

Mission Paradise

„In spite of everything I still believe that people are really good at heart. I simply can't build up my hopes on a foundation consisting of confusion, misery, and death. I see the world gradually being turned into a wilderness, I hear the ever approaching thunder, which will destroy us too, I can feel the sufferings of millions and yet, if I look up into the heavens, I think that it will all come right, that this cruelty too will end, and that peace and tranquility will return again“

Anne Frank

Version 2.2.0 / 14.2.22

© 2021 Marco Lardelli

All rights reserved.

This book can be downloaded free of charge from <https://mission-paradise.org> as PDF file.

You are allowed to distribute unmodified copies of the PDF file.

Cover image: Shutterstock

About this book

„When life itself seems lunatic, who knows where madness lies? Perhaps to be too practical is madness. To surrender dreams – this may be madness. Too much sanity may be madness – and maddest of all: to see life as it is, and not as it should be!”

Miguel De Cervantes in „Don Quixote”

If you are an active reader of a decent newspaper, it must have become clear to you that humankind is failing at a frightening rate. At every moment there are now countless military conflicts going on in the world. Global warming and other ecological disasters are threatening to make life on our planet much more difficult in the future and will lead to large migrations and poverty. Every year a great number of animal species are declared extinct. The wealth gap between the rich and the poor is widening. Political and social tensions are rising in many countries. Even the sexes are having increasing problems to understand each other.

I was wondering if these developments are somehow connected in the sense that they have one or a small number of common root causes. This book is the result of my efforts to answer these questions and it also unfolds a possible solution for the problems listed above.

The book has been written with the following guidelines in mind:

- It is not a science book. Unfortunately, science has not advanced enough to give clear answers to all the questions which are relevant for this book. Therefore many parts of it contain speculative (but I hope very plausible) theories. I sometimes mention this again but not always. I also confess that I am no expert in most of the relevant fields of science. But I believe that this is rather a good thing, because as such an expert I would have never dared to write or even publish this book.
- But I still wanted it to be based on reality and not how I wish things should be. I wanted it therefore to be free from political, religious, emotional or esoteric arguments. I also tried to avoid to use moral in arguments, because moral views vary a lot between individuals and cultures (but I will discuss where needed typical moral dilemmas or human behavior driven by moral). Note that this requirements make the tonality of the book necessarily very rational and „cold“.
- It should be optimistic in the sense that it offers a solution. I personally

found it very hard to digest many of my findings. I realized that some results are actually not hard to comprehend, but very hard to accept emotionally. This is the reason why they have been ignored (or repressed) by the majority of people until now. It became clear to me that people will only accept my results if I present a solution to the mentioned problems at the same time. Because of this, it took me altogether much longer to collect or develop all the concepts presented in this book than I expected.

To my own surprise, I ended up one day with a sketch for a possible transition to a new society, which could - I hope - offer a much better life for all humans and could allow us to live in a sustainable balance with nature. Surprisingly even the very rich of today could expect significant gains in their quality of life (as you will see, it is much more than just a simple redistribution scheme). And as a bonus, the sexes could become reconciled.

I am well aware of the fact that this is a huge aspiration and that I must have probably failed. But if someone said 200 years ago that people will one day fly to the moon, he (or she) was considered completely crazy. But to succeed one day with a crazy idea, someone has to start thinking the impossible. Therefore my book is probably inadequate and maybe only corresponds to a naive moon rocket as imagined by Jules Verne. But it was maybe Vernes 1865 book „From the Earth to the Moon“ which made people look up to the moon with new, more ambitious eyes. I hope this text can (at least) do something similar for the development of a fundamentally better society.

I want to warn you that this is a very challenging book to read. The reason is that you probably will have to let go or revise a large fraction of your beliefs. You will find it sometimes very difficult to abandon some of them which have become important to you over many years. Some might even form pillars of your personality.

The book has two parts: a history and analysis of our current society and why it is headed for certain disaster and a second part with a proposed solution. The first part is the one which is very difficult to digest. To make sure you don't get depressed or too angry while reading the first part, I have included a short teaser chapter at the beginning. I think it is very helpful to see early how much can be gained by the proposed way of thinking, why it might be worth taking such an unusual and often saddening point of view.

This book covers quite a lot of topics related to sex. Because of the enormous complexity of the subject, I have limited myself mostly (but not exclusively) to the case I know from personal experience: heterosexual sex between man and woman. This does not mean that other forms of sexual orientation are not interesting and worth exploring. I admit that I simply don't know enough about other kinds of sexuality. I also did not take the difference between gender and sex into account (I lack sufficient knowledge on this complex topic).

This book must remain, because of its large scope and my limited time, incomplete. It is also definitely very far from perfect. Its only goal is to spark a discussion and hopefully further efforts to design and implement a better future society. I hope many minds smarter than me will hop on the train and contribute. Whether this book remains just an interesting thought experiment and an exercise in creative thinking or if it can really help to change the world one day, depends on your contribution.

You will hate to read this book, but you will love what it could achieve

„The real voyage of discovery consists not in seeking new landscapes but in having new eyes“

„Le véritable voyage de découverte ne consiste pas à chercher de nouveaux paysages, mais à avoir de nouveaux yeux“

Marcel Proust

For ages it was generally accepted knowledge that the earth is in the center of the universe. People believed that the sun, the planets and the moon are circling around a stationary earth. This seemed to be obvious: God must have put his creation into the most privileged position.

But astronomers realized at some point in time that the calculations of the orbital motions could be simplified if the sun was assumed to be in the center instead of earth. It started in ancient Greece, but Nikolaus Kopernikus was the first astronomer to publish a detailed model in the year 1543. It was improved later by Johannes Kepler and Isaac Newton. The new model offered dramatically simplified equations and allowed to calculate the planetary motions with much higher accuracy.

But the new theory was in conflict with the religious believes of the time. It was not acceptable that the earth was not in the central position and even in motion. The astronomers had to face fierce resistance from the church. In 1616 the then powerful catholic church banned all books advocating the heliocentric system.

The conflict was the beginning of an important paradigm shift called the Copernican Revolution. It was more and more accepted that science is more suitable to describe nature than religion. It was the beginning of a new era of scientific discoveries and subsequent technological advances which brought enormous prosperity to the world.

What has all this to do with this book? A central thesis of this text will also make you most likely feel very uncomfortable: that you are not this good person you believe to be. The goal of this book is to show that such a realistic (and more scientific) view of the human mind could open extremely promising new possibilities to redesign our society. I'm deeply convinced that by exploring and understanding our true nature (including what we call our "dark side"), we could

be able to create a fully cooperative society. And it is not difficult to see how becoming fully cooperative will increase our society's prosperity (and most likely our happiness) at least tenfold.

I will also try to show that the transition to a fully cooperative society is in fact without alternative. If we don't manage to transition to such a state rather soon, humankind will face doom. There is no sensible compromise: it's all or nothing.

I will describe human sexual behavior in detail. I want to show that our sexual desires can be explained in a very compact way, if we abandon our precious belief that woman and man are designed to make each other happy. If we accept that the sexes unconsciously try to exploit each other as much as possible (which makes sense from a scientific/evolutionary point of view), human sexual behavior suddenly becomes easy to understand. And in this understanding lies a great chance for reconciliation: we can accept our partners according to their true nature and forgive them. This means we are able to love our partners for what they really are, which allows us to enjoy much deeper relationships. Armed with this understanding man and woman could find happiness.

Similarly I will analyze how competition leads to aggression between groups and individuals. We will see that this aggression is an inevitable consequence of the competitive system. As there is no effective alternative to evil behavior in a competitive system, we are ultimately all innocent. This is an important key ingredient to make the fully cooperative society work: it allows us to forgive ourselves and others and will make aggression much more unlikely.

I will also explain how people's minds are connected by means of a shared subconscious. We will see that, because of this connection, giving makes us more happy than taking and earning. This again can be utilized to create a fully cooperative society.

A note on evolutionary psychology

„The more society moves away from the truth, the more it hates those who reveal it.“

George Orwell

We are often discussing psychological reasons why we do something. Most of the time we mention so called proximate causes (a word from behavioral biology). These are the direct reasons why we do something. For instance a wolf prefers to hunt young animals, because he prefers tender meat over meat from older animals. This is the proximate cause (which the wolf would give as an answer why he behaves this way if we could ask him). But there is also an evolutionary reason: it is less dangerous and takes less effort to hunt down young animals compared to older animals (at least if the mother is not around). And young animals are less likely to contain parasites. Therefore the wolf is driven by his desire to eat tender meat to do the strategically right thing. This is the so called ultimate cause. Another example is our fear of spiders. We find them ugly and disgusting (proximate cause) but the reason why we feel like this is that spiders might be poisonous and it is better not to touch them (ultimate cause). In this book we will focus mostly on ultimate causes. Note that the wolf is not aware of the true reason why he likes meat from young animals. It's a survival strategy which is implemented in his reward system which he cannot analyze.

For instance there could be many reasons (proximate causes) why a man has aggressions against women (his relationship to his mother in his childhood for instance). But as male aggression against women is very common (domestic violence), it is possible that even different proximate causes have a common ultimate cause. There might be a genetically induced tendency to develop such aggressions which can then happen in different specific ways. The reason for this must be that this aggression somehow makes biological sense (i.e. offers an advantage). We will look at this example later in more detail, but try to get used to think in terms of ultimate causes instead of proximate causes.

I will in most cases not discuss proximate causes in this book which does not mean that they don't exist. They are important in other contexts (like psychotherapy).

Teaser

“We cannot solve a crisis without treating it as a crisis. [...] And if solutions within the system are so impossible to find, then maybe we should change the system itself“

Greta Thunberg

Imagine a world, where you work 2 hours a day and still everything you need and want is available. You own only a few personal items like your clothes and shoes. You therefore don't need to worry that someone could steal your things from you or that you can't afford something. If you need a car, you take the next available vehicle and drive wherever you want to go. When you have arrived at your destination, you just leave the car and forget it. You don't need car keys, because there are no keys anymore. If you travel you don't need a hotel or a restaurant. These things don't exist anymore, because nobody wants them. Instead you are invited by local people for a home cooked meals and you can stay at their place as long as you want. You can travel with very little luggage, because everything you might need is also available where you go. The doors to peoples homes are without locks, because you are always welcome. You don't own a house anymore, because you own every house on the planet!

You don't need to pay for anything. Everything is free. You just take what you want to use. Money does not exist. You don't need an insurance because you have anyway no possessions and everybody will help you if you are sick or in trouble. You don't need a pension fund because the young will help you when you are getting old. Poverty does not exist.

You don't have a passport or ID, there are no borders anymore. You are free to go anywhere you want, anytime. You are welcome everywhere.

People have everything they want but the industrial output is only 10% of todays level which is a huge blessing for nature. Wildlife is thriving again.

You spend most of your time doing what makes you really happy. You create art, teach kids or adults, cook, work in a garden, do research, invent, write software, travel or just spend time with other people or your partner.

You don't need a password to protect your data. You can borrow any computer anywhere to access them. Nobody wants to protect his „intellectual property“. Everything which gets created, invented or programmed is shared with everybody. All digital data is public, all software is open source. You have read access for every storage device on the planet. This leads to a thriving ecosystem of software

which can automate every imaginable task for those who want. Large scale social platforms finally become a blessing for everybody. Everybody owns everybody's data. Computer games become entertaining beyond anything we can imagine today, as they can be the product of the creative power of a whole planet.

Art, literature and music explode in volume and quality. Science and technology advance incredibly fast.

There is no police, no army, no taxes, no social welfare and no government anymore. We simply don't need these things anymore.

There are no schools anymore. All adults are enjoying to teach kids the things they are good at. Kids learn driven by their curiosity instead of pressure and go from adult to adult to learn something new which interests them.

You don't need to spend your life hoarding money because you can be sure the community will take very well care of your kids if you are one day gone.

Everybody likes to give others pleasure because they know that their efforts will be returned hundredfold by the community. People have time to make art (including useful items like clothes) which they give away to others as gifts. Utensils are often not cheaply produced by robots but unique items made with love by hand. But we don't keep them for ourselves forever but pass them on to someone else at a good opportunity.

Women and men can have the sex they both really enjoy, in harmony, with mutual respect, true love and without shame.

Impossible? Naive? Ridiculous? Well possible.

But what if not?

„When a distinguished but elderly scientist states that something is possible, he is almost certainly right. When he states that something is impossible, he is very probably wrong“

Arthur C. Clarke

The origin of competition

„Until you make the unconscious conscious, it will direct your life and you will call it fate”

C. G. Jung

If we want to understand ourselves, we have to study our history. Don't worry, I do not want to bore you by dwelling in old stories of kings and wars. For our purpose it will be sufficient to study the very first phase of our history. In this stage we can already see the fundamental principles at work, but things are still not overly complex and therefore easy enough to understand.

Let's start:

Life started in the primordial soup of the oceans around four billion years ago, when a first molecular structure (let's call it just „molecule“ in the following) managed, by coincidence, to replicate itself. Of course the first replica of the molecule would immediately start to self replicate too (and so on). For a while this process was not obstructed: there were enough chemicals to build new molecules (enough „food“ if you want). Therefore the molecule filled, within a short time, the whole primordial soup with identical copies of itself. We might call this first phase „the first paradise“, the exclusive reign of self replication. It was a boring paradise because the molecules most probably had no significant consciousness which would have allowed them to enjoy their replication party. Then at some point in time something important happened: The replicating molecules ran out of „food“, the building blocks to build new copies. Self replication stopped suddenly. Self replication, which I will call the „male principle“, had met the „female principle“: limitation. This is the moment when the process of evolution started. A small percentage of the replicated molecules were different from their originals, maybe because the replication process was not perfect or due to other influences like radiation. One day, one of the molecules was able to crack other molecules to use their parts for his own replicas. This allowed it to self replicate in spite of the lack of food. Molecules started to „eat“ other molecules for the first time. Since this day, there is a war going on on this planet, a war on resources which are required for replication. The process of eating other molecules is the result of „replication frustration“ (a precursor of the sexual frustration we all know): because of limitation - the female principle - easy direct replication was not possible anymore, more sophisticated mechanisms had to be found. An evolutionary arms race led to the creation of more and more complex self replicating structures: plants and animals. This „war“ has been raging for billions of years and we humans are a result of it.

Later life invented sex, a method to mix genes to generate variation in the offspring. The goal was still self replication, but sex added new complexity to the

game. The reasons why sexual reproduction has evolved are still disputed and probably quite complex.

I will call self replication the male principle, because a man creates millions of sperm cells every day (vs. about only 300 ovulated eggs in a whole lifetime of a woman). Sperm cells are mere information and are very cheap to produce. The enclosure part - needed only for transportation - is discarded when it enters the female egg, so really only the genetic code matters. The female egg on the other hand is a highly complex machine: a complete cell with membrane, organelles etc., therefore it is matter. The availability of matter is limited. The female cell is of course information too (it also contains DNA). It is important to understand at this point that men and woman are not implementing only the principles named after them. Women of course reproduce, and men are very much shaped by sexual frustration: they cannot easily reproduce all the time and they reflect this in their bodies and minds. Both sexes implement both principles to some extent.

Fortunately we do not feel the full extent of this sexual frustration. Our mind is shaped by evolution in a way which allows us to tolerate it. It's not possible anyway to conceive 100 babies a day (due to a lack of available women), therefore men don't feel the urge for sex all the time. But everything we do is ultimately directed towards reproduction. This is why we enjoy highly complex activities like conducting physical experiments: it's always frustrated (I don't mean this in a bad way) sexual „energy“ which is driving us. In the case of physical experiments it is the subconscious dream of a large gain in power resulting from a better understanding of nature which will allow us to have better access to resources (and ultimately increase our chances of reproduction).

The process of self replication together with the limitation of available resources makes sure it is always difficult to reproduce: resources are always scarce, because they are immediately used by a living creature to self replicate. Even if a creature is able to devour other creatures, there will be soon copies of it around which will do the same (and therefore compete for resources with the original creature). There are always only eight bones for the ten dogs.

What other creatures should be devoured? Of course not the own replicates („children“), this would not make sense because it would counteract replication. Members of the same species also rarely eat each other even if this would make sense from a resource perspective: it is dangerous to eat genetically close creatures, as this might transfer parasites and diseases. But many species kill competing individuals (to get access to their territory) or at least try to push them out of their territory. Even slavery is known in the animal world (i.e. certain ant species).

So far we have talked only about genetical information. But with the development of larger brains a new phenomenon appeared: culture. Culture is information stored in the brains of a population which is also replicated from generation to generation by communication processes between individuals (e.g. chatting). Like genetic information, culture is governed by the process of evolution. We have seen that genetic information is always searching for material („hardware“) to build creatures. Culture is in a very similar way always searching for brains (again the „hardware“) to run on. This means that elements of culture also have a mechanism for self replication (if they don't have one, they disappear very quickly). This can be their obvious usefulness (e.g. a cooking recipe for a tasty cake) or an obligation to preach in the case of some religions. Sometimes culture is spread by means of

killing or enslaving those who don't share the same culture (e.g. the christian crusades) and acquire their reproductive potential (territory, women). As these two levels of information (genetic and cultural) behave in a very similar way, it is often not important to identify whether a human behavior is dominated by genes or culture (the famous „nature vs. nurture“ debate). But an important difference is that our genes cannot be changed easily. Culture by contrast can be altered relatively quickly. Therefore if a behavior is driven by our genes, it cannot be changed easily as well.

This is why research about the genetic causes of human behavior (like in the field of evolutionary psychology) are refused by many. The genetic causes seem to deprive us of options to improve society. This is of course true.

I believe however that ignoring reality is a perfect recipe for failure. A better society can only be built on the ground of what we truly are and not on wishful thinking. We can build a new better house only with the bricks we have (or we can produce) and not with the impossible ones we would like to have. Unfortunately biological arguments have been often abused in the past to support simplistic right wing political views („to be egoistic is our nature, it's impossible to change this“).

As you will see in part 2 of this book, I believe that luckily a very comfortable „house“ can be built for all humans using the currently available „bricks“.

How we compete in groups

„One does not become enlightened by imagining figures of light but by making the darkness conscious“

C. G. Jung

If our genes make us compete against each other, where does cooperative behavior come from? Why do we help each other? Why do we live in groups? Obviously this must offer some advantage. It is not difficult to see that many tasks are easier to solve in a group compared to a single individual. Like this, everybody can profit from the strengths and knowledge of several individuals. Big projects can be finished faster and with higher success rates if several people are working on them (e.g. hunting a large animal). Defense against dangerous animals is easier. But, most importantly, it is easier to defend a territory (or to conquer new territory) in a group than alone. We see that cooperative behavior is also a strategy which helps us to compete with others (outside the group). And if the goal is to get an as large as possible share of the available resources, group formation is supporting this goal. What we perceive as „good“ social behavior is in fact a process of gang formation and ultimately directed against others.

This is not difficult to understand but very difficult to accept. It means that behavior which is generally perceived as „good“ is ultimately driven by something we consider to be „evil“. This is why this idea is generally rejected by most people. We will see later how this unwillingness to face the (admittedly hard to swallow) truth is ironically preventing us from building a better society.

Large groups have an advantage over small groups. This is why history led to the formation of larger and larger groups and it is not surprising that the most dominating countries (like the U.S., China and Russia) tend to be also very large today. But it has also led to a layered structure of groups. Where once groups consisted only of family members, we now have a complex circular structure. In the innermost circle there is the group of the family members. Then we have a circle consisting of close friends, followed by the larger group of people with the same religion or similar political views. The outermost circle is usually the country an individual belongs to. But any property which makes individuals distinguishable could serve for group formation (e.g. young people tend to show their group membership through their choice of clothes). One example is skin color. While skin color does not tell us anything important about a person, it allows to assign people very easily to groups having the same color (white, black, colored etc.). This can be used to form gangs. Racism is in fact the result of our natural tendency to form gangs and skin color is just a very convenient differentiation property. And because of this, it is much more challenging to get rid

of racism than most people think.

Can we avoid gang formation in a competitive system? Unfortunately probably not. If you do not belong to a strong group, you will lose on the long run control of resources and you will diminish your chances to survive (or your children's chances to survive and reproduce). This is why our current attempts to eliminate racism will only lead to other forms of gang formation (using for instance religious or political properties to define the groups).

We see already now that the problem of racism is unfortunately deeply rooted in our competitive behavior. So if we want to eliminate racism, we will have to find ways to overcome competition.

Members of the same groups tend to live geographically close together. A family might live in the same house, friends might live in the same town, groups of people with similar language and culture might live in the same country. These group territories border to each other and these borders are the areas where conflicts between groups happen. Not all group members are equally involved in these conflicts. Deep inside the group territory is where the most vulnerable and valuable members of the group live (women with their children) and territorial conflicts are typically carried out by individuals which are considered more expendable (i.e. men). The behavior of people living deep inside the territory (traditionally more women) is typically more cooperative while the behavior of people living on border territory (or for other reasons more involved in border conflicts) is more noncooperative.

In the past, a mutual understanding of these subgroups regarding their role and their difference in behavior existed. In the last few decades we have become increasingly aware of the destructive power of territorial conflicts (imagine a war using nuclear weapons). This has led to a strong pacifist movement (recently predominantly led by women) blaming those involved in or preparing for territorial conflicts or defending borders. The problem with these movements is the fact that it is suicidal to stop competing in a competitive system. A group which stops competing will sooner or later lose control over vital resources and get marginalized or eliminated. Or in an example: there is always a dictator in our neighborhood which is only waiting for an opportunity to invade our country and to kill or suppress/exploit us. This leaves us with a difficult dilemma: on one side territorial conflicts have become so destructive that they can threaten the survival of humankind (for instance in large scale nuclear or biological warfare) and on the other side we are still forced to compete if we want to have a future.

Note that we can vaguely identify the two subgroups „deep inside the group“ and „people at the border“ with the politically left and right. This is also consistent with the observation that women tend to be more often politically left than men. The „left“ are correct in their view that territorial conflicts have become far too damaging and are causing enormous human suffering and should therefore be eliminated (by abolishing armies, removing borders etc.). But they fail to see that such steps are suicidal as long as other groups are still operating in a competitive mode. The „right“ on the other hand see this problem, but are underestimating the destructive power and human cost of territorial conflicts. The „right“ also believe that their group is fit enough to be able to come out as a winner from the competition. We will see later that this is in fact extremely unlikely and such hopes are completely unrealistic.

These observations have deep moral consequences. If the purpose of cooperative

behavior is to gain an advantage over other groups and aggression against other groups is required to survive, the people „deep inside the group“ are in fact profiting from the „dirty work“ of those „at the border“. They are not only profiting, but their survival ultimately depends on the effectiveness of the work of those who are fighting other groups at the borders. Consequently the „inside people“ have no right to feel morally superior.

Let's study an example before we look at this in more detail. In Greece almost whole islands are filled with African refugees which Europe does not want to let on European mainland territory by all means. This in spite of the fact that these people live under the most miserable conditions and many of them are children. These refugees belong to the „other groups“ (other religion, skin color and culture). The Europeans are scared that they will, once allowed to enter Europe, form gangs and work against them. These fears are not unjustified: Germany for instance already has a substantial problem with criminal middle eastern clans. In France, it has become very dangerous to show pictures of Mohammed, which is threatening the freedom of speech, a core value of European culture. But it is important to look also at the other side: the Europeans are delusional if they believe that they will always stay on the rich side of the fence. At some point in time there might be wars in Europe or maybe an economic decline leading to a large scale migration out of Europe (this has happened in the past, the Irish can tell the stories). I have little doubt that many Europeans will have to feel the club of border police of neighboring countries at some point in time in the future. Please also note that the tendency of Middle Eastern and North African people to form gangs in Europe does not mean that they are morally inferior people compared to us (as the „right“ tend to say). As we have seen, gang formation is a perfectly rational strategy in a competitive world, and Europe is nothing else than a big gang territory itself. But of course it would be self damaging for Europeans to ignore these processes (as the „left“ tend to suggest).

People „deep inside the group“ tend to show behaviors which focus on reducing conflicts in the group. These include distributing resources from the more successful to the less successful (like sharing the meat with everybody after a successful hunt) and other „fair“ behavior. This helps to direct the groups potential for aggression to the other groups instead of wasting it in damaging conflicts within the group. People „at the border“ on the other hand are more concerned about the fitness of the group to fight other groups. They prefer to deny less successful individuals resources and redirect them to the strong in an attempt to strengthen the group. Both behaviors make sense in a competitive system and for a group to be successful probably a smart balance of the two is required.

Please note that the individuals within a group are still competing. There is also a strong element of competition between women and men, as they are genetically never identical and both sexes try to get as much as possible out of relationships. We will look at this mechanisms later in detail. We are subconsciously trying to hide our noncooperative (or „evil“ if you want) strategies from others in our group. This is happening in such a perfect way that we are often not even aware of the noncooperative strategies we implement. To hide them from other group members, they are often only unlocked (in the sense that we become aware of them) when we are in certain situations. These are situations in which the evil strategy promises to offer a significant advantage which outweighs a possible punishment by the group.

It is also worth mentioning that humans are capable of almost limitless violence

and cruelty against other groups. If you don't believe this you can enter the terms „Nagasaki“, „Auschwitz“, „Nanking“ or „My Lai“ into your favorite search engine (warning: I recommend you to just believe). The absence of punishment by the group and a lack of compassion can enable such extremely evil behavior in completely normal people.

We will try to find ways later in this book ways how to avoid aggression between groups and individuals.

Our belief in moral superiority

„Apart from the sex drive, no other human need determines the behavior of humans as much as the desire for moral superiority“

„Neben dem Geschlechtstrieb bestimmt kein Bedürfnis das Handeln des Menschen so sehr wie die Sehnsucht nach moralischer Überlegenheit“

Franz Werfel

We saw in the last chapter that our cooperative behavior in groups is the result of an effort to try to compete with other groups. On a large enough scale it is therefore not cooperative. And even within groups we are carefully hiding the fact that we are competing with others and we are in fact sometimes acting against other group members (stealing, cheating, exploiting, suppressing etc.).

It is quite obvious to see that an exclusively cooperative individual would have a hard time to survive and reproduce in this world. To be able to act „evil“ seems to be a necessary property. Let us explore to which extent this is true.

People who only rarely have to act non-cooperatively against other members of their group (the people we call „good“) are therefore in no way better than others, but are rather just privileged: obviously they managed to get a position in their group where they can achieve their goals with only little conflict with other group members. As every conflict can be damaging for the involved parties, this kind of positions are desirable. To be „good“ is therefore more a sign of high social rank in the group. It is often the weaker members of a group who get pushed into risky „border“ work (think about the high percentage of black people among U.S. army soldiers) or who are forced into more conflicting behavior with other group members (the higher criminality rate of the black population in the U.S. could serve as an example). But the „good“ people need the noncooperative behavior of the border people against other groups to maintain their wealth. And furthermore it is quite clear that they would also show noncooperative behavior against members of their group if they were moved into less favorable positions within the group.

If a person is not forced for long time to do evil, the resulting good reputation in the group forms a valuable investment which should not be risked easily. This means that the barriers to do evil are now higher, but the person will be still able to

act evil if this promises a high enough advantage.

This is true even for very evil behavior. In some situations it is unfortunately very effective to be extremely evil. It is known for instance that soldiers who raped a great number of women in wartime managed to produce a correspondingly large number of offspring. We don't like this but from nature's perspective this is clearly a huge success. A hypothetical design of a human being without any such evil strategies would be on the long run (over many generations) at a significant disadvantage compared to other individuals who do implement them. It would surely not manage to spread its genes successfully. This is why „good“ people simply do not exist, even if we all try to make the members of our group believe that we are good (and maybe even believe this ourselves). And it is why we all have a vast arsenal of evil strategies inside us, mostly deeply hidden in our subconscious mind to make them difficult to be sensed by others.

An interesting example is the human ability to be cruel. Most people think that this behavior does not make any sense, but its benefits are in fact quite easy to explain. If you have a reputation to inflict great pain on your captured enemies, you might be able to conquer territories without having to fight, because your enemies will prefer to flee instead of fighting back. This is a huge advantage. This effect requires the ability to communicate which is the reason animals are never cruel in this way (cats practice hunting on captured mice but in this case the suffering of the mouse is an unintended side effect). Cruelty does not work for animals because they cannot have a reputation.

It seems to be clear now that we are actually all morally on the same level. Nobody is morally superior to anybody else. And if we all fall into the same moral category („evil“, we must say unfortunately), the categorization simply does not make sense anymore. We should stop using it to determine the value of people. And we are in the end all innocent because, as we are the product of millions of years of competition, there is no alternative to being evil. And this makes the categorization guilty / innocent meaningless as well.

This is a very important first result and will play an important role when building a new society: our feeling of moral superiority is an important driver behind violence. We are often justifying our aggression against other groups or people by pointing at their apparent moral inferiority (like „they are primitive cruel animals because they do XYZ, we should conquer them to bring our superior civilization to them or simply eliminate them“). The truth is: the other groups/people are not more evil than us, their evil is just different from ours. The difference makes the other groups/people's evil perceivable. For Europeans it is very normal to eat cows (which are often bred under horrific conditions), but for many people from India this is a barbarian sin. Europeans on the other side are looking down on India because of its caste system and on China because some people there eat dogs. I believe it is time for us to learn that such views of moral superiority are all a big nonsense. A careful analysis shows that we are - by our own current standards - all evil. But in this case we are also innocent!

I hope you begin to realize the enormous potential of becoming aware of who we are.

Why our attempts to control evil are failing

“People who claim that they're evil are usually no worse than the rest of us... It's people who claim that they're good, or any way better than the rest of us, that you have to be wary of.”

Gregory Maguire

The horrors happening in the conflict zones between groups are nothing new. What is new is how we are getting informed about them today. In the age of TV and Internet we can witness the suffering of people in a very realistic and detailed way, something which was carefully hidden from us in earlier times. In colonial times nobody cared in Europe about the numerous victims of colonialism in Africa. Africa was far away and few people knew what was really happening there. Now because of electronic media the world has shrunk in an incredible way. Today, we know exactly what's going on in places very far away. This vastly improved perception of human suffering has led to many efforts to mitigate it.

But are these efforts really effective? Unfortunately there are strong signs that they are not.

It has for instance become rare for „civilized“ countries to invade weaker countries. Instead of colonializing them, they are nowadays „only“ outcompeting them economically which leads to widespread poverty in the weaker countries. And because the life expectancy of a country is strongly correlated with the GDP, this poverty leads to a substantial loss of life years and suffering which is probably comparable to the effect of a military invasion. This kind of violence is known under the name „structural violence“ already for a long time. No blood is shed, nobody gets dirty hands from direct violence, but people die early and suffer nonetheless.

I believe that the rise of terrorism is a result of this effect. Weaker groups (identified by religion for example, but in reality driven by poverty) try to fight larger gangs (i.e. strong countries) by forming small and highly agile armed gangs.

Some mitigation efforts are directed against obsolete evils. An obsolete evil strategy is a strategy which does not offer an advantage anymore. An example is rape, which has become ineffective in modern times due to the widespread use of birth control and the availability of abortion. While not too long ago a raped girl was forced to marry her rapist (what a success for the rapist!), rape is heavily

prosecuted in most countries today. But such efforts, albeit necessary, also give us the false impression that we make progress in eliminating evil in general. To get rid of obsolete evils is relatively easy: nobody is really missing them as they don't offer any real advantage anymore. So it is quite easy to achieve an agreement to outlaw them. But at the same time many new evils might appear which do offer attractive advantages (for instance the field of cybercrime is currently exploding) and are often overlooked for long time.

Activists believe that they can improve the world by fighting „evil“ groups of people. We understand now that this goal is flawed for fundamental reasons. The real problem starts when these people fail to verbally convince the members of the other groups that they are right. What kind of options are left? I can think only of 1. depriving the members of the other group of means to distribute their views and force them to accept the activists solution for the problem or (if this also fails) 2. eliminating them. Some right wing activists even tend to go immediately for the 2nd option. This is why activism tends to get more and more militant over time. What was intended in good faith to solve problems becomes a big problem itself.

Another method which some try to make the world a better place is to put power into the hands of women. Unfortunately there are fundamental limits for what they can do differently in a competitive world while remaining effective. It is true that women do tend to show more cooperative behavior, but they cannot change the rules of the game (the group they are leading still expects them to improve the groups access to resources). The resulting effect is mostly only a shift from direct violence to structural violence as described above. And after a long enough exposure to the harsh conditions of „the border“, women tend to behave not much differently than men anymore. It's not men who make the world a violent place but the competition which is a consequence of both the male and the female principle. Replacing men with women will not improve this world in a fundamental way (which does not mean that women should be denied power!).

Some people believe that by forming larger groups (e.g. the European Union from the individual states of Europe), wars between the former smaller groups can be avoided. This will not work because of the layered structure of groups: the smaller groups still remain intact in the minds of people, and the large group is just an additional layer. The smaller groups can still have conflicts (now renamed to civil war), and the newly formed larger layer can still have conflicts with other groups (admittedly with now improved chances of a victorious outcome if the other group is also large). This is the true reason why the European Union was founded: to be able to compete with the U.S., Russia and China (economically and militarily).

It's a popular believe that democracy is vastly superior to a dictatorship and that it will allow to solve our problems in the future. While it is indeed difficult to suppress the majority in a functioning democracy, it is quite common that minorities are suppressed by the majority (e.g. the black population in the U.S.). It reminds me the old joke „What is democracy? Two wolves and a sheep who vote on what they are going to have for dinner“.

The germans want to make sure the holocaust will never repeat. How much progress have they made with that so far? Apparently not much. They still bring 95 years old concentration camp guards to court and into prison. This extreme unwillingness to forgive makes only sense if you assume that a small elite of extraordinarily evil nazis is responsible for the crimes committed in the concentration camps. And that society can be purged by punishing them hard and

letting them die in prison. But the inconvenient truth is that the jews were murdered by (almost) the whole population of Germany collectively. Everybody who was contributing to bring Hitler into power is responsible for every crime committed by the nazis. Hitler revealed pretty clearly and early what he had in mind. And as we understand now, you don't need a special personality to act very evil. Everybody could have worked as a guard in the concentration camps. You may not like it, but the truth is: even me and you! Don't get me wrong: I don't want to blame the Germans. The rise of fascism is a necessary consequence of a competitive system. The Germans (including the concentration camp guards) are as innocent as everybody else. The competitive system is to be blamed and made obsolete. But as long as the Germans (like any other group!) don't understand this, they remain just another dangerous gang (like any other group!). If we stick to the competitive system, history will inevitably repeat. Most probably this time not in Germany but somewhere else. In some way history already repeats: the refugee camps in Greece resemble to some extent concentration camps and are a form of violence against another group (mostly Africans) which is considered inferior and a threat.

Competition in the information age

“Information is power. But like all power, there are those who want to keep it for themselves.”

Aaron Swartz

In the old days, if you wanted an axe, it had to be built by hand. And if you wanted another axe the second axe had to be built with the same effort. But at some point in time humans started to build machines which could build axes (and many other useful items). By using these machines, the human effort needed to build goods could be reduced drastically. The development culminated in the invention of computers and robots, universal machines which could be used to produce arbitrary goods by just changing their software. Computers can also be used to automate cognitive tasks, i.e. to process information. The invention of computers and robots has increased human capabilities by many orders of magnitude. I want to explore in this chapter how our competitive system is impacted by these powerful inventions.

The speed at which a group (such as a company or a country) can learn is proportional to what the group already knows. An example: if you know how to build a microscope you can do biological research much faster than without it. This means that the group which knows more will learn faster than other groups which know less. Therefore if the available know how is kept secret by the different groups, it is only a question of time until the group with the initially largest know how will dominate all other groups. This mechanism explains the natural tendency for companies in the tech world to form large monopolies. It also explains why the economic gap between the developed world and the third world is widening. The mechanism works also on the individual level: some people have, thanks to their good and expensive lifelong education, increasingly complex and well paid jobs, where for many others only poorly paid jobs are left. Everything you learn early is a building block to learn more later and gives you an advantage.

With the advent of technology, not only the power of large groups (companies and countries) has increased but also the power of the individual and small groups. Today you can 3D print a functioning gun at home with plans downloaded from the internet. This leads to a disturbance of the power relations between large groups and small groups / individuals. In medieval times farmers could revolt against their lords with a pitchfork (which was not too bad even against a sword). Now you need an automatic weapon if you want to start a revolution against your government. Of course it is very problematic to have automatic weapons in the hands of citizens and this is why they are forbidden in most countries. Why don't people in the U.S. simply trust their government and hand in their guns? The problem is that 1. even democracies allow subgroups to be suppressed and 2. democracies have a tendency to be transformed to dictatorships at some point in

time. It is scary to realize that it is in many countries almost impossible nowadays for people to overturn their dictatorial governments: citizens are facing machine guns when throwing stones.

This conflict will get worse with technological development and the improved availability of information. When I was a child I had a large chemistry lab at home. Today it is almost impossible to get the necessary substances for experiments as governments are scared people will cook drugs or create explosives with them. The recipes for these things can be easily found in the internet. So called „biohackers“ are playing with gene technology like CRISPR-Cas9 at home (using simple and cheap lab equipment) and this technology could be used to render extinct an entire animal species! Everybody can download quite advanced cyber weapons from the internet today. If this kind of knowledge is used in the wrong way by competing individuals or groups the consequences could be catastrophic for the whole world. This is why a competitive world needs strict control of such technologies on the level of individuals and of groups (like companies and countries). This will inevitably lead to an increasingly rigorous surveillance state. It is also a known fact that control on the level of countries does not work well: more and more countries are getting access to nuclear weapons in spite of strong international efforts to limit the spread of this technology.

The more our society turns into an information society, the more dangerous information can be. When everything is controlled by code, code can be a deadly weapon. This is not only true for computer code, but also for other kinds of information: social media content can be used as desinformation weapons. Viral information can turn citizens into weapons by making them distribute fake news and propaganda. This means everybody can today create weapons of almost unlimited power.

As long as we are competing with each other, we cannot live in a world in which everybody can create weapons of unlimited power. As a consequence, a total surveillance state seems to be unavoidable if we continue walking the current path.

The battle of the sexes

*„Everything in the world is about sex except sex.
Sex is about power”*

Oscar Wilde

In the following we will have a closer look at our sexual behavior (i.e. our sexual strategies) and common sexual fantasies. The purpose of this (rather long) chapter is to show with an example, how competition has shaped our mind.

Human sexual behavior is relatively easy to study: it has been described in great detail on countless porn websites. It is rewarding to do this, because it makes sense to assume that other parts of our behavior are shaped by our competitive history in a similar way.

Note that it is not clear to which extent the discussed sexual behaviors are really genetically determined. There are most probably also strong cultural and individual psychological influences (we observe large differences in behavior between individuals). But it seems reasonable to assume that the genes at least constitute a predisposition for the described behaviors. Why this? Because the assumption leads to a very compact and consistent explanation of the observed extremely diverse and complex behaviors.

Most probably the spectrum of our sexual behavior is also crippled and deformed by our moral views and our current culture regarding the relationship of the sexes (e.g. the currently predominant patriarchy). E.g. dominant/aggressive female strategies are probably underrepresented in the following discussion.

I will also give first hints about how the gained insights could be used to improve the relationship between the sexes and reduce conflicts.

The ideas presented in this chapter are very speculative. Evolutionary psychology is a notoriously difficult field where it is often impossible to prove a theory, and I am not even an expert in this field. But I think in their sum the arguments show that the general way of thinking is probably correct. This is enough for our needs. **For the sake of readability, I present all the theories in the following as facts (without the many necessary „could“, „maybe“ and „might“).**

Also note that all the described processes are subconscious. People, of course, don't think in the way described below before having sex, they just have a particular desire or fantasy and don't know why they have it.

Some parts of this chapter can only be understood by remembering that our history

goes back millions of years and that our ancestors at some point in time were primitive mammals. Our brains still show structures which are very similar to those of much more primitive animals.

Another important goal of this chapter is to show that people are innocent for having strange or potentially harming sexual fantasies and desires. They are just a result of our long competitive history and actually very common. So this part is also about learning to forgive. Note that many of the "evils" discussed below can actually be enjoyed without harming anybody (i.e. oral sex). And we will see later how our more dangerous desires could be enjoyed safely as well. It also becomes clear why women and men could fit so well together sexually. It is often our feeling of shame which prevents us from having truly satisfying sex.

Be warned: this chapter is emotionally a difficult read. But keep in mind that unearthing these facts is the only way to tame them (i.e. turn them into something good, and later even have some harmless fun with them).

Rape

Rape can be a very efficient method for a man to spread his genes. Especially in times of war, there are men who manage to impregnate dozens of women. This is why rape is a very common sexual fantasy among men (as we will see soon, it is much more complex). A majority of male college students state that they would rape women if they could do this without risking punishment. But, maybe more interesting, why is rape such a common sexual fantasy among women? The reason is not that they want to get raped or just love to be „overwhelmed by male desire“ (this is the preferred explanation for the phenomenon today). Rape is a disaster for women and no woman wants this to happen to her. The reason for these fantasies is much darker: they „want“ to have children with a capable rapist. The sexual fantasy makes them feel attracted to men who have a stronger tendency to rape. This makes sense, as they subconsciously try to create effective offspring. Effective means, their sons should implement effective strategies, and to be able to rape is sure one of them. This is a very common pattern, and we will stumble over this several times in the following. If we call the desire for rape in men a **„perversion“ (a word I will always use in the following for „sexual strategy“)**, we will call the corresponding desire in the other sex the **„adjoint perversion“**. Interestingly the adjoint perversion is always a strange attraction to something which can harm. Note that we will discuss „higher order“ strategies in detail („the adjoint perversion of the adjoint perversion“). They must exist (the adjoint perversion is just another sexual strategy like the original perversion) and they add even more complexity to the game. They are important because they implement more advanced (and therefore superior and even more attractive) behaviors in the sexual arms race. The adjoint perversion of the female rape fantasy is the male fantasy about women who have rape fantasies (which is very close to the initial male rape fantasy).

What does this sentence „they want to have children with a capable rapist“ exactly mean? Let's have a look at the details in this case: Let's assume a woman has a tendency to prefer men which commit rapes. This tendency could be the result of a coincidental mutation. The sons from her relationships with these men will then also have a stronger tendency to rape (inheritance). If rape now is indeed an efficient strategy, these sons will have further offspring (including daughters) with a higher probability compared to „normal“ men. The daughters inherit this

preference from the grandmother. This means that the fraction of women with a preference for men who like to rape increases in the future population. This is how the preference can become a frequent feature in the population.

The promise of rape is the subconscious reason why men join armies. Some hundreds of years ago many men did not have the means to found a family: the oldest son inherited the farm, the others got nothing. Their only chance to have sex and reproduce was often to join an army. The surplus in men was consumed in wars. In our time, soldiers don't get a chance to rape anymore because they are sitting in a climatized room in their home countries (or in a submarine) from where they control war drones or nuclear missiles.

Now we can see a great opportunity: what would happen if women and men could satisfy their adjoint rape perversions without guilt (i.e. in „rape play“)? I believe it would reduce the incidence of real rape dramatically. How would this influence the attractiveness of war for men? We know that such sexual fantasies cannot be eliminated because they ultimately have a genetic cause. But as we will see, it is possible to turn them into something positive and improve the relationship between the sexes.

Sexism / Objectification of women

While women have to select their breeding partners very carefully, this is not necessarily the case for men. For a man, impregnating a woman comes at a very low cost. Therefore he can try a „shotgun“ strategy, where he tries to make many children without taking care of them. Of course the opportunity for this behavior is rare (e.g. war), but when it is available the strategy is effective. From the perspective of this strategy it does not matter which kind of woman is impregnated. Every specimen is worth a few minutes of investment. This means from this perspective (!) women are just wombs, a pure form of the female principle, their information aspects (genes and culture) do not matter. Again, as this is sexually effective behavior, women are attracted to men who objectify women. But they have to make sure their partner does not objectify them, as they don't want to become a victim of this strategy (i.e. the man does not care for his child). Many women get aroused from objectifying porn (adjoint perversion), but most insist in having partners who love them.

Desiring young

The „teen“ section is one of the most popular genres in porn, where the age of the porn actresses is always close to the legal limit. Some scientists say that the reason for this is, that young women can have more children in the rest of their life which makes them more attractive. But again, the true reason is much darker. Imagine the following situation: you go to the village market to buy some vegetables. There are two market women: one is old and very experienced and known to be good at cheating with the scale. Sometimes she gives the wrong change back, but never in your favor. She is also known to sell the oldest vegetable first. Then there is also a young girl. She is for the first time on the market and can barely handle the scale and is poor at counting the money. Where would you prefer to buy your vegetables?

The truth is: men prefer young women simply because they are weak adversaries. They are easy to fool: you can tell them that you love them and they believe it

easily. And they are easy to rape if the conditions are favorable. Most men desire women as soon as they are visibly sexually mature (which is quite early). But why then are women so early sexually mature? Why did nature not protect them by letting them acquire experience first? The reason is that in our past women (and men) often died very early from diseases and violence. There was very little time to waste. There were often cultural factors which protected most girls from very early pregnancy. This could be for instance rules forbidding a too early marriage. But of course this culture could break down anytime (in wartime for instance) and in this case it was, from nature's cruel perspective, justified to try to have a child immediately (e.g. from rape), as conditions were bad and there would be maybe no second chance later.

To be precise, men are not really looking for young age but rather for the naivety (which of course is often present in the young). Young age is not really preferable because young women die more often in childbirth. If you look at (especially Japanese) cartoon porn, where men can draw their ideal of a woman, you will see girls with big breasts and the big eyes of children. This is the true ideal: women with a mature body but a child's mind. But note that the women are not depicted as stupid: men don't want stupid offspring. This makes naivety highly desirable for men. Women subconsciously know this and fake naivety whenever they can to increase their attractiveness. This is a problem for women in the professional world. To be attractive for men, women often subconsciously play the naive which does not make a very good impression to others in the office. Or in other words, women have to hide their knowledge to be sexually attractive. For men the contrary is true. Women also very often try to appear younger than they are, shave their pubic hair to look like young girls, use makeup which makes their eyes appear abnormally large (like children). Also they diet and go to the gym to get a slim build which reminds of the body of adolescent girls who are still in growth. They wear high heeled shoes to make their legs look slim and tall like the too long legs of girls in growth. It's no coincidence that some men call pretty women „babes“.

Men feel also attracted to women who are good at faking naivety. This is an adjoint perversion. Note that this strategy is harmless but somehow very closely related to the original perversion (men's desires for naive / young girls). As it is more recent, more advanced strategy, it can make grown up women even more desirable than young / naive girls. It can, in a sense, act as a powerful surrogate for the original perversion.

Again, satisfying our adjoint perversions (i.e. „age play“) could dramatically reduce or eliminate child abuse.

Men who fake love

Women need to be sure that the man they have sex with is enough interested in them to contribute to childcare later. Therefore they often require men to be in love with them.

Now the strategy of faking this love is, together with the rape strategy, the only means for a man to increase its reproductive potential beyond only a few kids from a single woman. This is why women have developed strong defenses against this common male strategy: as they must be able to tell serious lover from „fuckboy“ already at young age, they have evolved to have a faster social development than men and their emotional and intuitive intelligence are often higher.

Sadism

Why do some men enjoy to inflict pain to women in a sexual context? The reason has to do with the experience of childbirth. When a man impregnates the woman he loves, he is actually inflicting great pain on her. But it would be very bad (from nature's perspective) if the man would, after witnessing childbirth, not impregnate her again because he loves her. Men must have, to be able to impregnate women again and again, a certain unconscious pleasure from female pain. This is a very specific mechanism to counteract mercy which serves a purpose. Again there is the adjoint perversion of female masochism. Women, to some extent prefer men who have these urges. This is also the reason why in many cultures childbirth is exclusively the realm of women and men are not allowed to be present.

Sexually motivated murdering of women by men

The argumentation is very similar to the previous sadism: because some time ago so many women died in childbed, men must have a certain drive which makes them impregnate women again even if a loved woman has died from pregnancy. Some time ago to impregnate a woman meant killing her with a quite high probability. Sexuality is very destructive for women, but not for men (for men, the path to sexuality is often destructive). This is reflected in the male sexuality. Men also try to exert control over women to force them to have exclusive sexual relationships. To achieve this it is an efficient strategy to threaten women with violence. Again there is the adjoint perversion: some women, for instance, like to be choked while having sex.

Sexual slavery

Sexual slavery was very common in the past, simply because slavery was common. It is probably one of the strongest male fantasies: to have power over a large number of women and to be able to have limitless sex with them. It is also one of the strongest female fantasies: to live under the power of powerful men who impregnate them again and again. The male fantasy frees the man from all the efforts to get sex from women. The female counterpart frees the woman from worrying about finding the right partner (the men are powerful!) and from worrying about the resources to feed / take care of her numerous offspring (the men are also very rich!). Both versions are ultimate fantasies of reproductive limitlessness.

The male version is maybe the reason so many men from Europe joined some terrorist groups. The female version (adjoint perversion) is maybe the reason why so many women from Europe joined the same terrorist groups.

General exploitation of women

In a family, only the child carries the genes of the father, the mother is genetically different. Therefore men developed a general tendency to exploit their women for the benefit of the offspring. This is connected to the destructiveness of sexuality for women. The adjoint perversion is women's attraction to men who exploit them

(submissiveness). The second order adjoint is the male preference for submissive women.

Parents investing more resources into sons than into daughters

The biological reason for this behavior are fundamental differences in the reproductive potential of women and men:

- Women have a very limited reproductive potential (max. maybe a dozen kids). But it is easy to realize (before the invention of birth control, very few women did not have kids).
- Men have a very high reproductive potential (almost unlimited), but it is very difficult to realize due to strong competition between males.

It makes therefore biologically sense for parents to invest their resources into the education of their sons: they have only a chance to reproduce if they are fitter than other men. This is not the case for the daughters. It is not clear if this behavior is a product of an evolution of culture or if there is even a genetical predisposition.

The strategy is not promising anymore in a modern society but is still practiced.

Prostitution

Prostitution must have been very common in ancient times (in many parts of the world it still is). Among our ancestors there must be tens of thousands of prostitutes. Of course men pay for sex because they seek a small chance to impregnate the prostitute (in modern times this chance has, thanks to birth control, dropped to almost zero, but the urge is old and still present). The prostitute in return gets resources which she needs to raise a child. This kind of business probably exists since the times when we were living on trees (the „sex against banana“ behavior can be observed in primates).

Men prefer skilled prostitutes. A skilled prostitute is one which is good at cheating men (see „oral sex“ and „anal sex“). The reason is again that men hope to produce girls skilled in prostitution. Some men even get aroused from having to give a prostitute money without getting any physical contact in return („money slave“). This is the most extreme form of the adjoint perversion.

Adultery (and the cuckold fetish)

This is also a very effective sexual strategy. Women promise one man sexual exclusivity but still have sex with other men to gain additional resources or have sex with other interesting men (which are maybe not so interested in taking care of her kids). Other reasons might be to avoid infanticide by other men (they cannot be sure if the kids are maybe from them) or to get additional male support in raising the kids.

Adultery is the reason we are ashamed to have sex in public: women try to hide with whom they had sex so they can have „exclusive“ sex with several men. Men are also ashamed because this is the adjoint perversion.

Of course there is an adjoint perversion of female adultery, the „cuckold fetish“: some men get sexually aroused witnessing their partner cheating them with another man.

Incest

Our desires in general do not let our offspring appear as sexually attractive to us: it negates the idea of sex as mixing genes with somebody who is genetically different from us. Incest also produces often children with genetic diseases. But this depends on the conditions: if a man (or a woman) has no other possibility to reproduce, this path will be chosen nonetheless. Not being able to reproduce is, in the eyes of nature, the worst possible outcome of a life, because in this case the genes are lost completely. Accordingly incest is a strong sexual fantasy for both men and women (and as a result a popular porn theme).

Oral and anal sex

Oral („blowjob“) and anal sex are strategies to avoid impregnation (typically in a prostitution context). The dumb male was offered a warm wet opening, but of course without any chance for impregnation. The pleasure to receive oral sex is the adjoint perversion. Men tend to think that they are dominant when getting a „blowjob“ when in fact the woman cheats them. Why this obsession with getting cheated then? Of course to have a chance to become father of a girl who knows how to cheat.

Why does evolution not render such perversions ineffective quickly? It could make men detect and avoid such strategies quite easily. The answer is the adjoint perversion: they also like them, therefore they try to avoid them only selectively (i.e. they avoid to marry a „whore“ who likes oral sex, but go to a prostitute which offers this). More about this later.

Cunnilingus works differently. This is a male strategy to detect the fertility status of a woman (from a time when our animal ancestors had better noses). The female adjoint perversion is the desire to receive cunnilingus.

Homosexuality

Homosexuality is, like any other sexual behavior, too a product of reproductive frustration (in the sense defined earlier!). The goal is actually the much more common bisexuality while the rare strictly exclusive homosexuality is rather a byproduct. What is the advantage of bisexuality? It selectively moderates the sexual drive to avoid bad matches. Bisexuality is very common with women. They have often no adequate partners available (they have to be very selective, as the cost of raising children is very high). In this case homosexual behavior offers them an „overpressure valve“ for their sexual drive. Lesbian porn is among the most common categories watched by women. The same is true for men, but to a lesser extent: homosexuality allows them to refuse sex with women if they demand excessive resources in return (or in any other case where the price of sex with a woman is too high). It could for instance make men avoid too risky rape attempts. Homosexuality is the trade union of sex: The possibility not to absolutely need to mate with the other sex (i.e. „strike“) is an important advantage. If you are a bi- or homosexual man, you might say now that you don't have sex

with men because there are no women available. You do it because you like it. But this is the proximate cause. The ultimate cause (which is the evolutionary reason why you like it) is the mechanism described above. We see that homosexual behavior does make sense as an efficient sexual strategy (contrary to popular beliefs) and is therefore as normal as any other sexual behavior. But it is a result of the sexuality between man and woman nonetheless. It serves its role in the game of reproduction. This is why in homosexual relationships we often observe a division into roles which resemble the roles of man and woman.

„Watersports“

The reason why some of us enjoy to taste the urine of our sex partners comes from a time when our ancestors still had a very good nose. It allows to test the urine for chemicals which we usually try to hide. For instance from male urine the concentration of stress hormones can be determined which indicates which rank in the hierarchy the male has. From the female urine the fertility status of the woman can be determined by measuring certain hormones. Women try to hide their fertility status carefully (of course again not consciously), because it allows them to run the business of prostitution all the time (otherwise they would be limited to the fertile time window).

Men think that they humiliate women in „watersports“ when the true reason is that the woman is trying to get an advantage. And some of us embrace it because it allows them to produce skilled „cheater girls“. Therefore enjoying to pee in a woman's mouth is an adjoint perversion.

We see that sexual strategies can become useless artifacts over time, kept alive by their adjoint perversion.

Why men and women could fit so well together sexually

Of course this is because of the phenomenon of the adjoint perversions. This is why, for instance, „female friendly“ porn makes little sense and is much less popular among women than the stuff made mostly for men. Many women also get aroused - for instance - by the sexual aggressivity of men, because they subconsciously would like to have equally aggressive sons from these men.

Fortunately female and male sexual desire can fit together very well.

Women watch less porn because the material is not „pervert“ (in the sense of strategically interesting) enough. Women, because they have only the option to choose partners very carefully, need to feel a well matching and sophisticated sexual strategy to get aroused (see also „SEXISM“). Men on the other hand prefer this too but are also satisfied with just a (any) female body. This is why more men are sufficiently satisfied with today's poor quality porn. Women on the other hand watch a lot of lesbian porn movies also because here no strategy (which would need a story to be told) is required: in their lesbian desire women can objectify other women too (in the same way men usually do). Why? Because if there is no offspring anyway, it does not matter much who the partner is.

We see that, if we assume that competition has shaped our mind, our complex spectrum of sexual behavior suddenly seems to be quite easy to explain. This is again hard to accept, since it means that the purpose of our sexual behavior is actually to outsmart our partners. It goes against the notion that man and woman are made to make each other happy (and explains why so many people are

unhappy in their relationships). We will see later how accepting ourselves in this way can help us to become happy with our partners again.

Competition and the need for greed

„Women like a man with a past, but they prefer a man with a present“

Mae West

Greed is a confusing human trait. Why do many dollar billionaires still focus all their efforts on making more money, when they already have so much? The answers can be found again if we look at this behavior from the perspective of reproduction. Of course a single individual does not need such wealth. It's impossible to spend it in a lifetime. But there are reasons why it still might make sense to accumulate it:

Money gives status. And you can, if you have to compete with other members of the same sex for good mating partners, never have enough status. Therefore if your competitor has a 20m yacht, you want a 30m model. But how does status work? As a billionaire you are competing with other billionaires about who will get the attractive Hollywood star as a partner. But why do some women need a billionaire, why is a millionaire not good enough?

In a competitive system nobody helps you to raise your offspring (on the contrary, many will try to prey on them). You have to accumulate resources to make sure your children can thrive in the future. And it is not only about your direct children, but also about their children and so on. You have to try to secure the wellbeing of your whole branch of descendants, your dynasty. And as this branch can be extremely large if you look far enough into the future, you need almost infinite amounts of wealth to secure it.

Women are aware of this too. Their chances for successful reproduction over several generations are clearly higher if they chose a wealthy man as partner. Accordingly they have a strong preference for rich men. This of course is a strong incentive for men to accumulate wealth. The fact that resources (or money) are limited on this planet leaves less resources for the less aggressive men which again increases the fears of women who would like to chose these men as partners. It's a reinforcing feedback loop!

We see that unlimited greed makes perfect sense in a competitive system. You have no other choice than accumulating as much money as you can in your lifetime.

What if there was no money (nor other ways to store or even own wealth) and the only way to protect your offspring would be to convince your fellow humans to

take well care of them? How would you behave then?

How competition keeps us poor

“Companies aren’t families. They’re battlefields in a civil war”

Charles Duhigg

The fact that groups are hiding information from each other comes at an extreme cost for everybody. We have seen this in the COVID-19 crisis where vaccines could have been made available quite easily for the entire world. But companies were sitting on their „intellectual property“ and selling their products for high prices to the highest bidder. The resulting global shortage on vaccines harmed everybody including the rich countries (because mutated virus variants developed in the unvaccinated parts of the world). This is the first way competition impoverishes us: limited availability of what could easily be available for everybody. We have invented perfect robots to produce t-shirts very fast and in a fully automatic way. But in many poor parts of the world people still have to sew t-shirts by hand. This often under dire conditions. The reason is that these people earn so extremely little that investing into a machine does not pay off. It’s cheaper to use humans as „machines“. The machine is expensive because of intellectual property and because few companies buy them (because they are expensive compared to human labor). This does not make any sense.

Furthermore the vaccine producers developed their products secretly without sharing research results which probably drastically increased the amount of time needed to develop them. Imagine that a software to solve a particular problem is required. What is faster: ten groups of ten people each working on a different version of the software or hundred people working on one version? Of course in the first case you can chose afterwards the best version of the software. But also the team of hundred has the possibility to let subgroups develop variants in parallel where this makes sense. Therefore in most cases the second team is much much faster (we assume that the project management is competent). This is the second way competition impoverishes us: extremely slow development speed for intellectual property (software, inventions, machine designs etc.). Many many software modules get developed in almost the same way every year by hundreds of companies. This is an enormous waste of human resources.

Often a software (or other IP) developed by a group (and kept secret) could be, in an adapted form, used by other people. Unfortunately in a competitive system this is not possible. This is why open source software is so infinitely more useful than proprietary software. In fact most commercial software is built on a huge stack of open source software (like for instance Linux, Apache, PHP, Libraries and Frameworks, etc.) and the code of the proprietary software has only a very small fraction of the volume of the open source code used.

The art of being successful with startups is to identify a business model, where you can gain a monopoly position in the market quickly. This is usually done by developing a very thin layer of software (or other IP) on top of millions of code lines of open source software or scientific results developed by universities. These monopolies are possible, because the biggest platform often offers the largest benefit for the users. Therefore if you are first you get the whole market share and it is later extremely difficult for competitors to reclaim a part of it. Then you can charge the users whatever price you like, because they don't really have an alternative. It is obvious that these alleged „motors of innovation and future wealth“ do much more damage than good.

Because we are always scared that other groups could grow stronger than us, we deny them information which could be used by them to improve their living conditions. This information could be software, plans how to build machines, recipes, chemical formulas and processes etc.. It is easy to see that the poverty of the developing world could be easily avoided if the developed countries would share their intellectual property.

Information goods (like software or patents) last forever and can be copied infinitely. Why should only a few people have them? It simply makes no sense!

We have made huge improvements in economic productivity in the last decades. To be able to enjoy the wealth of 40 years ago, we would have to work only about 1 hour a day using today's technology. But this cannot happen: because of competition we are still forced to turn the hamster wheel many hours per day.

And last but not least: competition even puts our culture at risk. Soon all the music, books and movies ever made will be stored only on a few servers of streaming companies (like Amazon, Netflix and Spotify). If some terrorists blow up or hack these servers, a large part of our cultural heritage could be lost forever. The same is true for the important Excel source code which is probably also stored only on a few servers.

Compare this to an open source project or a mp3 file which is sometimes stored on tens of thousands of servers all over the world. It is almost impossible to destroy this kind of distributed information.

Competition and the ecological disaster

“Even if you win the rat race, you still remain a rat.”

Adriano Bulla

At least 90% of our economy is producing goods and services which are only required to stabilize our competitive system and have no real use. Think about the following examples:

- Money and the financial system (banks, investment funds etc.): money is only needed because we don't trust each other. If we give somebody a gift, we expect a reciprocal gift of exactly the same value back immediately. Money is the technical invention which makes this possible.
- Insurances are needed because we don't help each other if we are in trouble.
- Pension funds, charity and the social system are needed because we don't support old or poor people.
- The whole complex system of the government (alone about 50% of the GDP!) is mostly needed to redistribute money for „fairness“. The school system is required because we don't have time anymore to teach kids (which could be an exceptionally rewarding activity). The army is a joke anyway. The rest is enforcing millions of rules which make our lives complicated: controlling people and prosecuting/punishing them (police, courts etc.). All this is required only because people always try to get an advantage over others.
- Many products are produced to satisfy status needs (luxury cars, villas etc.). As we have seen status needs are fundamentally limitless and this is why this production sector is huge.
- The production of many products could be reduced drastically if we would share them (like cars). Some products would be even much more useful if shared (cars, bicycles).
- Restaurants and hotels are needed because we don't invite travelers to our home anymore.
- The whole security industry (including the fast growing industry of IT security) is only required because people are trying to cheat each other all the time.
- Marketing, advertising and sales are purely competitive tools. They are used to make people buy things they don't really need.
- Software industry: All the code gets written a hundred times in more or less the same way because few developers are willing to share. Therefore the sector is highly inflated because it is so inefficient.

- Of course all the companies and institutions producing the products and services above need offices, have travel and IT needs, need energy and products etc..

Of course all this economic activity results in a correspondingly high pollution of the environment and an enormous waste of natural resources. It also creates a false impression of resource scarcity: we learned to believe that the available resources on this planet are not sufficient to guarantee a nice life for everybody and that we therefore have to compete for the little available resources. But in reality the resource scarcity is created by the competition!

This means that we could reduce our energy and resource consumption as well as the pollution by about a full order of magnitude (i.e. 10x).

Which products and services are really useful and needed?

Only the following few points come to my mind:

- Agriculture. We need tasty and healthy food.
- Housing (mostly for people).
- Art (all kinds: music, design...) and entertainment. Lots!
- Health care.
- Some production of really useful goods (plates, corkscrews and the like).
- A bit of transportation (trains, bicycles, cars, planes etc.).
- Some energy, clean water etc. (on a low level which could be produced easily from renewable sources).
- Communication and computing (like telephone and internet, community maintained social media).

The latest developments show how disastrous the environmental effects of competition can be: we currently waste huge amounts of electrical energy to „mine“ bitcoins and other cryptocurrencies. Cryptocurrencies are completely useless (they are not even physical) and they are only popular because we don't trust each other (money, „smart“ contracts, tokens etc.).

How our hypocrisy makes people act evil

“Hypocrisy is a tribute that vice pays to virtue”

Francois Duc De La Rochefoucauld

We have seen before that every human being must have the potential to act evil. But this does not mean that we like to act evil under normal circumstances. Evil behavior may be sometimes rewarding, but it is also dangerous: others (people from the own group or another group) might retaliate. Because this is very likely, we generally much prefer to live cooperatively, in harmony with our group and in a state of ceasefire with other groups.

But when someone is not aware that it is normal to have evil strategies implemented in the mind, the following can happen: he or she comes into a situation where it is favorable to act evil, becomes aware of the strategy and behaves in an evil way according to this strategy. From this moment on, the person will think that it has an evil character, unlike „normal people“. The person will be inclined to repeat the behavior, assuming that it is unfortunately made to behave like this because of its bad character and that it is its fate to act like this again and again.

This is for example how cruel and obedient soldiers are made: a superior officer orders them to commit a severe crime (like raping a woman or killing a child) in a war zone. When the soldier experiences that he was capable of executing this order (and maybe enjoyed this even to some extent), he feels so much guilt that he will not want to go back to normal society. He becomes the willing servant of his superiors in committing more crimes. As doing evil is traumatizing also for the person doing the evil (we will see later why), this is very destructive for this person.

For some sensitive people it is enough that they sense the presence of evil strategies in themselves. They are disgusted and consequently reject themselves which can be very destructive and can also create very dangerous people. The catholic priests of the „holy“ inquisition come to my mind who tortured millions of „witches“ to death not so many years ago. The reason for this is: we see others they way we see ourselves. And if somebody believes that he is an exceptionally evil person, he will see others as evil. We will later see how this works.

Similar arguments can be made for the realm of sexuality. Many people (including women) watch „immoral“ porn and feel guilty about it. They think that they are detestable people and some give up their real sex life in favor of just watching porn. The many rape scenes in „game of thrones“ got often criticized in the media, but most likely a substantial percentage of the spectators (men and women)

masturbated to this afterwards (and felt guilty about it). They probably contributed a lot to the success of the movies and made the producers a lot of money.

This is why we should 1. try to become aware of the hidden evil in us (at least to the point that we admit that it must be there) and 2. be honest and not try to make others believe that we are entirely „good“.

We are collectively lying about this all the time: we watch cruel movies where the „bad“ guys in the end gets killed in the most gruesome way. We pretend that we enjoy this because of the element of justice but in reality it is only because we enjoy the cruelty.

Our dark future with competition

“If someone can change your mind, he has won you over without raising his hand against you. This is the future of warfare.”

Bangambiki Habyarimana

We have learned about the two subgroups of groups, the „inside people“ (which we associate with the political left) and the „border people“ (which we associate with the political right). It seems clear that the more a group is dominated by the „border people“, the better it is at competing with other groups. If the group is a country, they would increase spending for the army with resources they deny the weaker. But historically this process was always limited by the threat of severe inner social conflicts. This is changing now: we have seen before (chapter „Competition in the information age“) that there is a growing imbalance between the military capabilities of individuals and governments („stones against machine guns“) and that governments are under pressure to install a gapless surveillance system to limit the power of individuals. These developments make it possible for governments now to prevent social unrest by suppressing it with modern arms (police repression), propaganda, suppressing freedom of speech and surveillance. This allows a country now to operate in a highly competitive state without having the drawback of social unrest. This puts other countries under pressure to do the same. Note that the prosperity in these highly competitive countries will be very low for most people. In the end, the most competitive country will win the race. And again: this is nobody’s fault (also not of the „border people“) as competition will force countries to walk this path. The social democracies will have no chance against the totalitarian regimes and they will sooner or later have to implement a totalitarian military/police state too. Otherwise they will just face invasion from a more competitive country.

This was a short analysis. Let’s look at how this process could take place in detail and what will happen inside countries.

As groups don’t share knowledge in a competitive system and groups have different amounts of knowledge, they will grow at different rates. This means that at some point one group will dominate all others and there will be no way the other groups can catch up. It would be very difficult to create another Apple or Google today. These companies have just grown too big. The same is the case for some countries. Another effect is that due to automatization (soon in the form of advanced artificial intelligence), less and less people are required to run these companies. For a while, Whatsapp was serving hundreds of millions of customers with just a handful of engineers. This is also true for non tech companies. In the information age every company has to become a tech company, or it will perish.

This development will lead to an extreme concentration of power in the hands of the few people who are able to run these highly complex corporate machines. With the widespread adoption of A.I. most peoples work contribution will be not needed anymore. They will be replaced by robots and will have to be supported by the governments which will try to tax the mega corporations heavily to be able to pay for it.

Governments will also try to limit the power of the leading tech companies. But this will be very difficult as they are competing with other tech companies on a global scale (i.e. other tech companies in other countries). On the global scale size matters of course too. Therefore governments would slaughter the cow which gives the milk if they split large companies into smaller ones or hurt them substantially in other ways. Governments will have little choice and will have to leave them intact and let them operate mostly as they wish.

It is obvious that the elite will form a group to defend itself against taxation and laws limiting their power. They will try to corrupt democracies (buying politicians, e.g. by financing their election campaigns) and use the power of the digital/social media channels they own to influence elections. The elite will also play off countries against each other and use legal loopholes to avoid taxation.

This is why compromises like „social democracy“ will not work in the long run. In such schemes the government is trying to mitigate the growing social differences in the population but competition is still accepted, because it is assumed that it is needed to make people perform. But competition will always increase the concentration of power and the masses will be, for the mentioned reasons, ultimately powerless against the elite.

At some point in time the now „useless“ masses will be not only a huge financial burden but also a substantial risk for the few in power. The masses will be unhappy as the governments will be only able to support them at a minimal level. They will protest or even riot frequently. Terrorism will increase (also using cyber weapons and desinformation). This will allow the corrupted governments to implement a surveillance state and adopt drastic punishments for breaking the law (under the pretext that law and order have to be restored). A larger and larger percentage of the population will be „neutralized“ by putting them into prisons (which, as a welcome side effect, often deprives them of the right to vote).

As soon the incarceration rate will have grown to extreme levels, even more drastic measures will be required to keep cost at an acceptable level: a wider application of capital punishment.

Also the government will limit freedom of speech by controlling communication channels with A.I.. The free press will be replaced with propaganda channels.

Note that this process is happening already now: within countries (like the U.S. which has already a huge incarceration rate today), but also on an international scale: weaker countries are driven into poverty and when people defend themselves using unconventional measures, they can be fought under the pretext of „fighting terrorism“ using killer drones.

Even old democracies are starting to limit freedom of speech in social media and messenger apps.

It is clear that if the few in power want to survive on the long run, they will have to wipe out at some point in time the rest of the population. They offer no advantage anymore and are only risk and burden. The powerful will send death squads into the slums of the poor. Yes, the holocaust will come back.

At the same time these people will be very worried to lose ground to their competitors (it will have become evident at that stage what happens to those who lose) and they will also try hard to eliminate them too. This could lead to global war.

The final result might be a world where only one single individual has survived (and only competition is to be blamed, not the people involved which behaved rationally according to their fears!).

Now could this person be you? Of course it is statistically extremely unlikely even if you are a powerful, rich or famous person (there are still too many of those). But even if you are one of the world leaders it is extremely unlikely. The reason is that the person who makes it in the end will be most likely a highly technical person. It will be somebody who is able to decipher the encryption keys for a large drone army to take control of it or to hack into computer systems to gain important information about the enemy.

And even if you are the one who will make it: maybe you will want to suicide after two months alone because you are so terribly lonely.

This is an important result: even if you are the most powerful person on the planet today, you and your whole family tree are most likely going to be eliminated completely.

But this is only the case if the world is continuing to walk the path of competition. This is why we will try to develop an alternative in the following second part of this book.

The promise of cooperation

„You never change things by fighting the existing reality. To change something, build a new model that makes the existing model obsolete.“

Richard Buckminster Fuller

As we have seen, the economic inefficiency of competition is extremely high. If humans were able to work with the same determination like today, but in full cooperation, the gains would be likewise extremely high. We would have to work only a small fraction of the time compared to today for the same amount of wealth. This would free enormous amounts of time which we could use in many ways:

- Create art (painting, movies, music, computer games etc.)
- Create hand crafted goods (like fashion, tableware, jewelery, furniture etc.)
- Spend time with friends or the partner
- Sports and games
- Travelling
- Gardening
- Cooking nice food
- Teaching kids in a better way

The burden for the environment would be also minimal compared to the current system. And the resources of our planet would be sufficient for all humankind.

Cooperation would also allow the construction of IT platforms on a global scale (owned by humankind) without the enormous negative side effects we see today from such systems (monopolies, abuse of user data, filter bubbles due to unethical use of A.I. etc.).

Because people would not be forced to generate an income anymore, we could make aggressive use of automation (A.I. and robotics) without any negative side effects and for the benefit of all.

We could spend much more time into quality education of adults and kids. It would give us the time to do much more 1:1 teaching by working on projects (instead of the cheap video tutorials and 1:25 schools we have today).

A cooperative world would be also a world without suppression. What was considered a „weakness“ before could be enjoyed as diversity and richness now.

Are humans capable to live cooperatively?

“Law is made by the winner to preserve victory over the loser.”

Toba Beta

It is worth exploring why most people will say today that such a world is utterly impossible. People assume that humans are lazy and egoistic by nature and that only constant pressure from competition, laws and rules can make them perform.

Is this really true?

There are (or were) societies on this planet which lived together in a highly cooperative way. It is for instance known that on many islands of the south pacific people are very social and conflicts with other islands rare. The south sea is maybe what comes to our mind if we try to imagine a paradise on earth. This not only due to the beauty of nature but also from early reports of adventurers who described the generosity of the islands inhabitants. Why this difference to the highly competitive mainland cultures? If we look closer at the historical living conditions on these islands, we understand why this might be the case. In the past, the population was regulated by nature: many men were lost every year while fishing (it was easy to get blown away from the island by unfavorable winds or because of navigation errors). Therefore the islands were not overpopulated (today most are). It also did not make sense to accumulate a lot of wealth in the form of things and buildings, because the islands were hit by hurricanes every few years which destroyed or blew away most of the infrastructure on the island (and led to many more lost lives). This maybe limited wealth differences and consequently envy. We could say people were mostly busy fighting together against nature instead of fighting each other. Infrastructure was primitive, because people did not see a reason to invest much energy into it, if everything material was lost at regular intervals anyway.

This story should make us ask another question: could it be that similar conditions were much more common in our more distant past? We know that during the well described last 3000 years of our history, people were mostly busy slaughtering each other. But it is well possible that for a long time before the cooperative part of our behavior played a much more important role. For instance because the population density was still much lower and different groups came less often into contact (and therefore conflict) with each other. In this times groups were formed rather to hunt and to defend against wild animals than to fight other groups. Anyway it seems reasonable to assume that human beings, due to their long history with varying living conditions, are capable to live in a number of different

social modes. Our behavioral patterns might offer solutions for many different living conditions. And among them are probably also predominantly cooperative modes as seen in the south pacific.

It seems that the living conditions determine whether a competitive or a cooperative culture evolves.

Another thing which makes an estranged group cooperate is the appearance of an external enemy (for instance in the form of another group). This is an effect which is often exploited by politicians who start wars with other countries to distract from internal problems. Another example is camaraderie between soldiers in a war. The extreme external threat leads to a very strong bond between the soldiers and intense cooperation. If the world would be attacked tomorrow by an alien species from another planet, humankind would switch into a fully cooperative mode immediately. Of course we don't want to hope for this to happen.

We can now try to summarize the environmental conditions under which groups develop a cooperative culture:

- A. A mechanism which keeps the population density low (e.g. harsh natural environment like frequent storms, hard winters etc., frequent diseases). A high population density leads to social stress in a group and between groups. If resources are available in sufficient quantities, nobody wants to risk a conflict. But the less „bones“ there are for the ten „dogs“, the harder they will fight over them.
- B. An external common enemy or threat (could be other groups, dangerous animals or again harsh natural conditions). We have already seen that forming a group is an excellent strategy to compete with other groups. We have also seen that within the group people act mostly cooperatively to maintain its stability.
- C. Limited possibilities for people to accumulate individual wealth (possessions or money). Individual wealth is an important means to gain an advantage over other members of your group (otherwise it could be easily shared with everybody). It also reduces an individuals need for support from the other group members, as the possessions make it easier to survive without their help. It is therefore clearly competitive in nature. Therefore the limited availability of possibilities to accumulate individual wealth will probably support cooperative behavior in the group.

Is it possible to trigger a transition to a cooperative culture on a global scale by creating such conditions artificially?

Let's again look at the different factors individually:

- A. All these things are not available anymore (fortunately).
- B. Not available. We don't want groups to have enemies anymore and we also don't want them to be threatened. But it is an important reason why there is cooperative behavior inside groups today.
- C. Not available. It has become easier to produce and accumulate wealth than ever before, and I see no way to change this.

It becomes clear now why we don't have cooperative cultures in most countries today: the conditions simply do not support the development of this kind of behavior.

This means, our only chance is a change in culture which is not driven by environmental conditions. This means we have to want the change. All or most of us at some point in time.

Now let's study the cooperative culture which can evolve under such conditions. Maybe we can use some of it to create a global cooperative culture. Which are the cultural values of cooperative societies? And what additional cultural values do we need?

- A. The culture of enjoying to give and help. The early travelers visiting the pacific islands realized quickly that the islanders were very generous. Some visitors lived over long periods of time only from the gifts of the locals without ever giving something back. Now you might think that the islanders were obviously stupid and therefore easy to exploit. But I don't think the locals felt exploited and they were sure not stupid. The behavior can only be understood when we understand the locals perception of giving: giving and helping were a joy and a privilege which gives status. Therefore people who can never give something to others are considered poor and deserve pity. The local fishermen must have thought something along the following line: „wow, I'm allowed to bring this man joy every day and all I have to do is to catch another fish“. It is also important that help and generosity are not only granted to the members of the own group (like close family members, the „clan“) but also to strangers.
- B. The culture of not tolerating excessive personal possessions. Individual wealth needs a culture which accepts it. I spent some time in the south pacific and I remember an incident where we went back to our boat with many boxes full of food in a public bus (after shopping for a multi week sailing trip). An elderly woman in the bus opened without asking one of the boxes, took out a few boxes of cookies and distributed them among the people in the bus. Then she was smiling at us and the whole bus was happily munching our cookies. I was told that it would be extremely impolite to protest as this behavior was totally OK in the local culture. This means that individual wealth can only exist if it is accepted by the other group members. This is also interesting from the perspective that on many islands the possession of large riches is already limited due to natural conditions (frequent hurricanes). The culture seems to reinforce this further.
- C. Promiscuous behavior is accepted. This has the effect that it is often not so clear who really the father of a child is. Therefore it does not make much sense for men to concentrate their support for mothers only on one woman. They have to distribute their contributions among several women because all of them could be mothers of their children. If men distribute their support between several women, every woman also has several men as sources of support. Then women are not dependent anymore on a single man to support them. They don't have to chose a single man with large wealth as partner anymore. Note that in the future it will be very easy to find the father of a child using genetic fingerprinting. Therefore there must be also a culture in place which considers this a taboo. Similarly we could imagine a culture of women raising kids collectively which again decreases their dependence on men. Ideally both men and women raise the kids collectively.
- D. The culture of limited reproduction. People must limit their reproduction rate intentionally (by using birth control). This is not really a typical cultural value of existing cooperative societies, but we can observe it developing in many countries. This culture will serve as the main mechanism to the keep population density at a tolerable level.

- E. The culture of respect and appreciation for other groups and individuals. We cannot inhibit group formation. Groups are formed for many reasons and not only to allow competition with other groups. They are also a result of our individual personalities and the desire to find a home in a group of likeminded people. There is nothing wrong with this (we are not ants or bees which can form a single global group!). Therefore we need new cultural values which inhibit aggression between groups and between individuals within groups.

Could we implement such a culture on a global scale?

- A. This seems possible, but it won't be easy. The mentioned thought of the fisherman requires a completely different view of how certain inner processes work. We will look at this in detail in the chapter „Our shared subconscious“ (including the following chapters).
- B. It seems reasonable to assume that it is possible to create a culture which tolerates individual possessions only in a very limited way. This point therefore seems to be rather easy to solve. We will not study this in more detail.
- C. We can easily imagine a change in moral which allows women to have many sex partners (and as a result children from different men). Therefore possible. In the future it will be very easy to find the father of a child using genetic fingerprinting. Therefore also a culture to refrain from doing this would be required. We will not study this in more detail.
- D. It is a well known fact that the reproduction rate of humans is decreasing with increasing wealth and education of people (especially the education of women). The fertility rate is in fact, thanks to the availability of birth control, in decline in most parts of the world. Or to use terminology from the first chapter: we have already successfully defeated the male principle (uncontrolled self replication). If we start to share our knowledge with the developing world, the speed of this process will accelerate. So this seems to be a problem which can be solved. We will not study this in more detail.
- E. This again seems possible, but won't be easy. It requires us to have a fundamentally different view of others. This is only possible if we change the way we see ourselves. We will look at this in detail in the chapter „The 5 essential insights“ (including the following chapters).

This looks good so far!

Local and global optimum of a society

„None are more hopelessly enslaved than those who falsely believe they are free“


“Niemand ist hoffnungsloser versklavt als jene, die fälschlicherweise glauben, frei zu sein.”

Johann Wolfgang von Goethe

The creation of heaven on earth is considered an impossible task by 99.99% of people. I want to show in this chapter that they might be wrong, even if all our attempts to improve the world have always failed so far.

I can't explain the main concept of this chapter without a little bit of mathematics. Sorry for this.

Look at the following graph of a function of two variables (A and B) which shows the output of a function (labelled with „Prosperity“) on the vertical axes plotted against A and B:



(Image by author)

We can see in this graph the values of the prosperity of a hypothetical society for different values of the parameters A and B. A and B are two arbitrary parameters which describe properties of the society (e.g. its culture). Let's assume it is possible for us to modify A and B. We now look only at two variables but in a real society the number of such parameters is much much larger. The reason why we chose such a simple example is that we can only visualize the situation for a small number of parameters (but the argument works in the same way for the real, high dimensional case).

Let's assume our society is in the state $A=0$ and $B=4$ (with a prosperity corresponding to the smaller of the two peaks).

Now we can observe the following: If we move away only a little bit from the current state, the prosperity decreases very quickly. This gives us the (false) impression that we are in an optimal state and that it is impossible to increase the prosperity by changing the parameters A and B. Or in other words: whatever change we introduce, things only get worse and therefore our current society must be the best possible. But in the graph we see that there is in fact another state which offers a much larger prosperity: $A = -4, B = 0$ (i.e. the large peak). We say in this case that our current state is only a poor local optimum and the much better global optimum is at a different state.

Note that we cannot create such a graph for our real society. We don't know the value of the prosperity for each possible combination of parameters and even if we knew it we could not plot it due to the very large number of parameters. We don't know if the current state of our society is a local or the global optimum. But the

argument shows that it is at least possible that the current state is not the best possible and therefore a better state exists.

How can we find a superior state (i.e. better values for all the parameters)? And if we have a good idea where the better optimum could be, there is still the question of how to get there. As we have seen any small change in the parameters reduces the prosperity (i.e. increases our suffering). This means we have to change several parameters together quickly and dramatically (i.e. we have to „jump“ in the parameter space) to avoid suffering. Or we have to find a „path“ consisting of a series of parameter combinations which lead from the local optimum to the global one without increasing suffering much (in the example chart: the path following the direct connection between the peaks).

I believe that our society is currently in a very poor local optimum and even drifting fast to a much worse state. A much higher prosperity is probably possible.

It could be risky to „jump“ in parameter space when the prosperity in the target state is actually unknown and can be only guessed („does the new thing really work or is it in the end even worse than what we have now?“). We have to plan carefully to minimize the risk of jumping to an even worse state. But I think, considering the outlook of complete destruction in the current system as described earlier, it makes much sense to risk a well planned experiment.

„The only way of discovering the limits of the possible is to venture a little way past them into the impossible“

Arthur C. Clarke

The 5 essential insights

„I am increasingly convinced that the only way for us to change what we do is to change how we think of ourselves. How we act is a reflection of who we believe we are“

Francois Chollet

How can aggression between groups and individuals as discussed above be avoided? How can we learn to enjoy giving and helping others? I expect that this can be achieved by a deep cultural change. We have to learn to see ourselves with different eyes. This will lead to a different way we look at others and a change in behavior.

I have listed the envisioned changes in our self perception below in the „5 essential insights“:

- A. Understand and accept who you truly are. You have evolved to dominate and replicate in a competitive society. This means this conditions have shaped your mind over time and your mind implements inevitably also noncooperative strategies. We have to accept and even embrace this. We only have one past, one history and it cannot be changed anymore. If we reject our history we reject ourselves. This means that our past is a cultural heritage we should honor and not try to forget or delete. We should even learn to have fun from it. But we have to become highly aware of how our history has shaped our mind and what the dangers and contradictions are.
- B. Learn to forgive others. It's impossible to be „good by nature“ in a competitive system. Therefore you are not less evil than anybody else. You are not morally superior to anybody else. This means „bad people“ cannot exist for fundamental reasons. They are phantoms of imagination. If you don't get along with somebody, you have to find out what you could do to improve the relationship.
- C. Learn to forgive yourself. You are, for the same reasons, also not more evil than anybody else (even if you have acted evil in the past). Even if you have a sad past you are still perfectly capable to live in a cooperative society.
- D. Understand how you are deeply connected to the people around you. We will look at this important point soon in great detail in the next chapters. The result is that doing evil is actually self damaging and giving to others is rewarding. We have to understand why it makes us happy to help others and why we suffer if we inflict pain to others.
- E. You are not better or fitter than anybody else (nor are your children). Not genetically and not regarding your culture. The world does not need your

„superior“ children nor your „superior“ cultural strategies. All children are equally valuable. We will study also this point soon in detail.

We will study the „5 insights“ in more detail in the following chapters.

Please note that the 5 insights are not something you can read once and understand. To internalize them fully takes a few years and takes some effort.

Evil, the subconscious and awareness

„The most terrifying thing is to accept oneself completely“

C. G. Jung

Our brain basically implements two systems [1]: an intelligent agent and a reward system. The reward system has been shaped by evolution over large timescales and tells us which goals we should try to achieve. It implements a strategy which is supposed to achieve short term and long term goals (sometimes over a timescale of many thousand generations). A simple example of a reward related to a short time goal would be the thirst we experience, if we drink no water for a longer time. This negative reward for not drinking makes sure we survive the next few days. An example of rewards related to long term goals are our sexual desires (with the orgasm as the strongest positive reward we can experience). They work on a timescale of many human generations.

The intelligent agent on the other hand simply tries to optimize the reward (i.e. maximize pleasure and minimize pain produced by the reward system) by acting smart. It implements tactics (over a timescale of hours, days or a single life). Or in other words: the conscious part of our brain is just trying to act in a way which makes us feel as good as possible.

This separation into two systems allows us to achieve long term goals while still being able to adapt to the varying conditions on a short timescale.

The reward system in our brain does give us positive reward (good feelings, pleasure or even lust) when acting evil in certain situations, otherwise being cruel would be impossible for humans. To be evil is (or was), if we like it or not, sometimes a successful strategy to survive or reproduce. The problem now is that we cannot change the wiring of our reward system. Evolution has come to an end now, there is almost no natural selection happening anymore (and if it was there, it would not make things better). We are what we are now, we have to find a good way to live with it. Therefore we cannot get rid of the evil in us. No matter how hard we try to fight it, in certain situations humans do hurt other humans.

Humans are highly social creatures. But there are always situations where it is more effective not to behave cooperatively. The characteristics of such situations are also stored in our reward system. Once we are in such a situation, we are given the signal that we will get a reward for doing a certain evil. This does not happen before. The reason is that it is safer not to become aware of this evil behavior: other humans might sense it in us and stop to trust us. We might even reveal it by

talking. Therefore most of the evil in our reward system is carefully hidden from us (i.e. the conscious part of our mind, i.e. the intelligent agent) until the moment we „need“ it.

In the Vietnam war, young, well educated and churchgoing men started to commit the most horrible crimes after spending some time in the war zone. Nobody thought this could be possible, until some journalist brought pictures of the crimes back to the U.S.. The young men also did not know before that they had the potential in themselves to commit such crimes.

First it is important to realize that becoming fully aware of the reward system (which is very difficult to achieve) would not change our behavior. Even when fully aware of everything in it, the rewards, and therefore the way the intelligent agent behaves to optimize the rewards, do not change. Therefore awareness alone does not increase or decrease evil behavior.

This is important to understand. It means that becoming aware of the evil in us does not make us act evil (or good). Contrary to popular belief, we don't fall into the abyss when looking too long into it. Learning about ourselves is safe! This is good news. But this is true only if we know that it is totally normal to find such evils (see also the earlier chapter „How our hypocrisy makes people act evil“).

Acting evil normally comes with negative rewards (i.e. bad feelings), such as compassion for the victim/opponent and fear from punishment from other people (including revenge from the victim). There is normally a balance of a strong negative reward from compassion and fear with the comparatively smaller positive reward of doing evil which makes sure we don't actually act evil. Normally the net balance is therefore pushing us towards doing good and not evil. The biological purpose of this is to avoid dangerous conflicts with other humans. In general we prefer to be good because it is safer. Only when the negative reward gets suppressed for some reason (e.g. we feel no compassion because we don't identify with the other or we even hate) we are able to actually do evil.

Now we can understand why it is very important that we become aware of the evil in us:

- Not being aware of your inner evil gives us the wrong certainty that we are incapable of doing evil. This makes us potentially dangerous.
- We can learn like this that we are in no way morally superior to anybody else, not even to the worst criminal or the most difficult „asshole“. Then we cannot point with our fingers on other „evil“ people anymore. We cannot identify enemies anymore. **Evil is as much lurking in ourselves than it is in others.** This insight will conquer hate and will make it easier for us to identify with others (i.e. to be compassionate).
- It makes you realize how important compassion is! It is, apart from the fear of punishment and retaliation, the only thing preventing us from doing evil. The more you know about the evil in yourself the more you will want to keep it at bay by strengthening compassion in you (and this is not possible without some efforts).

There is another nice side effect of this insights: fortunately, if we only play evil, we can often get the positive reward alone without the negative reward from compassion and fear resulting in a great net pleasure for us. Until now, because we are scared to reveal our true nature to others, we deny ourselves in most cases to play with evil when in fact we could have great fun with it, without harming

anybody. We could even give others great pleasure by playing with evil (but not by actually acting evil). We will explore forms of ‚playing evil‘ (like war themed computer games, watching cruel movies, shooting guns, boxing, wrestling, BDSM etc.) as examples. Cruel movies and brutal computer games are in fact the only exceptions where most of us allow ourselves to play with and enjoy substantial evil. But we still always need the good hero to win such that we don't have to identify with the evil guys in the end. This is a big hypocrisy, because in fact we identify during most of the movie with both good and evil with equal intensity.

Let's look, as an example, at the following dialogue from „Alien“:

Ash: You still don't understand what you're dealing with, do you? Perfect organism. Its structural perfection is matched only by its hostility.

Lambert: You admire it.

Ash: I admire its purity. A survivor... unclouded by conscience, remorse, or delusions of morality.

It's a robot speaking the first sentence. But we identify with him. We also identify with the Alien, we admire it. This becomes clear in the final scene where Ellen Ripley undresses to get ready for the hybernation pod. The erotic touch in this scene should show us that we too would like to inseminate beautiful Ellen (or, in the case of women specators: see her getting inseminated), exactly like the Alien which is present in the same room.

Note that playing with evil will also not make us more evil. Playing has no influence on the reward system. Millions of people all over the world play cruel computer games and only an extremely small fraction of them commits crimes. But it will also not make us better people (this again would require a modification of the reward system).

But playing with evil does have an advantage: it makes us aware of the evil in us. Which is, as we have seen, a good thing.

Please note that people are different. My evils are different from yours. Also different cultures have different evils. While in one country they suppress women, they store the money of dictators in others (like in my country). But in a competitive system there is no alternative to noncooperative (i.e. evil) behavior. Within most countries there is a large amount of unfair rules and behaviors which are accepted or tolerated by most people. We got so used to them that we don't perceive them as evil anymore. But people from other countries easily identify these behaviors as what they are.

[1]: This simple model of the brain comes rather from machine learning than from neuroscience, but I believe it is helpful for the discussions in this chapter.

How the reward system evolved

“Progress isn't made by early risers. It's made by lazy men trying to find easier ways to do something”

Robert Heinlein

The reward system is very old. It evolves over timespans of hundreds of thousands of years. Our culture on the other hand has changed very dramatically in the last 2000 years. Because of this we are very poorly adapted to modern life. The positive rewards and the effective strategies become increasingly misaligned. For example, it was once effective to be lazy. Too much activity meant, in the absence of medical care, a high risk of injury and consequent death. Therefore the reward system rewards us for doing the necessary minimum. Nowadays to be lazy does not make any sense at all anymore: any injury can be fixed by medicine and most activities (like working in an office) are not dangerous anyway. The result of this increase in misalignment is that we have to force ourselves more and more to do things which are not rewarded by the reward system (we don't enjoy sitting in offices but still we force ourselves to do it). This problem will get worse, the more our living conditions differ from the conditions hundred thousand years ago.

We could find thousands of such examples. Sadly in our modern world „self discipline“, the ability of the intelligent agent to act willingly against the reward system, has become an important skill for humans. This is something very unnatural, animals can't do it at all. Animals do in every moment what makes them most happy.

Therefore we have only two choices in the long run:

- A. We can try to modify the reward system using drugs and (in the future) genetic modifications. This could make us „love“ the world we have created. In an uncontrolled way this is already happening: some people are taking all kinds of drugs to perform better or to feel good. Personally I don't think we should choose this option because it is very difficult to implement successfully and does not solve the many other problems of a competitive system.
- B. We can change our society in a way that our living conditions are, at least in some aspects, closer to the ones we lived in thousands of years ago.

If we want to opt for the second option, we have to ask the question of how this living conditions actually were at the time when our reward system was shaped. Most likely we lived in tribal communities, where intense cooperation was required to survive. This means evil behavior was mostly only effective when

directed against other tribes, and not members of the own tribe. So most of the time we probably lived very cooperatively and therefore our reward system has evolved in a way which makes us enjoy this kind of lifestyle.

We are not designed for the exclusively and increasingly stressful and competitive lifestyle of our modern world. It makes us deeply unhappy.

Our shared subconscious

„What I cannot create, I do not understand“


Richard Feynman

If you ever took hallucinogenic drugs (like LSD) in your life or had a psychotic episode, you know that the hallucinations you experience are extremely realistic. Hallucinated objects cast shadows and obey the laws of physics very accurately. They seem to be a deep part of the reality we experience under drugs. They are not a mere primitive overlay to the perceived reality. This must mean that the reality we perceive also without drugs is somehow synthesized by our brain. This sounds very strange but makes a lot of sense if we think a bit longer about it: learning means to develop a condensed (simplified) representation or description of the world. For instance if we look at a football, the eye will send millions of pixels to the brain. But the brain will convert this raw information to something much simpler: the position, the size and the color of the ball. This simplified description is the information we act on. The pixel image from the eye contains just too much information to process.

The only way to verify that this condensed representation is valid (without having an outside teacher who tells you if it is good or bad) is to reconstruct the reality from the condensed representation and compare it to the „real“ observed reality. Learning means, to update the condensed representation from the observed differences between the two realities. In the example this would mean that a pixel image is drawn from the football's condensed representation (position, size, color) and this image is then compared to the pixels from the eye. The differences in the pixels can be used to optimize the condensed representation of the ball (learning).

Therefore learning without a teacher always means that a synthetic variant of reality needs to be constructed. But why do we perceive the synthesized variant and not the „real“ one (in the sense that we experience this reality)? The real one must be more accurate than the one generated from the condensed representation. But it seems that this improved accuracy is in fact useless, because the real world is in partial conflict with the learned variant (because of the imperfections of the latter). Our perception would be sometimes in contradiction to our learned (simplified) version of the world. This could be very confusing.

We must live in the world as we understand it, otherwise we cannot act effectively.



(Image by author)

This means that everything you see, touch, smell or hear is in fact „made up“ by your brain. The part of the brain which contains your conscious mind is not directly connected to the sensors of your body (eyes, ears etc.) but only to a highly complex perception system. The „Matrix“ idea, that the world you live in is generated by a computer, is true. This „computer“ is the perception system of your brain. So in a way you are alone in your own world. The people you meet are products of your brain. Of course, most probably there exists a „real“ reality which served as a model for your inner reality. The other people do really exist. But, as we will see, the consequences of this insight are very important to understand yourself.

Note that our agreement of this reality is very high. It seems we all create more or less the same one internally.

What happens if you meet other people? It is, for many reasons, very important to be able to predict other peoples behavior. For instance if humans hunt a mammoth together, it is very important to know what other people are going to do next. What the brain does, it queries an inner model of this other people to find out how they are going to behave. This inner model is actually you (!) plus some modifications which take into account the personality of the person which should be predicted. Therefore you are in a way all these people! Of course you have a very unique character and your behavior differs from that of other people. Therefore the inner model of all humans is constrained by the parameters of your character when the brain calculates how you should act. The important thing is that the basis for your model of other people is the model of yourself. Therefore if you believe that you are despicable, you will consider other people to be despicable. This is why it is so important to forgive, to see that we are all innocent. If you forgive yourself, you almost automatically also forgive others.

It also means that concepts can be transferred quite fast from person to person, even without talking. For instance we are often able to predict what a person is going say next.

„We despise the others so terribly, we are so

*terrified from their victories, because we meet
our own demons in triumph in them“*

*„Wir verachten die anderen so wahnsinnig, wir
sind so entsetzt über ihre Siege, weil uns in ihnen
unsere eigenen Dämonen im Triumph begegnen“*

Alard von Kittlitz

A theory of good sex


“For women, the best aphrodisiacs are words. The G-spot is in the ears. He who looks for it below there is wasting his time.”

Isabel Allende


When you have sex with your partner it is very important that you are fully attentive because only then both enjoy most. You already know this, but why is this so? Imagine a woman observes her man during sex. She will create an inner image of him. Now let's assume he is thinking about the new car he wants to buy. Then this inner image of him will contain this thought, and not much can happen.

Imagine now both are very attentive. They will both create an inner image of each other. Like this they become aware of the others lust. Now there is an interesting effect: If we think „what does she think“ we also think „what does she think I am thinking“. Therefore, for example, the inner model the woman makes from the man contains as a sub model herself (because the man also has an inner model of the woman). This means, if both lovers are attentive, their own lust gets reflected into them via the partner.

One partner not attentive



Both partners attentive



(Images by author)

This is how we probe the sexual strategies of our partner and check if they match with ours.

Thinking without attention is the enemy of good sex. It fills the mind with crap

which has nothing to do with the partner. Both partners should focus fully on the partner and act out of lust, not thinking (note: you can talk, but your words should come from your lust and attention to the partner). Thinking without attention for instance goes like „I want oral sex now because this is what I liked yesterday“. This kind of mental state will break the connection between the lovers and will lead to poor sex. You have to be prepared for the unexpected, and you must trust the method. If both partners are attentive, you will not want to do things your partner does not deeply enjoy too. Because your lust is then actually fueled by your partners lust and vice versa. The secret of good sex is to stay connected by being attentive and to fully trust your lust.

The pleasures and dangers of compassion

“Tolerance and compassion are active, not passive states, born of the capacity to listen, to observe and to respect others.”

Indira Gandhi

The mechanism described in the previous chapter has another interesting effect. The state of mind of the people you have compassion for gets reflected into your brain. Now what is compassion? As we have seen in the previous chapter, you have a model of every person you meet in your mind. And as soon as the model is good enough so that you can identify yourself with it, you have compassion. As people are fundamentally very similar, this will always happen after interacting with a person for some time. With people from very different cultures it will take longer, but it will also happen sooner or later.

Then their happiness becomes your happiness and their sadness becomes your sadness. This is why it is so rewarding to have compassion: you can feel other peoples joy! The more people you feel compassion for, the more joy from others you will feel. Without compassion we are dead inside and very lonely.

Imagine two persons who give each other a gift. Both will be happy from the unexpected gift. Both reflect the others happiness in their own mind and within the others happiness is again their own happiness. This means both minds will be filled with happiness.

This is why the process of two people giving each other a gift is so much more satisfying than when both of them buy the same item from their own hard earned money in a shop.

It makes therefore sense in a cooperative society to work only for others instead of oneself. It's simply more fun. In a cooperative society, people will be sorry for those who never help others.

For the same reason it is traumatizing to hurt others: the pain of the victim gets reflected into the abuser.

But this means that we are able to, if we have compassion, feel also the pain other people experience. This is the reason why other peoples suffering makes us often aggressive: their pain is mirrored in our brain and it disturbs us. We literally feel their pain. This happens especially if we are not able to help the suffering person.

We then like to invent reasons to justify their suffering as kind of just punishment („he was stupid“, „she is a terrible person“, „he is not from my group, why should I care“). This helps us to get rid of the pain. But this also kills our compassion as we don't identify with the person anymore. This is why a society should be organized in a way that it is always possible to help others. And helping should not be delegated to government institutions (i.e. a social system). The process of helping is important for us to be able to develop compassion.

The huge amounts of detailed information (videos etc.) about suffering people which modern media channels provide, have a devastating effect on us: we have no choice than to react with the defense strategy mentioned above: we blame the victims for making us feel bad and lose compassion in the process. This makes us feel numb. This is why we should consume media only very moderately today.

To love means to feel responsible for the loved person. This always induces the fear of not being able to protect this person. So we often prefer not to love. This is the single factor which is limiting the amount of compassion present on this planet! And this is why love is such an extremely scarce resource today: it is extremely difficult to be able to guarantee the wellbeing of a person alone. So we love only a very small number of people (in modern, western societies: our wife or husband, our kids and very few friends).

But I am quite sure that we all would actually prefer to love many more people. And I am also sure that we are capable of loving many people. A cooperative society would allow us to do so. But is not abundant compassion a prerequisite for a cooperative society to form? Yes, and this is why it is not easy to transition to such a state. It requires a majority of people to become aware of this problem and people must become aware of their desire to enjoy unlimited love.

How to explore your subconscious reward system

„Humans have free will but much of their behavior is automatic. In that way, humans and robots are not too different. If you are not super conscious, you are nearly a programmed robot of yourself“

Unknown

If you want to know who you really are you can do the following:
Observe others. Everything they do, the good and the bad, you must have inside yourself too. This is a direct consequence of fact that your brain constructs a model of the reality around you and this includes other people. Your personality is the selection of behaviors you express. But all the other behaviors are there too. This allows you to deal with other peoples behavior or express them at some point in time too (if it seems beneficial). This selection of behaviors therefore implements your life strategy. But your strategy might change anytime. If you think carefully, you will also realize that you have already done in a similar way most of the things which others have done (the good and the bad).

The goal of this observation process is that you recognize yourself in others. This will enable compassion.

Strategies closely related to sex can be explored by exploring sexual fantasies. Find out what arouses you and try to find out what is behind. You can for instance read erotic literature or watch good (i.e. honest) porn.

Avoiding and solving conflicts

“We’re all water from different rivers, that’s why it’s so easy to meet; we’re all water in this vast, vast ocean, someday we’ll evaporate together.”

Yoko Ono

What are the consequences for our daily life which result from the fact that we live in a world synthesized by our brain? Basically it means that if you meet other people you somehow meet a part of yourself. It makes a lot of sense to act accordingly and be respectful, kind and generous. If you have a conflict with somebody, it also helps a lot to think that the other person is basically you. This makes you think hard how **you** would like the conflict to be resolved, and this leads usually very quickly to a solution (of course because the other person is indeed very similar to you). Remember the story with the Polynesian fisherman: if somebody wants a fish from you, give it, enjoy the happiness of the receiver and then go catch another fish. You basically give the fish to yourself. It is easy to see that, if we all do this, life becomes much better for everybody.

Also keep in mind that the only thing you can change efficiently is yourself. To change others against their will is very hard or even impossible. So you should always try to change yourself instead of the other.

When other people annoy you

„Everything that irritates us about others can lead us to an understanding of ourselves“

C. G. Jung

If other people are irritating you, you should think about why they irritate you instead of avoiding them or trying to change their behavior. You will discover that once you have found out why the behavior irritates, it suddenly does not irritate anymore. It always has something to do with your past experiences. You will soon learn to embrace anybody who irritates you, because these people are your best teachers.

The illusion of superiority (and inferiority)

“I don't have a feeling of inferiority. Never had. I'm as good as anybody, but no better.”

Katherine Johnson

Most people think that they are either superior or inferior to others. For instance they might think that they are more beautiful and more intelligent than others. In fact, others might even agree on this. But we will see that it has very little value in the eyes of nature and evolution. Being intelligent or being beautiful does not increase the chances of reproduction on the long run (on the short run maybe yes, but this does not matter). For instance high intelligence comes often with higher chance of mental instability. In Africa, a disease called sickle cell anemia is common. It is an inheritable disease of the red blood cells. The genetic mutation causing this therefore seems to be clearly a disadvantage. But scientists have discovered that the mutation can also help the body to fight malaria infections. Every coin has two sides.

Every single one of us shares the following property: she or he is the offspring of millions of humans and animals who were fit enough to reproduce successfully. Note that only a small fraction of all animals which have ever lived have reproduced successfully. Many fish produce millions of larvae from which almost all get eaten by other sea creatures and only a handful of them make it to adult age.

So if all these billions of ancestors were fit enough to live a successful (biologically) life, their last offspring must definitely have very good chances to be fit too. Why then do we sometimes have this feeling that some people are not fit (e.g. we perceive them as ugly, physically weak or stupid)? Because in biology it is like in roulette, you can bet on even / odd (with a small chance to lose but also not much to win) or on a number (with a high chance to lose but much more to win). Beautiful people with average intelligence in this example represent the „even / odd“ case and the supposedly weak represent the „number“ case. How does this work? Imagine that earth is hit by a meteorite tomorrow or an unknown deadly disease appears suddenly. It is clear that only individuals which are very different from the average will survive such an event and will be able to reproduce further. But in this case, they will have the chance to genetically dominate the future population because they are very few before. People which are close to the average (which we perceive as beautiful) have a good chance to reproduce in the case that nothing changes. This is likely in the short run but unlikely in the long run: sooner or later some significant event will change living conditions. Also, „average“ individuals cannot easily genetically dominate the future population because there are just too many of them. The far future will be always dominated

by some (we don't know which ones) of the rare „weak“ people of the present, as only they have the necessary extraordinary features to survive in a very different future world. The far future is always owned by special people, and - as we will see - we know this subconsciously.

This is the reason why in nature you always have both kinds of individuals: a large number of „even / odd“ creatures with the intent to dominate the near future and a small number of „number“ creatures with the intent to dominate the far future.

So we should stop to look at people which are different (such as small, skinny, nerdy or fat) as inferior. Only time can tell who will survive and who not. Until then, every single individual has a fair chance to make the race. And it is therefore valuable in the sense of biology.

Think about this, each time you catch yourself looking down on „weak“ people (which you might also do if you believe that they should be helped!) because you assume that they are biologically unfit.

This is the reason why diversity is so important. It does in a way form a backup for human life on earth. It makes sure we cannot be so easily made extinct by diseases or other disastrous events.

Note that beauty is often even only a fashion. This means that the value of the beautiful comes only from the shared (and well known) belief of many individuals that one particular individual is attractive. This makes the person attractive to mate with, because it is likely that offspring with this partner will be perceived as equally attractive and will have a larger number of partners to choose from for mating: e.g. If a group of men tells a man that they find a particular girl very attractive, he will suddenly find her more attractive too. Therefore in this case beauty has no meaning in terms of biological fitness. It's kind of a mathematical joke of nature, a self fulfilling prophecy.

But why then are we so obsessed with beauty? Surprisingly it is, because we don't have anything better to decide the attractiveness of people when we meet them first. Only later, when we get to know somebody (which is rare), we can fall in love. We fall in love, if we unconsciously detect a deep alignment or synergy in strategy with another person. Then it makes a lot of sense to prefer this person sexually, find him/her more attractive than others, because with this partner we are able to raise more successful children. When this happens, the superficial „average“ beauty becomes unimportant. Or more precisely: the special features become suddenly the reason for the attraction. It's like in roulette: if we don't have a minimal belief that a certain number will win, we prefer to play simply odd or even in order to make it at least to the next round. Falling in love is like rigging the roulette game, it increases the chances of success of a specific number.

Falling in love (i.e. the perception of a deep alignment of strategy) is more important for women as they don't have the men's „shotgun“ option of producing many offspring available. As they have a very limited reproductive capacity, they are forced to optimize every aspect of reproduction very carefully to be successful in the long run.

It has become obvious by now: we are all different but we have all equal value. Each single one of us is an equally fantastic and beautiful creature of mind-blowing complexity with billions of years of completely successful family history behind. And as long as we are not dead, we have a chance to live a successful life.

In the sense of biology, there are no living weak individuals which could be easily identified.

As a consequence we also understand that other peoples children are as valuable as yours. Your kids are in no way better than other peoples kids. So why to have your own children then? Why not to devote your time to other peoples kids?

Understanding this might be a key to reduce the overpopulation of our planet (of course some women have to give birth to children, otherwise humankind would drown in sadness).

Whats the implication for our love live? If we can free ourselves from the slavery of superficial beauty (which as we have seen is hollow), we are able to discover the sexual attractiveness of so called „ugly“ people. Note that I also mean visual attractiveness, not only attractiveness coming from inner values. Extraordinary people can be very attractive (visually and otherwise), you just have to find the matching strategy in yourself. A broad erotic appetite is the result of improved self awareness. And our current and shared simple visual preferences are the result of a kind of unconscious strategical despair.

Our current shared classification of people into „beautiful“ and „ugly“ is self reinforcing: those falling into the „ugly“ loose self-confidence which makes them even less attractive.

With intelligence we have the problem that there is not even an agreement among experts what it is. There is a huge range of cognitive skills which could be called intelligence (from counting to intuition etc.). IQ tests usually measure only a very small fraction of the possible skills (e.g. no tests on motoric, visual or emotional intelligence, creativity etc.). They focus on skills which are currently considered especially relevant for economic success. But this is short sighted as other skills might be very useful in the future or in an unusual situation. A group of people profits from diversity: if the group members have different skills they can complement each other. It is not desirable that everybody is only good at the same small set of skills.

Note that we have so far discussed fitness in the old context of competitive nature (fit are those who can win against others). If we can get rid of competition, the old concepts and criteria do not make much sense anymore anyway. Then the attractiveness of a person might be much more subjective and coming from things like creativity, humor or emotional warmth.

The reconciliation of the sexes

“A gentleman holds my hand. A man pulls my hair. A soulmate will do both.”

Alessandra Torre

Life is the result of millions of years of self replication under the presence of limitation. Therefore, to reproduce over many future generations is the ultimate goal of any living organism. This means, we are in a way sexually immensely frustrated without being aware of it. We would love to create lots and lots of quality offspring, but because of the limited availability of matter and energy (which manifests itself in the very limited availability of female wombs) we cannot. Note that this is equally true for women. But women are forced to wait for good opportunities to have sex as for them the cost of sex is very high (raising a child is a huge investment). They are the ones who have to implement limitation in their behavior. Men on the other hand, can have sex with many women at very low cost. They produce millions of sperm cells every day and making a woman pregnant takes only minutes of their time. All this is not a bad thing at all, because it allowed the enormous complexity and beauty of the living world to unfold. The female principle - limitation - is a necessary ingredient for life to be able to evolve. But we have to understand now that our desires are always directing our behavior in a way which leads to reproduction. Every single thing we do during the day is evaluated whether it might lead to some more good offspring (or not) and we are given (or not given) a good feeling accordingly. This means that in our brain, the whole world has to be translated into something like a „language of sex“. In fact our subconscious is deeply sexual in nature. Evil behavior is ultimately the result of sexual frustration. Men seek power over others because they want to get control over women (or seduce them or acquire the resources to buy them). A very powerful man once proudly declared that he can „grab any woman by the pussy“. Obviously this was the reason why he wanted to become so powerful (and, if you are tempted to laugh about him now, the same reason why you, if you are a man, want to be powerful/respected/rich!). Wars are the result of our unconscious desire to reduce male competition over the rare females and to get access to new pools of females (men say that they want „land“ or spread the „truth“ but the truth is, they want the women which live on it or at least some resource which can be converted into women). Men love to kill men just because they are men, as we can easily see from the enormous popularity of war themed computer games among young men (women don't care much about them).

Sexually fully satisfied men would show much less behavior which is damaging for society. For example they would not need to waste resources on their own expensive car and most likely not start wars. Women's preference for powerful men is a result of the competition of men: If women could be sure that they can raise their children in safety without the protection of a rich/powerful man, they

would choose by other criteria.

Unfortunately there are factors which can severely limit the satisfaction we get from having sex: We are unconsciously trying to hide our sexual strategies from our partners, because we fear he or she might identify them (correctly) as „evil“ and reject us. This mechanism is called „shame“ and - as we all know - very common. Note that, due to the fact that our outdated instincts don't know about contraception, also behavior is affected which most people consider harmless today. We have seen that for instance the „blowjob“ (and very similarly anal sex) are in fact ancient „evil“ strategies which were used in the past by women to „cheat“ men, typically in a prostitution situation. Prostitution was even much more common in our distant past than it is now. Women have, over millions of years, developed unconscious techniques for having sex with less attractive males in exchange for resources (like food) but avoiding getting pregnant from them. This also explains the male obsession with these practices (they were essential strategies of successful female offspring they want to produce) as well as why men often despise women who offer them (i.e. calling them „sluts“, „whores“ etc.) and avoid them for serious relationships, where they intend to care for the offspring. Men unconsciously try to produce successful and therefore „evil“ offspring (by having sex with women who behave like prostitutes or are actually prostitutes) but are on the other hand unconsciously scared to become a victim of the same evil in the case of their wives. Becoming a victim means in the example of oral sex that their sperm is killed in the woman's stomach instead of getting a chance to impregnate. This results in the split „saint or whore“ view of women which is very damaging for relationships. Men are disappointed from both their wife and their prostitutes. The former they despise, because they sense the „whore“ in her, the latter they hate because she want's money for her services. The sex with both is bad.

Men have to learn to love and embrace both aspects of women. They seek both of them equally and they are also both present in every woman.

We see that there are severe contradictions in our behavior which make it often difficult for us to enjoy satisfying sex. We have to become conscious about all this, as oral sex is just one example out of many other contradictions. Men for instance have to learn to truly love women in spite of them giving oral sex. If a woman feels this love, she will be more than willing to reveal her true nature (yes, fortunately there is a hidden „whore“ in every woman) and give him happily what he enjoys. If men start to truly embrace the „whore“ aspect in the women they love, they will find an erotic paradise.

Of course this is also true in the other direction: women can learn to embrace the „rapist“ (for instance) in men and resolve the famous „caring, but boring family man“ or „attractive bad guy“ dilemma (men can in fact be „bad attractive caring family men“!). We have to accept that the famous feminist statement „every man is a potential rapist“ is simply true. Yes, there is a hidden rapist in most men (even if they have never raped a woman and never will) and it can be enjoyed by inclined women.

This, applied to many more of the so called „perversions“, will lead to a much higher level of sexual satisfaction. Then both sexes can reveal the full spectrum of their sexuality in sexual play. Note that this does not have to lead necessarily to a spectacular, kinky sex life. Lovers can also reveal themselves with only subtle hints which can be highly erotic nonetheless.

This will also deepen the feelings the partners have for each other. Love is only real when you love a person for what he or she truly is. This can be felt by your partner and this love will be returned. And it will eliminate many of the fears, anger, wrong expectations and disappointment partners often feel for each other today.

The sexes are not „designed“ with the purpose of making each other happy. But if they become aware of this, surprisingly happiness is possible.

Shame does not stop us from doing evil (contrary to popular belief). Rather the contrary is true: its purpose (in the sense of the reason why it could evolve) is to hide our noncooperative strategies and weaknesses from others.

The boredom of monogamy

“If a man can possess a woman sexually -really possess- he won't need to control her ideas, her opinions, her clothes, her friends, even her other lovers.”

Toni Bentley

Most people live in monogamous relationships today. They offer the advantage that each individual gets a sex partner assigned and few people end up without one. But the „guaranteed sex“ is only available for men as long as they are permitted to force their partner (wife) to have sex. Fortunately, this is not possible anymore in most countries.

Marriage was invented to neutralize the destabilizing effect of sexuality in groups. As every man got some sex, there was little tension in the group about who gets the women (the women did not count and paid a high price). Marriage is therefore a result of the competitive nature of our society. It increases group cohesion which makes the group more effective.

But monogamous relationships are problematic in several ways. They most probably don't correspond to the living conditions under which our sexual behavior was shaped a long time ago. In the tribal communities of our past, women probably used sex to establish advantageous ties to several men. This ensured support from different sources. Sex makes men feeling attached to women and consequently they often offer resources of some kind (help, protection, food, advice etc). The reason is that they might be (or become) the father of one of her children. We could call this behavior socially motivated sex. This kind of sex is strategically highly complex. While men accept every opportunity to have sex, women have to be selective. For a woman to have sex, it needs to offer a „good deal“ of some kind (subconsciously). For men in contrast, sex is always a good deal, because it is so cheap for them. A „good deal“ for a woman can mean many different things and they are the triggers for her attraction and later arousal. Practically this means that women often need a „story“ to get sexually interested in a man. And because this „story“ is often missing in long term monogamous relationships, it is often the women who get terribly bored with their sex life after a while. The men are also bored, but can still be satisfied to some extent by just the female body.

Therefore many women would probably be sexually much more active if polygamy were socially accepted. Of course, this would benefit the sexually frustrated men too.

As we have seen, in a competitive system many women favor successful, rich or powerful men. This leads to an uneven distribution of sex: the mentioned groups of men get a lot of sex, many others little or none. In a cooperative system women and men would, of course, still chose partners they consider attractive, but attractiveness could have many more facets. A myriad of traits and skills could be considered attractive once the exclusive focus on success and power is lost. This would lead to a broader distribution of the female desire.

Similarly men could, after becoming more aware of themselves, lose their boring strong preference for average looking („beautiful“) young women and develop a much broader sexual appetite.

This, I believe, could take a lot of tension out of our society.

“The forbiddenness of a fruit makes even the taste of a lemon sweet”

Mokokoma Mokhonoana

The cultural values of the cooperative society

“Competition has been shown to be useful up to a certain point and no further, but cooperation, which is the thing we must strive for today, begins where competition leaves off”

Franklin D. Roosevelt

Now we can sketch a few cultural values we could teach our kids in a cooperative society to make it work well.

It is important that all the values can be followed without effort or forcing yourself. They should not be „rules“ or „laws“. It should be a pleasure and beneficial to follow them and not following them should bring nuisance. Only then they will be implemented by most people.

- Work only for others and give generously. Do things for yourself only if you really have no choice. You should do this not because you are a „good person“ but out of selfishness: you know that everything you give to the community will come back to you manifold. It is also much more fun to make gifts than to buy things for yourself. Don't expect reciprocal gifts. Thinking like this turns you into an accountant („You gave me already 4 wine bottles so I give you 4 back tomorrow“). What you give will come back from someone else.
- Be compassionate. Try to find yourself in as many people as possible. This allows you to feel their joy.
- Never feel guilty. Don't worry about the past. The past does not define you.
- Become aware of who you truly are and accept it. Invest time in discovering yourself. Also the difficult and inconvenient parts. Try to understand. Don't feel guilty to have fun in the process.
- Accept yourself the way you truly are and realize that you are an amazing creature. Then be critical with yourself. Attack yourself instead of others. You are innocent for what you are, but you can still grow.
- Never feel ashamed. Don't be ashamed to have harmless fun with who you are. Having fun with yourself is beneficial because it improves your awareness. If we one day can watch the „nude girls skipping rope competition“ in a pub or watch some „horror porn comedy“ together in the cinema we will have reached maturity. Only when we can laugh about our own strange desires (and not about the actresses and actors in the mentioned shows!) we have successfully rendered them harmless.

- Don't pretend to be good by nature. It's not true and you are only pushing others into behaving evil by doing this.
- Don't try to become a „moral person“. It will only kill your soul, your creativity, your humor, your sexuality. And you will fail anyway (like it's impossible to „cure“ homosexuality). Be unmoral.
- Honor our sad and violent past, don't try to forget it. It has created you in all your beauty. And it's the only past we have. „Cancel culture“ can only result in no culture at all. This is because our history is one big minefield. If you want to clean it from evil there will be nothing left. Treat our history as a valuable cultural heritage. We will have to build on it! But try to become aware of how history has shaped our minds.
- Raise children collectively. Learn to enjoy other peoples children. They are cute, inspiring and very funny.
- Teach others. Adults and kids should learn by doing driven only by curiosity and not in schools.
- Let information flow freely. Do not hide any information. It is a complicated hassle and makes you feel like a cheater. All the data stored on any digital storage device belongs to the community and everybody is allowed to read it. Go offline if you need privacy.
- It's good if women and men have multiple sex partners.
- It is better if nobody knows who is the father of a child.
- Own as little as possible. Possessions are a burden. In the end they own you. Share instead wherever possible and remain light and mobile.
- Don't let others claim to own important things: IP or ideas, ground, machines, houses, art etc.. It's not in your interest.
- Enjoy the company of strangers. Experiencing the company of people who are different is a great adventure. They also help you to understand yourself.

How could a transition happen?

“The real revolution is the evolution of consciousness”

Anonymous

The cultural values listed in the previous chapter need (like any other successful culture) a good replication mechanism to be spread in the population (remember the chapter „The origin of competition“).

In this case it will be (hopefully) „usefulness“. That’s all. There is no preaching required, no fighting against other people is needed, no missionaries have to be recruited.

I believe the world view presented in this book offers several significant advantages even if you don’t live in a cooperative society yet:

- Inner peace. It allows you to forgive yourself. You don’t feel guilty anymore.
- A kind view of other people and groups. There are no despicable people and enemies anymore. As a result the world suddenly looks much friendlier.
- Compassion. You will feel the joy of many people. This will make you feel much more alive.
- Much better relationships to others. As you don’t have high moral expectations from others anymore, you will enjoy much better relationships with other people (including your partner).
- Much more satisfying sex. You will be able to get rid of shame and experience a new dimension of sexuality.
- A much less stressful life. No more need to invest into status products or accumulate riches for your children.
- You don’t feel under pressure to make your own children anymore. But you can of course.
- A bright future to look forward to. The future might bring us a kind of paradise. If not for you then for your kids.

The full transition to the cooperative society could happen as soon as a very strong majority is ready for this step. A large amount of mutual trust has to be built up first. In some cases other culture has to be replaced. Some of this culture has strong defense mechanisms against being replaced („if you stop to believe, you will go to hell!“). I hope that the usefulness of the proposed culture is so high that it outweighs these mechanisms.

How the transition will happen exactly is difficult to predict. As we have seen before, we need to find a good combination of „jumps“ and „path walks“ in the

cultural parameter space to get there (see „Local and global optimum of a society“). Some of them can maybe be planned, others will just happen at some point in time. The process will probably take quite a few years to complete.

Unfortunately until then you will have to compete to some extent with those who are still on the competitive track. Otherwise another group will make you perish sooner or later.

Can a cooperative society be stable?

“Happiness is the richest thing we will ever own.”

Donald Duck

What if in a cooperative society a small number of people start to form a group again and start to compete with the rest? The rest of the people would then be forced to form a gang too to defend themselves. This could mean that cooperative societies are naturally unstable (and maybe explain why we don't live in such a society).

I think it is important that everybody knows very well that they can only lose with such a step. That, if some people do it, we all get expelled from paradise together. Then hopefully nobody will be stupid enough to „eat the forbidden apple“.

I also assume that the strong majority which wants to live cooperatively will have a normative effect on those who are contemplating to form a gang (e.g. by ignoring their territorial claims, not accepting ownership of things or ideas etc.).

Can a cooperative economy satisfy complex needs?

„Can collective intelligence save the planet? It's the only hope we have“

Patrick Joseph McGovern

To be able to produce complex products (like computers etc.) a cooperative society will have to find means to implement complex self organization in an efficient way. In our current society it's the markets and the monetary system which make sure resources get allocated efficiently.

People must know, what they should do to serve society best. Is it writing a software (and if yes, which one?) or setting up a factory for toilet paper? Which project should they join, where should they work and what should they do? They must also know how much or which resources they should use to accomplish their goals. It does not make sense to feed bread to pigs.

I believe that this problem can be solved also in a cooperative society which works without money and markets. In the open source world this seems to work on a simple level: users express how much they like the different projects by giving them upvotes. Useful projects with many upvotes then find it easier to find new contributors and grow faster. Open source software development (which works very well today) is a good example, because it will be one of the few real jobs which will remain: most other jobs will be automated away (see the next chapter).

It seems to be possible to build a similar, more sophisticated digital tool/platform which helps to allocate resources for all kinds of products and services. Such a platform would have to offer ways to express pleasure and gratitude for work done by people (because this will be the new currency!).

Let's look at some ideas how such a platform could work in detail. It should enable the efficient allocation of resources in a gift based and money free economy. This should work also on a large geographical scale: people should be able to make gifts to people on another continent. This is important as complex products are often produced in many steps taking place at different locations (production of upstream products).

Let's assume some people produce wooden ponys (or maybe only a part used to build them, like the wheels) in Europe. Now they have two problems: 1. Why should they do all the work when some of the toys end up far away (like Africa)? How can we make the job rewarding? They will only produce the ponys if they truly enjoy doing it. 2. To whom should they give the toys? They cannot give them

to the end users (children) but have to give them to a dealer (or a chain of dealers) who brings them to the children in Africa.

Each toy is equipped with a QR code at the factory. If the toy arrives at the final destination (i.e. somebody picks it up for free in a „shop“), people can scan this QR code with their mobile phone. They are directed to the platform where they can leave a thank you message. This could be a text or an image of a child playing with the wooden pony. The people at the factory (any factory which was involved in the creation of the product) can visit this platform too and see an endless stream of pictures of happy children playing with their product. This answers the first question above.

Now let's assume the Italians send mostly pictures of happy children playing with the pony whereas the British often send pictures how they are burning the toys in their fireplaces (if you are British don't be offended, it's just an example). The people at the factory know to which dealer they gave which toys (the QR code also contains a unique ID). They will then, to maximize the satisfaction from their work, favor the dealer which gave them to the Italians. Note that a „dealer“ in this new economy is somebody who is trying to maximize the pleasure from some kind of products by giving them to those people who enjoy most (or another dealer which they know does a good job). If a dealer does a poor job by giving the products to people who waste them, people will give him fewer goods to „trade“. Products can be passed on to other people if they are not used anymore and several people can generate thank you messages. This also encourages reuse and a sharing economy.

As a positive side effect, such a platform would generate tons of valuable information about how the „customers“ use the product and how it could be improved.

People could also scan the QR code and, instead of leaving a thank you message, leave a „please produce and send“ message. This means that the product is in high demand and more of it should be produced. Like this, people who would like to produce a product could check which products are in highest demand right now.

But the construction of such platforms is sure a very important area where good ideas and research/engineering will be required.

Who will do the hard and the dirty work?

“Unfortunately robots capable of manufacturing robots do not exist. That would be the philosopher's stone, the squaring of the circle.”

Ernst Jünger

Is hard, dirty or dangerous work not something people have to be forced to do? And will not everybody try to avoid it and be happy if someone else is forced to do it? Isn't this the reason why one group suppresses or enslaves another to be freed from hard work?

Remember that it will take a while until we can enjoy a cooperative society. Until then most jobs will be automated away. The answer to this question is therefore: it will be computers and robots who will do this kind of work. And thanks to the cooperative society the relevant know how and software is available for everybody to use (and this even in the technologically most advanced variant available on earth!). As soon as we work cooperatively on the software and A.I. of these robots, their technology will advance extremely fast:

- Special 3D printers will „print“ sophisticated houses in a few hours.
- Doctors will be replaced by extremely skilled diagnostic A.I. and surgical robots
- Vehicles will be produced in a fully automatic way
- Also most other products can be made using advanced 3D printers or other digital production robots
- Logistics and transport will be fully automated
- etc.

But there will be always here and there some hard work left for us. This kind of work will be a rare opportunity to make a great gift for someone and to experience something unusual.

What you can do already now

“Do what you feel in your heart to be right—for you’ll be criticized anyway.”

Eleanor Roosevelt

It will probably take a while until we can enjoy a fully cooperative society.

What can we do until then? You cannot implement the full set of cultural values of the cooperative society, as this would make you too vulnerable for attacks from still competing groups and individuals.

But there are some things, which can be already done now. Here are some ideas:

- Contribute to open source software in your free time
 - Create free intellectual property (music, art, literature, movies, courses etc.)
 - Become shameless. Become a great lover and make your partner happy
 - Consider living polyamorous
 - Learn not to feel guilty for your past mistakes (but try to understand what went wrong)
 - Help others (including strangers) for free
 - Be generous: invite friends and strangers, give things away for free
 - Learn not to pretend to be a „good person by nature“, don’t try to become one.
 - Become aware of the evil in you, accept and embrace it and don’t be ashamed to have harmless fun from it
 - Help others to raise kids, learn how much fun it is
 - Teach kids and adults stuff you have a passion for
 - Share possessions with others wherever possible (support the sharing economy)
 - When you have the urge to enjoy competition, participate in sports or games
-

“The highest forms of understanding we can achieve are laughter and human compassion”

Richard P. Feynman

How cooperation differs from communism

Cooperation is compared to the form of socialism/communism which was actually implemented (e.g. in the former soviet union).

Aspect	Communism	Cooperation
Image of humanity	People are morally insufficient , they must be changed to form the new human .	People are perfect . Only consciousness and insight is missing. People must only understand themselves and the situation we are in together.
Stratification of society	Competing social classes	Cooperating individuals.
Motivation for change	Moral demands equality.	Insight that everybody can be rich if we all work only for others and share the results. No moral, only smartness and selfishness required.
Ownership of things	People own the same amount of things but still own .	People own very little . But the amount of resources people move can be very different and depends on their function in society.
Work	People work for themselves , to earn money and buy things.	People work mostly for others . No money required.
Access to resources	All people should have access to the same amount of resources of any kind.	Cooperation accepts that people are different and people don't mind if somebody moves more resources in a certain field. They are happy to make this possible, to make others rich.
Rules and government	A government is enforcing rules to make sure „fairness and equality” are guaranteed.	No government required. No need to enforce anything. People like to do what benefits others.
Social radius	People care only for their own family. Therefore they still must compete to maximize their familys access to resources.	People care for everybody (or at least for many people in a large circle). No competition but cooperation .
Method of implementation	Class war .	Individuals becoming conscious .
	As people are morally deficient, their	

Flow of information	communication must be controlled by the government. To increase their power, people and the government keep secrets.	Freedom of speech. Free access to information.
Social system	Compassion delegated to government institutions. Government enforces redistribution of money.	No social system. People help each other directly. People give voluntarily because they like it.

Frequently Asked Questions

„Have no fear of perfection; you'll never reach it.“

Marie Curie

Q: This book is incredibly lousy. How can you even dare to publish it?

A: I agree. Measured against the complexity and the importance of the questions discussed, my analysis must remain deeply inadequate. But I hope that it is interesting enough to make you at least consider the possibility that a far better world is possible. I don't want to give final answers, I want to start a process. And yes, I sure could have done better. And: it cost you nothing, so you have little reason to complain.

Q: What you are saying is trivial: if humans were good, they could live in peace together. What is new about your model?

A: It shows that cooperative behavior is actually in everybodys interest. We don't need to sacrifice ourselves, it is sufficient to be egoistic (but in a smart/conscious way!). Or put differently: the problem is not that we are immoral, but that we are unconscious.

As the proposed model requires no improvement of moral, it has maybe better chances to succeed.

Q: Why should I trust you? How can I be sure that what you say is true?

A: You should not and you cannot be! I hope that you find the flaws in my arguments, that you improve and extend this book or even write a far better one from scratch. I hope that you contribute many new ideas, concepts, theories or even research. My only wish is that you start to believe that the sketched goal is not completely unrealistic.

Q: You are trained as a scientist but you ignore all the rules of scientific publication. You don't

cite your sources and the book is full of bold and unproven claims. Why?

A: True and I also feel a bit bad about this. But if I follow all these rules, my book will be published in a 1000 years. I felt that there is not so much time left (sure not for me and probably not even for humankind). Furthermore the individual claims are not that important: the book would not suffer much if 20% of them were wrong. Rather than many isolated facts, I want to convey a more general concept (which, I'm quite sure, is at least worth thinking about). It's a seeding effort, not more.

Q: You claim that many differences in behavior between the sexes have genetical reasons. This means they cannot be changed and we know that such theories were abused in the past to suppress women and homosexual/queer people. Don't you think we should consider the sexes to be equal or even ignore sex altogether?

A: I think we should rather stop competing (this is the central topic of the book). In this case differences would not lead to suppression anymore. If we steamroll differences we loose diversity and diversity is richness. The demand that we should ignore differences between sexes or people is an attempt to save an obsolete and increasingly dangerous competitive system.

Q: Don't you think evil simply exists, because people are not moral enough? In this case we don't need all your detailed analysis, we simply stick to some obvious moral rules.

A: It is for most people very hard to behave morally. It is against our fundamental urges so we would have to force ourselves to behave in an unnatural way all the time. This didn't work in the past and it will never work in the future. The central thesis of this book is that we are currently trapped in a competitive mode of operation and that we all could live much better lives if we became aware of this and stopped to compete. A cooperative society needs no moral, only insight and consciousness. Insight and consciousness are not easy to attain, but have the huge advantage that they, once attained, need no further efforts to maintain.

Q: I opened your book on page XY and found this horribly offensive sentence. Do you really mean what you write?

A: This book is very radical in many ways. It has to be to achieve its goal. You should read it from the beginning or better not at all. You will not be able to understand later concepts in the book without having read and understood the earlier parts. And for the same reason, please don't cite from this book on social media. And yes, I mean what I say, but I also know very well that I could be completely wrong.

Q: Your English sucks. Why didn't you have it proofread by a professional?

A: I did not want to force anybody to read my book. And it allowed me to save some money. I'm not a native speaker, sorry for this.

Q: I'm confused: are you politically left or right? Commie or fascist?

A: I'm very clearly neither of the two. I'm not even in the political center. And I think this is a good thing. This book is about new ideas, not about old and stale institutions and ways of thinking.

My proposed new model for society admittedly shares a few ideas with communism, but there are many fundamental differences (the last chapter of part 2 contains an overview). It also suggests some changes which are more typical for right wing views (absence of social system, free speech etc.).

Q: Are you really naive enough to believe that your book will bring us paradise?

A: No, I'm not (but I'm known to be not very good at predicting the future). But I have good reasons to believe that it is an interesting read, even if it will not achieve its goals. That's enough reason to have it published.

Q: Are you sure your book is not dangerous for society?

A: Yes! In the end, it only asks you to try to understand yourself. No missionizing, crusading or class war is required. I assume that the process of people becoming conscious will happen anyway and cannot be stopped. If this is true, this book can only accelerate the process.

Q: I think I don't fully understand some parts of the book. I have many questions. Can I discuss them with you?

A: I do not intend to become a leader of a movement or a guru. Therefore I suggest you discuss your questions with a good friend who has read this book as well (or some other good books). Sorry for this, please don't take it personal.

Q: Are you not scared to publish such a radical text? Some strange people could make you troubles.

A: Yes, I am. In fact very much so. But I'm even more scared from what will probably happen soon if nobody tries what I am trying with this book. I'm just doing my best. So, even if you disagree with me, please don't show up in front of my house with a baseball bat. Thank you.

Q: Do you suggest we should destroy the institution of the family?

A: No, the contrary is true. I rather suggest to increase the size of the family drastically. That we include many more people in this set of people which we care for and express our love to.

Q: You talk so much about sex. Are you a sex obsessed pervert?

A: Probably not more than you.

Q: Are you saying that women enjoy to be raped?

A: No! I'm saying that the evolution of human sexuality happened in interactions between the sexes which has created a mirroring effect on our sexual desires. This means the sexual needs of men and women are surprisingly compatible (contrary to popular belief). If you want to understand how this works, you have to read the book.

