

has meant that biologists had to find some way of supporting this denial. And, as we are now going to see, this need to deny the truth that our distant ancestors lived a nurtured-with-love, all-loving life, 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 dishonest Multilevel Selection theory for eusociality to deny that we lived an all-loving existence, also led to the dishonest Social Intelligence Hypothesis to deny the nurturing-with-love *origin* of that all-loving life. (Obviously, the entire need for denial should have been eradicated 30 years ago when I first presented the nurturing explanation in accompaniment with the explanation of the human condition, but, again, that is an issue I will return to in ch. 6:12.)

Chapter 6:5 To deny the importance of nurturing, the Social Intelligence Hypothesis was invented

⁴⁹⁹ 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 fields 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 persevered along the habituated path of denial, serving up completely dishonest interpretations of primate behaviour. This denial is particularly palpable if we compare their dishonest studies with the work of the rare few honest primatologists who have dared to recognise the role that nurturing plays in primate society.

⁵⁰⁰ For instance, the obviousness—if you're not practising 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 pars 446-448, 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 her 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 give your child love you’re a bad person, and, as has been emphasised, humans **‘would rather admit to being an axe murderer than being a bad father or mother’**.

⁵⁰¹In his 1989 book, *Peacemaking Among Primates*, the primatologist Frans de Waal describes a meeting that was held between an unnamed psychiatrist and the aforementioned 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 reveals 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, by comparison, 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, despite our species’ instinctive need to give and receive love, 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 unconditional selflessness/love, which is what nurturing essentially is, and the ramifications of not receiving it, has been nigh impossible. Since this *is* the end play time predicted in the Bible when **‘the love of most will grow cold’** (Matt. 24:12), it is no wonder mechanistic science practises the *extreme* dishonesty that Allot described in his aforementioned 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’**!

⁵⁰²It 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 chapter 5—have been *extremely* exposing, confronting and condemning of the unloved and unloving human race. As I mentioned in par. 416, 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 and undermining criticism from the mechanistic establishment.

⁵⁰³ So the question now is, how was denial of the obvious role nurturing plays in the lives of more developed/integrated/social mammals achieved, especially of 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? 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!

⁵⁰⁴ 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 chapter 5:4, 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. Again, it is not insignificant that 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.

⁵⁰⁵ 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 Richard Leakey referred to in his and Roger Lewin's 1977 book, *Origins*—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*; see <www.wtmsources.com/136>). As will be explained at some length in chapter 7:3 (in pars 660-669), 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.

⁵⁰⁶ As will be described in chapter 7:3 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.

⁵⁰⁷ 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, '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.

⁵⁰⁸ No, 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. (Again, this will all be fully explained in chapter 7:3.)

⁵⁰⁹ 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. Prior to the emergence of the human condition some 2 million years ago our species 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.**' As Plato wrote, this '**was a time... most blessed, celebrated by us in our state of innocence, before we had any experience of evils to come, when we were admitted to the sight of apparitions innocent and simple and calm and happy... and not yet enshrined in that living tomb which we carry about, now that we are imprisoned**'—the time when we lived a '**blessed and spontaneous life...[where] neither was there any violence, or devouring of one another, or war or quarrel among them...In those days...there were no forms of government or separate possession of women and children; for all men rose again from the earth, having no memory of the past [we lived in a pre-conscious state, obedient to our loving instincts]. And...the earth gave them fruits in abundance, which grew on trees and shrubs unbidden, and were not planted by the hand of man. And they dwelt naked, and mostly in the open air, for the temperature of their seasons was mild; and they had no beds, but lay on soft couches of grass, which grew plentifully out of the earth**'. The pre-human-condition-afflicted, integrated, cooperative, '**shar[ing]**', loving, social, '**calm and happy**', '**blessed and spontaneous**' 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. As Plato said, there was no '**quarrel[ling]**' and '**no [need for] forms of government**'.

⁵¹⁰ And the even more blatant flaw with the two arguments that have been 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 receiving unconditional love 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 does intuitively 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 practising 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.

⁵¹¹ We all do actually know that to achieve the '**loving order in the world**' that Montagu recognised, the '**cold**', '**bleak and loveless**' (as Drummond described it), 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 chapter 5:4, the problem 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 described in chapter 5:5). 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', Sacred Wildlife.org; 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 par. 452, 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. And 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 those 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, pre-love-indoctrination, 'must nourish and protect' maternal situation to the 'must love' maternal situation—they *are* attempting to develop love-indoctrination.

Chapter 6:6 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

⁵¹² While both the dishonest S/MIH and the EDSC Model have been relied upon to dismiss the mother-infant bond as 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 the light they shed on our own unconditionally selfless moral instincts? So the question now is, what nurturing-of-love-denying 'explanation' did human-condition-avoiding mechanistic scientists come up with to 'solve' this problem?

⁵¹³ The answer is that mechanistic scientists initially 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 the peace-loving bonobos didn't fit this model, they attempted to ignore the anomaly they represented altogether—and even maintain that despite the evidence, bonobos were no different to the other, competitive, aggressive primate species. And *then*, when these 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