traditions that Abraham established of a Religion, an identity, a home and a vision, he also added the laws, the rules, the Imposed Discipline, that would ensure the structure that Abraham had so ably established would endure. Very importantly, Moses also gave the Israelites (and humanity) a denial-free, honest, soul-relieving account of the history of the world and of humanity that they/we could see themselves/ourselves as being part of. He gave them/us if not a meaning (which he couldn't give because, apart from the meaning of having to serve God, he couldn't explain that the actual meaning of existence is to develop the cooperative, loving order of matter), then at least a contexting truthful history for their/our lives.

As mentioned, one of the descendants of Abraham's eldest son Ishmael was the prophet Muhammad who founded the religion of Islam around 1,400 years ago. Abraham's second son Isaac was the father of Jacob who in turn was the father of Joseph. It was Joseph who brought his father Jacob and his eleven brothers and their families to Egypt, **'seventy** [people] **in all'** (Exod. 1:5). Then, **'430 years'** (Exod. 12:40) later (approximately 3,500 years ago), Moses, the descendent of one of Joseph's brothers, led the (by then much multiplied) descendants of Jacob out of Egypt back to the promised land of Canaan, a journey through the desert country of the Sinai and Arabian Peninsulas that lasted **'forty years'** (Exod. 16:35).

In contrast to the situation today where society does not recognise its denial-free thinking prophets and instead evasive, denial-complying intellectualism holds sway everywhere, the ancient Hebrews collected only the words of their prophets. Humanity does not have any records of the great authors or poets or playwrights or composers or artists or singers or astronomers or academics or legal minds or politicians from the 4,000-year-history of the Israelites. Instead what we have is the collection of the words of the few prophets who appeared amongst them during those millennia. That collection is the Bible.

The more corrupted and alienated people became as humanity's corrupting search for knowledge progressed, the more insecure they became and thus the more evasive they became of any condemning idealism. While prophets have been persecuted throughout history for being so exposing of the evasive world of denial—as has been mentioned, the Bible asked rhetorically, **'was there ever a prophet your fathers did not persecute?'** (Acts 7:52)—in earlier, more innocent times, people were secure enough to at least acknowledge their prophets, even if they did often subject them to persecution during their lifetime. These early, more innocent, secure and thus less evasive civilisations even sought out their prophets to lead their societies. The Old Testament of the Bible is the documentation of the search for prophets to lead the Israelite nation. Moses upheld this tradition when he said, **'The Lord your God will raise up for you a**

prophet like me from among your own brothers. You must listen to him' (Deut. 18:15). Even the ancient Athenian society in Greece elected only natural-living, untainted-by-encounters-with-human-society, uncorrupted, upset-free, unembattled, ego-less, relatively innocent shepherds to run their society. To quote Sir Laurens van der Post, **'He** [Pericles] **urged the Athenians therefore to go back to their ancient rule of choosing men who lived on and off the land and were reluctant to spend their lives in towns, and prepared to serve them purely out of sense of public duty and not like their present rulers who did so uniquely for personal power and advancement.'** Sir Laurens continued, **'Significantly in *The Bacchae*, the harbinger of the great catastrophe to come is "a city slicker with a smooth tongue"'** (in his foreword to Theodor Abt's book *Progress Without Loss of Soul*, 1983, p.xii of 389). When deputising his authority Moses took the advice of his father-in-law to **'select capable men from all the people—men who fear God, trustworthy men who hate dishonest gain—and appoint them as officials over thousands'** (Exod. 18:21). (Note the 'fear' of God mentioned here refers to respecting God, not the fear of integrative meaning that another biblical prophet, Isaiah, for example was referring to when he said prophets, unlike everyone else, **'delight in the fear of the Lord'** [Isa. 11:3].)

To take up the story of Abraham's son Isaac and Isaac's son Jacob, as it was their descendants who gave rise to Moses whose contribution to humanity is, in particular, being considered here. In Genesis Moses states that **'the Lord appeared to Isaac'** and said to him, **'I will be with you and will bless you. For you and your descendants I will give all these lands** [in Canaan] **and will confirm the oath I swore to your father Abraham. I will make your descendants as numerous as the stars in the sky and will give them all these lands, and through your offspring all nations on earth will be blessed, because Abraham obeyed me'** (Gen. 26:2-5). For God or integrative meaning to be able to **'appear'** before Isaac, Isaac must have been an exceptionally sound person, like his father was, because, as has been explained, integrative meaning or God is unconfrontable for all but the exceptionally sound. Also we see how the traditions of obeying God, self-belief and destiny that Abraham began were being reinforced and added to by Isaac.

In Genesis Moses then went on to describe how Isaac's son Jacob, who **'God'** had also **'blessed'** (Gen. 35:9), **'struggled with God and with men'**, a struggle which he was able to **'overcome'** (Gen. 32:28), and how Jacob then said, **'I saw God face to face, and yet my life was spared'** (Gen. 32:30). Clearly Jacob, like his father and grandfather, was sound enough to be able to confront the normally unconfrontable truth of integrative meaning—as it says further on in Genesis, Jacob **'talked with' 'God'** (35:14). Further, in the wrestling match for innocence between codependency to the false world of **'men'** and trust in the **'God**[ly]**'**, integrative truths that his uncorrupted soulful self was telling him to believe in, Jacob was able to **'overcome'** his codependency. In short Jacob was an exceptional denial-free thinker or prophet. As a result of Jacob's wrestling match with God his name was changed to 'Israel', which the Bible subtext says means 'he struggles with God', which we can now interpret as 'he struggles with God when no one else can'.

Jacob's eleventh of twelve sons was Joseph, another exceptional denial-free thinker or prophet. Even as a child Joseph would have known that he was sound enough to be able to avoid having to resign to a life of denial when he reached adolescence and therefore that as an adult he would be able to think truthfully while others couldn't. In the future when we humans become free of the insecurity of the human condition and are able to look back in denial-free clarity upon life as it existed under the duress of the human condition we are going to realise how extremely sensitive our instinctive self or soul was to the imperfections of the world we

were born into. We will learn that even in our mother's womb we were aware of how perfect or imperfect the world we were entering. We were, for example, able to sense if our mother was at all neurotic. The truth of the extraordinary sensitivity of our instinctive self or soul is something that the insecure upset world has understandably been unable to cope with and thus admit, but, as will be explained later, that extraordinary sensitivity does exist in us all. It follows that if a baby does happen to have an exceptionally secure mother whose world is also exceptionally secure then that baby would know that.

At this point I should interrupt to give a more detailed explanation of why it requires an exceptionally secure mother to produce a prophet. The description of Christ's mother as a **'virgin'** (Matt. 1:23, Luke 1:27,34) is actually a recognition of this truth. A few pages further on it will be explained that when men became upset they perverted the act of procreation; they turned sex into a way of attacking the innocence of women, which means 'virgin' is the perfect metaphor for an innocent mother, a mother who has not had her innocence destroyed and thus not had to adopt denial of the ideal, soulful true world. Of course, Christ's mother wasn't a virgin but she was an exceptionally innocent, psychologically sound, upset-and-denial-free mother because that is what is required to produce a fully-loved, psychologically sound, upset-and-denial-free prophet. Laing's comment included earlier that **'Each child is a new beginning, a potential prophet'** contains the inference that if a child was to receive sufficient nurturing and love they would be a prophet; that it took love to produce a prophet. We will see in a few pages time how Moses' mother so loved him as a baby that she hid him for three months from the Pharaoh's henchmen who were killing all Israelite boys, and how she then devised an extraordinarily clever plan to keep him and raise him in a secure and peaceful realm in the Pharaoh's household. The stable realm was significant because for a mother to be able to give her son pure love she not only needs to be exceptionally secure, she requires a loving and secure realm around her. She needs to be an exceptionally sound person *and* she needs ideal nursery conditions.

It should be noted that for there to have been four successive generations of prophets from Abraham to Isaac to Jacob to Joseph is almost beyond belief because it would require four successive exceptionally sound mothers and under the duress of the human condition such women are extraordinarily rare. Either there has been some exaggeration to bolster the prophetic tradition that was so important to the Israelite nation, or the overall innocence of the Israelite people at that time, which was some 3,800 years ago, was so very great that a series of exceptionally innocent mothers could occur. Certainly genetic adaption to corruption happens very rapidly—as genetic adaption does in response to any strong selection pressure—and all people in the world would have been significantly more innocent 4,000 years ago than they are today—and possibly the Israelite people were still exceptionally innocent having not long ago departed from their Semitic race's original lifestyle as nomadic herdsmen where they lived naturally isolated from encounters with more upset people—but it still seems improbable even back then for the degree of innocent soul strength needed in a mother to produce a prophet to occur in four successive generations. Given how extraordinarily sound a mother has to be to produce a prophet, I favour the exaggeration possibility. Possibly there were more generations between Abraham, Isaac and Jacob (it seems Jacob was definitely the father of Joseph because there is so much recorded of their relationship), and/or perhaps some of the four, possibly Isaac, wasn't a fully nurtured, denial-free thinking prophet.

The question does arise that if Joseph's mother was secure and loving enough to nurture and preserve Joseph's soundness, why wasn't she able to do that for her other sons, Joseph's brothers? The answer lies in the delicacy of our original instinctive self or soul. The truth is our soul is so delicate and sensitive, so expecting of encountering an idyllic world of perfect love, happiness and sound, integrative behaviour that it doesn't take much corrupt behaviour to distress it. In the case of the mothers of prophets they are necessarily so imbued with awareness of the soul's true world and so naive about, and thus unbending towards and unsympathetic towards the upset, corrupt, alienated, dishonest, devious, false world that they live above that false world; they live as if the false world has no relevance or meaning, which can leave people who are not so strongly orientated and secure feeling as if they don't exist—even their own sons if they are at all fragile. Soul-strong mothers are not intentionally cruel at all, there is no anger or embitterness in them, they are simply strong in what they know is true and authentic, and strong in what they know is dishonest and false. They are simply perfectly centred on what is consistent with the integratively-orientated true world and because a child's soul is so delicate any sense of deficiency on the part of the child implied by this centredness of the mother on what is authentic to the world of our species' original instinctive self or soul can be psychologically crippling for the child. It is a soul-strong mother's total awareness of and belief in another true world, and total dismissal of the false world as having no meaning or relevance, that enables them to give a sound and secure son unerring alignment with the true world of our soul. While soundness is reinforced by such soul-strong mothers, lack of soundness is not. Soul-centred mothers have perfect love for what is authentic in the integrative, soulful true world but, in effect, no love for what is not; they lack compassion for corruption, about which they are naive. To them corruption in any form is irrelevant, a meaningless weakness and failing. An innocent mother is innocent—she doesn't know about the human condition. As will be explained in a few paragraphs further on, women aren't as aware of the whole subject and issue of the human condition as men, so an innocent woman can be extremely innocent, extremely unaware of, and thus extremely unsympathetic towards, the corrupted state of the human condition. We will see shortly when the story of Noah's Ark is explained that God, the personification of the integrative ideals, had to learn compassion for the corrupted state of the human condition, that 'He' initially made a mistake and drowned everyone because 'He' thought they were all cursed, but then 'He' relented and saw that **'even though every inclination of his** [upset humans'] **heart is evil from childhood'**, **'never again will I curse the ground because of man…never again will I destroy all living creatures, as I have done'** (Gen. 8:21). When viewed without any compassion, without any sense that there might be a good reason why humans became corrupted, the corrupted state of humans *is* a corrupted state—is a bad, evil, God-inconsistent, God-defying, God-defiling, worthless, irrelevant, meaningless, out-of-step-with-all-that-is-good state. The fact is wholly innocent women *are* wholly innocent.

Thus, soul-strong mothers can produce denial-free thinking prophets, but such offspring *are* rare. Exceptionally secure mothers, mothers who have virtually no core experience of, and thus empathy towards the upset hurt world—mothers who *are* metaphorically **'virgin**[s]**'** in their purity of soul—are rare enough, but it is even rarer for them to have a son who represents all that they know of as ideal and who can therefore grow up fully immersed in their mother's strong alignment to that ideal state and, as a result, be able to take on the world

of denial without bending. In an account about Moses' mother that will be given shortly it says that when she **'gave birth to a son** [Moses, she]**…saw that he was a fine child,** [and] **she hid him for three months'** from Pharaoh's henchmen, later saving him by placing him in a basket amongst the reeds of the Nile. There is a suggestion here of there being some significance in Moses' mother viewing him as a **'fine child'**, an inference that he didn't disappoint her. To not bend to alienation is the alignment given to prophets by their soul-unbent-and-soul-unbending mother. A mother capable of nurturing a prophet knows of another true world and that is where she lives, aligned to that world and believing in it. Such mothers are not sentimental, fussing or doting, they are simply strong and secure, but few offspring can fully meet the expectations of such centred integrity.

To return to the explanation of Joseph's extraordinary soundness. The knowledge that Joseph had of being an exceptionally nurtured and thus secure person made him extraordinarily inspired and authoritative in his thinking. Joseph's father Jacob, being exceptionally sound himself, recognised and loved Joseph's extraordinarily inspired enthusiasm for life, his **'zeal for your house** [soulful true world]**'** (Psa. 69:8) as the great prophet David said about prophets. However, while **'Israel** [Jacob] **loved Joseph more than any of his other sons'** (Gen. 37:3) Joseph's inspired authoritativeness and self-belief was not appreciated by the rest of his family—again as Christ said about the reception prophets received by those who were too close to them to recognise their extraordinariness, **'Only in his home town, among his relatives and in his own house is a prophet without honour'** (Mark 6:1-6). Somewhat naive at the young age of **'seventeen'** (Gen. 37:2) about the effects on others of being so inspired, Joseph told his brothers of dreams he had about how he would be able to achieve marvellous things while they wouldn't (see Gen. 37:6-9). As a result his authoritative self-belief and of his father's preferential love, Joseph was treated dismissively and even **'hated'** (Gen. 37:8) by his brothers to the point where they sold him as a slave to passing **'merchants'** (Gen. 37:28) who took him to Egypt where he was sold on to **'one of Pharaoh's officials'** (Gen. 37:36). Incidentally this same scenario of a prophet being **'without honour' 'in his own house'** had occurred in Joseph's father's inspired life where his brother had similarly held **'a grudge against Jacob'** (Gen. 27:41).

It should be explained that should a mother be secure enough to nurture a prophet it doesn't mean that she will be able to recognise him as a prophet. She can recognise and love his immense enthusiasm for life, and recognise that he has integrity, but being the closest of all to him she is in the worst position in terms of familiarity to be able to have the perspective needed to recognise him as an exceptional denial-free thinker or prophet. Being a woman she is also limited in her ability to recognise the significance of a prophet's work of grappling with the issue of the human condition. Shortly it will be explained that because males were the group protectors during our species' ape ancestry—it was the males for example who had to protect the group from marauding leopards—when the search for knowledge began and humanity had to defeat the threat to the group/humanity of ignorance coming from our original instinctive self it was men who had to take up that task. Women have been the nurturers and men the group protectors and when the threat of ignorance by our instinctive self of our species' fundamental goodness emerged it was men who had to take up that task of trying to defeat that threat. As a result women are less aware than men of this battle to defy the world of our soul, defeat its ignorance and ultimately explain the human condition.

Women have not been as aware as men of the battle that men are engaged in with the issue of the human condition, and, since that is the issue that prophets become focused upon, women aren't as easily able to identify with a prophet's work as men. This is why it is men not women who became prophets—defiers of denial of the issue of the human condition—and partly why prophets' mothers find it hard to recognise the immense significance of the work that their prophet son is engaged in. As a result of this situation, not only did Christ's brothers not empathise with Christ's work, his own mother didn't either. When Christ began his ministry and his brothers and mother heard about it, they accused him of having gone mad and, acting on that belief, tried to take charge of him—but again Christ had to be strong enough to carry on his work without his brothers' or his mother's appreciation of the work he was undertaking. As is recorded in the Bible, **'When his family heard about this** [Christ's ministry]**, they went to take charge of him, for they said, "He is out of his mind"'** (Mark 3:21); **'his own did not receive him'** (John 1:11); and **'Then Jesus' mother and brothers arrived. Standing outside, they sent someone in to call him. A crowd was sitting around him, and they told him, "Your mother and brothers are outside looking for you." "Who are my mother and my brothers?" he asked. Then he looked at those seated in a circle around him and said "Here are my mother and my brothers! Whoever does God's will is my brother and sister and mother"'** (Mark 3:31-35).

To now return to the story of Joseph's enslavement in Egypt. Not surprisingly given his extraordinary soundness, Joseph was so capable that eventually his Egyptian owner **'put him in charge of his household'** (Gen. 39:4). When his owner's wife tried unsuccessfully to seduce him she fabricated accusations against him which resulted in Joseph being thrown into prison, but again he was so able that eventually he was put **'in charge'** (Gen. 39:22) of the prison. Some time later two of the Pharaoh's officials happened to be put in the same prison where they both had dreams that Joseph was able to **'interpret'** (Gen. 40:8). Dreams are basically awarenesses that our species' all-sensitive original instinctive self or soul has about the world it finds itself in. As Carl Jung so insightfully said, **'The dream is a little hidden door in the innermost and most secret recesses of the psyche** [soul]**, opening into that cosmic night which was psyche long before there was any ego consciousness'** (*Civilization in Transition*, from *The Collected Works of C.G. Jung*, Vol.10, 1945). Our psyche or soul ('psyche' in the dictionary means 'soul') has immense sensitivity, coming as it does from our species' fully cooperative, loving and alienation-free past. It has access to all the beauty and magic enthrallment of an alienation-free life and when it encounters the immensely upset world of the human condition it is deeply shocked. While an upset human's conscious overlying self normally represses their hurtfully exposing and condemning instinctive self or soul, when they are asleep and the conscious self is resting the instinctive self or soul comes to the surface and expresses its immense anxieties about the horror of the world it has found itself in. This is why so many dreams are in fact nightmares—it is that innocent child within us, our instinctive self or soul being shocked by the horrific imperfections of the world in which it lives. For someone who is not living in conscious denial of the human condition their all-sensitive instinctive self or soul is closer to the surface in their mind and they can access all the truth about the imperfections of the world that our instinctive self is acutely aware of. This access enables denial-free thinkers or prophets to interpret people's dreams—in fact interpret everything about the upset state of the human condition that everyone else is living in denial of; as a woman said about a meeting she had with Christ, **'come, see a man who told**

me everything I ever did' (John 4:29). Prophets are not in denial of all the truth about our world that our instinctive self can recognise. They know what the soul is trying to 'say'. When someone is not in denial of all the horrors of this world and can access the extremely sensitive knowingness of our instinctive self or soul there is so much about our world that they know about. So, Joseph being an alienation-free, denial-free thinker could interpret dreams, could 'hear' what people's distressed souls were trying to 'say', and that's what he did for the Pharaoh's officials. As will be explained later in this book when Christ is explained in some detail (presently available in *A Species In Denial* in the chapter titled 'Christ's miracles and resurrection demystified'), Christ's ability to heal people was not 'miraculous' but simply due to his ability to connect with, empathise with, understand and thus bring great relief to their troubled souls—most sicknesses being psychosomatic or soul-distressed in origin. Prophets have the room in themselves to immerse themselves in people's lives, share and know their pain when the rest of the world can't. As Christ said, **'I am gentle and humble in heart, and you will find rest for your souls. For my yoke is easy and my burden is light'** (Matt. 11:29).

Later when the Pharaoh was being troubled by certain dreams, one of the jailed officials who had been reinstated recalled Joseph's ability to interpret dreams. Joseph duly did so, telling the Pharaoh that his dreams meant that there was going to be periods of good rainfall and then periods of terrible drought and that the Pharaoh should store the harvest from the good times to ensure there would be food in the bad. The Pharaoh was so impressed that he placed Joseph **'in charge of my palace, and all my people are to submit to your orders'** (Gen. 41:40).

When, in due course, a terrible drought occurred and there was no food apart from what Joseph had stored in Egypt, Joseph's father Jacob sent his other sons down to Egypt where they met Joseph who recognised them. When he learned of this, the Pharaoh invited Joseph's family to come and live in Egypt, which they did. In fact the Israelites were so successful and multiplied in such numbers that when **'a new king who did not know about Joseph, came to power in Egypt'** (Exod. 1:8) he became threatened by them and **'put slave masters over them'** (Exod. 1:11). In fact, the Israelites were so capable and had so **'multiplied'** (Exod. 1:12) that the new Pharaoh felt sufficiently threatened to order that **'Every** [Israelite] **boy that is born you must throw into the river'** (Exod. 1:22). When one Israelite mother **'gave birth to a son…**[and] **saw that he was a fine child, she hid him for three months. But when she could hide him no longer…**[she put him in] **a papyrus basket… coated with tar…and put it among the reeds along the bank of the Nile. His sister stood at a distance to see what would happen to him…**[When the] **Pharaoh's daughter went down to the Nile to bathe'** (Exod. 2:3-5) she found the baby and decided to keep him. Seeing this, the baby's sister asked the Pharaoh's daughter if she would like a **'Hebrew woman to nurse the baby for you?'** (Exod. 2:7) and when she answered yes, the sister **'got the baby's mother'** (Exod. 2:8) who then raised her son in the Pharaoh's household. The Pharaoh's daughter named the baby **'Moses, saying I drew him out of the water'** (Exod. 2:10).

'One day after Moses had grown up…he killed…[an] **Egyptian'** who was **'beating a Hebrew, one of his own people'** (Exod. 2:11-13). Realising he would be found out, Moses fled into the Arabian desert where he lived for many years with shepherds, **'tending…flock**[s]**'** (Exod. 3:1) and marrying the daughter of one their priests.

Growing up in the Pharaoh's palace, Moses, like Plato who was educated by Socrates during the golden age of Athens, would have received the best education then available in the

world, given Egypt was the most advanced civilisation at that time. Having the good fortune of being so well looked after and so well educated it is understandable that Moses would have felt a sense of responsibility to his persecuted people back in Egypt. He was also not an insecure, embattled, no-room-left-in-himself, just-have-to-survive, cowardly, selfish upset person but, as it turns out, an exceptionally sound, denial-free thinker or prophet. Moses was able to confront the truth of integrative meaning. Speaking from the perspective of the third person (that is, from the position of someone not directly involved)—because either Moses himself wanted the record to appear entirely objective, or because those after him changed Moses' record because they wanted it to appear entirely objective—Moses described how he was able to survive confrontation with the integrative truths and meaning of life, which in his day, as has been explained, was described as 'God'. Again the fire analogy, which, as explained in Part 6:2, is often used to represent the searing truth about integrative meaning and the human condition that almost all humans couldn't face, is used. Moses said **'the angel of the Lord appeared to him in flames of fire from within a bush…**[from within which] **God called to him'** (Exod. 3:2-4), saying **'I have indeed seen the misery of my people in Egypt…and I'm concerned about their suffering. So I have come down to rescue them…and to bring them up out of that land into a good and spacious land, a land flowing with milk and honey—the land of the Canaanites** [and others]**'** (Exod. 3:7-8). At first Moses said he **'hid his face, because he was afraid to look at God'** (Exod. 3:6) and tried to escape his responsibility saying, **'Who am I, that I should go to the Pharaoh and bring the Israelites out of Egypt'** (Exod. 3:11), but his all-loving, truthful, secure, strong, integrative-meaning-inspired, soulful self assured him that **'I will be with you'** (Exod. 3:12).

As has been explained earlier, exceptional mental cleverness or IQ is very often a limitation in being able to stay sound and Moses was not apparently exceptionally clever and, knowing how intellectually devious clever people can be, was anxious as to whether he would be able to stand up to the intimidating world of the ruling intellectuals back in Egypt. He complained to himself, **'O Lord** [the unerring inspiration coming from Moses' all-sensitive, truthful soul]**, I have never been eloquent, neither in the past nor since you have spoken to your servant, I am slow of speech and tongue'** (Exod. 4:10). But Moses rallied himself and knew that if he stood by his truthful, true self and let it say what it wanted to say he would be effective—as Moses said of this time of anxiety, **'I** [my immensely inspired happy, loving true self] **will help you speak and will teach you what to say'** (Exod. 4:11).

So Moses accepted that he had to return to Egypt and liberate his people from bondage and take them back to the promised land of Canaan and continue the world saving traditions that Abraham had begun. He went to Egypt and said to the Pharaoh **'Let my people go'** (Exod. 5:1). Obviously the Pharaoh was getting such good service from the Israelites he didn't want to let them go, however drawing on all his extremely clean access to his all-sensitive soul Moses was able to know where destructive forces were fermenting in the world of the Egyptians as a result of their greed and uncaring treatment of their environment and he used this insight to predict coming devastations, a series of ten **'plagues'** (see Exod. 7-11). When these predictions came true the Pharaoh became so afraid that he agreed to let the Israelites go, and after **'430 years'** (Exod. 12:40) in Egypt the Israelites began their exodus through the desert wilderness of the Sinai and Arabian Peninsulas which was to last **'for forty years…until they reached the border of Canaan'** (Exod. 16:35).

However **'the Pharaoh's heart'** became **'hardened'** (Exod. 14:4) and he changed his mind, sending an army to **'pursue the Israelites'** (Exod. 14:8). The account then says Moses parted the Red Sea so that the Israelites could escape and when the Egyptians followed they were drowned (see Exod. 14:26-30). As a result the Israelites then **'feared the Lord and put their trust in him and in Moses his servant'** (Exod. 14:31).

At this point it is relevant to explain the concept of miracles in the life of prophets. Essentially the supposed miracles attributed to prophets protected people from having to admit the prophet's soundness and by inference their lack of it. Describing the often extraordinary events in the life of prophets as miracles was a way of recognising that something remarkable had happened while avoiding the unbearably confronting issue of the human condition. As has repeatedly been illustrated, the denial-free state of prophets meant they could access all the truth and sensitivity of our species' original instinctive self or soul and as a result know things and be able to make sense of situations and therefore know an effective path to follow. So much of what denial-free thinking prophets said and did could seem miraculous to the resigned, denial-practicing mind, but in truth prophets were only thinking truthfully and thus effectively.

The concept of miracles is the resigned, denial-practicing person's way of acknowledging that an event in the life of a prophet was extraordinary without having to acknowledge its real significance, which is that they were living in an effectively dead, alienated state while prophets weren't. It is so much easier to talk of Moses having miraculously parted the waters of the Red Sea than to talk about Moses being so sound and therefore ingenious and innovative in his thinking that he could find a way to defeat virtually every problem that arose, even the problem of the powerful Egyptian army chasing them. What actually happened we don't know but the idea of a person literally parting an ocean is ridiculous. The more astonishing the fabricated miracle obviously the more amazing and impressive was the means by which the prophet managed to solve the problem that the miracle describes, so Moses must have come up with a very ingenious means to escape the pursuing Egyptians, but it wasn't by an outlandish miracle. Possibly he had everyone strip off and tie their clothes into a bundle and wrap it in an animal skin so that it would float and then had everyone hold on to their floats and swim across the sea when the tide was lowest and at the narrowest place he was able to find—perhaps the islands at the mouth of the Gulf of Suez were higher then and they were able to swim from island to island. Mt Sinai, where the Israelites went after crossing the Red Sea, isn't far from this point. The account in Exodus says that **'God led the people around by the desert road towards the Red Sea'** (Exod. 13:18), then **'the Lord said to Moses, "Tell the Israelites to turn back and encamp near Hahiroth, between Migdol and the sea. They are to encamp by the sea, directly opposite Baal Zephon"'** (Exod. 14:2). This does suggest Moses might have been searching for the narrowest crossing. After doing a quick search on the internet for where it is thought the Israelites crossed there is a view that the escaping throng came down the eastern side of the Gulf of Suez and then crossed to an island at the mouth of the Gulf of Aqaba at its narrowest point, so this idea of swimming across the narrowest point of the long barrier of water that is the Red Sea and through which the Egyptian chariots couldn't follow may be the ingenious way that Moses thought to escape those forces. (Since writing the above I have seen a documentary that presents a plausible non-religious interpretation of Moses's exodus

from Egypt and journey to Canaan. It appears in the 2009 *Battles BC* documentary series in episode S1, Ep5 'Moses: Death Chase'. Of course what's missing from that presentation is the explanation of how ruthless Moses had to be to implement his vision of establishing his world-saving religion.)

Other 'miracles', such as causing **'water'** to **'come out'** of a **'rock'** (Exod. 17:6), followed, which to the city dwelling Israelites would have seemed amazing but Moses, a former shepherd who was familiar with desert life, would have known how to find springs by watching the flight of birds and the paths of animals.

As always amongst upset, human-condition-afflicted people there would have been many social upheavals that Moses in all his soundness would have had to mediate—as is recorded: **'Moses took his seat to serve as judge for the people, and they stood around him from morning till evening'** (Exod. 18:13). There was also much **'grumbling'** (see Exod. 15:24, 16:2,7,8,9,12, 17:3; Deut. 1:27) to Moses by the people, saying for example **'you have brought us out into the desert to starve'** (Exod. 16:3), which Moses had to continually counter with the inspiration of his vision. It was a stressful life and when **'Moses' father-in-law'**, the desert nomad priest with whom Moses had lived before his return to Egypt, visited him, he said, **'What you are doing is not good. You and these people who come to you will only wear yourselves out. The work is too heavy for you'** (Exod. 18:17-18) and advised Moses to **'select capable men from all the people—men who fear God, trustworthy men who hate dishonest gain—and appoint them as officials…**[to help] **serve as judges** [so] **you will be able to stand the strain'** (Exod. 18:21-23). It is a very great problem for denial-free thinkers or prophets who can see so clearly where there are threats from people's extreme upset and blindness to the all-important project they are undertaking and they do wear themselves right out trying to contain the threats, and it is true that they do have to try to find individuals who are relatively secure in self and/or properly orientated to the project to whom they can delegate, risky as that is.

There are limits however to the extent to which supervision can contain upset behaviour and **'In the third month after the Israelites left Egypt'** (Exod. 19:1), when camped at the foot of Mt Sinai on the Sinai Peninsula, Moses became deeply distressed about the almost self-destructive behaviour of his people. Needing all the access he could muster to his truthful self or soul for guidance as to what to do, he climbed up to the cool, fresh air of the **'cloud covered'** (Exod. 24:15) peak of Mt Sinai where he spent **'forty days and forty nights'** (Exod. 24:18) alone fasting, eating **'no bread** [or]**…water'** (Deut. 9:9). Fasting, where the brain is starved of nourishment, is a means of shutting down the conscious mind and allowing the truthful, all-sensitive world of the soul to come to the surface. There on the mountain top **'Moses…**[was able] **to approach the Lord** [the truth of integrative meaning]**'** (Exod. 24:2) and with that denial-free clarity Moses realised that what he would have to do is establish strict rules or laws enforced by punishment to contain the upset, destructive behaviour of his people. He composed ten key laws, the now famous **'Ten Commandments'** (see Exod. 20 & 34:28) that begin with emphasis on obedience and deferment to the one true God, which, as has been explained, is the integrative, cooperative, loving meaning of existence. He also realised he would have to establish ceremonies around these laws to reinforce their importance to the people. When he came down from the mountain, **'his face was radiant because he had spoken with the Lord** [he had been living close to the authentic world of our soul]**'** (Exod. 34:29) and he had with him the Ten crucial Commandments which he had scratched on two stone tablets. These, he instructed, were to be housed in a

beautiful **'chest'** (Exod. 24:10) or **'ark'** (Exod. 24:16) that because of its sacredness was to be hidden within **'the tabernacle** [tent] **with ten curtains'** (Exod. 26:1). He then gave instructions about an altar for burnt offerings or sacrifices, and about priestly garments and other items of ritual. He also followed up the Ten key Commandments with a series of instructions about not having idols, about personal injuries, protection of property, social responsibility, laws of justice and mercy, the Sabbath day of rest and three annual festivals, and many, many other directives on how to live (see Exod. 20-23). Leviticus, the third book of the Bible, is entirely dedicated to outlining these further instructions to the Israelites.

The fourth book of the Bible, called Numbers, documents the living arrangements for the twelve Israelite tribes during their wanderings through the wilderness to the promised land of **'milk and honey'** (Exod. 3:8) in Canaan, which, incidentally, is symbolic of humanity's overall journey through the terrible wilderness of alienation to the promised state of fabulous freedom from the human condition. Numbers also records how Moses had to contend with more complaints from the Israelites—**'wailing'** about **'why did we ever leave Egypt?'** (Num. 11:20), they **'grumbled against Moses'** (Num. 14:2) saying **'we should choose a leader and go back to Egypt'** (Num. 14:4) and that **'there was no water for the community, and the people gathered in opposition to Moses'** (Num. 20:2). Certainly, if there wasn't any exaggeration to the depiction, there were a lot of people to be provided for as the Bible says that by this stage **'the total number of men of Israel was 601,730'** (Num. 26:51), and that was only the number of **'men'**! Clearly some exaggeration exists where numbers of years is concerned, as Moses regularly describes individuals living to impossibly old ages, such as Abraham having **'lived a hundred and seventy-five years'** (Gen. 25:7), so perhaps the number of people is also inflated. The remainder of Numbers documents the stages the Israelites' journey takes through the wilderness and the battles they had to fight against other tribes along the way.

The deeper significance of the continual complaints made by the Israelites to Moses needs to be explained. As is mentioned in the paragraph below, Moses instructed the Israelites **'to love the Lord your God and to serve him with all your heart and with all your soul'**. The essence of Religion is that instead of living through your upset, divisive, competitive, selfish, and aggressive self you lived through, or deferred to, or subordinated yourself to, or obeyed the integrative, cooperative, selfless and loving ideals embodied in the prophet and in his one true God of integrative meaning. Basically you had to do the opposite of what your upset self wanted to do. This was hard teaching and in fact, as will be explained much more fully later on, being too obedient to the cooperative ideals was not the right response because, as the Adam Stork story makes clear, the conscious search for knowledge *unavoidably* resulted in upset, divisive, competitive, selfish and aggressive non-ideal behaviour, so to not be allowed to become upset and non-ideally behaved at all was to not be allowed to search for knowledge. Obviously a balance had to be struck between participating in the upsetting, corrupting search for knowledge and obedience to the cooperative, loving ideals. Abraham's and Moses' instructions to obey God was both hard to do and not entirely the right thing to do, so it wasn't just the physical hardship of desert life that the Israelites were railing against, it was also the wrestling match they were having with their Religion. The introduction of Religions in the world was a fabulous, corruption-and-denial-correcting and thus humanity-saving influence, but Religions were also a difficult discipline to firstly be able to abide by,

and secondly to know to what extent to abide by. Worshipping a **'gold…calf'** (Exod. 32:2-4), which, in defiance of Moses, the Israelites tried to do at one stage of their journey through the desert, was much easier than worshipping God. Significantly one of the big differences between Religion and the new TRANSFORMED LIFEFORCE STATE that understanding of the human condition now makes possible for humans is that since understanding of the human condition was the key understanding we were in search of, now that it is found there is no longer any justification for continuing the upsetting search for knowledge—at least until all the excessive upset in the world is repaired. In the situation that has existed with a Religion there was justification for not completely deferring to the cooperative ideals of the Religion and to a degree continuing your participation in the corrupting search for knowledge, however now that the ultimate knowledge that we were in search of, namely understanding of the human condition, is found that situation no longer exists. Religion-defying 'Homer Simpson' of cartoon fame had a justification for not doing what his religion-loving, ideals-obeying cartoon neighbour 'Ned Flanders' was doing but that situation changes now. With understanding of the human condition found *everyone*, including 'Homer', *fully* takes up the new upset-self-deferring, abandon-living-out-your-upset-and-instead-take-up-support-of-the-understanding-of-the-human-condition TRANSFORMED LIFEFORCE STATE. There is no excuse not to stop living out your upset now as there was with Religion. This extremely important point was emphasised earlier when the new TRANSFORMED LIFEFORCE STATE was looked at in Part 9.

In his fifth and last book, Deuteronomy, Moses reiterates all that he has taught his people, summarising, **'what other nation is so great as to have their gods near them the way the Lord our God is near us…and…to have such righteous decrees and laws as this body of laws I am setting before you'** (Deut. 4:7-8); **'Has any other people heard the voice of God speak out of fire, as you have, and lived?'** (Deut. 4:33); **'I stood between the Lord and you to declare to you the word of the Lord because you were afraid of the fire'** (Deut. 5:5); **'obey the commands…to love the Lord your God and to serve him with all your heart and with all your soul'** (Deut. 11:13). Continuing the tradition of taking leadership from prophets, Moses said, **'The Lord your God will raise up for you a prophet like me from among your own brothers. You must listen to him'** (Deut. 18:15). Deuteronomy also states that **'Moses wrote down this law'** (Deut. 31:9), and that **'Moses finished writing in a book the words of this law from beginning to end'** (Deut. 31:24). (Incidentally, writing appeared almost simultaneously some 5,000-6,000 years ago in Egypt, Mesopotamia, and the Indus Valley.) Deuteronomy concludes with Moses dying at the foothills of the promised land of Canaan. It says he was very old, **'yet his eyes were not weak nor his strength gone'** (Deut. 34:7), and that **'Since then no prophet has risen in Israel like Moses, whom the Lord knew face to face'** (Deut. 34:10). Moses was sound enough to confront the truth of integrative meaning and the issue of the human condition with impunity: he was an absolutely exceptional denial-free thinker.

We can see that Moses was focused on establishing a structure that would allow upset, embattled humans to live with some degree of functionality and peace. He used all his soundness to give the world of upset humans a template for living. He brought order to chaos.

A world that is living in an alienated, dark, cave-like state of denial of the truth of integrative meaning and many other important truths is a directionless, lost, desperately lonely, meaningless existence. Unresigned, denial-free thinking prophets have the great good fortune of not living in such a horribly lost, alienated state. Living as they are with the truth of integrative meaning and with a denial-free awareness of another wonderful

cooperative, loving world, their lives are meaningful, full of enthrallment and excitement; they have reassuring and comforting order and direction. Realising how bereft of such orientation the world of all the people around them is, the one great driving force that a denial-free thinker or prophet has is to somehow share, communicate and recreate that order, direction and orientation for those who are so lost, bewildered and unhappy. While denial or alienation protected humans from unbearable self-confrontation it also left them horribly disorientated and alone, which prophets can see and want to help overcome. Being very great prophets, Abraham and Moses drew on all their soundness to realign their people, give them an infallible true vision and a structure that they could live in and which would bring to themselves and their society some peace. By so doing they also gave all of humanity the opportunity to adopt such a stabilising, peace-bringing structure—and through doing that they bought the time needed for humanity to complete its heroic search for knowledge, ultimately for self-knowledge, understanding of the human condition.

To help create that order, direction and orientation for all those suffering from the disorientation of alienation, prophets very much wanted to provide a contexting history of humanity, a denial-free account of where we humans came from and are heading, with all the major events that took place along the way truthfully acknowledged. Obviously with understanding of the human condition now found this can at last be done in clear, first principle, scientific and denial-free terms, as can be seen in this book. In Part 8:2, a denial-free step-by-step description of the development of order of matter on Earth was given. This description traces the history of the development of matter from the underpinning physical laws of existence, to the effects those laws have on the building-block elements of matter, to the emergence of life, to the appearance of our cooperatively orientated ape ancestors, to the emergence of fully conscious humans and with it the horror of the upset state of the human condition, to the development of the various strategies to manage that upset, to finally finding the liberating and TRANSFORMING understanding of the human condition. Despite living in pre-scientific times, Abraham and Moses did their very best to present that all-important orientating and contexting, denial-free history of humanity that people could see themselves as being part of and belonging to, and, given the knowledge available at the time, what they were able to assemble was truly extraordinarily insightful and accurate—as we will now see.

Although their initial society was small in numbers, the rhetoric of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Joseph and Moses shows that they knew that if, within that small society, they could create the ideal structure it could and would keep expanding and ultimately be able to influence the whole world—as Moses said of their initiatives, **'all nations on earth will be blessed'** (Gen. 26:5). In the case of the influence of the Ten Commandments, for example, they have become **'the moral basis for two thirds of the world's population'** (from *Moses*, BBC/TLC co-production in assoc. with Jerusalem Productions, 2002).

While Abraham's contribution of both monotheism and tradition were critically important in creating a successful path for the human race to follow, Moses was the one who firmly established what Abraham had initiated. As well as emphasising the need to defer, or subordinate yourself to one all-pervading truth or God and maintaining traditions, Moses added the laws, the Imposed Discipline, the society required, and the all-important contexting history that people could feel themselves a part of. Finally, he wrote all this down and put the resulting book, along with the Ten key Commandments etched on two stone tablets, in a box to be treasured.

This brings us back to the important first ten chapters of Genesis that were so crucial in establishing the contexting history of life and of humans, up to where we began the story of Abraham.

Genesis begins with the words, **'In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth.'** With these completely unevasive, denial-free words monotheism—the awareness that there is only one great cooperative, integrative truth or meaning or theme to existence—was established. Moses went on to say how God then created the **'light'**, the **'sky'**, the **'seas'** and the **'land'** (Gen. 1:3-9) and then **'plants'** (Gen. 1:11) and **'living creatures'** (Gen. 1:20). He then said **'God created man in his own image, in the image of God…male and female he created them'** (Gen. 1:27). Since we can now understand that God is the negative-entropy-driven, integrative process, for our ancestors to be created in **'the image of God'** we had to be living in an integrative, cooperative, loving ideal state that, as Moses said, **'was very good'** (Gen. 1:31). He then said God **'planted a garden…in Eden; and there he put the man…**[with] **all kinds of trees…that were pleasing to the eye and good for food'** (Gen. 2:8-9). We now know that our original arboreal-living ape ancestors did live in a Garden-of-Eden-like verdant world full of plants, especially fruits, that they lived on, much as bonobos do today. Moses continued, **'God commanded the man…not** [to] **eat from the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, for when you eat of it you will surely die'** (Gen. 2:16-17). If we go to Moses' fifth book, Deuteronomy, Chapter 1:39, where it refers to **'your children who do not yet know good and bad'**, we can understand the phrase **'knowledge of good and evil'** means 'to know or to suffer from or experience good and evil', although the use of the term 'knowledge' instead of 'know' does hint at the conscious search for knowledge as being the cause of the human-condition-afflicted state of good and evil. Moses confirms the involvement of a conscious search for understanding/knowledge as the cause of our good-and-evil-afflicted state when he says, **'the fruit of the tree was…desirable for gaining wisdom'** (Gen. 3:6). We can also now understand that when Moses said that if **'you eat of it** [the forbidden fruit] **you will surely die'** he was recognising and acknowledging that searching for knowledge was so corrupting you would eventually become so alienated that you *would* effectively be dead.

Through his integratively-orientated, denial-free, truthful self or, if we like to personify it, 'God', Moses then said, **'It is not good for the man to be alone. I will make a helper suitable for him…Then the Lord God made a woman…and he brought her to the man…**[to] **be united to his wife… The man and his wife were both naked, and they felt no shame'** (Gen. 2:18-25). Moses then said that the woman **'gave some** [of the forbidden fruit] **to her husband…Then the eyes of both of them were opened, and they realised that they were naked; so they…made coverings for themselves'** (Gen. 3:6-7). Moses then said as penance for what she had done **'the woman'** would have her **'pains in childbearing' 'greatly increased'** and **'Your desire will be for your husband, and he will rule over you'** (Gen. 3:16). To the man, Moses said that because he ate the forbidden fruit, **'Cursed is the ground because of you; through painful toil you will eat of it all the days of your life'** (Gen. 3:17). Moses went on to say that the integrative ideals or **'God said, "The man has now become like one of us, knowing good and evil. He must not be allowed to reach out his hand and take also from the tree of life and eat, and live for ever." So the Lord God banished him from the Garden of Eden to work the ground from which he had been taken. After he drove the man out, he placed on the east side of the Garden of Eden cherubim and a flaming sword flashing back and forth to guard the way to the tree of life'** (Gen. 3:22-24).

The different roles that men and women had to take up during humanity's heroic, human-condition-afflicted, search for knowledge was explained in Part 7:1. A very brief summary here of those different roles will help explain the significance and meaning of what Moses said.

Part 8:4 explained how humans developed a cooperatively orientated instinctive self or soul through nurturing, through the 'love-indoctrination' process in our primate past. This time of nurturing of our integratively-orientated soul was a matriarchal (or female-role-dominated) phase in our species' development that the bonobos currently demonstrate. The males' role during this nurturing stage was to act as group protectors against any threats, such as marauding leopards for example. When our species became fully conscious and we had to set out in search of knowledge and defy the threat from our integratively-orientated instinctive self that was ignorant of our need to search for knowledge and was in effect trying to stop that search, men, in keeping with their traditional role as group protectors, had to take up the all-important and thus dominating role of defying the threat of ignorance from our instinctive self. As a result of this development, our society changed from being a matriarchal, female-role-dominated society to a patriarchal, male-role-dominated one. The effect of men carrying out this role was that they especially became unavoidably angry, egocentric and alienated. In response, women, not being as involved in this battle against ignorance, tended to be unsympathetic towards men's especially upset angry, egocentric and alienated state. Unable to explain why they were so unavoidably upset and embattled, men then had no choice other than to contain and even oppress women for their lack of sympathy for the critical work that they were doing. One form of oppression was the perversion of the act of sex. While sex was originally for procreation (and, in the case of some species, such as the bonobos, a means of pacification), men began to use it as a form of retaliation against women for their unjust condemnation of them for being so angry, egocentric and alienated. Sex became used as a means of attacking—'fucking'—the naive innocence of women. It became rape. The feminist Andrea Dworkin recognised this underlying truth in her 1987 book *Intercourse*, when she said, **'All sex is abuse'**. Overall a battle emerged between men and women, however they still had to live together to raise children.

We can now interpret what Moses said above. In our pre-conscious state our human ancestors lived in a Garden-of-Eden-like world, free of upset, innocent and without **'shame'**. Then, with the emergence of consciousness the terrible upset state appeared. Men in particular had to take on the horribly upsetting job of defying the ignorance of our beautiful instinctive self or soul while they patiently and painfully toiled away at the job of searching for knowledge—as Moses unerringly said, **'Cursed is the ground because of you** [men]**; through painful toil you will eat of it all the days of your life.'** As a result, women, not understanding why men had become so upset, became unsympathetic towards men and the original **'united'** state of men and women ended, sex became perverted and **'the eyes of both of them were opened, and they realised that they were naked'**, the consequence being that the naked body that attracted sex had to be **'cover**[ed]**'** up to quell lust. Overall society changed from matriarchal to patriarchal, where a woman's **'desire will be for your husband, and he will rule over you'**. The blame put upon women for tempting men to seek knowledge is an acknowledgment of just how attractive women became for sex. The appeal of women's beauty became an inspiration for the search

for knowledge. Thus, as well as an attack on the naivety of women, sex became, at a more noble level, an act of love. The reason the **'pains in childbearing' 'greatly increased'** is because by the time our ancestors became fully conscious and the upset state of the human condition appeared, the size of the human brain had become so big it was difficult for the head to fit through the pelvis at birth. The characteristic swivel of women's hips when walking is a result of their pelvis widening as much as is functionally possible to accommodate the large head of infants at birth. Again it has to be emphasised that the situation that emerged between men and women under the duress of the human condition will all be explained more fully later.

Moses stating that **'God said, "The man has now become like one of us, knowing good and evil"'** refers to the fact that where other animals are ignorant or unaware of the difference between good and evil we fully conscious humans are, like the all-pervading, all-powerful, all-present and all-knowing truth of integrative meaning or **'God'**, aware or knowing of what is consistent with that truth and what isn't. We became creatures capable of insight. Again we see the metaphor of **'flam**[es]**'** for the unconfrontable truth of the human condition which our inability to explain **'guard**[s] **the way** [back] **to the tree of life'**. The **'tree of life'** that we weren't allowed to **'eat'** and therefore were unable to **'live for ever'** is a reference to the fact that once we became insecure and alienated we lost our sense of universality and immortality; we lost the sense of our eternal alignment to integrativeness that we had before we became corrupted and alienated.

In all, what Moses has put forward here is an astonishingly accurate overview of the human condition, an incredibly penetrating unevasive, denial-free analysis.

The main point, which has already been emphasised, is that the all-important dignifying understanding of the human condition was not possible in Moses' pre-scientific times so he was only able to say that we were **'banish**[ment]**'**-deserving evil beings when we became fully conscious. He recognised that we humans once lived in an upset-free, Garden-of-Eden-like innocent state and then conscious searchers for knowledge and, as a result, corrupted, but it wasn't possible for him to explain HOW and WHY that search for knowledge was so corrupting.

We don't know if Moses was the originator of this 'Adam and Eve' overview analysis of the human condition (Adam and Eve being the names Moses gave to the first two people in the story of the Garden of Eden), but if not he was able to recognise its immense significance to the extent that he began the Bible with it. If Moses wasn't the originator of the story and it was part of a tradition that was passed down to him, whoever did originally conceive it had to have been an exceptionally sound, denial-free, honest thinker to have been so immensely insightful. Certainly, as was mentioned earlier, people were more innocent, much sounder, less alienated, in earlier times so there would have been more prophets then to create such insightful stories.

Continuing the story of Adam and Eve and the Garden of Eden, Moses wrote that Adam and Eve had two sons, Cain, and then Abel, and that **'Abel kept flocks, and Cain worked the soil…** [and] **The Lord looked with favour on Abel…**[but] **on Cain…he did not look with favour. So Cain was very angry, and his face was downcast. Then the Lord said to Cain, "Why are you angry…**[and] **your face downcast?…if you do not do what is right, sin is crouching at your door…but you must master it"…** [but] **Cain attacked his brother and killed him…**[and for doing this God said to Cain] **"You will be a restless wanderer on the earth"…**[to which] **Cain said…"my punishment is more than I can bear. Today**

you are driving me from the land, and I will be hidden from your presence; I will be a restless wanderer on the earth, and whoever finds me will kill me." But the Lord said to him, "Not so; if anyone kills Cain, he will suffer vengeance seven times over." Then the Lord put a mark on Cain so that no one who found him would kill him. So Cain went from the Lord's presence…[and] **was then building a city…**[and had offspring some of whom] **lived in tents and raised livestock…**[while another was] **the father of all who play the harp and flute…**[while another] **forged all kinds of tools out of bronze and iron'** (Gen. 4:1-22).

As has been mentioned, later in this book the science-based, denial-free account of the history of the Earth and of humanity will be presented. There we will see how extraordinarily penetrating, accurate and denial-free Moses' story of Cain and Abel is when it comes to explaining what happened to humans after they became fully conscious and set out in search of knowledge. Essentially, as has already been mentioned, humans became increasingly upset: angry, egocentric and alienated, to the extent that we began murdering each other. It will be explained that the domestication of animals, and following that the advent of agriculture, allowed humans to live more sedentary lives in towns and then cities where greater proximity and interaction between people caused upset to rapidly spread and increase. It will be explained how those races who remained closer to nature, removed from the congested, human-condition-spreading town and city situations, stayed innocent longer. The differences in upset between individuals, generations and races caused conflict, even murder and genocide, because without reconciling understanding that upset was a heroic state, not an evil state, the more innocent could only view the more upset as bad or evil, while the more upset and corrupt couldn't help but feel unappreciated and unjustly condemned by the more innocent. Since the more upset were the most angry they were typically the ones to repress and even kill the more innocent because of their unjust condemnation of them; even if the more innocent didn't actually condemn the more upset their presence alone was enough to make the more upset feel unjustly condemned. Innocence has often been oblivious to its impact upon those more corrupted, as the following quote demonstrates: **'In the small fenced-in waiting area outside the departure hall an African woman sits with her wares spread out upon the grass. On the way to the plane I notice a framed piece of needle point she has hung on the fence that reads: "I love those who hate me for nothing"'** (*River of Second Chances* by Eric Ransdell, *Outside* mag. Dec. 1990). This reaction was also evident in the words of the innocent, denial-free thinking prophet David when he referred to **'those who hate me without reason outnumber the hairs of my head; many are my enemies without cause'** (Psa. 69:4; see also Psa. 35:19), a view which Christ also held when he repeated David's words, **'They hated me without reason'** (John 15:25). As has been and will be repeatedly emphasised in this book, while it hasn't been safe to admit to different levels of innocence and upset amongst people, generations, races and cultures because any such acknowledgment only led to unjust condemnation of the more upset, now that the dignifying understanding of all humans has been found it is not only safe but necessary to acknowledge and talk about these differences because it is only with such honesty, acknowledgment and discourse that the upset in the world can be understood and ameliorated.

What has just been presented is a very brief description of the explanation that will be given later of why humans began to attack each other, however, it is enough to demonstrate just how extraordinarily insightful and accurate Moses' account of the story of Cain and Abel is. **'Abel kept flocks,** [he lived the nomadic life of a shepherd, staying close to nature and

innocence] **and Cain worked the soil** [he cultivated crops and domesticated animals and as a result was able to become settled and develop towns and cities and through greater interaction with other humans became increasingly upset]**…Cain was** [became] **very angry, and his face was downcast** [he became depressed about his corrupted/upset state and]**…Cain attacked his** [relatively innocent and thus unwittingly confronting and condemning] **brother Abel and killed him'** (Genesis 4:2,5,8).

When Moses said **'but you must master' 'sin'** he was describing the emergence of the need to control and contain excessive upset. Cain described the punishment he was having to endure as **'more than I can bear. Today you are driving me from the land, and I will be hidden from your presence; I will be a restless wanderer on the earth'**—an accurate depiction of the terrible, blind, deathly dark cave-like state of alienation that humans had to endure when they became resigned to living a life of denial of their corrupted condition. Once upset developed humans had no choice other than to live **'hidden from'** the **'presence'** of the condemning truth of integrative meaning as guilt-afflicted, distressed, **'restless wanderer**[s] **on the earth'**. The account of Cain being worried that he had been so destructive that **'whoever finds me will kill me'** and of **'the Lord'** countering with **'Not so; if anyone kills Cain, he will suffer vengeance'** and **'put**[ting] **a mark on Cain so that no one who found him would kill him'** is a deeply insightful account of the emergence of compassion for the upset state of the human condition. Cain saying **'whoever finds me will kill me'** is an accurate summary of the fact that if there was no compassion towards upset then upset humans *would be* totally condemnable, deserving of death. The fact that upset humans are not condemned to death, that in fact such condemnation was, as Moses so pointedly said, forbidden, is a recognition of the eventual emergence of compassion for upset in the lives and world of humans. The **'mark on Cain'**, that would identify him as an upset person who should be treated with compassion, is the depression that the upset, corrupted, guilt-ridden state has caused humans. While upset, human-condition-afflicted humans learnt to live in denial of their corrupted state and find as many ways as possible to think positively about themselves, all the denial and efforts to do so was designed to keep at bay an underlying depression that the truth of their upset state caused them. Although upset, human-condition-afflicted humans went to great lengths to present a positive representation of themselves to themselves and to the world, the fact is depression has been the dominant characteristic—the **'mark on Cain'**—of the lives of humans living under the duress of the human condition.

Moses' account of the descendants of Adam and Eve building cities and turning to all kinds of occupations and trades is an accurate account of the emergence of division of labour and occupation in society.

The final section of the first chapters of Genesis before the emergence of Abraham describes the story of Noah and his ark. While the story of Cain and Abel provides an overview summation of what happened to humans in their two million-year-long journey from innocence to extreme upset, the story of Noah's Ark focuses on the most significant yet least acknowledged event in that journey, namely humans' resignation to living in denial of the issue of the human condition as the only means of coping with it. Resignation was explained in Part 3:8.

The great flood in the story of Noah's Ark is a metaphorical description of the most cataclysmic event that occurred in humanity's corrupting search for knowledge, the time when Resignation became an almost universal phenomenon amongst humans. There was a time

when all humans were sufficiently free of corruption and innocent, to be able to go through life without ever having to resign themselves to blocking out the issue of the human condition and any truths that brought that issue into focus, which, as we have seen, was nearly every truth—a time in fact when all humans were innocent, denial-free, truthful thinking prophets. However, as the search for knowledge developed and corruption increased, more and more people needed to resign themselves to a life of denial to cope with their suicidally depressing corrupted condition. Eventually there came a time when almost every adolescent was growing up sufficiently corrupted in soul to have to adopt the strategy of Resignation to a life of denial to avoid the depression that their upset, corrupted, divisive condition would have otherwise caused them—a time when Resignation and the extremely competitive, aggressive, must-prove-that-I-am-not-bad, egocentric way of living became a normal part of adult human life.

The Noah's Ark metaphor describes this time in our species' past when Resignation and its denial of any truths that bring the issue of the human condition into focus—including oppression and repression of our cooperation-and-loving-behaviour-demanding instinctive self or soul—became almost universal amongst humans. It describes the time when Resignation **'flooded'** (Gen. 7:24) the world and our soul and all its truths went under, were drowned, **'wiped out'** (Gen. 7:23). It describes the time when the innocent, truthful world of our soul was pushed into our subconscious, out of conscious awareness, and in its place the highly competitive, egocentric, 'give-me-liberty-or-give-me-death', 'I-am-never-going-to-accept-that-I-am-bad' way of living emerged.

The only ones to escape the horror of humanity's Resignation—the great 'drowning' of humans—were the very few exceptionally innocent people or prophets, symbolised by Noah, and the few innocent animals that Noah's upset-free, loving state protected from all the extremely upset, brutal, innocence-hating, nature-attacking, I-hate-criticism, anger in the rest of humanity. As Moses said, **'Noah was a righteous man, blameless among the people of his time, and he walked with God** [he did not have to deny integrative meaning]**…God saw how corrupt the earth had become, for all the people on earth had corrupted their ways. So God said to Noah, "… make yourself an ark…I am going to bring floodwaters on the earth…Everything on earth will perish** [the innocent, soulful, natural world and all the denial-free truths will perish when people resign to a life of angry, egocentric denial]**. But I will establish my covenant with you** [but from here on I will depend on prophets to preserve the truth of integrative meaning and all the other great truths that relate to it]**, and you will enter the ark…Go into the ark** [stay free of the cave-like dead, drowned state of denial]**, you and your whole family, because I have found you righteous in this generation. Take with you…** [representations] **of every kind of…animal…to keep the various kinds alive throughout the earth"'** (Gen. 6:9,12,14,17,18; 7:1-3).

The Bushmen people of southern Africa have a word for prophets that employs a similar analogy to the story of Noah's Ark: **'Samutchoso'**, which means 'he who is left after the harvest', a reference to the few stalks of wheat that are left standing upright after a harvest. Only an exceptionally innocent few don't have to resign to living a dishonest life of denial of the issue of the human condition and of any truths that bring that issue into focus, which is nearly all truths. I learnt of this description the Bushmen have for prophets from Sir Laurens van der Post's 1958 book *The Lost World of the Kalahari*. In that book Sir Laurens describes meeting a Bushman **'prophet and healer'** named **'Samutchoso'**, which the Bushmen told him

meant **'He who was left after the reaping'** (pp.159,129 of 253). Christ too was referred to as **'the firstborn from among the dead'** (Col. 1:18), the only one left psychologically alive when alienation spread across the Earth. In Ecclesiastics in the Bible it says, **'God made mankind upright** [uncorrupted]**, but men have gone in search of many schemes** [understandings]**'** (7:29)—we went in search of understanding and then had to resign to a life of deadening, drowned, **'upright**[less]**'** denial.

Moses then said that God relented, saying, **'Never again will I curse the ground because of man, even though every inclination of his heart is evil from childhood. And never again will I destroy all living creatures, as I have done'** (Gen. 8:21). **'Then God blessed Noah and his sons, saying to them, "Be fruitful and increase in number and fill the earth. The fear and dread of you will fall upon…every creature that moves…they are given into your hands…I now give you everything…But…I will demand an accounting from every animal. And from each man, too, I will demand an accounting for the life of his fellow man…I now establish my covenant with you and with your descendants after you and with every living creature that was with you"'** (Gen. 9:1-10). We can understand what Moses means: after Resignation, the great 'drowning', humans rapidly became more and more upset such that **'fear and dread of you** [the now extremely upset human race] **will fall upon…every creature that moves'**. In this situation where upset was becoming extreme, ever stronger forms of restraint had to be developed to maintain order and functionality and prevent upset from getting out of hand—if **'an accounting from every animal. And from each man, too… for the life of his fellow man'** was to be maintained. Upset had to be contained, a **'covenant'** or agreement had to be reached and maintained between behaving in an extremely upset way and behaving ideally. Basically upset was no longer seen as being entirely evil. God, as it were, had relented on that view. Compassion and tolerance had emerged for upset humans **'even though every inclination of…**[their] **heart is evil from childhood.' 'But'** there was also a limit to the compassion and tolerance; upset humans had to stay **'account**[able]**'** or *responsible* for their actions. With this structure in place, upset was able to be contained and a semblance of functionality and order achieved allowing upset humans to build great cities with heroic, egocentric, we-are-absolute-legends-not-villains skyscrapers—**'a city, with a tower that reached to the heavens'**, the tower of **'Babel'**. Different **'language**[s]**'** developed and humans **'scattered…over the face of the whole earth'** (Gen. 11:4-9).

The story of Cain and Abel recognised the overall principle that once humans became variously upset and at odds with each other, they had to learn to contain or **'master'** their upset. The story of Noah's Ark focused on Resignation and the need to contain the extreme upset that developed after Resignation, namely the need for Imposed Discipline and for Religion. Of the three most functional ways of **'master**[ing]**'** or containing or 'civilising' upset of Self Discipline, Imposed Discipline and Religion, the Self Discipline stage happened well before the Resignation stage that the flood in the story of Noah's Ark describes. As was explained in Part 3:11A, in the life of an individual corrupted human today they become frustrated with the imperfection of their lives when they are around nine years of age—the so-called 'naughty nines'—and as a result have to quickly learn to restrain their upset, learn Self Discipline. As mentioned in Part 3:11D, this Self Disciplined state became a normal part of adult human behaviour long ago in our species' past, long before the resigned state of denial became universal amongst adult humans. What the end of the story of Noah focuses on therefore is those forms of functional restraint that had to be developed after Resignation when upset became so great that self-restraint could no longer manage it, namely Imposed Discipline

and Religion. It was only through these two strong containment devices that the **'covenant'** of **'account**[ability]**'** could be maintained. The difficulty was that the development of Imposed Discipline and Religion required the involvement of exceptionally sound, denial-free thinkers or prophets, which the story of Noah's Ark recognised with its focus on the importance of Noah as the only human left uncorrupted and not resigned to a life of blind, dishonest denial and who could therefore lead humanity.

After establishing in the story of Noah's Ark the need to maintain restraint of the extreme upset that developed after Resignation, Moses went on to describe the development of the functional methods of restraint that the Noah's Ark story recognised as necessary. He went on to describe how he developed the Religion that Abraham had initiated of deferring to one true God, and how he introduced the Imposed Discipline of the Ten Commandments. We can see then that in his stories of Adam and Eve, Cain and Abel and Noah's Ark, together with his account of Abraham's and his own journey, Moses perfectly described all the major events in the development and management of the upset state of the human condition. It was an absolutely extraordinary achievement.

Again, even if the story of Noah's Ark was an Israelite tradition passed down to Moses, as it and the stories of Adam and Eve and of Cain and Abel most likely were, since such memorable tales with their strong central characters seem steeped in oral tradition, Moses had to be able to recognise its significance to incorporate it so prominently and sequentially in his extraordinarily accurate, contexting, denial-free history of the main events in humanity's journey to find liberating understanding of our species' upset human condition.

It should be mentioned that the description of Noah as being **'a righteous man, blameless among the people'** is an accurate description and acknowledgment of the innocent state of prophets. There is a similar description for Moses in Numbers 12:3: **'Now Moses was a very humble man, more humble than anyone else on the face of the earth.'** And, as was mentioned earlier, in Matthew 11:29, Christ similarly said **'I am gentle and humble in heart, and you will find rest for your souls. For my yoke is easy and my burden is light.'** As has been mentioned before, Sir Laurens van der Post was an exceptional denial-free thinker or prophet—indeed, in his 20 December 1996 full-page obituary in the *London Times* he was described as **'a prophet'** (view van der Post's obituary that was reproduced in *The Australian* at <www.humancondition.com/vanderpost-obituary>). The former Prime Minister of England, Baroness Thatcher, described him as being **'the most perfect man I have ever met'** (interview with J.D.F. Jones, ABC Radio, *Late Night Live*, 25 Feb. 2002). Charles Darwin is not normally recognised as a prophet but the penetrating truthfulness of his work reveals that he was and while some of his many enemies tried to suggest he was egocentric the very opposite was true, he was soul-centric, as this quote points out: **'In vain was Darwin's life scrutinized for the moral weakness that his enemies were sure must underlie his free thinking. All they could discover was a gentle old fellow who passed his days amid flowers and with children—his two greatest delights. Never by any word of his was God denied, nor the soul of man'** (*Great Lives, Great Deeds*, Reader's Digest, 1966, p.335-336).

The gentleness of real prophets should not be confused with the artificial gentleness that new-age-guru-and-eastern-mystic type false prophets present to the world from having manufactured happiness by transcending the whole issue of their upset self, or from artificially attaining inner peace by meditative extinction of thought. As was mentioned

earlier, pseudo-idealistic, false prophets were merchants of delusion: they promoted ways to escape confrontation with the underlying issue of the human condition whereas true prophets addressed that issue **'face to face'** (Deut. 34:10). True prophets were immensely courageous in their resistance to denial and as a result were exceptionally capable of defying and penetrating all the lies on Earth. Basically they were extraordinarily strong in the amount of soul they had guiding and supporting them. The denial-free-thinking Lebanese prophet Kahlil Gibran (1883-1931) spoke the truth about the real strength of prophets—that their immense gentleness and sensitivity could seem, to proponents of pseudo gentleness and sensitivity, to be inconsistent with—when he said about Christ: **'Humanity looks upon Jesus the Nazarene as a poor-born who suffered misery and humiliation with all of the weak. And He is pitied, for Humanity believes He was crucified painfully…And all that Humanity offers to Him is crying and wailing and lamentation. For centuries Humanity has been worshipping weakness in the person of the saviour. The Nazarene was not weak! He was strong and is strong! But the people refuse to heed the true meaning of strength. Jesus never lived a life of fear, nor did He die suffering or complaining…He lived as a leader; He was crucified as a crusader; He died with a heroism that frightened His killers and tormentors. Jesus was not a bird with broken wings; He was a raging tempest who broke all crooked wings. He feared not His persecutors nor His enemies. He suffered not before His killers. Free and brave and daring He was. He defied all despots and oppressors. He saw the contagious pustules and amputated them…He muted evil and He crushed Falsehood and He choked Treachery'** (*The Treasured Writings of Kahlil Gibran*, 1951, pp.231–232 of 902).

It has to be emphasised again what an absolutely exceptional prophet Moses was and what an incredibly important role he has played for humanity. Moses presented the complete denial-free history of humanity—*all* the major stages that humankind has progressed through. The story of Adam and Eve described how the human race once lived in an uncorrupted, innocent state and then, when we became fully conscious, our upset angry, egocentric and alienated state appeared. Included in this story of the appearance of upset is the acknowledgment that humanity became patriarchal, or male-role led, and the acknowledgment that sex became perverted, with all the consequences of that. Then, in the story of Cain and Abel, Moses acknowledged the emergence of the different degrees of upset, of innocence and alienation, amongst humans, and how the development of upset became so great that the more upset turned on the more innocent and began to oppress, attack and even kill them for their unjust condemnation of the more upset state. The story of Cain and Abel also described how compassion appeared, and how the rapidly developing upset had to be contained or **'master**[ed]**'**. Then, in the story of Noah, Moses recognised the advent of that most significant of all events in human life under the duress of the human condition of Resignation to a life of denial of the issue of the human condition. The story of Noah also recognised that after Resignation upset intensified to the point where we had to learn stronger forms of restraint and how only prophets with their ability to think truthfully were left to lead humanity in the development of such restraints. Moses then described the first two of the three stages of the prophet-led journey to the liberation of humanity, which was his contribution of the Imposed Discipline of the Ten Commandments and the development of the Religion of deferring to a one true God that Abraham had begun. (Plato contributed the third stage, namely of

initiating and orientating the actual search for understanding of the human condition.) With these developments sufficient order and functionality in society could be maintained so as to allow humanity to spread across the world, progress depicted by Moses' story of the Tower of Babel. In describing the work of the great prophets who preceded him, Moses also provided humanity with a truthful account of their lives. With the ability now to understand Moses' stories and descriptions of the extraordinary nature and work of prophets we can understand what an absolutely incredible achievement Moses' contribution to humanity was.

With regard to Resignation it should be pointed out that while Resignation was obviously a critically significant event in the history of humanity, until the human condition and with it Resignation was able to be explained, as has now finally been done, this metaphorical description of Resignation by Moses some 3,500 years ago is, to my knowledge, the only fully developed account ever given of it. Such has been the extent of the great black-out of denial and its alienation on Earth.

It should also be pointed out that while the meanings of Moses' stories and metaphorical descriptions may not have been clear to denial-practicing, alienated humans, the fact is the truthful, subconscious, soulful self within all humans could recognise their truth and, as a result, find great comfort from their insightful honesty, a psychological comfort that was another of Moses' awesome contributions to humanity. Evidence that upset humans did have a way of recognising the immense truth contained in his stories and accounts is the reverence accorded to him in Judaism, Christianity and Islam. For example, **'Moses is mentioned by name more than any other person…**[in] **the Koran** [the holy book of Islam]**'** (*The Koran*, by S. Murata & W. Chittick, Accessed Sept 2009: see <www.wtmsources.com/195>).

With the human condition now compassionately explained, all the great truths in all of the Bible, such as the important events in the human journey that Moses described in his stories, can be explained in clear, non-metaphorical, non-abstract, first principle, scientific, denial-free terms, which means the psychological comforting effect of knowing about our lives and humanity's history will be infinitely better than the psychological comforting effect Moses' extremely abstract and metaphorical descriptions were able to supply. We can fully emerge from Plato's dark, death-like cave state now.

As has been pointed out, not only did Moses establish a system of laws or Imposed Discipline, and a denial-free contexting and orientating history of humanity that humans could see themselves as part of, he also furthered the initiative of Abraham of establishing a Religion that would counter the extremely corrupt behaviour of people. Abraham and Moses established the Religion of deferring to, or obeying, or subordinating your upset self to the one true God of integrative meaning. To live out your angry, egocentric and alienated self was to behave in defiance of the integrative ideals. God, the integrative ideals was very confronting and oppressive, but to live in total defiance of the integrative ideals led to social disintegration.

Earlier it was mentioned that Christ gave humanity the strongest possible corruption-and-denial-countering Religion. This now needs to be explained. Unlike Christ, Abraham and Moses didn't go as far as to say that they were themselves uncorrupted representations of God.

Christ said he was the Son of God, the uncorrupted denial and alienation-free expression of our integratively-orientated, cooperative, loving, all-sensitive original instinctive self or soul: **'I tell you the truth, the Son can do nothing by himself; he can do only what he sees his Father doing, because whatever the Father does the Son also does. For the Father loves the Son and shows him all he does** [Christ is saying there is nothing—no alienation—standing between his conscious self and his integratively-orientated instinctive self]**…I tell you the truth, whoever hears my word and believes him who sent me has eternal life and will not be condemned; he has crossed over from death to life** [If you defer to Christ rather than live through your upset self you will be a force for good instead of bad in the world and that will bring you such relief you will feel like you have been reborn]**. I tell you the truth, a time is coming and has now come when the dead** [the alienated] **will hear the voice of the Son of God and those who hear will live. For as the Father has life in himself, so he has granted the Son to have life in himself. And he has given him authority to judge because he is the Son of Man** [because he is not alienated from our truthful, integratively-orientated, all-sensitive soul]**…By myself I can do nothing; I judge only as I hear, and my judgment is just, for I seek not to please myself but him who sent me** [I am not an upset angry, egocentric and alienated resigned person]**'** (John 5:19-30). Christ also said, **'I and the Father are one'** (John 10:30), **'The Father is in me, and I in him'** (John 14:10, 10:38), and **'I am the way and the truth and the life** [through me you can come back to life from your resigned, alienated, effectively dead state]**'** (John 14:6). Christ has clearly said here that he was the embodiment of the ideal state that God or integrativeness represents; that he was an uncorrupted expression of the innocent, cooperative, loving, soulful, ideal state, and that corrupted humans could live through him, could trust in and safely defer to and subordinate themselves to him when they become overly corrupted.

In his 1989 book *What Am I Doing Here*, the aforementioned English explorer and philosopher Bruce Chatwin acknowledged this truth that Christ was the innocent, uncorrupted expression of our species' integratively-orientated, original instinctive self: **'There is no contradiction between the Theory of Evolution and belief in God and His Son on earth. If Christ were the perfect instinctual specimen—and we have every reason to believe He was—He must be the Son of God. By the same token, the First Man was also Christ'** (p.65 of 367). As was mentioned earlier, and as Chatwin has acknowledged here, before upset (and with it Resignation) became universal, all humans were innocent denial-free thinking prophets.

By putting himself forward as the embodiment of the ideal state Christ was 'humanising' the ideal state. It was far more tangible to relate to a human representation of the ideal state than to a remote, abstract representation of the ideal state in the form of the concept of God, as Abraham and Moses advocated. A human representation of the ideal state reminded humans that humans could be ideal. This was far more confronting than having to relate to a remote, abstract concept of the ideal state but it was also far more honest and thus denial-defying and denial-correcting. Christ was in effect saying that an uncorrupted human state exists because he was the personification of that human example—God, the integrative, ideal state has, does and can exist on Earth. Through Christ, corrupted humans could have the most direct access possible to the ideal state because like them he was another human, but an ideal version. Christ, as it were, brought the ideal human state right into the reality of the living rooms of people's lives, brought them into contact with another human just like themselves but one who was free of denial and alienation. Ideality was made human, real and tangible through Christ. As such, Christ gave humanity the strongest possible corruption-and-denial-countering Religion.

Abraham and Moses said they were servants of God, and Muhammad acknowledged he was a prophet of God, his messenger, but none of them said that they were the *Son* of God, a human representation of God, as Christ did. Christ knew how extraordinarily sound he was, and he knew how corrupted and lost people were, and he could see that being so sound his responsibility was to put himself forward as a living, human representation of the ideal state that humans could most directly recognise, relate to, trust in and live through. Of course offering people such a denial-countering, honest, ideal-human-revealing religion made the Christian religion an exceptionally corruption-exposing and confronting religion, which for some could prove too exposing and confronting.

Overall, Christ stood as witness to the existence of another soulful, uncorrupted, all-loving *human* state. His was the ultimate denial-defying and corruption-correcting act—and the denial and corruption on Earth had become so great that such an extreme denial-countering and corruption-correcting representation of the ideal human state *was* necessary if the human race was to maintain any semblance of alignment to the ideal human state while it was completing its heroic but immensely corrupting search for the liberating understanding of its human condition. As Christ described his denial-and-corruption-countering strategy: **'If I had not come and spoken to them** [spoken the truth about the integrative, cooperative, loving ideal state to the extremely upset human race]**, they would not be guilty of sin. Now, however, they have no excuse for their sin. He who hates me hates my Father** [hates the integrative truth] **as well. If I had not done among them what no-one else did** [if I had not been a witness for the existence of the uncorrupted human state]**, they would not be guilty of sin** [they would not have been sufficiently re-aligned to the integrative state]**'** (John 15:21-24). What Christ did was so clear-sighted and so courageous it is almost beyond belief. It is no wonder he is **'the most famous man in the world'** (*Jesus Revealed*, produced by Creative Differences for National Geographic Channel, 2009) and that most of the world dates its existence around his life, as either BC or AD—'Before Christ' or 'Anno Domini', which translates as 'in the year of our Lord', referring to the year of Christ's birth. Sir James Darling, the aforementioned great Australian educator and denial-free thinker or prophet (in his full-page obituary in *The Australian* newspaper on 3 November 1995 he was described as **'a prophet in the true biblical sense'** [view Darling's obituary at <www.humancondition.com/darling-obituary>]), rightly considered that Christ's life **'was incalculably the most important event in human history, as we understand it, up to the present'** (*The Education of a Civilized Man*, 1962, p.206 of 223).

It can be seen then that Moses gave humanity the most effective form of Imposed Discipline, Christ gave humanity the strongest possible corruption-and-denial-countering Religion, and Plato gave philosophy—the actual business of studying the truths underlying all reality, in particular studying and finding the all-important understanding of the human condition—the best possible orientation and assistance. We can now understand why, for example, **'It has been said that after the Bible** [which features the teachings of Moses and Christ]**, Plato's dialogues are the most influential books in Western culture'** (From the inside flap of Plato's *Symposium and Phaedrus*, published by Everyman's Library in 2001).

The great eastern Religions, in particular Hinduism and Buddhism, were also founded around exceptional denial-free thinking prophets and these great Religions and their prophets played a similar role in civilising the great civilisations in their parts of the world, as must the great prophets of the Americas and other regions of the world. These other great civilisations

contributed greatly to the advancement of knowledge in the Western world, just as advances in the West assisted them. Just where the leading edge in the advancement of knowledge was occurring at any one time depended on what stage in the human journey from innocence to exhaustion or decadence the various civilisations were at, so it is in truth meaningless passing out accolades to any particular individual, race or civilisation.

With understanding of the human condition we can now appreciate that every human who has ever lived and therefore every civilisation that has ever existed contributed fully to the journey to our species' final liberation from the horror of the human condition. Some individuals, generations, races and civilisations were more innocent than others and could make exceptional contributions from that position, but being more innocent only meant that they had not yet participated in the great battle to defeat ignorance which humanity as a whole was waging. With understanding of the human condition we can know that no one is inferior or superior, only differently exhausted from their different position in the great battle that humanity as a whole has been waging. In fact the concepts of 'good' and 'evil' disappear from the conceptualisation of ourselves and therefore from our languages.

With understanding of the human condition we can know that all humans are equally wonderful beings—and since we all, humanity as a whole, won the great battle against ignorance and finally championed nature's greatest invention, the fully conscious mind, it follows that humanity as a whole is the absolute hero of the story of life on Earth. Humanity achieved the greatest success imaginable. This is the end of all doubt and uncertainty about our species' worthiness, in fact this is the time for the most wonderful celebration the world has ever seen!

(Note: religious concepts are further demystified later in the chapter titled 'The Demystification of Religion' in my book *A Species In Denial*.)

Part 10:2 The Three Varieties of Thinkers

From all that has been presented about the difficulties of thinking about the human condition it should be clear that human thought has fallen into three categories. There has been thinking undertaken in an unresigned, denial-free, truthful and thus effective, prophetic way; thinking that tried to do so as truthfully and honestly as possible from a position of having resigned to living in denial of the human condition; and thinking in a way that was fully committed to the resigned strategy of denying the issue of the human condition. Put simply, you could confront the human condition, you could avoid it but try to be as honest as possible, or you could determinedly deny it.

For example, earlier in Part 4, when looking at the history of biological analysis of our human situation, we saw how Darwin took honest, truthful thinking about humans' biological origins as far as it was able to go without confronting the human condition. Then we saw how E.O. Wilson, Robert Wright and others developed a biological account of human behaviour that was committed to denying the issue of the human condition.

It needs to be emphasised here again that the key, yet totally denied, issue in understanding human behaviour as it has existed for some two million years under the duress

of the human condition is alienation. As R.D. Laing said, **'Our alienation goes to the roots. The realization of this is the essential springboard for any serious reflection on any aspect of present inter-human life.'** Acknowledgment or **'realization'** that **'our alienation goes to the roots'** *is* **'the essential springboard for any serious reflection on any aspect of present inter-human life'**. To not recognise the element of alienation when attempting to understand and talk about human behaviour is really as absurd as trying to understand and talk about how bread is made while not admitting the process involves flour. The problem has been that precisely because **'our alienation goes to the roots'** we haven't been able to acknowledge that truth, make that **'realization'**. We haven't been able to be alienated and not be alienated—which is precisely why what was needed to look into alienation and thus human behaviour was freedom from alienation. Alienation can't investigate itself. We can't be living in a state of denial/insecurity about the human condition/psychosis (which literally means soul-illness, derived as the word is from 'psyche' meaning 'soul' and 'iasis' meaning 'abnormal state or condition')/truth-evasion/alienation/corruption/dysfunction/upset/hurt and at the same time not be living in a state of denial/insecurity/psychosis/soul-illness/truth-evasion/alienation/corruption/dysfunction/upset/hurt. We can't be committed to being false and at the same time be committed to being honest. We can't lie and simultaneously tell the truth. We haven't been able to acknowledge our condition while we couldn't confront it. Alienation has been the denied 'elephant in the living room' of the lives of humans, the main feature of human behaviour in the world today, but the one that hasn't been able to be universally acknowledged—until now. It is only now with the dignifying understanding of the human condition found that it becomes both safe and necessary to acknowledge alienation, and the degrees of it, in order to undertake **'serious reflection on…**[all] **aspect**[s] **of present inter-human life'**.

There is much to learn about in the new denial-free world, most of all about alienation, its characteristics and the extent to which it exists within us all. The main distinction that can and must be made is that between unresigned, denial-and-alienation-free minds, and resigned, denial-practicing, alienated minds. A denial-free thinker is someone who was sufficiently free from hurt in their infancy and childhood to not have to resign themselves to living in denial of the issue of the human condition in their adolescence. Not living in such denial meant that the denial-free, truthful, effective thinkers or prophets were thinking in a completely different way to resigned, denial-practicing, evasive, ineffective minds.

While this freedom from denial, or alternatively, commitment to it, has been the main difference that has existed in human minds there has also existed degrees of soundness within the two categories. While denial-free thinkers or prophets could think truthfully because they had avoided Resignation, they did vary in how sound they were and thus how easily and effectively they were able to confront and think about the issue of the human condition, and any subject related to it, which is virtually all subjects. We have already seen in the analysis of the life of Moses and other Old Testament prophets how some of them were more able to confront God/the integrative ideals **'face to face'** than others. Similarly, amongst those individuals who had to resign themselves to living in denial of the issue of the human condition there has existed a spectrum of soundness whereby some were more sound and as a result could afford to think more truthfully than others.

To illustrate the overall situation, a mind could be just sound enough to have avoided Resignation and yet that mind would be almost totally different in the way it thought to the mind of someone who was nearly as sound as that person but not quite sound enough to have avoided Resignation. In this instance, the resigned mind had become committed to denial of the human condition and any issues that brought the subject into focus, while the other mind hadn't. One mind had become committed to and practiced in lying while the other hadn't. In terms of the issue being looked at here of being able to find understanding of the human condition, once a mind became resigned to denial its ability to find that understanding, despite its attempts or intentions to do so, was severely limited.

The first two categories of thinkers mentioned above were denial-free thinkers and those who were resigned to living in denial but were sound enough to try to think honestly about issues related to the human condition. Because both these categories were involved in thinking honestly they can be termed as Unresigned Prophets and Resigned Prophets. The Resigned Prophets, those who tried to think from a basis of honesty even though they were not sound enough to avoid having to resign to living in denial of the human condition obviously ran the risk of becoming psychologically destabilised, dangerously depressed. Trying to think truthfully and honestly when you weren't sound enough to do so required great courage but such thinkers could and have managed to contribute valuable insights about human life—they have managed to be prophetic, hence their description, 'Resigned Prophets'.

(Before going on it should be emphasised once again that with understanding of the human condition we can know that while humans differ in their degree of alienation as a result of their differing encounters with and participation in humanity's heroic battle to find sufficient knowledge to liberate our species from the human condition, all humans are equally good and worthwhile. No one is inferior or superior. In fact, as mentioned earlier, the concepts of good and evil disappear from the conceptualisation of ourselves and therefore from our languages.)

With this overview of there having been three fundamental categories of thinkers—Unresigned Prophets, Resigned Prophets and Dishonest Thinkers, with the latter being those who are resigned and committed to denying the issue of the human condition—we are now in a position to look more closely at Unresigned Prophets, those few people in recorded history who have been able to confront and think honestly about the human condition.

Part 10:3 Unresigned Prophets

Individuals who fall within the first category of Unresigned Prophets, as has already been explained, are extremely rare. In a 1983 interview between myself and the distinguished Australian zoologist, author and broadcaster Anthony Barnett, who was then Professor of Zoology at the Australian National University in Canberra, emphasised the rarity of denial-free thinkers when he said that **'In the whole of written history there are only two or three people who have been able to think on this** [all-confronting, macro] **scale about the human condition'** (From recorded interview conducted with Prof. Barnett by this author, 15 Jan. 1983). I didn't ask Professor Barnett who he thought the **'two or three people'** were but I imagined he was referring to Christ and one or two of the other

prophets around which great religions were formed. Plato might have been one of the people he was thinking of but I cannot be sure. Later I will list those individuals from contemporary times, the last 300 years or so, whom I think can be regarded as either Unresigned or Resigned Prophets. Of those, the ones who have lived since Darwin put forward his idea of natural selection in 1859, and who therefore had the benefit of his insight into the orientating mechanism of instincts, are Charles Darwin himself (1809–1882), Friedrich Nietzsche (1844–1900), Olive Schreiner (1855–1920), A. B. 'Banjo' Paterson (1864–1941), Eugène Marais (1872–1936), Nikolai Berdyaev (1874–1948), Carl Jung (1875-1961), Pierre Teilhard de Chardin (1881–1955), Kahlil Gibran (1883–1931), D.W. Winnicott (1896–1971), Sir James Darling (1899–1995), Antoine de Saint-Exupéry (1900–1944), Louis Leakey (1903–1972), Joseph Campbell (1904–1987), Arthur Koestler (1905–1983), Sir Laurens van der Post (1906–1996), Simone Weil (1909–1943), Albert Camus (1913–1960), Ilya Prigogine (1917–2003), Charles Birch (1918–2009), Robert A. Johnson (1921–), John Morton (1924–2011), R.D. Laing (1927–1989), Dian Fossey (1938–1985), Stuart Kauffman (1939–), Paul Davies (1946–), and, since I have been able to look into and explain the human condition, myself (1945–). In terms of which of these may have been able to explain the human condition before 1983 when I took the explanation to England, we can begin by considering who amongst them, apart from myself, were Unresigned Prophets—because, as stated, it was going to require an exceptional denial-free thinker to explain the human condition and such a thinker would have to come from the Unresigned Prophet category. Certainly in my view Sir Laurens van der Post was an Unresigned Prophet. Possibly so too were Sir James Darling, Charles Darwin and Pierre Teilhard de Chardin. I am confident all the others belong in the category of Resigned Prophets. Thus the candidates for an exceptional denial-free thinking, human-condition-solving prophet are van der Post, Darling, Darwin and de Chardin. Since no one had, to my knowledge, explained the human condition prior to 1983, none of these four men could have been exceptional denial-free thinkers because if they had been they would have explained it, so crucial an issue is the human condition to a mind that is exceptionally free of denial and so accessible an explanation is it for such a mind that has the benefit of Darwin's idea of natural selection. There are possibly other post-1859 Unresigned Prophets who I have not become aware of, although it is remarkable how each one of them became aware of the others so that if there are more I suspect I would have read or heard about them through references to them made by those I have become aware of. While there are billions of people and many cultures in the world, there are only a few regions left where a degree of innocence survives, and in a realm where there is a good education system in place to protect and foster soundness while giving access to the history of knowledge. Even if there are others who I have not become aware of the same argument applies: since the human condition wasn't, to my knowledge, explained before 1983 an educated and exceptionally unresigned thinker seemingly didn't exist among them.

So, the situation is that if van der Post, Darling, Darwin and de Chardin were Unresigned Prophets but were unable to explain the human condition then they can't have been exceptional denial-free thinking, human-condition-solving, Unresigned Prophets. In the earlier mentioned spectrum of soundness that existed amongst Unresigned Prophets, it appears that these men must fall into those not sufficiently sound to explain the human condition, as will now be explained.

At this point what needs to be explained again is how when we were young children and still thinking completely honestly and thus effectively we knew the truth about our destiny. We didn't know exactly what would happen in our adult lives but we did know the general form it would take as a result of how hurt our original instinctive self or soul was in our infancy and early childhood. This was briefly explained in Part 10:1 when the prophet Joseph's authoritativeness as a young man was described. From a young age Joseph knew he would be able to achieve extraordinary things because he was sufficiently sound and secure to not ever have to adopt a strategy of denial. When we are children we have a clear awareness of the imperfections or otherwise of our circumstances and think truthfully about the consequences. If those circumstances were not ideal, as was the case in nearly everyone's lives, then we rapidly began to stop thinking about those unhappy consequences, but the point is there was a time in everyone's life when we knew the basic path our life was going to follow. In that brief time in our early childhood of total honesty and thus insightfulness we all knew of the immense problem facing humanity of the dilemma of the human condition, the issue of the extreme imperfection of human life and, knowing that crux problem, we made an assessment of our chances of being able to contribute to its solution. For the very rare exceptionally fortunate, those exceptionally loved and nurtured in their infancy and early childhood, they knew they could make a difference and the precise nature of it. When we talked of people being driven by a 'vision' this is essentially what we were talking about. We were talking about an awareness in someone of having the opportunity to make a special contribution to the underlying battle that humanity has been engaged in. People with such guiding visions were very difficult to deter from their path because they were carrying such a strong awareness of what they could and must do from such a young age that it was as if they were owned or possessed by their vision. As they progressed through life all the battles they would face would erode the clarity of the vision they had as a child but such visions were so powerful they would still be owned, directed and guided by it. All those who couldn't see a way for themselves to make an exceptional contribution to humanity's battle to overcome the problem of the human condition and instead who saw how they were going to have to be preoccupied with all manner of hurt, and in particular need for self-distraction and egocentric reinforcement, they learnt very quickly to forget their unhappy destiny. Everyone was born a truthful, denial-free thinking and thus insightful prophet, but few could afford to stay thinking so truthfully and insightfully. Most had to forget what they could see, just get on with their life as best they could. As will be described in more detail when Resignation is fully explained later, while the main Resignation to the imperfections of life typically occurred when people were about fifteen years of age, there were many mini resignations prior to that major one.

This quote from Sir Laurens van der Post recognises the essence of what has just been explained: **'Human beings know far more than they allow themselves to know: there is a kind of**

knowledge of life which they reject, although it is born into them: it is built into them' (*A Walk with a White Bushman*, 1986, p.142 of 326). While knowledge of our particular destiny is not something we are **'born'** with, we *are* born with a depth of soundness and thus sensitivity that does give us a special **'knowledge of life'**.

In the case of Sir Laurens van der Post, Sir James Darling, Charles Darwin and Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, they were all possessed by a vision that they could make a special contribution to overcoming the great and terrible impasse before the human race of the human condition. As we will see, it wasn't a vision of being able to *solve* the human condition but in each case it was a vision of being able to make a valuable contribution towards the finding of that solution. By inference, they knew they weren't sound enough to fully confront and solve the human condition but they did know they were sufficiently sound to make a valuable contribution towards that solution. They saw an opening in that great and terrible impasse before the human race of the problem of the human condition that they realised they had sufficient soundness to push through and advance humanity that much further towards its goal of solving that condition.

The online version of my second book, *Beyond The Human Condition* (1991), contains the following dedication that summarises the vision of three men who had such visions. (While I don't regard Louis Leakey as an Unresigned Prophet, I do think he was a Resigned Prophet, so people who were not sound enough to avoid Resignation could also have a vision in their childhood of making a special contribution to humanity's battle, but obviously the less sound you were the less exceptional the contribution.)

> This book is dedicated to the vision of Sir Laurens van der Post:
>
> **'…for I had a private hope of the utmost importance to me. The Bushman's physical shape combined those of a child and a man: I surmised that examination of his inner life might reveal a pattern which reconciled the spiritual opposites in the human being and made him whole… it might start the first movement towards a reconciliation…'** Laurens van der Post, *The Heart of the Hunter*, 1961, p.135 of 233.
>
> And that of Sir James Darling who acknowledged that:
>
> **'…the future lies not with the predatory and the immune but with the sensitive who live dangerously…the truly sensitive mind is both susceptible and penetrating: it is open to new ideas, and it seeks truth at the bottom of the well. It is the development of this sort of mind which it should be the object of the educational process to cultivate'** James Darling, *The Education of a Civilized Man*, 1962, pp.63-64 of 223.
>
> And that of Dr Louis Leakey who foresaw:
>
> **'…that knowledge of the past would help us to understand and possibly control the future'** Mentioned by Dr Mary Leakey in her book *Disclosing the Past*, 1984, p.211 of 224.

Part 10:4 Sir Laurens van der Post's Vision

The visions of Sir James Darling, Charles Darwin and Pierre Teilhard de Chardin—and Louis Leakey, will be looked at shortly.

With regard to Sir Laurens van der Post's vision, which I summarised in my dedication to him in my 1991 book *Beyond The Human Condition* with this quote from his writing: **'... for I had a private hope of the utmost importance to me. The Bushman's physical shape combined those of a child and a man: I surmised that examination of his inner life might reveal a pattern which reconciled the spiritual opposites in the human being and made him whole…it might start the first movement towards a reconciliation…'** (Laurens van der Post, *The Heart of the Hunter*, 1961, p.135 of 233), his vision was to use the Bushmen or San people of southern Africa, that DNA studies have shown to be the most ancient race of humans alive in the world today, to resurrect the truth that humans once, before the advent of the human condition some two million years ago, lived happy, loving, harmonious, innocent-of-upset lives. Since, as will become clear later, the upset state of the human condition began some two million years ago and has been increasing ever since, the Bushmen, being relatively modern people must be far from being completely free of upset, however compared with the rest of the existing races of humans in the world they are comparatively free of it. As Sir Laurens recognised, in the difference between them and other existing races we can see something of what innocence is like.

The following condensation of the beginning of Sir Laurens' famous first book about the Bushmen, *The Lost World of the Kalahari* (1958), further illustrates Sir Laurens' vision that the quote of his used in my Dedication above evidences: **'This is the story of a journey in a great wasteland** [Kalahari desert] **and a search for some pure remnant of the unique and almost vanished First People of my native land, the Bushmen of Africa…I know…that no sooner did I become aware of myself as a child than my imagination slipped…into a profound pre-occupation with the little Bushman and his terrible fate…Beside the open hearth on cold winters' nights on my mother's farm…the vanished Bushman would be vividly at the centre of some hardy pioneering reminiscence; a Bushman gay, gallant, mischievous, unpredictable, and to the end unrepentant and defiant…He was present in the eyes of one of the first women to nurse me, her shining gaze drawn from the first light of some unbelievably antique African day** [because she had]**…a strain of Bushman blood…The older I grew the more I resented that I had come too late on the scene to know him** [the Bushman] **in the flesh…They said…there had never been anyone who could run like him over the veld…When he laughed, which he did easily, his face broke into innumerable little folds…Whenever my mother read us a fairy-tale with a little man performing wonders in it, he was immediately transformed in my imagination into a Bushman. Perhaps this life of ours, which begins as a quest of the child for the man, and ends as a journey by the man to rediscover the child, needs a clear image of some child-man, like the Bushman, wherein the two are firmly and lovingly joined in order that our confused hearts may stay at the centre of their brief round of departure and return'** (pp.11-13 of 253). Sir Laurens has here recognised and acknowledged how we humans once did live in an innocent, happy, loving state which we then lost, and he has described his vision of reconnecting us with that truth in order that we might better find our way back home to that **'lost world of the Kalahari'**—the Kalahari also being a metaphor for our **'pure'** soul, that **'great wasteland'** of neglected substance and soundness within us.

As further evidence of his vision it is worthwhile including more of Sir Laurens' inspirational, truth-full writing about the Bushmen: **'He** [the Bushman] **and his needs were committed to the nature of Africa and the swing of its wide seasons as a fish to the sea. He and they all participated so deeply of one another's being that the experience could almost be called mystical. For instance, he seemed to *know* what it actually felt like to be an elephant, a lion, an antelope, a steenbuck, a lizard, a striped mouse, mantis, baobab tree, yellow-crested cobra, or starry-eyed amaryllis, to mention only a few of the brilliant multitudes through which he so nimbly moved. Even as a child it seemed to me that his world was one without secrets between one form of being and another'** (*The Lost World of the Kalahari*, 1958, p.21 of 253). **'Wherever he** [the Bushman] **went he contained, and was contained, deeply within a symmetry of the land. His spirit was naturally symmetrical…And there is proof too of the balance and rough justice of his arrangements in the fact that when my ancestors landed on the southern tip of the continent three hundred years ago, Africa was largely bursting its ancient seams with riches of life not found in any other land on earth. Even I who came on the scene so long after the antique lock was picked and the treasure largely plundered, can still catch my breath at the glimpses I get, from time to time, of the riches that remain'** (ibid. p.22). **'He** [the Bushman] **built no home of any durable kind, did not cultivate the land, and did not even keep cattle or other domestic chattel'** (ibid. p.25). The Bushmen possessed an **'astonishing gift of painting…I know one painting where a frightened herd of running eland is shown with such a gift of movement'** (ibid. pp.29,31). **'**[E]**ven his bitterest enemies were forced to reluctantly admit his immense courage'** (ibid. p.42). **'Wounded and bleeding he fought to the last. Shot through one arm…the Bushman would instantly use his knee or foot to enable him to draw his bow with the uninjured one. If his last arrow was spent he still struggled as best he could until, finding the moment of his end had come, he would hasten to cover his head so that his enemies should not see the agony of dying expressed upon his face'** (ibid. p.45). [When you are still in touch with your soul you are in touch with such truth and awareness of another true world that, unlike the alienated, soul-destroyed and lost, you have something precious to hold on to and thus **'immense courage'**.] **'It seemed a strange paradox that everywhere men and women were busy digging up old ruins and buried cities in order to discover more about ancient man, when all the time the ignored Bushman was living with this early spirit still intact. I found men willing enough to come with me to measure his head, or his behind, or his sexual organs, or his teeth. But when I pleaded with the head of a university in my own country to send a qualified young man to live with the Bushman for two or three years, to learn about him and his ancient way he exclaimed, surprised: "But what would be the use of that?"'** (ibid. p.67). [Bereft of soundness, mechanistic science could not look at the whole truth.] **'One of the most moving aspects of life is how long the deepest memories stay with us. It is as if individual memory is enclosed in a greater which even in the night of our forgetfulness stands like an angel with folded wings ready, at the moment of acknowledged need, to guide us back to the lost spoor of our meanings'** (ibid. p.62). **'I thought finally that of all the nostalgias that haunt the human heart the greatest of them all, for me, is an everlasting longing to bring what is youngest home to what is oldest, in us all'** (ibid. p.151). **'You know I once saw a little Bushman imprisoned in one of our goals because he killed a giant bustard which according to the police, was a crime…he was dying because he couldn't bear being shut up and having his freedom of movement stopped…Physically the doctor couldn't find anything wrong with him but he died none the less!'** (ibid. p.236).

In his other great book about the Bushmen, *The Heart of the Hunter* (1961), Sir Laurens wrote that, **'mere contact with twentieth-century life seemed lethal to the Bushman. He was essentially so innocent and natural a person that he had only to come near us for a sort of radioactive fall-out from our unnatural world to produce a fatal leukaemia in his spirit'** (p.111 of 233). In *The Heart of the Hunter* Sir Laurens also wrote that, **'There was indeed a cruelly denied and neglected first child of life, a Bushman in each of us'** (p.126). And on the last page of *The Heart of the Hunter*: **'All this became for me, on my long journey home by sea, an image of what is wanted in the spirit of man today. We live in a sunset hour of time. We need to recognize and develop that aspect of ourselves of which the moon bears the image. It is our own shy intuitions of renewal, which walk in our spiritual night as Porcupine walked by the light of the moon, that need helping on the way. It is as if I hear the wind bringing up behind me the voice of Mantis, the infinite in the small, calling from the stone age to an age of men with hearts of stone, commanding us with the authentic voice of eternal renewal: "You must henceforth be the moon. You must shine at night. By your shining shall you lighten the darkness until the sun rises again to light up all things for men"'** (p.233).

As was explained in Part 5:2, Bruce Chatwin's comment that **'the First man was also Christ'** (from his quote included earlier that **'There is no contradiction between the Theory of Evolution and belief in God and His Son on earth. If Christ were the perfect instinctual specimen—and we have every reason to believe He was—He must be the Son of God. By the same token, the First Man was also Christ'** (*What Am I Doing Here*, 1989, p.65 of 367)), was reminiscent of Sir Laurens' observation that **'The pastor, Dominee Ferdie Weich, though much loved by the Bushmen, could report no permanent conversion to Christ in 21 years'** (*Testament to the Bushmen*, 1984, text accompanying photograph 91). The Bushmen, being Christ-like themselves in their innocence, weren't in need of Christianity. They didn't need a sound person to defer to, live through, be 'born-again' through as a result of being so upset they could no longer afford to trust in and live through themselves. They weren't that upset. In his 1985 book *Black Robe*, the Northern Irish novelist Brian Moore recorded this revealing comment made by an American Indian to Jesuit missionaries in Canada about the comparative innocence of native people: **'It is because you Normans are deaf and blind that you think this world is a world of darkness and the world of the dead is a world of light'** (p.184 of 256).

Elsewhere in his writings about the Bushmen, Sir Laurens wrote of **'This shrill, brittle, self-important life of today is by comparison a graveyard where the living are dead and the dead are alive and talking** [through our soul] **in the still, small, clear voice of a love and trust in life that we have for the moment lost…**[there was a time when] **All on earth and in the universe were still members and family of the early race seeking comfort and warmth through the long, cold night before the dawning of individual consciousness in a togetherness which still gnaws like an unappeasable homesickness at the base of the human heart'** (*Testament to the Bushmen*, 1984, pp.127-128 of 176). Sir Laurens further recognised the battle between our original innocent instinctive self and our newer **'individual consciousness'** when he wrote, **'I spoke to you earlier on of this dark child of nature, this other primitive man within each one of us with whom we are at war in our spirit'** (*The Dark Eye in Africa*, 1955, p.154 of 159).

Significantly, while Sir Laurens was able to clearly recognise the **'war'** between our original, innocent, instinctive soulful **'dark child of nature'** and our newer **'individual conscious'** intellect or **'spirit'** he wasn't able to explain the reason for the **'war'**. His vision, as stated in my Dedication to him, was the **'hope'** that by **'reveal**[ing]**'** the **'inner life'** of the **'child'** in **'man'** he **'might start the first movement towards a reconciliation'**—and that **'hope'** of **'reconciliation'** that, as I will now explain, his work contributed so greatly to is exactly what has been achieved in this book.

Once we became hurt and alienated, hearing about the magic world of our soul was unbearable, which is why all the truth about our soul has been so denied and buried. J.D.F. Jones, a British journalist who wrote a book that tried to crucify Sir Laurens as a charlatan (which is a ridiculous accusation when it could not be more clear from Sir Laurens' writings how sound and secure he was), said in an interview, **'the academic experts on the Kalahari** [Bushmen] **are absolutely berserk with rage about the things he** [Sir Laurens] **said, because, if you read *The Lost World of the Kalahari*, you must not believe that this is the truth about the Bushmen; it's not'** (ABC Radio, *Late Night Live*, 25 Feb. 2002). Throughout history denial-free thinkers like John the Baptist and his protégé Christ were often brutally persecuted, or, like John the Baptist and Christ, even killed for telling the truth. The great danger of such persecution was that while it protected upset humans from unbearable condemnation it also thwarted the expression of truths needed to explain the human condition. In fact, as has been mentioned before, the real threat facing the human race was terminal levels of denial/alienation—a world where humans were walking around in such terrible truthless and meaningless darkness that they could never hope to find their way back to a world of liberating and relieving light/knowledge. To write so honestly about humanity's collective loss of innocence was Sir Laurens' great inspiration and vision. It was an incalculably important contribution to the world because it brought light to an area of denial that was crippling the human race.

I know how precious the truth Sir Laurens resurrected was because it was able to save my soul from extinction. Some time in my late teenage years, my mother, Jill Griffith, gave me a copy of a book by Sir Laurens (I think it was his 1952 book *Venture to the Interior* because I remember the zebras pictured on the cover) and it was this book, and then Sir Laurens' two main books about the Bushmen, *The Lost World of the Kalahari* (1958) and *Heart of the Hunter* (1961), which I sought out soon after reading the first book, that gave me the confirmation I needed that my very different unresigned, denial-free, unevasive way of thinking wasn't some form of madness. As some evidence of how precious Sir Laurens' writings have been to me, my original copies of *The Lost World of the Kalahari* and *Heart of the Hunter* are now so tattered from use they are held together by lots of tape and some string. Many times as a young man, especially when I was at a party, I couldn't contain my complete bewilderment about everyone's denial and pretence that there was nothing wrong with the world, in particular with human behaviour, and ended up protesting out aloud or running away through the night in tears of confusion. To the resigned, alienated person the reason for upset behaviour is self-evident but to the relatively innocent it is a complete mystery, made so much worse by the upset not acknowledging there was anything wrong with their behaviour, in fact pretending that they were completely happy with the way they and the rest of upset humanity were behaving. For example in 1973 when I was 28 years old and had just returned from the wilds of Tasmania where I had been searching for the possibly extinct Tasmanian Tiger or Thylacine (which did turn out to be extinct—you can read more about my search at <www.humancondition.com/tasmanian-tiger-search>) I remember being taken by my girlfriend at the time to a lavish dinner party attended by many of Sydney's young socialites. I think it was Sydney's Black and White Ball, or something like that. I remember I became so overwhelmed by the extravagance of the function and the artificiality and pretence of everyone that I ended up standing on my chair defiantly accusing

everyone in the room of being fake and phony and totally indifferent to the epidemic of suffering in the world. I remember that following my outburst that there was a great silence in the room, then the men in particular turned their backs. My girlfriend then stood up and kindly put her arm around my shoulder and said out aloud so everyone could hear something like, 'Jeremy, the world isn't an ideal place but it's all we have' and persuaded me to sit down, after which everyone returned to their jovialities. On another occasion I remember going to a woolshed party (a woolshed is a big shed used for shearing sheep that offered lots of space for a band, dancing and a party) at Bowral, south of Sydney, and becoming so distressed by everyone's silence about the artificiality of the world and pretence that the world was exactly as it should be, that I ended up running away through the bush for miles and miles until my arms were torn from running through the rough scrub. Eventually I collapsed in a heap on the ground in a state of exhausted distress before eventually walking all the way back to where my friends and I were staying at a residence near the party. I have always had many friends because I have always been outgoing and excited about the world, but when it came to trying to understand why the world wasn't an authentic place, I was deeply perplexed and alone in that regard. In my late teens and twenties there were many occasions like the two just described. I know exactly why Christ in his extreme innocence as a youth frustratedly **'overturned the tables of the money-changers'** in the temple (Matt. 21:12 and Mark 11:15) and later on angrily called the denial-practicing academics of his day **'you, blind guides… you blind fools…you hypocrites…you snakes! You brood of vipers!'** (see Matt. 23:16-33).

As mentioned above and as I have said before in this book, to the resigned and alienated it is self-evident why the world is so false but to the relatively innocent it is a complete and utter mystery, and if the alienated won't admit that they are living in denial, and in fact are pretending to be happy and content, then the mystery of what is going on is truly incredible. My mother once told me that when she was young she thought of joining a monastery and I understand now that that was because she was so innocent and naive that the false and superficial upset world was an almost overwhelming unbearable mystery for her also. The significance of an alienation-free, unresigned mother in producing an alienation-free, unresigned son was explained in Part 10:1 about Moses, Christ and Plato. Given how bewildering a mystery upset behaviour is for innocence it can be appreciated how immensely relieving it was for me to read Sir Laurens' books. As I mentioned, his honesty virtually saved my life; better than that, it encouraged me to hold on to my unusual way of thinking. I was variously being described by people as 'hopelessly idealistic', 'quixotic', 'a dreamer', 'utopian' and, more unkindly, as being 'mad', 'idiotic', 'childish', 'pathetic'; and my ideas as being 'offensive' and 'just plain wrong'. Later in my life I was regularly accused of practicing 'bad science', which I now know only too well is mechanistic science's code words for science that doesn't comply with its evasive, denial-complying etiquette. With the confirmation from Sir Laurens' writing that I wasn't mad I was able to go on thinking unevasively and eventually find my way to the humanity-liberating truth about the human condition. Sir Laurens played a crucial role in producing these liberating understandings of the human condition.

As a boy, Sir Laurens must have also suffered from total bewilderment about the silent, fraudulent, dishonest, deluded, pretentious, arrogant, artificial, escapist world of upset humans and he must have found much needed reassurance and confirmation that the ideal world that he knew of was real from the Bushmen. Realising their importance to him he realised their importance to humanity in terms of bringing some real truth back into the world, and that was his vision, the contribution he could see that he should make. My innocence, my naivety, my soundness was so great that my vision was to be able to actually explain and liberate humanity from the human condition.

On 30 January 1972, when I was 27 and still in the wilds of Tasmania trying to rediscover the Tasmanian Tiger I wrote a love letter, which I still have a copy of, to my then girlfriend in Sydney (the one that took me to the lavish party I mentioned earlier) that included these words: **'Playing saying seeing dreaming you left me with a funny feeling! I won't study so I will try and write to you. I feel like writing because it's cloudy. There were a thousand wild horses out on that great plain and before them strode a boy and he was alone and hopelessly happy.'** Accompanying the letter was a drawing of thousands of galloping horses coming over the horizon towards the viewer with a small boy out in front leading them. I can understand now that this image of the horses and boy was a representation of my vision of my innocence being able to lead humanity home from its alienated state. In fact in every major document I have written I have included a phrase that has always summarised my vision, which is that **'soon from one end of the horizon to the other will appear an army in its millions to do battle with human suffering and its weapon will be understanding'**.

All my life whenever I have heard or read Australia's most celebrated poem, Banjo Paterson's 1895 *The Man From Snowy River*, emotion has overtaken me and tears come to my eyes. For a long time I didn't understand why. While Australia has an ancient mythology that is grounded in the Dreamtime stories of the Aborigines, it also has a powerful contemporary mythology with *The Man From Snowy River* at the centre of them—Banjo Paterson's image and all the words to *The Many From Snowy River*, written in tiny text as they are, even features on our most used currency, Australia's $10 note. Mythologies only develop if they contain a resonating deep truth. Ostensibly the poem is about a great ride by mountain horsemen to recapture an escaped thoroughbred that joined the wild horses or brumbies in the mountain ranges but I now understand the poem is a recognition that it is in this relatively innocent country of Australia that the answers to the human condition would finally be found—it is a description of my vision, hence my emotional identification with it. The poem describes how eventually a **'stripling'** boy (the embodiment of innocence) goes beyond where the rest of the horsemen (the alienated adults) dare go, and follows the brumbies down the **'terrible descent'** of a steep mountain where (if you weren't sound) **'any slip was death'** (to confront the unconfrontable issue of the human condition) and recapture the thoroughbred from the impenetrable mountains (retrieve the escaped truth from the depths of denial). The poem describes how the boy **'ran them** [the brumbies] **single-handed till their sides were white with foam / He followed like a bloodhound on their track / Till they halted, cowed and beaten—then he turned their heads for home / And alone and unassisted brought them back'** (he fought all the alienation and its denial

that has been enslaving this world to a standstill until it finally gave up the truth). The story of David and Goliath is the same recognition of innocence eventually slaying the giant, the giant being our species' alienated state of denial. In the great European legend of King Arthur, the wounded (alienated) Fisher King whose realm was devastated (humans unavoidably made their world an expression of their own madnesses) could only have his wound healed, and his realm restored, by the arrival in his kingdom of a simple, naive boy. In the legend the boy's name is Parsifal, which, according to the legend, means **'guileless fool'**. To the alienated only a naive, **'guileless'** fool would dare approach and grapple with the confronting truths about our divisive, corrupted condition. Hans Christian Andersen's 1837 fable the *Emperor's New Clothes* contains the same resonating truth that it would take a small boy to break the spell of the denial that has captured humanity. While these other mythologies have recognised the truth about innocence leading humanity home from its lost state of alienation, they were not the central mythology of their civilisations like *The Man From Snowy River* has been in Australia's mythology. Australia was where the great breakthrough would occur.

As I mentioned in Part 3:12, in my mid-twenties I also wrote this poem which clearly describes the excitement of the time of humanity's liberation that my vision anticipated: **'This is a story you see, just a story—but for you / Um—I remember a long time ago in the distant future a timeless day / a sunlit cloudless day when all things were fine / when we all slow-danced our way to breakfast in the sun // You see the day awoke with music / Can you imagine one thousand horses slow galloping towards you across a vast plain / and we loved that day so much / We all danced like Isadora Duncan through the morning light // We skipped and twirled and spun about / Fairies were there like dragonflies over a pool / Little girls with wings they hovered and flew about / their small voices you could hear / You see it was that kind of morning // When the afternoon arrived it was big and bold and beautiful / In worn out jeans and bouncing breasts we began / to fight—our way—into another day / into something new—to jive our way into the night / from sunshine into a thunderstorm // We all took our place, rank upon rank we came / as an army with Hendrix out in front / and the music busted the horizon into shreds / By God we broke the world apart / The pieces were of different colours and there were so many people / We danced in coloured dust, we left in sweat no room at all / We had a ball in gowns of grey and red / There were things that happened that nobody knew / Bigger and better, I had written on my sweater / Where there was sky there was music, huge clouds of it / and there were storms of gold with coloured lights / It was so good we cried tears into our eyes / In a tug of war of love we had no strength left at all / Dear God we cried but he only sighed and / whispered strength through leaves of laughter // On and on we came in bold ranks of silvered gold / to lead a world that didn't know to somewhere it didn't care / It couldn't last, it had to end and yet it had an endless end / We were so happy in balloons of coloured bubbles that wouldn't bust / and we couldn't, couldn't quench our lust / There we were all together for ever and ever / and tomorrow had better beware because / when we've wept and slept we will be there to shake its bloody neck.'**

The imagery of an army of galloping horses that appeared in my 1972 letter to my girlfriend and in the drawing attached to it, and in my poem above, and in Banjo Paterson's epic story, appears in many anticipations of the incredible excitement and rapidly gathering support the liberating and transforming understanding of the human condition will receive when it arrives.

In the Bible the prophets Joel and Isaiah described the same event using similar imagery. Joel said: **'Blow the trumpet in Zion; sound the alarm on my holy hill. Let all who live in the land tremble, for the day of the Lord** [the liberating but at the same time all-exposing denial-free understanding of the human condition] **is coming…Like dawn spreading across the mountains a large and mighty army comes, such as never was of old nor ever will be in ages to come. Before them fire devours, behind them a flame blazes. Before them the land is like the garden of Eden, behind them, a desert waste—nothing escapes them. They have the appearance of horses; they gallop along like cavalry. With a noise like that of chariots…like a mighty army drawn up for battle. At the sight of them, nations are in anguish; every face turns pale. They charge like warriors; they scale walls like soldiers. They all march in line, not swerving from their course. They do not jostle each other…For the day of the Lord is near in the valley of decision. The sun and moon will be darkened, and the stars no longer shine. The Lord will roar from Zion and thunder from Jerusalem; the earth and the sky will tremble…"In that day the mountains will drip new wine, and the hills will flow with milk; all the ravines of Judah will run with water…Their bloodguilt, which I have not pardoned, I will pardon** [the dignifying understanding of humans' corrupted state is finally found]**"'** (Joel 2,3).

Isaiah said: **'He lifts up a banner for the distant nations, he whistles for those at the ends of the earth. Here they come, swiftly and speedily! Not one of them grows tired or stumbles, not one slumbers or sleeps; not a belt is loosened at the waist, not a sandal thong is broken. Their arrows are sharp, all their bows are strung; their horses' hoofs seem like flint, their chariot wheels like a whirlwind. Their roar is like that of the lion, they roar like young lions; they growl as they seize their prey and carry it off with no-one to rescue. In that day they will roar over it like the roaring of the sea. And if one looks at the land, he will see darkness and distress; even the light will be darkened by the clouds'** (Isa. 5:26–30).

While it doesn't contain the imagery of horses, the immensely popular 1993 song *Holy Grail*, written and sung by Mark Seymour of the Australian rock band *Hunters and Collectors*, represents another anticipation in Australia's mythology of the arrival of the all-exciting and all-cleansing dignifying understanding of the human condition occurring in Australia: **'Woke up this morning from the strangest dream / I was in the biggest army the world had ever seen / We were marching as one on the road to the Holy Grail // Started out seeking fortune and glory / It's a short song but it's a hell of a story / When you spend your lifetime trying to get your hands / on the Holy Grail // Well have you heard about the Great Crusade? / We ran into millions but nobody got paid / Yeah we razed four corners of the globe for the Holy Grail // All the locals scattered, they were hiding in the snow / We were so far from home, so how were we to know? / There'd be nothing left to plunder / When we stumbled on the Holy Grail // We were so full of beans but we were dying like flies / And those big black birds, they were circling in the sky / And you know what they say, yeah nobody deserves to die // Oh but I've been searching for an easy way / To escape the cold light of day** [I've lived a life of resigned evasion] / **I've been high and I've been low** [suffered the consequences of recurring depression] / **But I've got nowhere else to go / There's nowhere else to go! // I followed orders, God knows where I've been / but I woke up alone, all my wounds were clean** [our psychosis was cleared up] / **I'm still here, I'm still a fool for the Holy Grail / I'm a fool for the Holy Grail.'**

There are other powerful anticipations in Australian mythology of the emergence of understanding of the human condition in Australia, that are documented in my book *A Species In Denial* in the section titled 'Australia's role in the world'.

So while Sir Laurens' was an exceptionally Unresigned Prophet, the vision he had was to resurrect the truth of our species' past innocent state and to do this he used the vehicle of the Bushman people as evidence for that lost innocent state. Again, while Sir Laurens was able to clearly recognise the **'war'** between our original, innocent, instinctive soulful **'dark child of nature'** and our newer **'individual conscious'** intellect or **'spirit'** he wasn't able to explain the reason for the **'war'**. His vision, as stated in my Dedication to him, was the **'hope'** that by **'reveal**[ing]**'** the **'inner life'** of the **'child'** in **'man'** he **'might start the first movement towards a reconciliation'**, and that **'hope'** of **'reconciliation'** that his work contributed is exactly what was achieved. The Bushmen looked after the soul and its truth in Sir Laurens, and Sir Laurens in turn looked after the soul and its truth in me, and in turn I am now using that soul and its truth to look after humanity, rescue it from the horror of alienated oblivion. Again, as Sir Laurens anticipated: **'We live in a sunset hour of time. We need to recognize and develop that aspect of ourselves of which the moon bears the image. It is our own shy intuitions of renewal, which walk in our spiritual night as Porcupine walked by the light of the moon, that need helping on the way. It is as if I hear the wind bringing up behind me the voice of Mantis, the infinite in the small, calling from the stone age to an age of men with hearts of stone, commanding us with the authentic voice of eternal renewal: "You must henceforth be the moon. You must shine at night. By your shining shall you lighten the darkness until the sun rises again to light up all things for men"'** (*The Heart of the Hunter*, 1961, p.233 of 233).

Jeremy Griffith and Tim Macartney-Snape with Sir Laurens van der Post in London in 1993, a few years before Sir Laurens' death in 1996

One of my most precious memories was when I met Sir Laurens in London in 1993 and was able to thank him personally for the assistance he had been to my work and life, which is when the above photograph was taken. I wrote to Sir Laurens on a number of occasions and treasure a 20 May 1988 response to my first book *Free: The End Of The Human Condition* which I had sent him where he said, **'Could you please send me an extra copy of your book? Yours to me is already out on loan because it was so appreciated, and I shall give it to my publishers to read and**

see whether they are as interested as we are.' His publishers didn't show the interest Sir Laurens hoped for, and in fact all my books, which are about the human condition, have had to be published by our own organisation, the Foundation for Humanity's Adulthood, now called the WORLD TRANSFORMATION MOVEMENT. Sir Laurens never stopped trying to help promote my books, writing to Tim Macartney-Snape on the 15 August 1989 saying: **'If I do not do more to help Jeremy Griffith it is simply that the weight and amount of my responsibilities prevent me, short of self-destruction.'** On 6 May 1993, three and half years before his death, Sir Laurens wrote to me saying, **'I would hope you will always know how we value the examples you set and the work you are doing in Australia.'** Denial-free thinkers can recognise denial-free thinking but for everyone else they are an anathema.

As the quote from Sir Laurens used in my dedication to him states, he hoped his work of acknowledging the relative innocence of the Bushmen would **'start the first movement towards a reconciliation'**. I only wish that Sir Laurens was still alive to tell him how successful his vision of starting such a movement was, but then again I know that he doesn't really need to know that it was successful because his vision was so clear that he always knew it would be successful.

Appropriately, Sir Laurens' full-page obituary, which was reproduced in *The Australian* newspaper from the *London Times*, was titled **'A Prophet Out of Africa'** (20 Dec. 1996)—(view van der Post's obituary that was reproduced in *The Australian* at <www.humancondition.com/vanderpost-obituary>).

Part 10:5 Sir James Darling's Vision of Fostering the Ability to Undertake the 'Paramount' Task of Solving the Human Condition in Order to 'Save the World'

As has been mentioned, the online version of my second book, *Beyond The Human Condition* (1991), contains this Dedication:

> To the vision of Sir James Darling for acknowledging that:
>
> **'…the future lies not with the predatory and the immune but with the sensitive who live dangerously…the truly sensitive mind is both susceptible and penetrating: it is open to new ideas, and it seeks truth at the bottom of the well. It is the development of this sort of mind which it should be the object of the educational process to cultivate'** James Darling, *The Education of a Civilized Man*, 1962, pp.63-64 of 223.

Sir James Darling's work has been referred to throughout *Freedom Expanded: Book 1*, in particular a brief analysis was included in Part 5:1 of his absolutely astonishing vision of deliberately setting out to foster the innocence needed to solve the human condition and by so doing save the world. What follows is an elaboration of that presentation. There is also a longer, even more in-depth essay I have written about Sir James' vision which is available on the WTM's website at <www.humancondition.com/darling-longer-essay>.

Amazing as it may seem, it is apparent in the following material that the life of Sir James Darling—who was headmaster of Geelong Grammar School (GGS) for 32 years until 1961—was specifically dedicated to, as he described it, cultivating the innocent, sound, alienation-free **'sensitivity'** needed to undertake the **'paramount'** task of finding the **'answer'** to the **'all-important question'** of the human condition and by so doing **'saving the world'**.

What is perhaps even more amazing is that Sir James succeeded in his gigantic undertaking because, having greatly benefited from his extraordinarily courageous soul-rather-than-intellect-emphasising education, I have been able to confront the issue of the human condition and, by so doing, solve it—and not only solve it, but, with the help of some very special Australians, establish an organisation, the World Transformation Movement (WTM), to take that world-saving insight to the world.

And moreover, amongst those very special Australians supporting this breakthrough insight against the intense resistance—indeed, tirade of persecution—that opening up the subject of the human condition attracted, have been other Darling-inspired Geelong-Grammarians. Those key GGS-trained supporters include WTM Founding Directors Tim Macartney-Snape AM OAM, Simon Griffith (my brother) and Christopher Stephen. It is also not insignificant that in this great undertaking to create a place in the world where the soundness needed to solve the human condition might be cultivated that Tim Macartney-Snape's great-great grandfather, Dean Macartney, was one of the founding fathers of GGS, and that my and Simon's father, and Tim's father, also attended GGS.

The point is that saving the human race through finding the reconciling, redeeming and rehabilitating understanding of the human condition has been very much a Sir James Darling/Geelong Grammar School/Australian-led undertaking.

Given the human-condition-confronting-not-avoiding, denial-free, truthful nature of this whole world-saving enterprise it should also be recorded that Sir James' full-page obituary in *The Australian* newspaper on 3 November 1995 acknowledged his extraordinary capacity for denial-free, truthful and thus penetrating, prophetic thinking, describing him as **'a prophet in the true biblical sense'** (see Sir James Darling's obituary at <www.humancondition.com/darling-obituary>).

As well as headmaster of GGS, Sir James Darling was also Chairman of the Australian Broadcasting Commission (today's Australian Broadcasting Corporation, or ABC) from 1961 to 1967 (and before that, from 1955, a member of the Australian Broadcasting Control Board). In 1953 Sir James was appointed an Officer of the Order of the British Empire (OBE) and in 1968 he was knighted 'for services to education and broadcasting'. In Australia's bicentennial year, 1988, he was officially designated one of 200 'Great Australians'. Of the 200—22 then living—Sir James was the only headmaster, a public recognition of his exceptional, indeed unique, influence in Australia as an educator. In fact, by the end of Darling's tenure GGS had become one of the most highly regarded schools in the world, with the current heir to the English throne, HRH The Prince of Wales, attending the school for part of his education.

Given Sir James Darling's tenure as Chairman of the ABC, it should be noted that the ABC is the organisation that did all it could to misrepresent, vilify and destroy the all-important work being carried out by the WTM of bringing understanding to the human condition. From the following material, it can be imagined how deeply impressed, interested in and encouraging of the work of the WTM a Darling-led ABC would have been. That the

very opposite response occurred shows how dangerously the ABC has lost its way; in fact, how bankrupt it has become as a meaningful influence in Australian society. If he were alive today, Sir James Darling would be appalled by the ABC's treatment of the work of the WTM.

Born in England in 1899, Sir James Darling was the beneficiary of the very best education the world could then provide (just as Moses was growing up in the Pharaoh's court in Egypt; and Plato was in Socrates' school; and Christ was by the Old Testament; and I was through having attended the school Sir James established). England's universities at Oxford (where Sir James read history) and Cambridge were the centres of learning in the world at the time. One of Sir James' teachers and later mentor, William Temple, went on to become what many regard the Church of England's greatest ever Archbishop of Canterbury.

When Sir James was selected at the young age of 30 to become headmaster of GGS at Corio in Victoria, Australia, there were only 330 pupils. By the time he retired as headmaster of the school 32 years later in 1961 GGS had become, as mentioned, one of the most highly regarded schools in the world, with the current heir to the British throne, HRH The Prince of Wales, being sent all the way there from England for part of his education. Penny Junor's 1987 book about HRH The Prince of Wales, titled *Charles*, states that **'Dr Darling had been a disciple of Kurt Hahn'** (p.54) who was the **'founder'** of '**Gordonstoun**', a school on the north-east coast of Scotland that the Prince also attended. Junor wrote that **'Geelong** [Grammar School]**…was not unlike Gordonstoun'** (p.54) and, about the conception of Gordonstoun, that **'Dr Kurt Hahn…was a German whose unconventional ideas about education had been prompted by his country's defeat in the First World War…As a young man he had suffered a long period of illness, and while convalescing had read Plato's *Republic*. Inspired by the ideals he discovered there, he had conceived the idea of starting an entirely new sort of school, broadly based on the Platonic view'** (p.35).

Plato's view about education was that it should be concerned with cultivating **'philosopher guardians'** or **'philosopher rulers'**, those who Plato said were **'the true philosophers…those whose passion is to see the truth'** (*Plato The Republic*, c.360BC; tr. H.D.P. Lee, 1955, p.238 of 405). Plato explained, **'But suppose…that such natures were cut loose** [sheltered]**, when they were still children, from the dead weight of worldliness, fastened on them by sensual indulgences like gluttony, which distorts their minds' vision to lower things, and suppose that when so freed** [during their nurtured upbringing] **they were turned towards the truth** [during their education]**, then the same faculty in them would have as keen a vision of truth as it has of the objects on which it is at present turned'** (ibid. p.284). Basically Plato's—and Hahn's and Sir James'—idea was to cultivate and develop conscience, rather than emphasise consciousness, as most educators do today with IQ tests, competitive emphasis on achieving high academic grades, passing university entrance exams, etc, etc. It is all about intellectual excellence at most schools, with virtually no focus on preserving and developing the naturally inspired, enthralled, questioning, happy, imaginative, sound, conscience-infused instinctive souls of students. Focusing on and talking about our species inspired and loving natural, innocent, human-condition-free, original instinctive soulful state has been unbearably confronting for our species present human-condition-afflicted state and, as a result, it has been far easier to focus on and talk about our intellect: eulogise it, and make no mention of our instinctive soul. The end result is what we have today, a world that vastly overemphasises the

intellect and vastly underemphasises our original natural instinctive moral self or soul and its truthful conscience. The problem is this near total emphasis on intellectual excellence was only ever going to perpetuate alienation. It was all about indulging life in Plato's dark cave (where humans have been hiding in fear of the unbearably confronting issue of the human condition) when Plato, Hahn and Sir James saw that the objective in education should be to try to break free from that cave of alienating denial; fight to keep the 'windows' in students' minds open and 'let the sun/truth in'; preserve and develop the **'passion' 'to see the truth'**.

Defiant of all convention, visionary, immensely courageous and astonishing as it surely is given the alienated reality of our world today, if we look at a collection of quotes from Sir James' speeches it becomes clear that his objective in education really was to not only preserve and cultivate the souls of students as a general, right-minded principle for education, but to *actually* cultivate the specific truth-confronting, soul-full, conscience-strong degree of innocent, sensitive soundness needed to undertake the specific task of solving the human condition for the human race.

Before presenting this evidence from his own words of Sir James' deliberate intent to cultivate the soundness needed to save the world, the following is some enlightening commentary on the unfolding of Sir James' amazing vision that he seemingly had from the time he was a small boy. On pages 104 and 105 of his 1978 autobiography *Richly Rewarding*, Sir James said that he found the question he had **'often been asked'** of **'why he had decided to come to Australia' 'not easy to answer succinctly'**, that **'sometimes I felt…that it was pre-ordained, that indeed God…had decided it all for me'**. He went on to write that when he made the decision to apply for the job of headmaster of GGS **'one very odd thing happened…when I was still a small boy at home, my father recounted a point from a speech…**[that there] **was a country, Australia, which was developing without any religion…**[and this] **came back into my mind with all the force of a prophetic utterance…**[and that my decision was thus] **concerned with religion in that…I felt that I had something to give in a comparatively new country'**. As I have previously explained, when we are young we can know the form of our destiny in life that we then have to live out, never again seeing it quite so clearly as the battle and resulting alienations develop to cope with the struggle of life. The surfacing of Sir James' childhood vision of how he could make a difference is apparent in what he has said here: Australia was a **'new country'**, a place where there would be enough innocence left that students could be **'turned towards the truth'** during their education, as Plato described it, thus cultivating the ability to take on the world of denial and bring out the reconciling truth about the human condition, a vision that the following extracts from his speeches confirm. (The underlinings in the following quotes have been added for emphasis.)

In this first quote Sir James identifies the human condition as the **'all-important question'** to which **'there must be a complete answer'**, otherwise **'our existence'** is faced with becoming **'fragmented into a rubbish-heap'**. In an oration Sir James gave in Melbourne in 1954 to the College of Radiologists of Australasia, appropriately titled *On Looking Beneath the Surface of Things*, he said, **'<u>in seeking for such purpose</u>** [in all of existence and in our own lives] **<u>it will be necessary to seek below the surface</u>…**[for the] **<u>thoughts which do lie too deep for tears</u>.** (Cf. William Wordsworth, *Intimations of Immortality from Recollections of Early Childhood*, last line.) [The thoughts that lie too deep for tears are those that for most people are so depressing they can't go near them, namely thoughts about our imperfect human condition]**…Only so can we come to a better understanding of life, <u>to answer</u> even**

the all-important question: 'What is man that thou art mindful of him [why is human behaviour so often less than ideal]**, and the son of man that thou visitest him?'** [when Christ's behaviour by contrast was sound and ideal]**.** (Psalm 8, v.4; Hebrews 2.6.) [Sir James has clearly stated here that the **'all-important question'** that we have **'to answer'** is the issue of our species' less-than-ideal human condition.] **For to exclude that question from the study of evolution** [for science to avoid that question] **is indeed to play *Hamlet* without the Prince of Denmark** (Sir Walter Scott, *The Talisman*, introduction)**—an exclusion surely as futile as to talk theology and to forget evolution?** [Sir James is saying that it is around this **'question'** of the human condition and its biological **'answer'** that the reconciliation of science and religion, reason and faith, occurs]**. There must be a complete answer; there must be coherence and sense in the universe; and, until we find it, our thinking is degenerated into disintegration, and our existence fragmented into a rubbish-heap of shreds and patches, with coherence, significance, and growth impossible, our compass-bearings lost, and civilization foundering.** [Healing amelioration of the human condition has to be found if the world is to be saved from terminal levels of alienation]**'** (The Röntgen oration, 17 Nov. 1954, published in *The Education of a Civilized Man*, ed. Michael Persse, 1962, pp.74-75 of 223).

In these next quotes Sir James talks about the qualities that needed to be cultivated in his education program for the **'paramount'**, **'all-important'** search to **'find'** the **'complete answer'** to the issue of the human condition that is needed to **'save humanity'** and **'the world'**. In his *On Looking Beneath the Surface of Things* oration, part of which was quoted above, Sir James said, **'It should be the prime object of education…to develop this sensitivity…the truly sensitive mind is both susceptible and penetrating: it is open to new ideas, and it seeks truth at the bottom of the well'** (ibid. pp.63-64). In his 1961 Anzac Day address at GGS he said, **'What, then, is the issue? It is this. Do we wish to preserve…this country as a place in which…free men and women can live and seek Truth…It means that each of us should regard our lives as pledged to the one paramount purpose of saving the world…the sands of time are running out'** (*The Education of a Civilized Man*, 1962, pp.139-140). And in another presentation, while referring to **'the kind of man needed to save Australia and humanity'**, Sir James spoke about cultivating **'men of conscience…men not afraid of facing unpleasant facts'** *(Light Blue Down Under: The History of Geelong Grammar School*, by Weston Bate, 1990, p.219 of 386). On another occasion he similarly said, **'it is not for men to run away from the truth for fear of the consequences'** (Address to the Victorian Branch of The Royal Empire Society on 14 Mar. 1946, *The Education of a Civilized Man*, 1962, p.131), and likewise, **'Lean towards danger like a good boxer'** (Sermon at GGS Chapel on 11 June 1950, *The Education of a Civilized Man*, p.155). In a Speech Day address given at GGS in 1960, he said, **'It requires more toughness to resist the world** [of denial] **than to join in…It is the awakening and vivifying of the conscience of those who belong to it which ought to be the chief purpose of a Church school…because… conscience is the executive part of consciousness'** (*The Education of a Civilized Man*, pp.96-97). In an address to The Royal Australasian College of Surgeons in 1960 Sir James said: **'It is wise sometimes to remember the all too frequent rejections of the prophets by the barbarians…The quality which, above all other, needs to be cultivated** [in education] **is sensitivity…**[Education's] **objective is a development of the whole man, sensitive all round the circumference…the future,** [Canon Raven] **has said, lies not with the predatory** [selfish] **and the immune** [alienated] **but with the sensitive** [innocent] **who live dangerously** [defy the world of denial]**. There is a threefold choice for the free man…He may grasp for himself what he can get and trample the needs and feelings of others beneath his feet: or he may try to withdraw from the world to a monastery…: or he may "take up arms against a sea of troubles, and by opposing end them"…**[and so] **There remains the sensitive, on one proviso: he must be sensitive *and* tough** [to solve the

human condition and **'save humanity'** requires sufficient sensitivity/innocence to access the truth but also sufficient toughness to not **'withdraw…to a monastery'**, as my mother considered doing when she was a young woman, but instead to stand up to, defy, and ultimately overthrow the all-pervading false world of denial]**. He must combine tenderness and awareness with fortitude, perseverance, and courage. The sensitivity is necessary because without it there is no life of the mind, no growing consciousness, no living conscience; nor is there any real communication one with another. It is necessary also if we accept Father Teilhard's** [Teilhard de Chardin] **extension of the idea of evolution as illuminating the end of life. Only by a growth of sensitivity can man progress from the alpha of original chaos to the omega of God's purpose for him** [only through denial-free innocence can the reconciling biological understanding of the human condition be found]**…Sensitivity is not enough. Without toughness it may be only a thin skin…**[only from] **an inner core of strength are** [you] **enabled to fight back…Can such men be? Of course they can: and they are the leaders whom others will follow. In the world of books there are, for me, Antoine de Saint-Exupéry, or Laurens van der Post'** (ibid. pp.28-36). [Sir Laurens van der Post is also my favourite author, and is the most quoted author in my books. Sir Laurens was also so important a person to HRH The Prince of Wales, Prince Charles, that he was chosen to be godfather to Prince Charles' eldest son and the future king, Prince William, and there is **'A bronze bust of van der Post…in Prince Charles' garden at Highgrove'** ('Post, Sir Laurens Jan van der (1906-1996)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Christopher Booker, 2004). A former British Prime Minister, Baroness Thatcher, no less, once described Sir Laurens as **'the most perfect man I have ever met'** (ABC Radio, *Late Night Live*, 25 Feb. 2002). Sir Laurens was also immensely impressed with Jeremy's writing, responding to his first book by asking, **'Could you please send me an extra copy of your book. Yours to me is already out on loan because it was so appreciated.'** For daring to be honest about the human condition Sir Laurens was, like me, also viciously persecuted, and, like Sir James, he was also recognised as an exceptional denial-free, penetrating, honest, prophetic thinker, being described in his full-page obituary in the *London Times* as **'a prophet out of Africa'** (20 Dec. 1996)—(view van der Post's obituary that was reproduced in *The Australian* at <http://www.humancondition.com/vanderpost-obituary>). To illustrate Sir James' point about the need for both innocence *and* toughness, the Bushmen of the Kalahari were all somewhat Christ-like in their relative innocence—for example being Christ-like they had no need of Christianity; as Sir Laurens van der Post recorded, **'The pastor, Dominee Ferdie Weich, though much loved by the Bushmen, could report no permanent conversion to Christ in 21 years'** (*Testament to the Bushmen*, 1984, text accompanying photograph 91)—but they were not a race sufficiently toughened from thousands of years of encounter with the horror of the extremely psychologically upset and distressed state of the human condition to take on the world of denial—as was also illustrated by Sir Laurens when he pointed out the Bushman's inability to cope with the extremely upset, human-condition-afflicted modern world, writing that **'mere contact with twentieth-century life seemed lethal to the Bushman. He was essentially so innocent and natural a person that he had only to come near us for a sort of radioactive fall-out from our unnatural world to produce a fatal leukaemia in his spirit'** (*The Heart of the Hunter*, 1961, p.111 of 233). The English explorer and philosopher Bruce Chatwin acknowledged the innocent, alienation-free soundness of Christ and also of the innocent races when he wrote these extraordinarily honest words: **'There is no contradiction between the Theory of Evolution and belief in God** [Integrative Meaning] **and His Son** [the uncorrupted expression of our original instinctive orientation to Integrative Meaning] **on earth. If Christ were the perfect instinctual specimen—and we have every reason to believe He was—He must be the Son of God. By the same token, the First Man was also Christ'** (*What Am I Doing Here*, 1989, p.65 of 367).] In a column Sir

James regularly wrote for Melbourne's leading newspaper, *The Age*, he observed that **'The time is past for help which is only a Band-Aid. It is time for radical thinking and for a solution on the grand scale'** (*Reflections for The Age*, ed. J. Minchin & B. Porter, 1991, p.145 of 176); and in a renowned 1950 GGS Speech Day address he said, **'We are not now that strength which in old days moved Heaven and Earth…but something ere the end, some work of noble note may yet be done'** (*Light Blue Down Under: The History of Geelong Grammar School*, Weston Bate, 1990, p.219). Yes, despite humanity approaching a state of near terminal levels of alienation, the human-race-saving, reconciling, redeeming and rehabilitating understanding of the human condition might still be found.

The references to **'seeking' 'purpose'** and for biology not **'to exclude that question** [of the human condition] **from the study of evolution'** in order that **'Father Teilhard's…idea of evolution as illuminating the end of life'** could be fulfilled, indicate that Sir James was not only concerned with cultivating and orientating the innocence needed to solve the human condition and save the human race, amazingly and courageously he was also sound enough in his own thinking to know precisely where that denial-free thinking would have to begin if it was to solve the human condition. As the following further extracts from his speeches reveal, Sir James recognised that acknowledgment of the **'teleological'**, holistic, integrative, negative-entropy-driven, Godly **'purpose'** or meaning or theme of existence was the starting point to thinking truthfully and thus effectively about the human condition. Not only that, in these further extracts Sir James identified precisely where the stalling point was with the current very limited, narrow, reductionist, mechanistic approach of science and the lack of tolerance for reasoning in religious thought.

These further extracts come from Sir James' 1954 speech *On Looking Beneath the Surface of Things* (all of his speech can be read in the in-depth essay about Sir James' vision that was mentioned earlier): **'It was the ancient Greek philosophers who…first…sought… for some single binding principle from which it might be said that all else sprang…Plato, coming near to monotheism…**[in his] **idea of the Good and the Beautiful'**. But **'A multiplicity of new facts…has tended to obscure all sight of principle…concentration upon the development of even the twigs upon the branches has resulted in our losing sight of the tree…**[It is] **most unsatisfactory…how difficult it is for modern man to see life clearly and to see it whole.' 'The difficulty is accentuated by the modern…divorce between theological and scientific thinking…The scientist can no more deny or devaluate the truths of spiritual experience than the theologian can neglect the truths of science: and the two truths must be reconcilable, and it must be of importance to each of us that they should be reconciled…truth is there to be revealed…and the seeing of the truth is a discovery, not an invention…a poet…Robert Bridges… first, as far as I know, and as long ago as 1927…tried to produce order out of chaos…in** [his poem] ***The Testament of Beauty*…that…Archbishop Temple…hailed…as one of the greatest works in the English language…**[Bridges wrote of] **"the creator's Will that we call Law of Nature…the determin'd habit of electrons, the same with the determining instinct of unreasoning life, necessity** [finally] **become conscient in man…of ministry unto God, the Universal Mind"…This is the idea of** [integrative, teleological, holistic] **Purpose in…all things that we must return, if we are to discover unity in the midst of variety… it is high time that there should be some whys and some answers; only so will there be any chance of the required revision and synthesis…this binding idea of purpose…**[The problem is] **religion…**[has become]

an escape…[and] **scientific thought…became dominated by the mathematicians and the physicists…with its consequent enhancement of economic and industrial values at the expense of aesthetic and moral… until, with Charles Darwin, man himself was deposed from the position of controller and graded as part of the machine…**[but] **by that time mechanism was…securely established…It is only recently that the physicist has abandoned his dogmatism** [the denial of Integrative Meaning or teleology]**, and the biologist begun…to study the living creature…**[At this point we pick up where Sir James described the need to solve the human condition that was included at the beginning of these extracts. His recognition of the need to solve the human condition is so significant that what he said is presented again here as the rightful conclusion to these extracts.] **I should like…to come back to the possibility that the solution lies quite simply in what is known as the teleological conception of evolution…Only so can we come to a better understanding of life, to answer even the all-important question: 'What is man that thou art mindful of him** [why is human behaviour so often less than ideal]**, and the son of man that thou visitest him?'** [when Christ's behaviour by contrast was sound and ideal]**.** (Psalm 8, v.4; Hebrews 2.6.) [Sir James has clearly stated here that the **'all-important question'** that we have **'to answer'** is the issue of our species' less-than-ideal human condition.] **For to exclude that question from the study of evolution is indeed to play *Hamlet* without the Prince of Denmark** (Sir Walter Scott, *The Talisman*, introduction)**—an exclusion surely as futile as to talk theology and to forget evolution? There must be a complete answer; there must be coherence and sense in the universe; and, until we find it, our thinking is degenerated into disintegration, and our existence fragmented into a rubbish-heap of shreds and patches, with coherence, significance, and growth impossible, our compass-bearings lost, and civilization foundering…It is God's purpose that men should be like Christ…whole and healthy'**.

I have been told that the despair Sir James felt after losing so many gifted contemporaries in the First World War, in which he served as an artillery officer, led him to decide that the only way that he could live with the fact that he survived when they hadn't was to try to live the life of 10 men. This great commitment could not have produced his deeply clear-sighted vision of cultivating and orientating the innocence needed to save the human race—such clarity could only come from the purity of vision of a young child—but it certainly would have reinforced his vision, helped him to be even more determined to fulfil it. There is some oblique acknowledgment of this view in this quote about Sir James' war years: **'His war service toughened and filled him out and gave him a sense of having the right to put the world in order; indeed, like many of his contemporaries and especially those who went into teaching, he thought he should work twice as hard to make up for the loss of the finest spirits of the age'** (*Light Blue Down Under*, Weston Bate, 1990, p.179 of 386). I had a similar vision-focusing experience during my life, in my case caused by the loss of my father. My father died in an accident on a tractor on our sheep station in 1971 when I was 25 years old. In his obituary in the Geelong Grammar School magazine (*The Corian*, Sept. 1971, pp.251-252) he was described as **'the salt of the earth'**, and he was. He was renowned for his goodness, never saying a bad word about anyone, always being fair and never being manipulative of others. My brother Simon has a very similar personality. It is almost saintly how much our father and Simon are not retaliatory towards the world. Simon internalises his pain from life but he never expresses it outwardly. He absorbs it rather than takes it out on the world. This saintliness of my father was important because under the duress of the human condition there are very few men that do not externalise their ego's frustration and as a result oppress their sons to some degree. This oppression of the spirit

of boys by their fathers is so common that I'll never forget my biology professor at Sydney University, Charles Birch, once saying to me, **'haven't you heard Jeremy, the best thing that can happen in a man's life is that his father dies when he is born'**! If that oppression had happened to me it would have seriously compromised my innocence that my mother was able to nurture and protect in me to an exceptional degree. I attribute my soundness above all to my mother's soul strength and defiance of the false world of alienation and denial—a situation I described in Part 10:1 when I explained how Joseph acquired his soul strength—but my father's saintliness was also very important. In all it was a very lucky combination of circumstances. So deeply loving of my father's goodness was I that when he died the pain of his death turned my resolve to solve the human condition into steel. To cope with his loss I determined to never ever be broken, to never ever have my vision compromised and I never have despite absolutely incredible provocation to compromise my vision. It is with my mother's strength that I have fought but for my father's goodness that I fight. The dedication in my first book, *Free: The End Of The Human Condition* (1988) is **'To my father and from my mother'**. This acknowledges that the ability to write about the human condition comes **'from'**, is directly due to, the nurturing I received from my mother, but that since it is men's role to take on the task of defying the ignorance of our soul and solve the human condition, my work is carried out for, or is dedicated **'to'** my father, in particular to his extraordinary goodness as a man. So like Sir James had his war experiences to strengthen his resolve, so I also had the death of my father to strengthen mine.

As was explained earlier, when we were young and still thinking truthfully about our and the world's plight we all knew the problem that had to be solved was the issue of the human condition. Why, when we knew humans had such a loving soul, were humans behaving so atrociously? From there we could reason and know that what was needed was a clarifying first principle based, scientific explanation of the human condition. Until we could explain and thus understand ourselves we would not be able to lift the siege of insecurity and guilt that was causing all our upset and resulting suffering of humans and all the devastation of our planet. Some very serious and profound thinking was needed and for that thinking we would need certain insights. In particular we would need to know what the meaning of life on Earth was: what was the overall purpose of our and our world's existence. We knew instinctively that the theme of existence and the purpose of life was to love but what was the actual nature, significance and meaning of that love? Also we knew that any evidence about our human origins would be extremely valuable in working out what happened to cause us to stop being loving. It follows that the various visions that exceptionally sound people have had of being able to help solve the human condition have involved contributing to these keys insights into the meaning of life and into our human origins. Most people can't look at early man truthfully any more than they can look at or acknowledge their past innocent state and current lack of it. Similarly most people can't begin to acknowledge the truth of integrative meaning because it is so condemning of their existing competitive and selfish divisive state. It is only the exceptionally sound who can have a vision of seeking insight into these phenomena.

Sir Laurens van der Post's vision was focused on studying the innocent nature of early man, which the Bushmen provided a living example of. Sir James Darling's vision also recognised the significance, in terms of being able to think truthfully about the human

condition, of different states of alienation in the human race and knowing that sought to identify and cultivate the soundness needed to solve the human condition. He also recognised the importance of the truth of the teleological, integrative purpose in all of existence that explained the significance of love, a truth that was fundamental to any honest thinking about what happened to us as a species. We will shortly see how Pierre Teilhard de Chardin's vision was focused on the need for humanity to resolve the human condition, reach an **'omega point'** of reconciliation as he described it. As part of his vision he desperately sought clues about human origins by seeking out and studying fossils of early humans. We will see how Louis Leakey had an amazing vision guiding him to find fossil evidence of our ancestors and to learn about our human origins through studying the lives of other existing primates. We will see how Eugene Marais' vision was also to find clues about what happened to our species through studying our primate relatives. We will see how Arthur Koestler's vision involved recognising the teleological, integrative purpose of existence and from there trying to explain what caused the conflict between our species' instinct and intellect. Basically the sounder the individual the stronger and better focused was their vision of throwing light on the nature and origins of our upset human condition. All these men recognised the elements of instinct and intellect as being involved in producing the human condition, some more clearly than others, but none were able to explain the human condition. Their visions came down to contributing insights towards the finding of that solution, rather than to actually finding it. Sir Laurens talked at length about the battle of our conscious self with our instinctive self. In the case of Sir James Darling, earlier in Part 4:6 a quote from Sir James was included where he talked of Plato's two-horsed chariot. While Sir James' interpretation of the roles of the two elements in Plato's analogy of instinct and reason wasn't quite right, he clearly recognised those elements as being the underlying elements in our distressed human predicament. It will be described later where the others have recognised the conflict between instinct and intellect.

To return to Sir James' vision, as described earlier, his last year as headmaster of GGS was my first year there; which I suppose means I had the benefit of all of his years at GGS of developing his culture of orientating soundness. I described earlier the importance of the influence of GGS in my work of looking into the human condition in my Dedication to my second book, *Beyond the Human Condition* (1991). To describe it again here using an extract from a thank you letter I wrote Sir James on 14 February 1989, **'Sir James I cannot begin to tell you how much I value what you did at GGS … Michael Collins Persse** [the long-standing master at GGS who thankfully greatly helped in chronicling Sir James' records and time at GGS] **invited me to inscribe an edition** [of *Free: The End of The Human Condition*] **for the school archives and in the cover I wrote " For Geelong Grammar School for looking after my soul". In a world that treads all over our soul you looked after it. Along with Sir Laurens van der Post, and one or two other soul-preservers, you have been of the greatest importance to me. Thank you.'** In his gracious—and surely excessively humble where he says he is not a deep thinker—reply to me on 21 February 1989 Sir James wrote, **'The main, perhaps the only thing, that a school can do is to create an atmosphere in which boys can grow up in such a way as to develop their own selves without having too much imposed upon them or destroyed in them. If they are lucky enough to find even one teacher who inspires them that is a bonus. A school also has, I think, to have a sort of conscience or soul of its own, which sets some standards of social behaviour, a liberal attitude to life, and a social conscience, but it must be very humble about this and make sure that**

it is not too dogmatic or intrusive. From reading what you have written it seems to have been successful with you. I particularly like the combination of furniture building and metaphysical thought. I fear that your book will be a bit above my head. I am not a very deep thinker, being empirical by nature, and having worked always on the basis of seeing something to be wrong and needs correcting, or something which leaves a gap and needs filling. This was very much the case with Timbertop [the wilderness-located part of GGS that all students spend a year in during their time at GGS]**, which seems to have been the most significant part of your time at school** [I absolutely loved the outdoors/nature/innocence that Timbertop gave me access to and it showed because even though I didn't do very well academically in my year there I was runner-up for Best Boy of The Year, won the Natural History Prize and two of the three cross-country races.]**'**.

It was mentioned earlier that Tim Macartney-Snape's great-great grandfather, the Reverend H. B. Macartney, Dean of Melbourne, was one of the founding fathers of GGS. I think it is wonderful that the story comes full circle with Tim's involvement as a founding director of the WORLD TRANSFORMATION MOVEMENT because what is even more astonishing about Darling's vision of fostering the capacity to solve the human condition is that he succeeded. Some Old Geelong Grammarians in the WTM, assisted by a group of other exceptionally able and courageous young Australians in the WTM, *are* bringing enlightenment of the human condition to the world.

To conclude this description of Sir James' vision, as with Sir Laurens van der Post, in Sir James' full-page obituary in *The Australian* newspaper on 3 November 1995 he was appropriately described as **'a prophet in the true biblical sense'** (view Darling's obituary at <www.humancondition.com/darling-obituary>).

Truly, the vision of Sir James Darling to save the human race by coming to Australia and cultivating the innocence there needed to explain and resolve the human condition was one of the greatest visions a human has had in recorded history!

What *now* needs to occur is for that human-race-saving, reconciling explanation of the human condition that Sir James dedicated his life to bringing about, and which has finally arrived, to be presented and promoted throughout the world—despite the human-condition-avoiding, mechanistic establishment's resistance to it.

Again, I have written a longer, more in-depth essay about Sir James Darling's incredible vision to foster the innocent soundness needed to solve the human condition, which can be read at <www.humancondition.com/darling-longer-essay>.

AN ANALYSIS OF OTHER DENIAL-FREE THINKERS WILL BE INCLUDED IN DUE COURSE.