

Chapter One

The Theory of this Book

As we begin our journey, we will first describe the theory which this book will attempt to explain. On the coming pages you will see algebraic equations, strange names for brain structures, complex personality assessments, and other scientific terms and technical concepts. You will find yourself thrust headlong into detailed analyses of current scientific understandings and debates, within a myriad of fields. As each piece of evidence is placed upon those which came before it, a crisp picture of just how and why political ideologies arose within our species will emerge.

Unfortunately, such a massive quantity of information, presented piecemeal, in such a coldly technical fashion, may fail to clearly convey the essence of the theory behind this work to those who have not spent considerable time in the sciences. The underlying premise of this book will be buried beneath the mountains of evidence supporting it, before you ever gain a chance to see the theory clearly, in its totality. This would be a shame, because the premise of this book has real potential, to alter not just how we govern ourselves, but to alter the very destiny of our species and its individuals.

It is for that reason that this work will begin with a very short, clear explanation of the theory behind this book, absent evidentiary support. Having explained the theory, only then will we methodically progress through the scientific evidence supporting it. Then, having supported the theory scientifically, we will examine the theory in the context of our modern political reality, showing how much of what we see in politics today is easily explainable through this simple biological model. Finally, we will discuss how this theory may impact political strategy and matters of governance.

The theory of this book is that there is a simple explanation for the origins of political ideology. This simple theory will easily explain exactly why two people of similar intellect and understanding will come to two diametrically opposite conclusions on issues of governance. It

will explain exactly how ideologues will perceive the world differently from each other, and why such different perceptual frameworks evolved in the first place. We will show how primitive versions of these two psychologies are present in other, more primitive organisms in nature, and we will examine how these primitive natures mirror both Conservatism and Liberalism. We will also show how the simple science behind this theory has been researched and taught within the biological sciences for decades.

Put most simply, our two main political ideologies are merely intellectual outgrowths of the two main reproductive strategies that have been described in the field of Population Biology for decades.

Biologists have long recognized that two different psychologies exist in nature. These two psychologies each guide the organisms which hold them to pursue a behavioral strategy which will be most likely to yield effective reproduction. They are referred to as reproductive strategies, but they are really deeply imbued psychologies, which frame how an organism views the world, how it views its peers, and how it behaves as it moves through life.

The study of these psychologies is often described using the shorthand “*r/K Selection Theory*.” Both the “*r-strategy*,” and the “*K-strategy*,” as they are referred to within the field, are psychologies which yield behavior that is custom tailored to an environment. In humans, as in nature, the r-type psychology is primarily an adaptation to the presence of copious resources, while the K-type adaptation is an adaptation to the scarcity of resources.

Although the presence or absence of resources may vary within a population over the short term, over the long term these two environmental conditions will usually accompany either the presence or absence of a high mortality, most frequently predation. Predation lowers population numbers and prevents overcrowding, thereby increasing the per-capita resources available to each individual, preventing the onset of resource shortage, such as occurs with overpopulation.

It is for this reason that the r-strategy, which is the origin of Liberalism, is most often seen in nature within prey species, while the K-strategy, which underlies Conservatism, is most often seen in species which are not preyed upon. This is, in fact, the biological underpinning of the oft heard maxim, “*Conservatives think like Lions, Liberals think*

like Lambs.” Lions are a K-selected species which exists sans predation, and whose members exhibit a K-type, competitive psychology to match this. Sheep, by contrast, are a more r-selected prey species, and this is reflected in their less belligerent, more pacifistic, more freely promiscuous nature. One species exhibits a psychology which is belligerent, competitive, and sexually restricted, while the other exists as the exact opposite.

As one will find in any basic biology text, the r-strategy entails four main psychological traits. It exhibits a psychological aversion to both, competition with peers and the competitive environment. It also exhibits a tolerance for, or embrace of, early onset sexual behavior, promiscuity, and low investment, single parenting.

Of these four traits, (competition aversion, early onset sexuality, promiscuity, and single parenting), political leftists exhibit a tolerance of, or an embrace of, all four. Liberalism seeks to quash competitions between men (from capitalism, to war, to citizens killing criminal attackers with privately owned firearms). Liberalism exhibits a tolerance for, or an embrace of, ever earlier sexual education for children, and ever earlier exposure to sexual themes in entertainment for children. Liberalism also adopts a lax attitude towards rampant promiscuity, if it is not actively embracing it. And Liberals tend to support single parenting, such as was seen in the debate over the TV show *Murphy Brown's* glorification of single motherhood. On top of all of this, at the heart of most Liberal policy is a fundamental perception that resources exist in limitless quantities, and that any shortage is not inherent to the finite nature of the world. Rather, any shortage must be due to some specific individual's greed altering the world's natural state of plenty, which would otherwise be able to easily provision everyone with equally high levels of resources.

Any basic biology text will also state that the opposing K-strategy entails an embrace of four opposite psychological traits, as well as a fifth trait. K-selection favors an embrace of competition and the competitive environment, where some individuals succeed, and others fail, based upon their inherent abilities and merits. The K-strategy also favors delaying sexual activity until later in life. It also tends to reject promiscuity in favor of monogamy, and it will strongly favor high-investment, two-parent child-rearing. Finally, in its most extreme form, it will tend to imbue individuals with a fierce loyalty to their in-group.

Clearly, Conservatives favor competition, from capitalism, to war, to armed citizens fighting off criminals with personally owned firearms. Conservatives accept that such competition will produce disparate outcomes which will be based upon inherent ability and effort. Conservatives also tend to want to see children protected from sexually stimulating themes or sexual education until later in life, so they will be more likely to delay the onset of sexual activity until they are mature. Conservatives favor a culture of monogamy over promiscuity, and they tend to desire a culture which favors high-investment, two-parent child-rearing, as evidenced by the Conservative uproar over *Murphy Brown*, as well as the growing debate over “family values” within our culture. Of course, Conservatives have always viewed Liberals as exhibiting diminished loyalty to their nation and its people.

Why do the r and K reproductive strategies exist? What advantage does each strategy offer the individual who exhibits it? Suppose you have a field, and it produces enough nuts to support 100 mice. A group of owls moves in however, and keeps the mouse population at only 20 mice, in a field which produces enough food to support 100.

Now this environment offers specific advantages and disadvantages to each mouse. The owls will shorten each mouse's average lifespan. As a result, Darwinian selection will favor mice which reproduce fast and early. If a mouse waits to mate, it will be eaten, and that sexually procrastinating trait will be culled. As a result, those mice who produce the next generation will have no compunction about mating as early as possible. In this environment, “teenagers” and “children” mating is simply normal, as anyone who feels otherwise is eaten prior to reproducing.

Competition's risks will serve no purpose, as each mouse already has vastly more food than it can eat. Those who compete will waste time and energy fighting for something which is already freely available elsewhere. They will produce fewer offspring than those who avoid competition's risk, and focus all of their time solely on reproducing. As a result, the competitive will find themselves numerically out-competed by the more prolific individuals who avoid conflict and competition.

Under r -selection, monogamy is disadvantageous, as to impregnate only one mate, and then see the few offspring you have with

her eaten, is to see oneself fail, in Darwinian terms. Monogamy will also limit the total numbers of offspring produced, as a single female can only produce so many young. Thus, in this environment, one is best served by producing as many offspring as possible, by as many mates as possible, beginning as early as possible, all done as quickly as possible. In that way, it becomes likely statistically, that some of your children will survive to reproduce. Since under conditions of r-selection, these are the traits Darwin rewards, these are the traits which will evolve within such an r-type species.

Since producing high numbers of offspring is the goal, it is also advantageous to not waste too much time on rearing any one offspring. The goal in r-selection is mass production, as early and as often as possible. Those who produce more offspring outcompete those who do not. As a result, high investment parenting for extended periods will give way to investing as little as possible in offspring rearing, so one may dedicate oneself to the actual act of reproduction. This will diminish the chances that all of one's offspring will be killed before reproducing themselves. It will also allow the individual to most effectively take advantage of the surplus resources available by producing as many offspring as possible. Since resources are freely available, and aggression and competition are rare, offspring do not require much education or protection anyway, and they may be turned out of the home relatively early to fend for themselves.

Thus, in this environment, a population will evolve to avoid conflict and competition, mate early, mate with as many partners as possible, and not invest highly in any one child. The emphasis, as so many biology textbooks will assert, is to produce *quantity over quality* when producing offspring.

Now suppose that all of the owls were killed by an avian virus, removing the predatory force which kept the population so far below the capacity of the field in which they lived. The mouse population would grow, until there were 100 mice in the field. Once these mice reproduced, there would not be enough food to go around, so some mice would die due to starvation. This creates a different selective pressure entirely. Here, to survive, a mouse must aggressively compete with his peers, for the limited nuts available. Those who avoid conflict and competition, to seek non-existent nuts elsewhere, will die from starvation. The mice who survive, will be those who go after any nut

they see, even if they have to try and take it from another mouse by force of violence. Thus, such a K-type species will evolve to exhibit a more aggressive, competitive nature, more accepting of disparities in competitive outcomes between individuals.

Of course, a mouse's success, in Darwinian terms, will revolve not just around surviving and mating, but also around producing offspring who survive and reproduce themselves. From a Darwinian perspective, if a parent survives and mates, but all of their offspring die due to competitive failure, the parent might as well have not bothered reproducing at all. As a result, K-selected mice will evolve a psychology designed to invest heavily in a few, highly competitive offspring. This will produce a small number of offspring that are likely to outcompete their peers, rather than a larger number of lower quality, competitively incompetent offspring. Those mice who mate randomly and often, with any mate they happen across, will see their numerous offspring all killed off by the fitter offspring of those parents who carefully sought out the fittest mate possible, and then competitively monopolized their mate's genetic fitness through monogamy.

Young mice will evolve to wait before entering the competition for a mate, so as to make sure they are as competitive as possible, and are not simply killed by their older competition due to their immaturity. Parents will also evolve to discourage such early sexual precociousness in their young. Likewise, parents will evolve towards high investment, two-parent rearing, so as to better protect their offspring until they are ready to compete, and to carefully prepare them for the rigorous competition with peers, which awaits them.

Intense K-selection often evolves into groups of individuals competing with other groups, since this is a more effective way to acquire limited resources than working alone. As a result, K-type organisms will tend to evolve into groups of individuals who exhibit pro-social traits, such as loyalty to in-group and disregard for out-group interests. This is why K-selection produces herds of elephants, packs of wolves, pods of dolphins, and prides of lions, all of whom care for each other, while neither mice nor antelope, nor any other r-selected species exhibit any sadness should one of their ranks fall prey to a predator.

Since mice exist at the bottom of the food pyramid in nature, and are preyed upon fairly consistently by a wide range of predators (from

owls, to snakes, to foxes), mice never truly experience the K-selected environment for any extended period. As a result of eons of fairly consistent r-selection pressures, mice express a consistently r-type psychology throughout their species. Other species, which have existed for long periods under conditions of limited resources, will be highly K-selected in their psychology and behavior. Still other species, such as humans, can exhibit a mix of r and K-type psychologies, likely due to varying environments with resource abundances and resource shortages.

This theory will be highly controversial within the biological sciences. Biologists have long derided r-type organisms as inferior to K-type organisms, for a few reasons. To begin with, humans are highly K-selected, and thus have not evolved to be morally tolerant of r-type behavior. Promiscuity, child abandonment, cowardice, and the sexualization of children all clash with the K-type mores and values of our species, and thus are rejected as morally inferior by most humans.

Moreover, due to the r-type organism's abandonment of competitive selection for mates, in favor of a more random mate assortment that is less concerned with mate fitness, r-type organisms usually exist as far less evolved organisms. Absent the fierce evolutionary force of competitive selections, or breeding of the fittest with the fittest, r-type organisms become less capable, less intelligent, and less impressive as specimens as their r-selection goes on.

Pure r-selection will tend to devolve those species which adopt it, through the abandonment of this competitive selection - producing quantity over quality is not without cost evolutionarily. The quality of the product will decline, if there is no competitive test of fitness prior to mating. The fact that r-type species will often be prey species, their evolutionary development trapped helplessly at the whim of a more impressive predator does not help. Liberals will most assuredly not like this work.

Regardless, there is no denying that anyone who would take issue with this work must run head-on into the fact that r/K Selection Theory revolves around five issues of behavior, while political ideology revolves around the exact same five issues, arranged in the exact same way. These five issues - attitudes towards free competition/aggression, age of exposure to sexual activity, promiscuity/monogamy, high or low-

investment child-rearing, and loyalty to in-group - are the intellectual bedrock of both, ideology and r/K Selection Theory.

Of course, we will present evidence that in humans there is a gene which is documented to be involved in producing r-type behavior. We will show how this gene has been shown to be involved in the adoption of a Liberal political ideology, and we will even show where a researcher examining this gene's behavioral effects describes how the distribution of its alleles in humans will vary with r and K-type selection pressures. To any reasonable reader's eye, it will be impossible to deny the relation between the well documented r/K Selection Theory, the well documented natures of political ideologues, and the substantial scientific evidence for this theory contained herein.

As discussed, in nature, populations can exist as almost solely r-selected organisms, almost solely K-selected organisms, or as a bifurcated population, with sub-populations of each psychology. In such bifurcated populations, we will show how each psychology will compete with its opposite psychology for numerical dominance within the population.

We maintain that this r/K bifurcation in humans has its origins in our worldwide migration. When we first evolved we acquired critical mutations, such as the loss of body hair, which allowed us to function well in the heat of an African day. This allowed us access to prey which was more adapted to the cold of the African night. During the day as we hunted, this prey was unable to flee or resist our predation, due to its inability to move about in the heat. As we pursued such prey, it would quickly experience heat stroke due to its warm fur coat, allowing us to kill it and acquire its meat with ease.

As time went on our populations multiplied, resources became diminished, competition began, and the environment turned K-selective. One group of humans stayed put, formed groups, and battled for the limited resources remaining. They experienced the selective pressure of a K-selective environment. As a result, they evolved tendencies towards competitiveness/aggression, monogamy, high investment parenting, and sexual chastity until monogamous maturity. They also evolved an intense loyalty to in-group, and a preference for familiarity.

Another group fled the violence, and landed in a new untapped, uninhabited environment, filled with freely available resources. As this

new environment became competitive, the descendants of these migrators fled again. This evolved into a strategy of avoiding competition by fleeing to a new environment of freely available resources. This group became the r-selected cohort of our species, prone to docility and anticompetitiveness, promiscuity, low-investment parenting, and early age at first intercourse. They also evolved further traits to motivate their exodus, such as reduced loyalty to in-group, and preferences for change and novel environments.

Over time we colonized the globe, as these migrators spread out and multiplied with the ferocity of an r-selected invasive species. Closely behind them, as each new environment turned competitive due to overpopulation, would follow the K-selected humans, who would then quickly advance the evolution and adaptedness of these new populations.

In this book, we will present evidence that will demonstrate that in such bifurcated populations in nature, the r-selected males adopt non-threatening, feminine appearances as a means of conflict and competition avoidance. Meanwhile their K-selected counterparts exhibit large, macho displays of aggression, as a means of promoting the conflict and competition they so readily enjoy. In such populations, r-selected organisms are wholly pacifistic and violence averse, even as their K-selected counterparts fight violently, just feet away.

We will go on to examine how this K-selected Competitor/r-selected Anticompetitor model of evolution has evolved within humans. We will first examine how the primitive r/K urges have been modified by group selection processes, how this group selection model molded our modern sense of morality and fair play, and how all of this has produced our modern political ideologies. We will even explain why both psychologies exist within our species together, and why our species has not evolved to exhibit solely one or the other.

We will then lay out all of the evidence which presently supports this theory. We will begin by citing examples of how these behavioral models in other species mirror those of our human ideologues. We will go on to examine research into the brain structures of ideologues, and show how the brain structures involved govern exactly the same traits as r/K Selection Theory governs. We will even examine experiments in monkeys in which ideology-related brain structures were damaged, and show how the monkeys then adopted every facet of the r-selected

organism's behavioral tendencies, from docility, to hyper-sexuality, to promiscuity, to the adoption of low-investment child-rearing strategies.

We will go on to study the genetic origins of political ideology, and show how a gene involved in ideological predisposition codes for a neurotransmitter which is involved in both, r/K psychological drives and the brain structures associated with ideologies. We will even show that the Liberal-associated form of this gene is found in large numbers in migratory populations. We will examine research in the social sciences, and show how the psychological traits of ideologues correlate with human r-type and K-type psychologies. We will examine how early childhood experiences likely modify the adoption of r/K strategies in both humans and animals, and how this mechanism is related to the same gene that is associated with the adoption of a political ideology. We will even examine a pathogen which alters the function of the signaling system produced by the “political” gene, and show how this pathogen's disruption of this signaling system, and its physical alteration of the associated ideology related brain structures, produces many of the traits of both, the r-type organism, and the modern Liberal.

We will finally discuss how this analysis can explain many of the more subtle aspects of our modern political battles. We will show how evolution has not yet managed to catch up with the more modern selection pressures of today, such as birth control, democracy, and modern governance. We will even show how this theory may explain some important historical events in our species' history. By briefly examining the periods preceding historical events in the context of r or K-type selection pressures, we will show how the imposition of either r or K-type selection upon a populace has altered the ideology of entire populations and the course of history - sometimes just one generation hence. Finally, we will examine what all of this may mean for the future of our species' evolution, as well as what this evolutionary model may tell us about future historical events yet to come.

This research has the power to indelibly alter our populace's view of our political debate. It is our fervent hope that by the end of this book, history, politics, and the structure of your government will appear much different to you. If so, for the good of our civilization, please help share this new perspective with others, by sharing this theory with them. Knowledge is power.