

The Counterculture Movement of the 1960's

There is ample evidence of some means of transmissibility, from parent to child, of political ideologies. Many studies show that a familial tendency towards a political ideology exists.^{229, 230, 231} In a study on twins, it was shown that both direction of political leaning and strength of adherence to ideology would appear to have a genetic root.²³² Other studies also indicate that a familial tendency towards a particular social attitude, and the strength of adherence to that attitude, are heritable.^{233, 234, 235}

If there is a transmissible component of political psychologies, then historical events which favored the survival and/or reproduction of K-type Competitors or r-type Anticompetitors could be expected to skew the proportions of Competitors vs. Anticompetitors conceived within that period, just as populations can be either r or K-selected. This would then be expected to alter the general psychology of the affected generation, relative to it's culture's baseline standards and mores. Under this theory, this effect would also alter the political ideologies of societies more generally.

This scenario would offer competitive advantage to groups (and the individuals within them), as it would allow a rapid psychological adaptation to changing historical and evolutionary circumstances. For example, r-type Appeasement (which in group interactions is similar to, if not identical to, the *Stockholm Syndrome*) would benefit the persistence of a group under conditions of defeat in group competitions such as war, if the populace suddenly began to exhibit it following their defeat.

So, should all of a society's Competitive Warriors be killed in a battle, it likely would be advantageous to a population's genetic persistence if that population's overall psychology adapted, changing from a more belligerent, competitive, K-type psychology, to a less threatening, more pacifistic r-type psychology that is tolerant of being governed and controlled by hostile outsiders. In other words, were a population to lose a war, it would be in the interest of that group to

immediately adopt a mentality and behavioral drive willing, or even desirous of ceding to the wishes of the conquering force.

Under the tenets of this theory, should a form of r-selection or K-selection ever be applied to a population of humans, their political ideologies should change radically. Furthermore, given that we assert that group competitive processes have exerted an even stronger role over our ideological evolution than mere r/K stresses, any selective pressure which specifically removed K-type group Warriors from a population should be expected to exert an even stronger force over the political ideology of a population than mere r or K-type environmental selection pressures.

Indeed, when America deployed as many K-type, Competitive Warriors as possible during WWII, the sudden depletion of physically capable K-type Warrior males which ensued could be construed as similar to the conditions that would occur under the r-selection of a population, such as tremendously increased predation, or even defeat by foreign forces. Under the tenets of this work, this massive deployment of force would have been a clear r-selection pressure within the US population.

Those who stayed behind during the war contributed heavily to the gene pool of the generation born in the early to mid 1940's. These individuals produced a generation whose psychology was so inclined against the traditional American culture that 20 years later, they were referred to as being the “counter-culture” revolution.²³⁶

The counter-culture revolution did exhibit many thematic influences similar to that which we maintain would accompany an Anticompetitive, r-selected psychology. They sought a competition-free, commune-like social structure.²³⁷ They denigrated capitalism and economic ambition,²³⁸ through embrace of anti-materialism.²³⁹ They adopted a radical form of sexual promiscuity denigrating of monogamy, and demanding that women provide “free love,” absent any careful fitness-based selection of potential mates.²⁴⁰ Finally, in an extreme form of out-group tolerance, they allied with a foreign enemy (the NVA and Vietcong), and protested on this enemy's behalf at the very moment the United States was at war with this enemy.²⁴¹ There even existed an animus between physically aggressive males who embraced K-type Darwinian Competitions, such as military members and police officers,

and members of this “counter-culture,” r-type, Anticompetitive generation.²⁴² Indeed, so great was this animus that these r-type counterculture Hippies even spit upon returning servicemen, and derided them as baby killers.²⁴³

There are some who have tried to assert that the Counterculture revolution was produced by the children of WWII vets. According to this assertion, it was some aberrant aspect of the returning vet's parenting styles, perhaps produced by their traumatic exposure to war, which produced the modern Hippie. There are several aspects of this argument which conflict with a simple factual analysis of the era.

First, is the timing. The Hippie/Counterculture movement began in the early sixties, often being cited as a direct outgrowth of the Beat Generation of the late fifties. This Counterculture movement peaked around 1967, and by 1969 the Hippie movement was well in decline,²⁴⁴ with the final “*death knell for Hippies*” being cited as the Hippie association with the Sharon Tate Murders in 1969.²⁴⁵

This Counterculture period begins just over 20 years after the beginning of American involvement in WWII. It ended just over twenty years following the peak yearly birth rate of the baby boom (births from 1946 to 1964),²⁴⁶ in mid-1948.²⁴⁷ This would indicate that as the individuals conceived during US deployment during WWII reached 20 years of age (20 years and nine months from conception), they created an r-type social movement, which grew in strength with each subsequent year of r-type births added. As the offspring of returning veterans became prominent 20 years after their births in 1968 and 1969, this r-type movement was ended. At that point, the twenty something social culture began a gradual return to more traditional K-type mores and values, and the counterculture Hippie once again became aberrant.

Second, one must confront the fact that that the American period surrounding World War II had three distinct periods, consisting of a period of peace preceding the War (when K-type psychologies would have reproduced at a normal rate), a period of War involvement (during which K-type American Warriors were removed from the breeding pool while r-type psychologies enjoyed enormous favor), and a period of peace following the war (when K-type American Warriors were allowed to reproduce again, and did so in large numbers).

Likewise, America showed three distinct periods of political and social behavior in its twenty-something youth, consisting of a period of normative K-type Conservative behavior during the fifties, a period of unusually r-type behavior during the early to mid sixties, and a following period consisting of a gradual return to more K-type behaviors which began in the late sixties. These three periods all occur a little over twenty years after their corresponding wartime periods, which consisted of a normative K-favoring reproductive environment, an r-favoring reproductive environment during the war, and a final return to a K-favoring environment.

Of course all of that ignores the following simple logical argument. The War effort removed all males who showed even the slightest loyalty to their in-group. Those who refused to fight would have shown diminished loyalty to in-group. Since lack of loyalty to in-group is associated with a Liberal political affiliation,²⁴⁸ which has been shown to have a heritable component,^{249, 250, 251, 252} it could be expected that a period of selective breeding favoring those who demonstrated diminished loyalty to in-group would have produced a generation which embodied this trait. Indeed, this is what we see here. Since lack of loyalty to in-group is associated with Liberalism, one could expect this less in-group loyal generation to show increased levels of Liberalism, and likewise, we also see this. Since this text makes the case that Liberalism is actually merely an intellectual manifestation of an r-type reproductive strategy, this work would predict an increase in r-type behaviors. Here, we see an aggressive predisposition towards r-type behaviors such as promiscuity, and a greatly diminished respect for K-type behaviors such as monogamy in the Hippie population.

Interestingly, since diminished loyalty to in-group is associated with Liberalism, and the development of Liberal ideology is associated with an r-type polymorphism in the Variable Number Tandem Repeat (VNTR) of the D4 dopamine receptor gene,²⁵³ it could be expected that the Hippie would also exhibit similar long form VNTR polymorphisms in their DRD4 genes. This would lead to predictions of increased novelty seeking,^{254, 255} promiscuity,²⁵⁶ and drug abuse^{257, 258} in the r-type Hippie population. Of course, again, this prediction fits with observations.

As a result, given the perfect timing, the aspects of the selective pressures applied to the populace before, during, and after the war, as well as the behaviors and psychologies one finds in the populations

before, during and after the counterculture revolution, it is extremely likely that the counterculture revolution arose as a direct result of an r-type favoring, selective breeding of the populace during WWII.

Such selective breeding of individuals who avoided the K-type behavior of War, and it's associated demonstration of loyalty to in-group, would predictably create a more r-type generation of offspring. This generation would be prone to exhibit r-type behaviors, such as aversions to free competitions, promiscuity, rejections of monogamy, early age at first intercourse, low investment parenting, hostility to K-type humans, as well as the drug use and novelty seeking common among those with the D4 dopamine receptor alleles which likely produce the r-type strategy in humans.

Combined with our understanding of the underlying genetic mechanisms producing these behaviors, as well as what r/K Theory tells us about behavior, breeding, and political tendencies, it is difficult to assert that the children of returning WWII veterans, born in greatest numbers in 1948, sparked the start of the Counterculture revolution in 1962, when they were just 14 years old.

This would further require believing that the offspring of individuals who demonstrated such immense loyalty to in-group would grow up predisposed to exhibit such an immense absence of any loyalty to in-group that they would ally with an enemy of their in-group, during time of war. Given the tendency for the lack of loyalty to follow leftward political affiliation (according to John Jost's work), and leftward political affiliation to be genetic, this would have seemed unlikely, even if the timing did render it possible. It would appear far more likely that a parentage which eschewed the in-group focused loyalty of war would produce offspring which would do the same.

As a result, assertions of the Hippie movement having a veteran parentage are not only implausible, they run counter to every factual and scientific analysis of the era. Much more likely, is that as the surge of young K-type descendents of the War veterans turned twenty in 1968 and 1969, they viewed the Hippie as an inferior specimen. Feeling something more within them, they broke free of the r-type Counterculture of hedonism, disloyalty, and selfishness, and instead followed their own K-selected path. In doing so, they destroyed the

Counterculture Hippie movement, and preserved American greatness, all without ever firing a shot.

Jost²⁵⁹ said that one delineation between political ideologies is loyalty vs. rebellion. In the counter-culture model of the r-type Appeasement Strategy emerges a picture of a psychology prone to cultivate positive relations with an enemy force which sought to destroy their government, while being driven by subconscious, innate perceptions and urges that were designed to bring defeat to their own indigenous population. These urges are complemented by a desire to implement a strict Anticompetitive economic and social structure upon the populace, where even female mate choice was to be rendered uncompetitive. (In an r-type movement, the position of women is prone.) It is the position of this work that all of these urges are examples of how the r-type Anticompetitive Appeaser will seek to use rebellion and betrayal against their in-group, as one facet of a broader, r-type, Anticompetitive Darwinian strategy.

In ancient times, wars were fought in close geographic proximity. To bring about defeat of one's society, while having acquired the favor of the conquering enemy, would have been a very effective Darwinian strategy for a less capable specimen seeking to defeat the more capable indigenous Competitors within their society. If the enemy chose to lay waste to one's society, they might spare such a cooperative Anticompetitor, while eliminating the Anticompetitor's Darwinian nemesis, the indigenous Competitor. And were there an occupation, such an Anticompetitor could have been promoted to a position of authority, overseeing some aspect of their occupier's new domain, and in the process gaining free access to copious resources, and numerous mating opportunities.

This work maintains that an Anticompetitor is likely to be an individual who has received cues in childhood indicating that they will prove uncompetitive with K-type Competitor peers. If this is the adult Anticompetitor's childhood experience, then using a force of foreign K-type Competitors as a proxy, to subdue or eliminate local Competitors, would be an astonishingly brilliant Darwinian strategy. Like the r-type transvestite cuttlefish, the r-type Liberal Hippie could defeat their K-type Competitor nemesis in war, without ever competing or risking Darwinian defeat themselves. In addition, an occupation would facilitate the imposition of an Anticompetitive societal environment, where men

were not free to compete with each other, lest they outshine their new occupiers.

In the Vietnam/counterculture example, had America been defeated and occupied by NVA/Vietcong forces (as would have occurred in our ancient evolutionary history), the counter-culture revolutionary would have been astonishingly well positioned to seize competitive advantage from their fellow indigenous Competitors, a group for whom they exhibited open animus. While the few remaining K-type Competitors resigned themselves to the oppression of outsiders, the Anticompetitor would have thrived upon the favor they carried with the new occupying force, while benefiting as well from the Anticompetitive environment an occupation would have brought.

It is this clash of Darwinian strategies that Jost identified as a battle between “*loyalty vs rebellion*,” and it is the purpose which the Liberal's increased levels of openness towards out-group interests likely serves. Combine an urge towards rebellion with an openness to out-group interests, during time of war, and you have an r-type psychology designed to use betrayal to gain advantage during group competition.

No member of the counter-culture would have believed that their innate perceptions and behavior would facilitate a seizure of competitive advantage in this fashion, however. And indeed, in the newly formed world of globalized warfare, where occupation was not so easy due to geographical constraints, this Anticompetitive urge proved maladapted to that modern change in circumstances. However, such r-type individuals in our distant evolutionary past, where wars were fought in close geographic proximity, certainly would have been well served to pursue such an Anticompetitive Darwinian strategy during group competitions such as war.

Thus, we maintain that the counterculture was unconsciously driven by ancient r-type Anticompetitive behavioral drives which had evolved in a very different time. Such individuals were completely unaware of the Darwinian strategy they were employing. Given the strongly anti-K-selection effects of the draft in WWII, it is fascinating to see such a massive ground-swell movement of r-type psychologies arise, and then disappear into the ether as the children of the K-type Warriors of WWII began to enter the population in the 70's and 80's.

The theory contained within this text is the only theory extant which would explain why a movement, so opposed to traditional American culture that it would be termed “counter-culture,” would suddenly erupt within our nation, dominate the political debate within its generation for a short period, and then disappear, just as the children of WWII veterans came to dominate the young-adult scene.

This theory is also the only theory available which explains a mechanism that would predict all aspects of the counter-culture's political and social platforms. This theory predicts their sympathy with the causes of out-groups during group conflict, their favoritism for less competition-driven economic models, and their adoption of a mating strategy entailing sexual promiscuity and monogamy aversion. It predicts their hostility to the military and police, as well as their rejection of social rules designed to produce societal cohesion.

This is also the only theory extant which explains how each Anticompetitive aspect of their behavior would have conferred survival advantage upon them under similar conditions, in our evolutionary past. This theory shows where similar psychologies can be found in other species, demonstrates how these psychologies pursue similar behavioral strategies, and highlights that they would be produced under similar environmental conditions. This theory also explains the ephemeral nature of the counter-culture movement, and why it disappeared, never to be seen in such strength again. No other theory to date can explain just why young men of subsequent generations did not continue to hop on the train of free and easy sex, drugs, anti-Americanism, pretty colors, and no responsibilities - thereby keeping the movement, and all of its hedonistic pleasures alive and well for decades to come.

Finally, peer pressure influences likely played a considerable role in the evolution of the counter-culture movement. This will make it difficult to analyze each case individually. However, it is still notable that enough of a shift in the overall psychology of a generation occurred to produce this dramatic, yet temporary, shift in culture and political ideology. That this temporary shift in psychology so closely aligned with such a momentous occurrence as the temporary deployment of American military might during WWII, and that it proved reversible with the return of our military members at the end of the war, lends further support to this thesis of political ideology as Darwinian strategy.

Chapter Twenty Three

- 229 Bouchard, T. J., and McGue, M. (2003). Genetic and environmental
influences on human psychological differences. *Journal of Neurobiology*,
54 (1), 44–45.
- 230 Cloninger, C. R., Svrakic, D. M., and Przybeck, T. R. (1993). A
psychobiological model of temperament and character. *Archives of General
Psychiatry*, 50 (12), 975–990.
- 231 Eaves, L. J., Eysenck, H. J. (1974). Genetics and the development of social
attitudes. *Nature*, 249, 288–289.
- 232 Alford, J., Funk, C., Hibbing, J. (2005). Are political orientations
genetically transmitted? *American Political Science Review*, 99 (2), 153–
167.
- 233 Hatemi, P. K., Medland, S. E., Morley, K. I., Heath, A. C., Martin, N.G.
(2007). The genetics of voting: an Australian twin study. *Behavior
Genetics*, 37 (3), 435–448.
- 234 Hatemi, P. K., Hibbing, J., Alford, J., Martin, N., Eaves, L. (2009). Is there
a ‘party’ in your genes? *Political Research Quarterly*, 62 (3), 584–600.
- 235 Settle, J. E., Dawes, C. T., and Fowler, J. H. (2009). The heritability of
partisan attachment. *Political Research Quarterly*, 62 (3), 601–613.
- 236 Roszak, T. (1968). *The making of a counter culture*. Berkeley: University of
California.
- 237 Levitt, M., Rubenstein, B. (1974). The counter-culture: adaptive or
maladaptive? *The International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 1 (3), 325–336
- 238 Lattin, D. (2003). *Following our bliss: how the spiritual ideals of the
sixties shape our lives today*. New York: Harper Collins. p. 186.
- 239 Douglas, J. D. (1970). *Youth in turmoil*. Chevy Chase, Md.: National
Institute of Mental Health. p. 131
- 240 Lattin, D. (2003). *Following our bliss: how the spiritual ideals of the
sixties shape our lives today*. New York: Harper Collins. p. 186.
- 241 Hagopian, P. (2009). *The Vietnam war in American memory: veterans,
memorials, and the politics of healing*. Massachusetts: University of
Massachusetts Press. p. 66.
- 242 Sale, K. (1973). *SDS*. New York: Random House. p. 648–653.
- 243 Hagopian, P. (2009). *The Vietnam war in American memory: veterans,
memorials, and the politics of healing*. Massachusetts: University of
Massachusetts Press. p. 66.
- 244 Bugliosi, V. Gentry, C. (1994). *Helter skelter*. New York: W. W. Norton &
Company, Inc. p. 493
- 245 Ibid., p. 492
- 246 US Census Bureau. (2002). Population Profile of the United States.
<<http://www.census.gov/prod/2001pubs/p23-205.pdf>> (retrieved February
24, 2012)
- 247 Centers for Disease Control. (2004). Live Births, Birth Rates, and Fertility
Rates, by Race: United States, 1909–2003.
<http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/data/statab/natfinal2003.annvol1_01.pdf>.

- (retrieved January 13, 2012)
- 248 Jost, J. T. (2006). The end of the end of ideology. *American Psychologist*,
61 (7), 651–670.
- 249 Alford, J., Funk, C. Hibbing, J. (2005). Are Political Orientations
Genetically Transmitted? *American Political Science Review* 99 (2), 153–
167.
- 250 Hatemi, P. K., Medland, S. E., Morley, K. I., Heath, A. C., Martin, N. G.
(2007). The Genetics of Voting: An Australian Twin Study. *Behavior*
Genetics 37 (3), 435–448.
- 251 Martin, N. G., Eaves, L. J., Heath, A. C. Jardine, R., Feingold, L. and
Eysenck, H. J. (1986). Transmission of Social Attitudes. *Proceedings of the*
National Academy of Sciences 83 (12), 4364–4368.
- 252 Tesser, A. (1993). The Importance of Heritability in Psychological
Research: The Case of Attitudes. *Psychological Review*. 100 (1), 129–142.
- 253 Settle, J.E., Dawes, C. T., Christakis, A., Fowler, J.H. (2010). Friendships
moderate an association between a dopamine gene variant and political
ideology. *The Journal of Politics*, 72, 1189–1198.
- 254 Ebstein, R. P., Novick, O., Umansky, R., Priel, B., Osher, Y., Blaine, D.,
Bennett, E. R., Nemanov, L., Katz, M., Belmaker, R. H. (1996). Dopamine
D4 receptor (D4DR) exon III polymorphism associated with the human
personality trait of novelty seeking. *Nature Genetics*, 12, 78–80.
- 255 Benjamin, J., Li, L., Patterson, C., Greenberg, B. D., Murphy, D. L.,
Hamer, D. H. (1996). Population and familial association between the D4
dopamine receptor gene and measures of novelty seeking. *Nature*
Genetics 12, 81–84.
- 256 Garcia, J. R., MacKillop, J., Aller, E. L., Merriwether, A. M., Wilson, D. S.,
Lum, J. K., (2010). Associations between dopamine D4 receptor gene
variation with both infidelity and sexual promiscuity. *Plos One*, 5 (11),
e14162.
- 257 Olsson, C. A., Moyzis, R. K., Williamson, E., Ellis, J. E., Parkinson-Bates,
M., Patton, G. C., Dwyer, T., Romaniuk, H. and Moore, E. E. (2011),
Gene–environment interaction in problematic substance use: interaction
between DRD4 and insecure attachments. *Addiction Biology*. doi:
10.1111/j.1369-1600.2011.00413.x
- 258 Kotler, M., Cohen, H., Segman, R., Gritsenko, I., Nemanov, L., Lerer, B.,
Kramer, I., Zer-Zion, M., Kletz, I., Ebstein, R. P. (1997). Excess dopamine
D4 receptor (DRD4) exon III seven repeat allele in opioid dependent
subjects. *Molecular Psychiatry*, 2, 251–254.
- 259 Jost, J. T. (2006). The end of the end of ideology. *American Psychologist*,
61 (7), 651–670.
- 260 Haensch, S., Bianucci, R., Signoli, M., Schultz, M., Kacki, S., Vermunt, M.,
Weston, D. A., Hurst, D., Achtman, M., Carniel, E., Bramanti, B. (2010).
Distinct clones of *Yersinia pestis* caused the black death. *PLoS Pathogens*,
6 (10), e1001134.
- 261 Austin Alchon, Suzanne (2003). *A pest in the land: New world pandemics*
in a global perspective. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press. p.
21.