

Now, lets travel to the ocean floor off Whyalla, on the western shores of Australia, where as May turns into June, thousands of Australian Giant Cuttlefish (*Sepia apama*), are gathering to mate. These fat, squid-like organisms have gathered by the thousands to reproduce. Large males, some as long as five feet, with long flowing tentacles, seek out the best caverns on the ocean floor to serve as egg chambers. Females, with short stubby tentacles, seek out such males, and pair with them, as they search out such chambers, knowing that the biggest and best males hold the key to the most secure egg chambers.<sup>13</sup>

Over time, other large males arrive, and due to males outnumbering females by as much as 11:1, the males all begin to battle over the waiting female, in a fascinating mating ritual, with several different forms. From flashing undulating patterns of color on their skin at each other, to charging, to actual wrestling matches, the males test each other, to see which one will prove the fittest, and lay claim to the female below.

This species was selected for this text because the Cuttlefish's skin is an amazingly complex organ, which required an amazingly intense evolutionary process to develop, much as human intelligence and physical development would also have required. For this reason, the mechanisms involved in Cuttlefish skin evolution can be viewed as likely being similar to the mechanisms involved in the evolution of the myriad of traits which make Humans so amazing.

Within Cuttlefish skin, a deep layer of reflective cells called Iridophores and Leucophores reflects ambient light up, through the skin cells above. Pigmented cells of various colors called chromatophores reside above this base reflective layer. Attached to muscles, these pigmented cells, in colors such as yellow, red, and brown, can be stretched flat by contracting muscle fibers, so as to filter the light through their pigment, and cause the area of the skin above them to adopt the color of whichever pigmented cell is stretched by the muscles surrounding it. Or these

---

13 Seeing as how this is a Conservative text, and will likely be assailed over the smallest detail, it must be noted all of these descriptions of events have been simplified for presentation to a general audience. A myriad of behaviors, including additional means of “sneaking,” role of egg chamber in selection, and some subtleties of mate pairing have been abbreviated or not discussed, as they do not relate to the thesis. For more detailed information see Hall, K.C. & Hanlon, R.T. (2002) “Principal Features of the Mating System of a Large Spawning Aggregation of the Giant Australian Cuttlefish *Sepia apama* (Mollusca: Cephalopoda),” *Mar. Biol.* Vol 140 (3), 533-545 (2002)

pigment cells can be allowed to contract back into small balls, removing the pigment from the light's path. Multiple cells can be stretched simultaneously, filtering the light through their combined pigments and producing almost any color imaginable, from bright orange to jet black. The end result is a skin made up of millions of “pixels” of skin cells, any one of which can produce a myriad of colors, with each individual pixel's color and brightness under the neurological and muscular control of the Cuttlefish's brain.

The level of this control is truly astounding. In laboratories, Cuttlefish have been placed in an aquarium with a black and white checkerboard pattern on the floor, and they rapidly produce an almost matching checkerboard pattern on their skin, so when viewed from above, they actually appear translucent. It is unimaginable how complex their brain structures must be to control the neurons which innervate the 20-60 muscles attached to each of the pigment cells. Simply to perceive the surroundings through their eyes, and process it into raw data, would require immense brain power, but to control each of the 130,000 pigment cells (each with 20-60 individual muscles attached to them) per square inch of skin (on a five foot long cuttlefish, mind you), and to match what they see with their skin's pattern is unfathomable.

During the mating ritual they engage in, males flash aggressive “masculine” color patterns at each other, using vividly colored, undulating patterns that appear to ride over their skin, like waves traveling on the water's surface. Males have evolved to be intimidated by such patterns if they are impressive enough, and often this simple show is enough to settle the competition. When it is not, charging each other, or even physical wrestling matches are used to settle the issue of whom the female below will mate with.

To our human eye, this is merely a mating ritual. In other words it is something done to secure a mate. In truth, this ritual, as well as the fear, daring, and other emotions which drive it, is all part of a mechanism these organisms evolved. The purpose of this evolved mechanism was to increase the speed with which their species evolved. We will refer to such mechanisms as Evolutionary Advancement Schemes, as they are mechanisms programmed into a species to enhance it's rate of Darwinian evolution.

Cuttlefish depend on their skin to camouflage them. The world is a dangerous place for a Cuttlefish. They are preyed upon by dolphins, seals, fish, and even other Cuttlefish, at times. Lacking a shell, or other protective mechanism, their best defense is to adopt the appearance of their surroundings, and elude their predators.

These Cuttlefish, by competing with each other and using these flashing patterns, are actually testing each other, and enhancing their species' development of this ability. These males are seeing who has the greatest degree of neurological control over their skin patterns, and the most ability to produce vivid and

controlled patterns of color. They are seeing if anyone has a mutational defect which has rendered an Iridophore, Chromatophore, or a Leukophore non-functional, and should therefore be culled. And, if one Cuttlefish has secured that golden ring of nature, a mutation which allows him to actually improve the ability of the species to control the colors on their skin, he will easily defeat the other males in this stage of competition. Males have evolved a fear of such vibrant displays, because such a fear aided the functionality of these competitions, and the Evolutionary Advancement Scheme of which they are a part. Their skin is as amazingly evolved as it is, because males compete in every breeding cycle, to see whose skin is the most impressive, and those who lose such competitions, are programmed to accept their fate.

Having resolved who has the requisite chameleon-like skills, the remaining males then compete by charging each other, and testing their daring and courage, and finally by fighting, testing each other's physical strength, muscular endurance, and vitality. The winner then acquires the right to pair with the waiting female.

In short, the Cuttlefish mating battle is designed to improve the next generation's ability to deal with the rigors of a harsh underwater world, filled with predatory organisms which kill Cuttlefish. These mating rituals evolved because over the eons, populations that did not engage in them gradually failed to compete with the populations that did. The marvelous displays we see today, are what is left of the species after millions of years of natural selection killed those populations which failed to compete in such Evolutionary Advancement Schemes, and subsequently, failed to evolve fast enough to survive. We shall refer to those individuals within the species who are behaviorally driven to embrace such competitions, and the Evolutionary Advancement Schemes of which they are a part, as "Competitors."

Now here is where this subject becomes interesting. Occasionally, smaller, weaker Cuttlefish males, who would otherwise have no chance in battle among the larger stronger males, hover nearby as the battles rage. Normally, these small males would stand no chance in competition with the larger, stronger males who are fighting, however these smaller males have a different strategy. They draw in their long flowing tentacles, making them look short and stubby - like a female's. They then display the bland color pattern of a female, and glide in past the unsuspecting large males, who just assume this transvestite male is a female is passing by. As the battles rage above, these cross dressing males mate with the female, all without fighting for her. They, in essence, pretend to be a female in order to avoid a conflict with the larger, more aggressive males - a conflict which they would likely lose. These males have been referred to as "Sneakers," but we will call them

“Anticompetitors,” as their goal is to subvert their species' Evolutionary Advancement Scheme through their subversion of such competitions.<sup>14, 15</sup>

This situation, where strong aggressive males do battle for females of high standing, while a smaller, weaker male affects a harmless, feminine personae in order to avoid his embarrassing defeat at the hands of a larger stronger male, may seem familiar to you. Clearly, the effete, competition averse, Liberal intellectual, who seeks Darwinian success through deception, is a motif we have seen before.<sup>16</sup>

It is an interesting evolutionary model. The progeny of the larger, stronger males, through their father's success in competition, possess the obvious selective

- 
- 14 Much of what has been described in this section relating to Anticompetitive Darwinian behavior, including that of *Sepia apama*, as well as that of other species, can be seen in slide show form at “Kings of Camouflage, Mating Trickery,” n.d., <<http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/nova/camo/mating.html>> (15 May 2010)

Additionally, there is an amazingly in depth section on Anticompetitive Mating Strategies at the University of California Museum of Paleontology's *Understanding Evolution* Website, detailing this complex evolutionary behavior in fish, salamanders, copepods, insects, and other organisms. See:

“Evolution's Dating and Mating Game,” 01 May 2008 <[http://evolution.berkeley.edu/evolibrary/news/080501\\_octopusmating](http://evolution.berkeley.edu/evolibrary/news/080501_octopusmating)> (15 May 2010)

- 15 For more on the above mentioned show, or to purchase a DVD showing the Anticompetitive Cuttlefish plying his trade, see the following website. <<http://video.pbs.org/video/1150618835>> To go directly to the NOVA TV transcript, “Transcripts - Kings of Camouflage” 3 April 2007 <[http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/nova/transcripts/3404\\_camp.html](http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/nova/transcripts/3404_camp.html)> 15 May 2010

- 16 “*Know yourself, know your enemy - a thousand battles, a thousand victories.*” Sun Tzu's admonition is particularly apropos here. Do not read this book, solely seeking a window into the Liberal mind, for you will receive only a fraction of the benefit this book offers. At every opportunity, examine yourself, and the emotions I evoke within you, in the context of this theory. Here, the human Competitor will snicker, as he sees the modern Liberal likened to the transvestite cuttlefish. But why? Competitors are possessed of an evolutionary psychology which emphasizes Honor, fairness, respect for outcomes of fair competition, and an innate tendency to view cheating in evolutionary competitions as the height of pathieity. Here, in the Cuttlefish, we see a duplicitous coward, shamelessly seeking to cheat in his competition for mates. We recognize that likening the Liberal so accurately, to such a pathetic reprobate, even a mere cephalopod, is a vile slander. (And yet we still snicker...) We know that our entire species will recognize the contempt such a psychology deserves. Indeed, as Competitors, we do not question the origins or purposes of our urges towards Honor, fairness, respect for outcomes of fair competitions, or our innate disdain for cheating. In truth, all are aspects of our evolutionary psychology, and are designed to enhance the efficacy of our Evolutionary Advancement Schemes. They make our competitions more effective in selecting for genetic competency, and see to it that

advantage of vitality, as well as enhanced camouflage ability, and the daring of the courageous. Such progeny are strong, daring, and better suited to a life spent fighting for survival in a harsh state of nature. Females who fertilize their eggs with the sperm from such males will have healthier children, which are more likely to return to the reef, and carry on those genes to the next generation.<sup>17</sup>

However, the smaller weaker Anticompetitive male, though less well suited to actual survival, also possesses a competitive advantage. He does not have to fight. Though his progeny will not be as healthy, strong, or capable of competition, and likely will not survive in as great a number as the Competitor male's, the few who do return to the reef will be able to easily acquire a female with very little risk, and thus his phenotype will persist within the population.

---

the results of such competitions are honored by all. These behavioral drives thereby maximize the effects of such competitions on the evolutionary advancement of our species, and historically increased the rate of our evolutionary advancement. Notice how strongly these urges affect your world view, how they govern your behavior, how they even define who you are, and yet you have no urge whatsoever to question their origins or purposes. The fact that the modern Liberal is descended from some duplicitous, cowardly ancestor organism, psychologically akin to the transvestite, Anticompetitor Cuttlefish, is interesting itself, and indeed, amusing to ponder. However to not also examine ourselves, and grasp the origins of our urges, is to deny us the even more critical advantage of understanding ourselves better. It is important to understand, as we will show shortly, that the vast majority of our population, who determine our electoral outcomes, is in fact, just like us, because humans are, overwhelmingly Competitors – this is why likening the Liberal Anticompetitor to the Transvestite Cuttlefish is such an insult within our species. The overwhelming predominance within our species of both the Competitive urge, as well as the Warrior urge which we will discuss shortly, define our very standards of right and wrong, and place the minority of Anticompetitive Liberal Appeasers in our species firmly on the side of wrong. To understand ourselves is to understand our species, and to realize how to guide the debate through the use of these urges. This is to gain critical battlefield advantage over our enemies.

- 17 Greater survival rates for Competitors are inferred from the fact that over the preceding eons, neither the Anticompetitor, nor the Competitor has come to fully dominate the population. This despite studies showing that the female of the species, though she acquires sperm from many males, has been shown by genetic testing to produce more Anticompetitor offspring than Competitor offspring. This is likely a common motif among the Anticompetitors, as they eschew competitions which are designed to enhance survival of offspring through ability. Thus to maintain competitiveness with the superior Competitors, they must possess increased reproductive rates compared to Competitors, to account for increased mortality rates in the wild. For details of *Sepia apama* fertilization, see Hanlon, R.T., Naud M.J., Shaw, P.W., Havenhand, J.N. (2005) "Transient Sexual Mimicry Leads to Fertilization" *Nature* 430 : 212 [PMID: 15662403]

It should be noted, it is the Competitor males who will evolve the species, into a stronger, more vital specimen. This is accomplished through their drive to compete, and engage in their species' Evolutionary Advancement Schemes. The Anticompetitive males, by contrast, are a parasite on the species, simply existing to perpetuate their own inferior genes, without regard for the overall well being, or advancement of their species as a whole. Their entire purpose is to serve themselves. Meanwhile the Competitor follows a path which could doom him to Darwinian failure, but even in failing, he aids the species to better itself as a whole. Should he prove unworthy, he willingly falls upon his Darwinian sword, and accepts responsibility for his own performance, all for the betterment of his species' gene pool.

In his speech to the Heritage Foundation, writer and comedian Evan Sayet referred to the Liberal “cult of indiscriminateness.” He speaks of how this cult promulgates the idea that nothing is really good or bad, and if you attempt to pass any such judgment, then you are bad. In short, I think he unknowingly hit upon the earliest evolutionary origins of the Liberal phenomenon. I suspect this philosophy first evolved as mechanisms similar to the above example of the Giant Cuttlefish. In short, at some point, there was a schism between the members of some species upstream of us in our evolutionary path.

Individuals who were driven to engage in Darwinian Selection advanced the evolution of this species (henceforth referred to as Competitors), while a second group who sought advantage through avoidance of the competition of Darwinian Selection, (henceforth referred to as Anticompetitors) parasitized this species, seeking to live among their peers, without engaging in the competition required to produce the most fit species possible. I believe there are many psychological features of the modern Liberal which exist as somewhat vestigial features of this early evolutionary history.

Basically, there is nothing more discriminating than Darwinian Selection. The decisions it renders are final, with those judged unfit removed from the population. If one examines much of Liberal doctrine, as well as Evan Sayet's “cult of indiscriminateness,” they will find that the Liberal does have a psychological tendency to encourage others to not make any discriminations between good and bad, better or worse, capable, or incapable. As Evan Sayet pointed out,

*“The way the elite does this is by teaching our children, starting with the very young, that rational and moral thought is an act of bigotry; that no matter how sincerely you may seek to gather the facts, no matter how earnestly you may look at the evidence, no matter how disciplined you may try to be in your reasoning, your conclusion is going to be so tainted by your personal bigotries, by your upbringing, by your religion, by the color of your skin, by the nation of your great-great-great-great-great grandfather's birth; that no matter what your*

*conclusion, it is useless. It is nothing other than the reflection of your bigotries, and the only way to eliminate bigotry is to eliminate rational thought."*

If one examines the model of the Competitor Cuttlefish's evolutionary scheme, one finds individuals who examine the environment around them, discriminate truth, exhibit a rudimentary form of Honor (Competitors, to our knowledge do not later attempt to act as Anticompetitors), and exhibit no compunction about using the force of their power to effect change on the environment around them, should they discriminate some state of affairs requiring rectification. It is this group of daring, responsible, discriminating individuals, whose behavioral drives have advanced the species evolutionarily, and indeed, produced the Giant Cuttlefish as they exist today.

Conversely, there exists within the Anticompetitive model, individuals who have no compunction about engaging in deceit, who seek to subvert free competition due to inferiority and weakness, and who have no use for the rules which comprise the Competitor's rudimentary form of honor, as such rules would inevitably harm their personal interests. Inferior, weak, deceptive, absent the Honor of the Competitors, and only released from being at the mercy of other stronger individuals by adopting a feminine appearance, to thwart the discriminateness which would destroy them, these Anticompetitors persist within the species as parasites, while contributing nothing to it's evolutionary advancement.

Of course it is worth noting that such "indiscriminateness" among human Liberals does not extend to Conservatives, whom the Liberal feels no shame in discriminating against, and castigating as evil, selfish, violent, and a plethora of other negative adjectives. In ancient evolutionary times, the Competitor (who is the evolutionary forerunner to the Conservative) was the most direct threat to the Anticompetitor's Darwinian success, and it is only natural a Liberal should possess a vestigial perception that, on some level, there is a fierce competition between them and their Conservative Competitor contemporaries.

The Liberal's refusal to discriminate does extend to a host of issues relating to our modern day Darwinian battles, however. The Liberal seeks indiscriminateness in salaries, school admissions, the "bias of standardized tests," the ability to defend one's self and one's family in Darwinesque physical battles with firearms, as well as indiscriminateness of criminal sentencing, where even violent crimes receive lax sentences. War, the supreme Darwinian Selection, and akin to the Cuttlefish mating battles, is viewed as wrong, no matter the rationales or motivations, and any form of fighting or conflict is frowned upon. There is no better way to stir Liberal ardor than to point out that someone is costing you competitive advantage somewhere. This is why so many have learned that the cry of "Victim!" is a Liberal call to battle. It is akin to crying out, "Darwin is about to cull me!"



Each of those cases of indiscriminateness is an attempt by the Anticompetitive Liberal to alter the balance in our modern day civilized Darwinian battles. The Liberal universally seeks to prevent any element of competition and selection, in the sense of our modern scheme of civilized Natural Selection, through Economics and Law. At this point, I should not need to point out the parallels between the Darwinian environment, and the cruel Godless world of Marx, in which the strong prey upon the weak, and the nature of the revolution he advocated as necessary to stop such evil Darwinian victimization. Or that Marx was fascinated and obsessed with the writings of Darwin. During some of my readings, I have wondered if he ever perceived this theory I am expounding upon, on some level, and kept it to himself, as he sought to thwart the competitive circumstances of life.

It is also interesting that one of the hallmarks of the Liberal movement is a push towards sexual promiscuity, which is a form of sexual indiscriminateness. Clearly, if one were a Competitor, one would have evolved certain desires for the behaviors of your contemporaries. Among these desires would be, a desire to compete, and having won the competition, one would then desire that the females of the species would have remained chaste until they selected the best Competitors as mates, and exclusively bore their children in monogamous relationships. Such a scheme would give the Competitors an overwhelmingly dominant advantage within the species, by shutting out the inferior Anticompetitor's ability to mate. The Anticompetitor trait would rapidly recede into the ashbin of Darwinian history. And, here, in the cuttlefish example, we see that the Competitor Cuttlefish adopts a sexually selective, paired mating strategy, similar to the Social Conservative ideal.

Conversely, if one were of inferior genetic stock, and unable to compete with a Competitor, one would desire females be sexually indiscriminate, ie, women who hold sexual activity in such low esteem that they will engage in it regularly with whomever they happen across, no matter how unfit a specimen they may encounter. Thus, an Anticompetitor would be programmed to dissuade women from choosing their partners carefully. Of course such a drive was particularly apparent during the Hippie movement (to be discussed in greater depth later), where "Free Love" became a household term, and women who mated as often as possible with as many random individuals as possible, regardless of their fitness, were deemed superior by the Anticompetitors of the time. Clearly, the constitutionally inferior Hippie Anticompetitor would require an advantage in free competition with Competitors. Thus, it is not surprising that such an urge to derail careful selection of mates by females would exist among them, or that their ancestor, the transvestite cuttlefish, exhibits promiscuous sexual behaviors as well.

With respect to general philosophy, this early evolutionary history also aids us in better understanding the modern Liberal's aversion to freedom, and the modern Conservative's burning desire for freedom. Freedom has, inherent in it, the



ability to compete. If the government didn't tax us, didn't limit our behavior, and allowed us to do as we pleased, we would all begin to compete freely, seeking to make our own advantages by our own hand. We would all innately become Competitor Cuttlefish. As in Darwinian Selection, some of us would win, and some of us would lose. To a Conservative Competitor, such a circumstance is liberating, and alluring, regardless of the risk. To a Liberal's mind, however, such a situation is untenable. The Anticompetitive Cuttlefish does not want a world where their ability to mate depends on their ability to compete with the Competitors of their species, in free competition.

Conversely, were the government to take all of your money and redistribute it evenly among the populace, limit your behavior to only what Anticompetitors deem acceptable, and saw to it that no one could be too successful, the Anticompetitors would have successfully subverted our modern civilized selection processes and evened the Darwinian competitive field to a point that they could enjoy the same selective advantage as anyone else. This control of behavior and competition is the type of scheme a Competitive Conservative would find untenable. However if one were an Anticompetitor, it would feel like the ideal environment to live in. In such an environment, the Anticompetitor is no longer at risk of Darwinian defeat at the hands of a Competitor.

Unfortunately for the Anticompetitors, humans as a whole, are programmed through evolution to compete. It is this drive which has led us to the apex of Darwinian advancement on our planet. Even as children, we are driven to play and compete in marbles, board games, and video games. If left to our own devices, we are uncontrollably driven to battles of all kinds. This innate, uncontrollable drive advanced our species, by forcing us to engage in activities where we would select the most capable specimens among us, and elevate their positions, so they could produce a new generation composed of their superior genes. This type of system, which arises spontaneously when men are free, does not bode well for the selective advantage of the Anticompetitor, who will quickly become out-evolved, if left as a sub-species, absent interbreeding. As Conservatives, our urge towards freedom could be viewed in the context of a Darwinian Competitor urge, an urge to compete amongst ourselves, free from interference, and in so doing, enhance the evolution of our species. It is this urge, burned into us through eons of selection, that led our ancestors to evolve farther and faster than every other species on the face of this planet.

Thus, the Anticompetitor, in order to stifle this urge to compete, must restrict our behavior, and limit our freedom. This is why the Libertarian ideals of freedom, and small government can never be adopted by the Liberal Anticompetitors. If Government is limited, so is it's ability to curtail our freedom, and restrict competition. If Government doesn't curtail our freedom, we are free, and if we are free, we will by genetic default, compete with each other. And if we

compete, the smaller weaker Anticompetitor will possibly find themselves defeated. Thus the Anticompetitor seeks to enlarge Government, and increase it's scope and interference in our lives and affairs, as a means of curtailing the competition which would endanger the competitive advantage of the Liberal Anticompetitor.

Thus, the battle between the Conservative and the Liberal is on some levels, a battle between the Darwinian Competitor, and the Darwinian Anticompetitor. This innate antipathy between the Competitors and the Anticompetitors is also, on some level, related to the political battles we see today. When a politician like John McCain seeks to appease the Liberals, support their Government restrictions of our freedoms, and avoid a campaign which might inflame the populace against Liberals, it does not go down well with Conservative Competitors for this very reason. We are designed to battle the Anticompetitor by the eons of Natural Selection we have endured as a species, where Competitors who dealt with Anticompetitors harshly prospered, and those who did not faded away, as their ranks were culled from the population by their unwillingness to compete.

Now I am not saying the evolutionary theory regarding the Giant Cuttlefish, above, closely aligns with all of the Liberal behavior of today. Clearly, our species has covered a lot of evolutionary ground as we joined together in small groups, developed communication skills, began waging organized systematic warfare upon each other, and ultimately began engaging in civilized political discourse, and pursuing the civilized Darwinian selection of our members through economic competitions. All along the way, this early primitive Anticompetitive urge was adapted to the changing circumstances, and as this book progresses, we will discuss the likely means by which this occurred. With each new environment, the urge likely altered itself to function best in it's new set of conditions, until it became the modern Liberal of today. This book will, to the best of my ability, follow this evolutionary path, and offer a complete, though speculative theory on the origin of modern Liberalism and Conservatism, which is in fact, quite different from this early evolutionary model. For now, however, this primitive example is a model which approximates where it all began. A subversive element among our ancestor species began to seek personal competitive advantage by avoiding all of the selective rituals which were designed to improve our species genetically.

I should also be clear, I do not believe Liberalism is an entirely genetically transmitted trait, though we will postulate an interesting example of possible inheritance of some form later. As I will explain, I suspect these Competitor and Anticompetitor traits, as well as the Warrior and Appeaser traits we will discuss later, are programmed into us, and triggered by mechanisms as yet unknown. To be clear, this cannot be viewed simply in the context of mere Mendelian genetics. There will be no single dominant Anticompetitor gene to be found, and traced

through ancestral lineages. As we will postulate later, the origins of this trait have likely evolved to express themselves in response to a complex mixture of genetics, early developmental effects on psychology, present environmental stimuli, and probably an underlying indefinable ephemeral quality which underlies who we are destined to be, from the day of our conception.

So to be clear, one cannot draw too many parallels between the Anticompetitive Cuttlefish's behavior and the modern Liberal of today, though obviously many similarities do exist. Both the Anticompetitive Cuttlefish trait and the precursor to modern Liberalism are similar Darwinian survival mechanisms designed to aid individuals to obtain selective advantage over their peers. In both humans, and cuttlefish, two psychologies exist, one embracing competition, and insisting that outcomes of such competitions be allowed to persist, the other seeking continually to subvert such competitions, or ameliorate the effects of any outcomes through varied means of outcome amelioration. In my opinion, the similarities are too great to ignore.

Clearly the aversion to the Darwinesque system of Capitalism, and the desire to replace it with an economic model in which there is no selective effect, is the philosophy one would expect from an evolutionary psychology designed to eschew Darwinian selection. A desire to disarm a populace, so that no one is capable of defending themselves, is indicative of a psychology which would seek to render those capable of defending themselves as helpless as those incapable of defending themselves. A law-abiding citizen with a gun would present the psychological stimulus to a Liberal of possessing a potent selective advantage over the disarmed Liberal, and the Liberal aversion to such a state of affairs would comport with the expected behavior of an Anticompetitor in such circumstances. Aversions to violent activities, and war could also be viewed in this context. The Anticompetitive Cuttlefish would detest all violence and competition.

However there are facets of the Liberal psychology which would indicate some further evolution has evolved the human Anticompetitor trait, so as to make it more amenable to a world where selective events did not just occur at the individual level, but at the group level as well.

For example, an Anticompetitive psychology would support locking up criminals who would pose a clear threat to the Anticompetitor in individual competition. The modern Liberal, however, seeks to curry favor with the criminal class by supporting lax sentencing, and engaging in strange behaviors like those explained in future chapters, such as the Jack Abbott case. We will discuss why this is, and what evolutionary stress produced such changes in this Darwinian strategy shortly. We will explain why the road from Anticompetitor to Appeaser is, in fact, not such a long evolutionary road to travel.

In the meantime, it is interesting to note that such a primitive species as the Giant Cuttlefish, so different from our own, contains individuals who have sought

selective advantage by subverting the free competitions which are designed to advance a species evolutionarily. Additionally, the observation that the males who have pursued this strategy were small and weak, and took on the non-threatening behavioral and physical characteristics of the female of the species as a means of conflict avoidance, is even more interesting. In this vein, it is worth noting, whether examining a Cuttlefish population or a nation, the Anticompetitor does not aid their society in developing. Rather, like a parasite inhabiting the gene pool, their goal is simply to pass their genes to the next generation, despite their inherent maladaptation to the rigors of survival and selection.

It is also fascinating that the effect of this psychology on a nation's economy parallels the effects upon the genetic development of a species. When an Anticompetitive organism subverts a population's selective rituals successfully, it weakens the population genetically, and renders it less capable of competing with other populations, by advancing its weak constitution, and weakening the vitality and genetic vigor of the population. When the Anticompetitor is allowed to successfully subvert our economic model to avoid the failure of the less fit businesses, so too does our economy begin to fall to those economies which are not so burdened by the Anticompetitor's urges. So too with education, social services, and privatization, as well as just about any issue where a free competitive model of organization is pitted against a rigidly controlled organization. As they say, *"Big fleas have little fleas upon their backs to bite'em, and little fleas have lesser fleas, and so on, ad infinitum."* Everything is a microcosm. Just as the Anticompetitive Cuttlefish does not aid their species to become bigger, stronger, faster, or better adapted to the rigors of nature, the Anticompetitor seeks to stall the Darwinian effects of Capitalism on the businesses of a nation, making the business engine which powers a nation's economy weaker, and less efficient.

Just as a Cuttlefish population in which only Anticompetitors bred would quickly become more sickly, weak, and less competitive, nations which adopted the redistributive ideals of the Liberal Anticompetitor have seen their economies gradually decline, as their business infrastructures deteriorated in the absence of the Darwinian effects of Capitalistic selection of businesses. As a consequence, these countries inevitably become weaker and gradually succumb under the stress of competition with nations possessed of freer economies. Those freer economies, where selective Capitalistic effects produce healthy, highly efficient businesses that deliver the best products at the lowest prices invariably will win, and this is why.

Hopefully, this book will serve to ignite further debate over these theories, and that debate can lead to a greater understanding of the Liberal enemy our country faces today. It will also allow us to better manipulate the Anticompetitive Liberal Appeaser's psychology, a feat which should prove all too easy given that, as we will show in future chapters, the more modern Anticompetitive Liberal Appeaser survives by being highly concerned with the opinions of others.