

The Spanking Gene
Or
The Autistic and the Blade

.

Jeff's Introduction

The Chalice and the Blade

First of all, if you tried to read this introduction before Sept. 8th., 2024, I'm sorry. It was the last thing I wrote, an afterthought, and for some reason I was emotionally finished and already running away from this book. I finally noticed yesterday, it looked like I died and someone posted my notes, the stream of thought simply ends, I declare I'd done a thing I absolutely had not and then wish you well as though you were going to read on, Good Lord, I mean Lady, why would you?

I am sorry, and this can only be better.

Jeff

.

The project. It's to reinterpret the iconic The Chalice and the Blade, by Dr. Riane Eisler in terms of genetics rather than social models, to say that their dominant social model is less of a model and more of a gene, more of a Neurotype matter (I am a self diagnosed, late hatched Autistic). I'm framing it as an attack on the species by an aggressive and ultimately unworkable genetic adaptation – the Spanking Gene, like the warrior gene.

I hope you'll know what was in the Chalice and what I am trying to update about it when I'm done.

.

Riane Eisler's book is a terrific description of prehistory, history, and the human world today, it was one of the truest things I ever read in terms of its clear eyed view of what has been happening and where we are headed. I want to read it to everyone, and that's what this project is, me reading the Chalice to you, but of course if that's all it was you could just read her, you wouldn't need me, and where the Chalice offers the world a choice, I think I offer it a prescription.

That will be something like gene therapy, becoming the creature that makes a better choice, because Eisler's toxic social model is more than that, it's a genetic matter, a matter of evolution. People really haven't got as much choice as we like to say, rather, the choices aren't what we think they are.

The human genome has been under attack, suffering invasion from a new, violent usurper, this is the story of the Chalice and the Blade, and I expect Eisler too, has already caught up to all this biology, apparently their latest book, *Nurturing Our Humanity*, focuses on neuroscience, and that sounds great. I'm ordering that.

Having said that, I'm not waiting for it. I hope they agree with me, but I need to think through everything myself anyway.

The Chalice describes a neolithic disaster, when the first known, "Dominator society," first arrives in the Near East and Old Europe and there is a violent societal collapse, followed by a slow regrowth of "civilization," in a new direction, and it documents the long ideological defeat of the Old World and its knowledge with new gods and new myths.

None of it has to be altered or refuted to be seen also as the drift of an irresistible gene.

It seems obvious that we'd be talking about a warrior gene, but there's a problem with that, the idea has been . . . moved away from, and despite that we search for a genetic connection for pretty much everything and even everything in neuroscience the narrative seems to be that that's not what that was, and the one they found needs a series of unfortunate events to activate it, and stop talking about it, of course there's no gene for anything so complex, and, and . . .

. . . and ha ha ha, shut up, of course there are warrior genes.

Next you'll tell me there aren't walking genes or breeding genes and genes aren't real, but anyway that's not really the crux of the matter so they can have the point for a minute. I'm going to call it the Spanking Gene, that's the point. We are abused children first and warriors second, this is the hierarchy of time and causality and genetics.

Spanking is your series of unfortunate events.

I'm not saying that first famous "warrior allele," that took the initial social rejection was the one or anything, but maybe it's one and there are some, let's be serious. Surely you don't think war is humanity reaching the stars, beyond its genes or anything like that, of course you don't. I think in 2024, what you probably think is we are still suffering under chimpanzee aggression, as though we aren't better at it than they are by an order of magnitude. There's no "warrior gene," it's a whole bunch of chimpanzee genes, is all, I think this is the current public view?

It is the current view inasmuch as the current view completely missed the Chalice and the Blade and history generally where humanity isn't slowly "getting better," at least not anymore.

The story of the Chalice and the Blade is the story of the growth of a monster, not the slow taming of one. The drift of a gene, the genetic invasion, this has echoes in a thousand sci-fi and horror stories, doesn't it, in tales of spiritual or demonic possession,

zombie films, *Invasion of the Body Snatchers*, they were perfectly normal, peaceful people until . . . until something got into them, and they started frothing at the mouth and going on rampages, and spreading the pathogen.

I feel like we have a brain path for describing this phenomenon.

The nasty gene does make for different sorts of people, and we don't talk about human subtypes or subspecies, but we have begun to talk about Neurotype, and that's what it is, a different mix of within-species genes, apparently affecting the neuro parts, clearly affecting social matters.

Eisler does say that the world is largely full of people living according to the Dominator social model, so I'm afraid that translates to the Allistic Neurotype, what we call the Neurotypical, or basically the modern normal person, blessed and cursed with what we call "Human Nature," – but there's a caveat, today, in the world of this Allistic dominance, of ideas of Human Nature, "types," sound like fixed states, permanent things.

This is not the case and this view is problematic as can be.

Inasmuch as we think they are, then to criticize a type is to simply declare war upon it, or to complain while being sure there is no solution, but it's a biology matter, the victims pose a problem, but the victims are not the problem per se, the victims are not the plague. It's not simply that they exist – it's something they're doing, something they think, and it's evolution, nothing simply exists, the problem is not that something merely exists, but that something keeps growing.

It's something that knows how to fight, it's the warrior gene – so I don't think we want to declare war on it, anyway that's quite redundant, it brings the war to us, that's the problem, not the solution – I think we need to go the other direction and stop trying to hurt anyone, we're feeding the thing, the Spanking Gene is your Bad Wolf, stop it. I suppose the hippies got it right, it's love that's required – but I need to pile some technical caveats onto that too.

It's just not love if it spans, or it's not good enough to be the answer if it does.

It doesn't matter how much love and good will you pile on after the fact of child abuse, because spanking is an environmental stressor that sets an epigenetic option to "warrior mode," so spanking *and* love, this is first switch them into warrior mode, and then it's heap love upon your new warrior – this is not solving the problem. It's less, "*Love* is all you need," and more, "*Love* is *all* you need."

Like, cut the crap. You need *all* love, otherwise you're feeding the Bad Wolf.

The Spanking Gene, the Bad Wolf is an abuse detector, is there abuse or not. It doesn't make excuses about only a little bit of abuse that "shouldn't matter." It sees what is real and does what it can to protect you whether you like it or not and whether or not

it's to the detriment of everybody else. That's why it's the Bad one. So, not a choice, a prescription.

I'm not asking, I'm telling you: it's evolution. Stop abusing your species, stop spanking, it's working too well. You do not have the "choice," to keep abusing yourself and still change anything any more than you have the "choice," to keep smoking through your emphysema and not require supplemental oxygen. The choice was earlier, you missed it, no-one told you, and it was "normal," you have lots of good reasons and/or excuses – but we're forever setting the next generation up for the same mistake.

We need to know this, that the Spanking Gene is the Bad Wolf. People act as though it were the Good one - this is what the Spanking Gene makes you think, perhaps.

You know, I'm not sure there is a Good Wolf inside of you, that's the same error I just shot down, like people think it's OK to feed the Bad one if there's a Good one too, no. And if we extend the metaphor to humanity, the Chalice and the Blade is the story of the growth of the Bad Wolf, while the Good Wolf is on hunger strike for the last seven to ten thousand years, fading away, being replaced.

The Bad Wolf is a gene, an allele, several, some genetic . . . entity – this is the social, colloquial meaning for, "a gene," right? We'd best say that once, get it out of the way. I am not speaking from the microscope, this is a bird's eye view. Like all philosophy, I try not to deal in what appears to be true, but in what must be true, the kids with the microscopes can catch up later if I'm right.

As such, as a gene, as a real biological thing and not an ideological one, the Bad Wolf isn't necessarily in everyone. Also, the inverse, the other side of the gene, the Good Wolf may still be alive in some people, who knows? I'm not trying to cherry pick this bit of Turtle Island wisdom, if I think they're so right about the Bad one, then I think they probably know what they're talking about regarding the Good one too, maybe some people really do have a Good Wolf still, or less of a Bad one, again, these perhaps are two sides of a gene.

I think if we step through the Chalice and history with our genes, and perhaps with some bit of knowledge regarding neurodiversity in mind, all this will get clearer, but it's not simple, sharing the "world as one neurotype sees it," with the rest, language isn't really adequate, each type has its own truths and its own language, it's always a long story and I'm afraid you do need all of it and you need to do half the work yourself, you have to accept the premise and be trying to get it.

Nothing in the world is easier than critiquing across neurotype, of course it's not what you already think, it never will be, it's like sympathy versus empathy, you have to volunteer to find the hurt when it's not automatic for you, you have to immerse yourself. I mean, don't get me wrong, I'll do everything I can, I'm just warning you, across types, it's never enough.

So the Chalice traces the situation from prehistory through history; they're a social scientist, so they've identified a "social model," they have suggestions, and this has provided the perfect framework for just about any theory about just what is humanity's problem anyway – except the "forever," ones.

It's pretty clear about it and the fact is humanity hasn't been on this bad trip forever, and not even longer than we remember. I'm clear that it's still not all of humanity either, and that's not to blame, or start any pogroms, that's just where the hope is for us all.

We are all humanity and none of us will be saved without all of us being saved, it just happens that types are involved, part of this fantastically complex puzzle. Mostly, this project is my proof, it ought to be a third title: Why We Shouldn't Spank.

So after that prescription, when your symptoms are a little more under control, come back and maybe we can start to talk about choices.

Jeff

Sept. 9th., 2024

Free Book

.

It's a new definition of humanity, a neurologically revolutionary text that flips who are the original human beings and who are not on its head and centers children in life and in science.

Please, feel free to share,

/1

#AutisticScience

#TheAutisticAndTheBlade

#TheChaliceAndTheBlade

#ActuallyAutistic

#TheSpankingGene

@actuallyautistic.

.

Restarting this project.

THE AUTISTIC AND THE BLADE

Or

THE SPANKING GENE

I started here, so it's the project again, then into the book, Eisler's project, which was to complete our picture of history and prehistory by including women and female things, and Eisler's framing, of "Partnership," and "Dominator," social models, or paradigms. She takes us into the prehistoric, pre-war world of the Near East and Old Europe and introduces us to the Goddess, the original monotheism. There is theory, theirs and mine. Talk about my Neurotype and Autism generally.

I am going to live-post as I read this great book, The Chalice and the Blade for the second time, at the opposite end of my adult life.

I'm going to read it differently this time, not thinking about Women's Liberation - that's almost how long ago, I must have read it nearly new - I mean, not thinking about feminism and the patriarchy, but thinking about spanking and genetics, and about Neurotype this time, about "Spanking, Autism and the Allisty," to put it in the same format.

If you follow, I've been saying that Neurodiversity is almost certainly the correct key to the situation Eisler lays out so well - and maybe I'll learn they beat me to it, but I

read it and missed it the first time, who knows. But that's the plan, if they haven't already done so, to turn this history into the history of the rise of the Spanking Gene, to audit it for child abuse and Neurodiversity.

.

Introduction: The Chalice and the Blade

In the first paragraph of the introduction Eisler invites it and welcomes us in to do it: "This book opens a door. The key to unlock it was fashioned by many people and many books, and it will take many more to explore the vast vistas that lie behind it."

I'm going to take them up on that, big time.

They then describe their family escaping Austria in the nick of time, living for a time in Cuba and ending up in America, and this experience shattered some "local" culture things, showed them the common things across cultures and prompted their lifelong search for just what is so wrong, my words.

Ah, a phrase I love, they say, ". . .we are quite literally partners in our own evolution." So they know it's still happening. Not like some of you Tootsters (Mastodon's version of tweeting is "tooting," so "Tootsters," is Tweetsters). I've been honing these arguments online, of course.

Ah, I'd forgotten this language, "we are at an evolutionary crossroads," politically, meaning, Left or Right, Capitalist or collectivist - but again they say what I maybe got from them, that both sides act the same, suggesting any "crossroads" are behind both of them, and that is not the choice in front of us now.

They say the recent past seems rough, and that we are trying to be less so and that is where we would like to go, but then the project seems to be how to get there, and then we are off and into the heart of the matter, because to know how to get anywhere, first you have to know where you have been, and which direction you are already travelling, so they take us into the past first. My words.

It says what is new is that they plan to address prehistory and female history and build a far more complete picture than patriarchal, or I might say than Allistic science has. Of course I approve. I only want to complete it further and add from the childhood side of life also. One might say there are children of both sexes and without them the picture was only half complete, adults only.

Or perhaps since "children," is all of us, it perhaps includes us all and misses us all, all at the same time. Not that there is a lot of data regarding children to begin with, no-one said this was going to be easy. Ah, I almost missed it, right at the end of the opening, what I'm here to adjust:

"(The Chalice and the Blade) shows that war and the "war of the sexes," are neither divinely nor biologically ordained."

Got to stop you right there. Everything is biologically, not "ordained," but created. I think there is biology in this story, in the forms of genetics, of neurology and of ongoing evolution. Every story spanning generations needs evolution, and I hope to show that it all makes far more sense, once we consider genetics and Neurotype.

This is always the only thing missing, when all else is good about the Human Sciences, they think they're "biology free," somehow - again, like I say far too often: like evolution is only an origin story, like biology is only an origin story.

But I think I can explain that.

The Human Sciences have a way of giving up the entire world of biology to the patriarchy and to the fascists, they feel where biology appears, that humanism loses, automatically or something, just like the bad guys think. The entire stance is, "OK, that's reality - but wouldn't THIS be better?," or something. Everyone believes in some "Human Nature," which has some aspect of Christian Original Sin in it, and when we get down to it, when push comes to shove, we think Goodness loses.

It's not true. Biology is life.

Biology is on our side.

This is the point of this project, one of them.

For the record, much of this first argument is simply old, that meme of No Biology Allowed in psychology has gone through many changes, indeed all the way to never mind the whole world of talk, just go straight to medicating for "chemical imbalances."

This attitude, like humans have transcended their biology and are running on something else, it doesn't have the sense it had when they were writing this book anymore now, when I formed this opinion. It's more complex, if I were in a bad mood, I might say it's insidious. It's got a lot of biology, modern psychology, in the sense that it usually means a drug prescription, and in the sense that they largely look at us as chimpanzees living vastly out of any natural context it's all biology, it's just . . . well, that, I guess. The biology is for chimpanzees, it's in the past.

I guess I think it is biology but not evolution?

Drugs help, so that's physical, that's bioscience, but other than that, nothing about the environment is apparently causative, not since what, the Ice age or something. The function of psychology seems to be helping people adapt their "Paleolithic emotions," to their modern, unnatural lives, which I intuit as invalidating everything about today and everyone's emotions right now.

Psychology is somehow only a personal matter, whereas I think the matters it attempts to deal with are the very environmental stressors that drive our evolution and make us what we are. It deals with pain and abuse every day, but thinks our bad feelings are “Paleolithic,” already and it doesn’t think those bad feelings are compounding over time, still active every day like interest, making us ever more . . . something.

Nope, just help another identical human, same old feelings, they haven’t had a new one in a literal age. All this psychology exists in the patriarchy’s world, where it was all created yesterday and everything remains as it was made by it’s warrior god, none of this psychology has the always and forever self-creation of real life and evolution that I assume is natural to every other creature.

Today, they are medicating for the pain of the enshittification, easing the de-evolution, while they sit, smug in the anti-evolution knowledge that is just “Human Nature,” that we abuse one another and nothing really changes. I’m sorry.

Humans have not stopped evolving, evolution is life, it doesn’t stop. War and the “war of the sexes,” is not ordained any way at all, but everything is biologically created, and this situation may require to be biologically . . . addressed and biologically repaired.

Still, this is the project, I shall try to answer in Eisler’s language wherever possible. The basic, possibly Manichean setup of these people and those people, two alternatives, that I’m afraid, is part of the story, even if it’s not enough, as that sort of thing never is enough.

.

Introduction

"Human Possibilities: Two Alternatives"

It begins by telling of common legends of a previous age of gender equality and female wisdom, the Garden of Eden, and a previous time written of in the Tao Te Ching, and in Hesiod and suggests that "legends," is perhaps less than they really are, that there is archaeology to match these supposed "legends," now, and I will add that this picture is getting around, it's what we see in The Dawn of Everything too, and maybe in Debt, the First 5,000 Years, a long, deep prehistory of intellectual growth before we see the stone walls of war.

Next, they make a case that during this long period, the obvious natural and perhaps animistically-related religion was Mother worship, the source of life, kind of thing, and they list Goddess religions and idols from all over. They also makes the case that this has not gone away, that even that vast bastion of the patriarchy, the Catholic Church has room for a Mother of God, had to have, to be relevant, perhaps.

Ah, here they say that when they found sites with predominantly goddess imagery, that today's men have said that "the women must have been in charge then," speaking as though of course some gender must have supremacy, that they don't think

equality is a thing or something. It is Eisler's point, that when the men weren't in charge, supremacy wasn't in charge, nobody had to be supreme, and that nobody was in most of our past - and mine that when the Spanking Gene is not in charge, the same thing. Spanking inculcates a need for supremacy, I think.

I will only say that that this rule is a neurology matter, obviously not a genitalia matter, and that during these later, male dominated periods of history, did all women disagree because they are women, or did they mostly go along, because they are normal? I'm saying probably it wasn't only the men that believed and taught the patriarchy, that no other education was available for anyone.

This is Eisler's point also, it is a mode of life for all, and that men existed in the more equal past also and shared in that mode of life too. Of course there are women at the front of the regressive social movements today too, standing up for the patriarchy, aren't there? Of course it's more than genitalia.

But what is it?

Ah, here's the stuff I didn't remember, the technical stuff, terminology.

They say they have a new theory of cultural evolution they call Cultural Transformation theory (oh, whups, you don't capitalize the "theory," part, I've only had that wrong a million times about mine), where two "models of society" underlie human cultures, the Dominator and Partnership models.

In the Dominator model, it seems, my words, inequality and dominance are normalized, and both a patriarchy and any possible matriarchy would qualify, as long as there's an imbalance of power.

The Partnership model therefore is the other thing, equality, and running on something besides the inequality, surely the inequality of authority, we assume an equal society runs . . . voluntarily. Voluntarily and consciously. My words, starting with "running."

So, Eisler says these are social "models," and I think probably Neurotypes, more like Neurological models, and crudely put, the Partnership and Dominator social models appear to map perfectly onto Neurological stereotypes, Partnership as the God's Fool sort of Autistic and Dominator as the Neurotypical or Allistic authoritarian sort. In this sense, the term, "Partnership," appears a little backwards, because Autistic means self oriented and Allistic means group oriented, but only a little because the Greek term is also backwards in a way, in that "the group," seems to mean the group's leaders to the Greeks, and group oriented this way is not "partnership," but authority, at least not to my Autistic brain.

I mean, the words Neurodiversity and Neurotype didn't exist when this book was written, I don't think. It's no great gotcha moment. I had no better idea when I read this book the first time either, it seemed pretty good.

You know, I can see something coming, I think this exercise is going to settle for me a central mystery of human life, which is when did we start "spanking," that is to say when did we start programming children for the Dominator model and honestly, when you put it like that, the answer was in the question, wasn't it, it must be the central factor in all of this and so it must have begun when the Dominator model began, meaning a whole lot earlier than anyone dreams.

Ah, and the second major theme of Cultural Transformation theory, the transformation, we used to run on Partnership, and we were on track to keep "culturally evolving," that way, but we are since something, now running largely on the Dominator model.

They suggest something like the Shock Doctrine perhaps, a disaster, whereupon some opportunistic power hungry men took over, a "cataclysmic cultural event."

This event was when the Goddess symbols began to be replaced by symbols and ideologies that had shifted focus, a hundred and eighty degrees, they says, from the worship of the Chalice of womanhood and life, to the worship of the Blade of death - and again, this is how I have criticized today's evo bro biological theorists, this maps, that they seem to think evolution is about who is no longer alive to breed, rather than about the changes living things go through when they don't die.

The same one hundred and eighty degrees.

.

Introduction

"The Evolutionary Crossroads"

First, I'm doing Eisler some disservice already by arguing, that it's "not men," and "not genitalia," a few times, or I have been doing that in the process of writing, when they never said it was. It's a little bit of an easy mistake, the point seems to be that the Dominator model includes a supremacy of gender (and of a lot of things), so it often seems a distinction without a difference - but still, I've gotten close to putting words in Eisler's mouth and I apologize for it and pre-emptively, in case I do it again. They begin this section making that very point again, that it's not something that simply comes with gender but a social model that the whole society follows, men, women, and everyone else, and I agree.

OK, not *EVERYONE*, that's one of the points. We are Not All the Same.

They make this "social model," causative, though, which, always to me has seemed top down thinking, backwards, that the causality works from the bottom up: biology makes what is social, what is socially constructed is not a first cause of any sort but develops from biology somehow or other. It's not different from what I said above that the Human sciences have learned to treat biology as the enemy of humanist goals, because no answer they produce can defeat the negative "Human Nature," myth.

They expand on the one-sided theme of the existing science, pointing out that even when the prehistory of women was considered by some few women, that this knowledge was also sort of only, "for women."

I think I/we are at just that stage now, that I am trying to make science that includes Neurodiversity and Autism in the Story of Humanity - not just, "for Autistics and the Neurodivergent." I mean, maybe both. I'm not comfortable with the way people talk about Neurodiversity and Autism and evolution now, the Neurodivergent included, they seem to think, as the Antivaxx people do, that we are the new thing in the world, just for good reasons, adaptive reasons, rather than due to poisoning by Tylenol.

I say this as the very model of a medically caused nightmare, I have recently been identified as a Thalidomide baby, and I have medical issues, I do not love the drug companies, but the drug companies have not achieved the level of mastery required to create an Autistic brain. They can cause all manner of brain damage, sure, obviously, but it hasn't anything to do with Autism.

I'm just like my Dad, and neither Thalidomide nor Tylenol existed in his mother's day.

My position is that Neurodiversity, and maybe Autism specifically is OG, the original or at least the longstanding version of humankind, and that it is the modern, Allistic who is new in the world and has modern, or more modern "causes," than Autistics do. This is a major point in this project, that their Cultural Transformation theory is really a Neurotype Transformation theory, a Genetic Drift theory.

(I suppose it's only a minor point then that the search for an "Autism gene," is utterly misguided and quite doomed to produce nothing positive with which to balance out any nightmares it creates.)

I think the Dominator's origin myths are exactly that, the stories of the origin of the Dominator, not the human being, and in these stories, there were already human beings, like how Adam and Eve's children found wives, because they weren't the first "people," only the first of a new type of person.

They say again that the book hopes to make a more complete picture, history and prehistory, complete with women, for everyone - and again, for fullness, I would try to add children to the story, for everyone.

Rather than make the point empirically, they say what might happen if you run a society based this way, on the Dominator model, and say it is not difficult to see what might go wrong. They then sort a lot of civilizations or groups by the Dominator vs Partnership models, making better sense of them than the several ways they describe themselves, Capitalist, Communist, Religious, etc., and I approve heartily. All the Dominator "systems," are basically the same, but you'd never know it listening to them talk about themselves. They define each other by their small differences, by the shape of

the bit of their iceberg that's sticking out of the water and not by the great identical mass beneath it.

The section ends with them saying that how things might go wrong is very much happening and we need to change our ways, and soon.

It seems I have stolen my entire schtick from Dr. Eisler. The dire warning, the pithy ending. Sorry, and thank you. The pithy ending, I have taken it to new heights (and lows), it's part of me now and forever, a thing I love too much and fight with always. Ha.

It says the last section of the Introduction is sort of optional, but we'll have a look.

.

Introduction

"Chaos or Transformation"

Hmm. It says the Cultural Transformation theory traditionally has the pattern of progression we are familiar with, from nomadism to agriculture to cities to industry, and places their idea within or alongside this context, that as that progression plays out, we have choices, Dominator or Partnership models going forward?

Time passes, I think the Davids dispensed with that idea of the order of events that way, or rather summarized for us that the whole field is moving away from it (perhaps an example is that the monumental works of Gobekli Tepe precede any permanent farming community there). A little further on, Eisler does as well, in a way, first they contrast themselves with the traditional sequence by saying it misses the models, and then reminding us that the colloquial meaning of "evolution," as a progression is not the technical one, and that in evolution proper, regression is also very common.

They don't dispense with the idea that we want this progression to be true and that it may be, they only caution that it is not a smooth ascent. I'll go a little farther, as do all evolutionary scientists and say that sometimes it goes the wrong direction altogether and dies out.

After this they go off on what seems a tangent today about books and scientists involved in what did as they predicted turn out to be called Chaos theory. Ah, and stuff about Dynamic Change, my capitals, systems stuff to explain sea changes like the disaster that moved us from Partnership track to the Dominator one – I'm sorry, I just hear Charlie Brown's teachers when people speak about "systems theory," with no content, just "systems," and again – evolution and Neurotype are the dynamics we really need for this puzzle.

There was some inflection point, though, the disaster.

Gould is one of their guys, and I seem to be in the Not-Gould school. It mentions an idea that evolution operates like life in the army, long periods of stable boredom punctuated by times of intense pressure and change. The term, "bifurcation points," appears.

If you've read me before, you know my alarm klaxons are sounding: change, "back then," but "not now," this is what I consider the insidious infiltration of creationism that suffuses Allistic evolutionary thinking as regards their own species: evolution only works sometimes. I mean, they want another bifurcation, "now," but again, "We should try evolution," isn't right, is it? Of course we are forever "trying it."

Blaming Gould, not Eisler, LOL (fist-bump to Bob Trivers, who might enjoy someone accusing Gould of unconscious creationism).

I'm sorry, I couldn't treat the change and systems theory fairly. You like that sort of thing, get the book. Actually, no, not this book for that, at least not for this bit, it's only a page, only a bunch of names and hints, really. There is more later.

They end this optional or later section and the whole Introduction with mention of the female knowledge and a list of female scientists and authors, some of whom I'm proud to say I have heard of.

They promise to begin the book proper "thousands of years before recorded history," which is all well and good, just because we don't remember doesn't mean important things didn't happen, and that they'll tell us about the disaster - ah, five thousand years ago.

When we all fell into debt too, according to Graeber.

I keep feeling bad about not diving in about the chaos stuff - but they said it was optional, didn't they. Plus if I would have owed it to anyone then, I don't think I do anymore, that stuff has stayed in the past, I think.

I mean, I'll still need a reason why we're on this road too, why humanity thinks it has to be the way it is, I mean, the Dominator model, to go with their framing, I too need to know why everything is so awful.

(For the record, I've said and will continue to, that my "position," is what I think is the Autistic position, and that it's rather arbitrary, in the end, I base it all upon nothing better than "what makes sense to me," - in other words, my own neurology - and this is Even Steven, equal and opposite, because that is what I'm trying to tell everyone, that this is all Allistic science does also, verifies with its own neurology.

What else can any of us do?

In some Star Trek future, we will all bring our various neurotypes to the table and negotiate and plan for some overall best outcomes that are bigger and better than any one our single neurologies could ever devise. The entire human mind. Neurodiversity is

a Discovery of the Age sort of a thing, that causes everything to be audited by it, science and philosophy most of all.

Or it ought to be. I'm trying.)

.

Chapter One

Journey into a Lost World: The Beginnings of Civilization

“The Paleolithic”

Eisler shows us the Paleolithic and Neolithic world, with dates, making the case that for a long time there is no evidence of the life of conflict we have come to think of as the original state of affairs. They speak of life and life giving – and I spend most of this entry trying to make the case that all that means evolution, aboriginal, forever knowledge of evolution, that this knowledge is the crucial thing that was lost when the disasters happened and everything changed.

Beginning in the Paleolithic, it talks about burials with female symbols, cowrie shells, shaped like vulvas, is that it? and says that symbols of life and birth in a burial are indicative of resurrection thinking, birth from death and they also talk about fertility rites for wild things, plants and animals, and this is the interconnectedness of the life first approach of the partnership model, that the live-giving powers of the goddess extends to all things.

This paragraph about the paleolithic ideological environment, the Goddess religion:

“These cave sanctuaries, figurines, burials, and rites all seem to have been related to a belief that the same source from which human life springs is also the source of all vegetable and animal life – the Great Mother Goddess and Giver of All we still find in later periods of western civilization. They also suggest that our early ancestors recognized that we and our natural environment are integrally linked parts of the great mystery of life and death and that all nature must therefore be treated with respect.”

Much of the Goddess imagery has her surrounded with plants and animals and sometimes she has animal features. Today still, many Indigenous societies share this orientation, and it's all good.

Life giving, birth death, resurrection, all good.

I just think there's more. There is more about the today people, it's not just a religious awe or respect about nature, I mean that's what we WEIRDs, we modern European sorts notice, that's the glaring difference, the respect, the treatment of other living things and we think of that as a moral matter, but this respect is founded in deep knowledge, in understanding how it works, environments, it is real knowledge, not morality or religion. “Seven generations,” is real, practical knowledge, not religion.

Evolution, in a word.

I mean, we know about birth and life and death today still, but we lost something, didn't we.

All the talk about “life giving,” ought to somehow be about evolution, about life’s mechanisms, not the power of reproduction but the power of evolution is the opposite of the Dominator and their blade. Again, today’s Dominators know about birth – what people don’t know is evolution, it’s a bloody debate these days, even as an origin story, let alone as working on us all every minute. Life and death seem equal and opposite in a snapshot maybe, but . . . but what, one lives and moves and one just lies there.

I see I’m having some trouble making the case that humans always used to understand evolution, I know it’s a “new discovery,” to the “western mind,” or something but I’ll tell you a secret, of genetics and Neurotype: it always will be a debatable new discovery to the Dominator mind, a novelty, I think.

That department in the modern brain is labelled, “Creation Stories,” I think, and this is a configuration created by the Spanking Gene, somehow it all works together, spanking is reasonable if you are a product created by something or someone and not a spontaneous entity of self creation. Some modification of you is necessary and acceptable before you go to market if you are a created product with limitations and flaws – never mind, I’m in the ether.

It is impossible to speak about how other genes think, of course I’m guessing, but they all surely close their own circles this way. We don’t have to prove to ourselves what is already in our brains, nor can we, that’s the problem. You get something in there, it’s like provenance, it’s its own proof. I simply offer another sort of mind’s best attempt, for comparison.

I mean, it’s clear in reverse, that when you believe some creation story, you will lose any chance of grokking evolution because your data is gone, proscribed - but that still doesn’t prove our Goddess worshipping predecessors had the chance and took it, even if they didn’t have their own fictional creation myths, does it?

I may have to settle for “they *MUST HAVE*,” arguments, like since they didn’t spin out of control into environmental disaster or war in the Neolithic, they must have known something, like the Seven Generations meme - ah, but they farmed and kept animals, didn’t they? It’s hard to farm and breed livestock without learning the basics of genetics and even evolution - unless you have some creation story stuck in your craw that you’re not allowed to think around?

That would seem to make sense!

I mean, how is the miracle of birth a developmental thing for humans, birth predates humanity by a very long time. Humans did not discover sex and reproduction and no such discovery counts as any part of our mental history, does it? – but knowing evolution or not sure seems to be. Inventing creation stories and forgetting about how life operates is absolutely part of the story.

Of course it is going to be my position that it is not that the disaster was a turning away from life, and the patriarchy as we see likes to outlaw birth control, they “love life,”

as such, the protection of life is their entire excuse, their entire reason to be, they are not going to admit to “turning away from life,” but rather it seems to me that they turned away from evolution (and started saying stuff like, “I hit them, but it doesn’t hurt them,” which means “they have a created permanent Nature, their environment doesn’t affect them,”). Not away from life, just away from . . . understanding life, I guess?

From the simple causality of evolution, which means from the accountability of reality, of the future.

Ouch.

Central to my thinking, though. That the humans around me don’t worry about the evolution they cause has been a blinding light in my eyes all my life. This is what the Davids called actuarial knowledge, that what we do to one another causes how we evolve, the environment we create in life directs people’s evolving. My words.

I think they said, “the knowledge of what sort of a society we create,” staying in sociology or anthropology, history mode, and not straying into evolution about it as I . . . must.

Because the thing is, everything is smaller than Allistics think. They go straight to “the miracle of birth,” - which exists for everything that lives pretty much - for some question they’re only asking about people and speak as if they discovered it.

This again:

“These cave sanctuaries, figurines, burials, and rites all seem to have been related to a belief that the same source from which human life springs is also the source of all vegetable and animal life” – italics mine – and that belief could well be describing evolution, could it not? The Tree of Life? The first noun could be changed, from “source,” to something like method or principle, but it would be the same sentence.

I suspect that the magic “power of life,” really means or at least includes the magic transformative power of evolution. To me, that’s the magic, sex and birth is only creation, only reproduction, not magic – the magic is the little bit of actual change you get with evolution. New things, that’s magic, that’s creative. If the female symbols lead us to magic, the magic of life, to me, that’s evolution.

(Here’s my optional section. Shades of Dune, if the priestesses were evolution conscious, were they selective, trying to arrange bloodlines? Hmmm. If humanity were evolution conscious, did we exercise some sort of control and might Eisler’s (Gimbutas’) disaster be a rebellion of the unwanted traits or something?

It feels like a sort of a psychological truth, everything about the warrior society seems like a childish rebellion against the truth of evolution to me, the idea of a deterrent is the opposite of the idea of the environments shaping us, with a deterrent, we are supposed to adapt in reverse or something. We have had every opportunity to

realize that environments shape us, two hundred years, but no, screw you, Darwin, we're going with "deterrents.")

Ha – Eisler contrasts this older society, conscious of life and the interconnectedness of nature with the view of the modern men who looked back and saw only men as active and causative, and basically only hunting as what life was all about, and I'll say it about hunting, same as birth, although I don't have to tell Eisler, this is for the boys - hunting also is not part of the story of humanity, humans didn't invent hunting either. Somehow they look back a little way, to only our immediately previous situation, and treat that like the bloody Beginning of Time, some ideological starting point. Sorry, ha.

Hunting. Breeding. Sexual differences, even, all of these predate the very idea of human beings and they are not our story. That's just silly.

I mean, yes, sometime in the past, our ideology was still with the world and not against it, and that doesn't seem to be the case anymore for most people alive today, and all that nature stuff, Goddess religion, it was all real and good of course. I'm just saying there is more to what humans are than the very most basic building blocks of life, sex and nutrition. All animals have those.

There was more to that previous life than knowing where babies come from, this knowledge is only causative of revolutions in our strange, modern, personal lives, and I have never bought people saying that we didn't used to know, as a species. That's just bizarre, to imagine that, they don't think animals know what breeding is, it's bizarre. I think it is projection to place these things as causative of anything that all animals don't do. Again, if there is depth, secret knowledge held by the priestesses, I think it has to be evolution, at least the Seven Generations sort of thinking.

Full disclosure, at least intellectually, I'm asexual. I don't think sex or gender have any of the power everyone since Augustine or Freud thinks it does, I think humanity has big violence problems and they spend all their time thinking and talking about sex as though our lives were the same as the bonobos, as if we weren't also at war while we diddle one another. I'm sorry but get your science out of the gutter. There is more to life. What about sex and gender affects climate change, or war, or the plague? Can you look somewhere else, my Freudian minded friends?

But evolution, that I think has power, and that's what maybe people sense, sex is touching evolution, it is possibly a distinction in belief without a difference again, sex has power, because it means evolution and genetics. Of course.

Sorry, back to it.

We spend a few pages talking about how the patriarchy projected its violence onto much paleolithic art and how many arrows and spears are not, they are trees and branches and plants, which if they weren't, would be conspicuously missing in the art of people living off the land. They mention cases where they must have worked awfully

hard to read it so, spears with the pointy part at the wrong end and whatnot. They say nature and animism make far more sense than hunting in most scenes, and the supposed spears and arrows, if that's what they are, never seem to find the mark, and paleolithic art is being seen as far more holistic these days, it's a Goddess and her world, not pornography and hunting. LOL.

All well and good. I agree with the premise, it was good and now it's not, I just need to make sure we have evolution thoroughly embedded in it all, and I think that's its role in this story: it was good when we understood and believed in evolution, then some disaster happened and they started talking about creation and Human Nature instead, and stopped seeing the changes they make in each other, and began exploring a technology of mistreatment, ignoring all complaints.

So they're saying we used to live from this partnership attitude, which was aligned with female principles of life and nurturing, closer to nature than today, and I'm just trying to say those principles include an Indigenous sort of understanding of evolution, of how environments change us - that is not perhaps still automatically part of even the female side of today's most common human profile.

I mean neurotype, and it seems to be what Eisler is getting at, it's a mode of life for all, and to try to understand it by projecting our, today's dominator mode people, even women back onto Palaeolithic life is sure to miss.

We are today, "life giving," and "nurturing," more so the women, or we think we are, but something is surely different and while we still literally give birth and feed it is nevertheless not the same, coming from a mother who thinks people were just created by some warrior god as it was from one who understood that motherhood sort of IS the Goddess, simply breathing.

Eisler saw this, I just feel it was extremely difficult to express, perhaps they hadn't quite seen what I think I do, that this human, the dominator model is somehow blind to evolution as regards themselves. I mean, it's a thing I say a lot, and I've never heard anyone else say it.

If they knew we couldn't see it, they could see that's what changed, maybe, but no-one sees it, even the Allistic scientists, this is the problem.

But hey - you would be, wouldn't you? Blind to your own changes. Do you suppose as we bred pit bulls to be tougher and tougher, that the dogs noticed? Think they knew their parents and grandparents were relatively peaceful dogs?

Of course dogs don't grow up with their families, so they couldn't. But could they if they did? Every pit bull growing up in shame about his milquetoast father? That we do hear from ourselves, don't we, Death of a Salesman and whatnot.

We hear it, but we hear it from the newly evolved POV, like that, Willy is weak it's because we are now tougher, and we don't worry what we are now, we resent what Willy was or wasn't? We evolve because we hate the past, so we like our present better and the

pit bulls probably would too, we have both been bred to like it this way, and how does a creature find objectivity and perspective, ever?

Except Neurotype, except diversity, maybe they don't all change at once, right?

The Columbian cultural exchange caused the European enlightenment, according to the Dawn of Everything, we got a glimpse when we encountered the New World, unfortunately the Dominators have been pushing hard to bring the Turtle Islanders and the Indigenous the world over to join the model.

Neurodiversity is another chance, another glimpse.

(Back to the optional line of thought, referring to the "Dune," bit, it bothered me for a minute like it had to be that conscious, but of course it doesn't.

Every anthropologist has a story about how small Indigenous groups retain any egalitarianism and it's about nipping it in the bud when some Big Man wants to start telling people what to do by force, by nudging said would-be boss off a cliff. That would do it for the vector that concerns me, the Bene Gesserit (spelling, I forget, it's Dune) wouldn't have to do more than that, I mean they wouldn't have to be arranging marriages.

But, psychologically, is this different? Perhaps the disaster of 5,000 years ago is still some rebellion of Big Men that failed to die, perhaps the cliffs weren't high enough. The volcano went cold or something. Honestly, I'm not in love with it. I mean why do Big Men just pop up anyway, there's an assumption of evil Human Nature in that idea that I'm supposed to be fighting, isn't there.)

.

Chapter One

Journey into a Lost World: The Beginnings of Civilization

"The Neolithic"

While people were re-interpreting the symbols of the cave art in this more holistic way, in the early 1960s, others were digging out Catal Huyuk and Hacilar, Neolithic cities in modern Turkey that filled the Neolithic years for us, having been occupied for most of a millennium on either side of 5,700 BCE and seeing that the first signs of the agricultural revolution are from between 8,000 and 9,000 BCE and it was an established fact by 6,000 BCE.

The Goddess religion was continuous, from the Ice age through the Paleolithic, clear through to what we know as the Bronze Age civilizations, becoming all the goddesses we know of today.

Over and done by 6,000 BCE, the agricultural revolution – not ready to back it up yet, but I suspect these Partnership people weren't spanking. There's no record of jails before Athens, I don't think, and those were debtor's prisons, but Graeber says we've

been in debt for the same 5,000 years Eisler says we've been stuck on Dominator Mode for 5,000 years, so I'm going to say we almost certainly had the debtor's prisons at least immediately with the disaster, at 3,000 BCE and that spanking probably became an established fact in Europe and the near east then.

Eisler says the Neolithic was a long period of progress, continuous, and, "... almost universally, those places where the first great breakthroughs in material and social technology were made had one feature in common: the worship of the Goddess."

If we're talking about Neurotype, this would smooth a trouble I've been having about who invented the new tech, but who seems to have invented "society," and that while many technologies seem brilliant and not harmful by themselves and I would happily take Autistic credit for them, I don't want to blame society, or the collapse of the modern world on Autistic invention, and certainly not on the previous world of Goddess worship. All this trouble looks like part of the new world to me, Dominator model trouble, not smart tech trouble.

With a change of Neurotype, with the drift of a gene, it can all fit, I think.

Eisler says, sometime before or in 1987, that this new knowledge of older civilizations hadn't made it into the logos yet, and maybe it still hasn't that people – and my TV shows it still to be true in 2024– still talk about Mesopotamia as "the cradle," because basically it's still the men doing all the talking. Plus I guess pyramids look great on TV.

.

Chapter One

Journey into a Lost World: The Beginnings of Civilization

"Old Europe"

First, Europe too, at least south-eastern Europe was settled long before Sumer. Eisler shares the work of one Marija Gimbutas who besides their own excavations, reviewed thousands of sites in this region and documents a stable few millennia following the agricultural revolution, beginning at 7,000 BCE. Between then and 3,500 BCE was a long period of technical and cultural growth – and danged if they weren't peaceful times, that the cities weren't placed in defensible positions or fortified – indeed that for the 1,500 year existence of Catal Huyuk and then Hacilar, neither place was ever destroyed by war.

There are as many and as rich burials of women as men, all over this area and this period, and no evidence at all of anyone's sexual supremacy. From an earlier section, the Goddess statuettes are too numerous to list. Without fortifications and weapons, all there is to be found at these sites are the comforts of life and food, and a great deal of wonderful art. It ends by saying that the place this seems to have lasted the longest, is in the mysterious lost civilization of Crete, and that's where we're going next.

I believe that concludes Chapter One.

.

Reading Chapter two of the Chalice, it's about ancient art and the Goddess' world - but I'm having a . . . correction, bit of an epiphany.

I've made a few rants and a few blogs talking about "Creation as the toolmakers' myth," and placing it older than farming and what would be the farmer's myth, evolution, because of million year old stone blades and whatnot - but that's backwards to everything else I and Eisler have been saying about timing, the creation myths are the new ones, so either I have to say the toolmakers' myth is the new one, perhaps rather there is no toolmakers' myth, but the weapon makers' instead - and are the truly old stone artifacts weapons? Hunter gatherers can't use blades for peaceful purposes? Even so, axes are for trees, and spears and arrows aren't just for people.

Don't visit my blog alone, it's a process.

It's the Autism, you know, sometimes the words just come out backwards. Of course I had help making this mistake, that was the old, taught view I was working off of, fighting first and farming second. Again, the Chalice didn't quite take the first time, or the firehose of Allistic noise drowned it out since.

It's life and farming first. Fighting is new and . . . not tried and true.

Of course evolution is forever and Indigenous, I need to stop falling into speech where Wallace and Darwent (sorry, trying to make Wallace and Darwin sound like Wallace and Grommet, I don't know why, just to shake them on their perches a little bit) invented it.

I couldn't see the mistake until I read The Dawn of Everything, that's when I realized it was about Neurotype, and about what was actually new and what was old, when I met Kandiaronk. And that's what got me thinking about The Chalice again.

.

Chapter Two

Messages from the Past: The World of the Goddess

More of the Goddess and the art, and Eisler pointing out the patriarchal sort of errors that suffuse the archaeology world, how since Babylon, it's all looked back at incorrectly, through modern, violent, patriarchal eyes. Eisler talks about choosing social models and I talk about choosing not to spank, saying that spanked people don't really choose their social models, and also Neurotype, that not everyone is offered the same choices. My theory that if you don't spank a born Dominator, they'll have more options.

The opening continues the message that everything we hear about the ancient past, we hear from modern, Dominator sort of people with their attitudes projected backwards, I might say, seeing things their neurology sees, what the Spanking Gene sees: weapons, battles, and hunting, which I suppose is battles with animals. Our oldest historical texts about the deep past are from post-disaster, Dominator societies, the Babylonians, the Greeks and they all share that trait.

The “modern,” view of the last few centuries has been pretty much all that, it says the prevailing view is of “our cultural evolution as a linear progression from “primitive man,” to so-called “civilized man,” who, despite their many differences, shared a common preoccupation with conquering, killing, and dominating.”

They say we have a lot of later, interested hearsay – but we have the actual art, which tells a different story.

.

Chapter Two

Messages from the Past: The World of the Goddess

“Neolithic Art”

This section begins by telling us what is absent from Neolithic art and burials and it is war and warlords and weapons and victims. What is present is the Goddess and nature and plants and animals. But honestly, I'm not going to describe the Goddess religion, which seems to be the point of this chapter's title, and I think they say this too: “religion,” isn't really right. Everything really is connected, and for me, what I think we are trying to get at with reincarnation and rebirth is probably evolution, and that isn't “religion,” either, that too is simply reality.

I suppose if there was ritual, then there was, “mythology,” but there was a large dose of reality first.

I think the disaster meant we moved from reality into mythology, period. And it might not matter what direction you take with your myths, when they all mean you are putting reality behind you. I mean, the direction is terrible, seems like straight down.

Oh! Whups, I guess I am talking about it, that's the next section.

They end with saying that the obvious reason for the lack of war art was a lack of war and that the central image was of a woman giving birth, not as we have today, of a man being killed, and says it is not unreasonable to see we used to worship life and now we worship death instead, my words, the last bit.

.

Chapter Two

Messages from the Past: The World of the Goddess

"The Worship of the Goddess"

We begin by saying that the Goddess in more modern times and in the past appeared as both multiple and local, as in many female pagan goddesses, but also provides the original model for the monotheist's gods, transcending all of that, which, somebody tell Moses, huh.

This remarkable religious unity across our Neolithic world they suggest as being because all were engaged in some level of agriculture, and that the Goddess, fertility and the creation of life is always the natural religion for that life, that we see it all over the world . . . and yes, I think life, birth and evolution is likely the original mindset of humanity, and probably all the other animals too if we could ask them. That basic mindset didn't have to change to imagine farming.

Besides the Goddess herself, bull and snake motifs appear, and are also Goddess symbols, as well as the "waters of life." I suppose this makes direct sense of the Ouroboros, and snakes generally as symbols of eternity and rebirth. The Goddess is shown giving birth to a bull in Catal Huyuk, the bull, like all things, is one of her children first, before he is the "male principle," or anything. Ah, there it is, what I thought it was me saying earlier: religion was life, life was religion. Tacitly included in that thought is that today, they are different things.

Because one of them became fiction.

Again, intuition, I hope I can make a case later: the disaster was the invention of fictional mythology. OK, now, that I remember is the point of the book, the invaders come along with their war and patriarchy and made up male gods – so what I missed, the first time as well as so far this time, what I am always so childishly certain that is only me who knows (as a born Partnership sort), is that the older, Goddess mythology wasn't fictional. This book left me feeling the first time around what all books do, that the good folks, the women, the progressives are asking for something they don't think is real, that we want what is good, but deep down we don't think that is real, because what I said earlier, Human Nature.

That would only be the Dominator good folks and women who think the Old Way was just another fiction, wouldn't it? Partnership folks and Eisler had a better idea,

maybe. I was on the wrong side of my own line calling it religion and I will say, it is not easy staying out of the everywhere Allistic thinking always.

Touché.

I thought the Goddess religion was offered as simply a better religion, I didn't think it was just the evolved, organic truth of the world like I do now. I'm sorry, Dr. Eisler, I have lived my life telling myself no-one "gets it," and you were included. I will say, that so far, in this reading, I haven't seen a declaration of "factual," regarding the partnership model's ideology in the old world, only talk about what is better and worse. I mean, I haven't seen anything derogative either, no "just religion," talk, that was me, and I'm sorry.

It is a matter of my Neurotype, perhaps, that I assume the worst, that what is fact and what is fiction doesn't matter to people, but because of it, I think the entire conversation is framed as competing fictions and my mind doesn't want to see it that way, I want the higher ground of better science than the other guys, not just the moral high ground. Again, I suppose it is all here, and this is where I got some of this thinking. I mean, most people not of my mindset are not slow to tell you, they are sure there are no real truths to be found, right? So of course that's the framing for most folks, "just another religion."

It's not all me! It's partly my mask, what I think you think, and I'm not always wrong about it!

I'm not clear what is necessary for Eisler to think, I'm not clear about their neurology, as I say, I had included her in all I argued with, but I haven't been fair about it, and they don't have to answer to me for the whole Allistic world's assumptions. If I had to guess, I say they're normal, and understand the people they're writing to better than I do, but that doesn't mean they don't understand everything I worry about even if they don't spell it all out.

.

Chapter Two

Messages from the Past: The World of the Goddess

"If It Isn't Patriarchy Then It Must Be Matriarchy"

This is several pages of the Goddess' world, with evidences that men were not basically enslaved as women so often are since the trouble, I think I've said what I needed to about it, I agree, the point is, there was a pre-supremacy time that way, and anyways, were women bigger than men back then or something?

Not saying it can't happen, but the whole world, and for a long time?

There is a paragraph, they say, "Again and again, we find that the debate about whether there was or was not a matriarchate, which still periodically erupts in academic

and popular works, seems to be more a function of our prevailing paradigm than of any archaeological evidence.” – followed by talk of group dynamics, polarization, and binary thinking that they offer psychological insights about, mention logical fallacies -

– here I will only invoke Neurotype, every type has its list of fallacies and biases, in fact those are as close as we have to a definition of the typical, modern Neurotype in negative, Aristotle’s list of fallacies.

If I haven’t been clear yet, I think the modern sort of mind, the typical Neurotype, is a product of warrior genes, the Spanking Gene, and Aristotle’s list of errors comes with the gene. Of course there are positive things that come with it too.

The point of my silly sounding name for it is that the typical form has two modes, and that spanking is a sort of an on switch for the more aggressive one, a developmental mode switching mechanism, a stage in the life cycle of a warrior.

It’s still optional, apparently, otherwise why this stage? But on this theory, the modern sort seems to expect supremacy in their lives, maybe more so after their spankings.

They then offer that while in today’s world, the male figure is seen to normally have relationships of competition, of dominance and subservience more than today’s women are, but that even today, the primary relationship we all imagine for women is the live giving one, mother to child. A male god you expect that from, hierarchy and such, the Goddess we don’t, I mean, even today.

Ah, then we parse power, *actualization power* in the partnership model and *domination power* in the modern one, I like that very much, that is getting closer to evolution. It’s almost, “actuarial,” which is . . . everything, sort of, because again, it means evolution.

They end by saying we need to choose, or reverse our choice, that in dominator mode, we shall be warlike and find no peace, that if we wish for peace, we need to go the other direction. For my part, I say that “not choosing the dominator model,” is not how the question presents itself in real life, that it shows up in the very choice nearly all parents fail to make with any actuarial sense, the one not to spank. What is spanking besides raw, clear domination, force taught, early in life, to everyone?

That punchline to Chapter Two, our choice is just what I’m here to adjust, I think it’s more than a choice.

For a number of reasons.

Like I say, I think it’s a Neurotype matter, a matter of a gene with other priorities, not a mental, “model,” anyone is deliberately, consciously following.

Neurotype means every sort doesn’t really get all the options to choose from; everyone sees a different set of choices and also have different criteria to apply. It’s very

counterintuitive. Life is exponentially more complicated when you realize the person in front of you is writing a completely different exam from the one you are.

It's more than a model and a choice. These are different machines, somehow. I mean, yes, we need to make the right choice, but making that choice takes real changes and time. I say again, we make that choice when we spank or not, we affect the ability of the next generation to make a free choice as adults when we force the neurological change on them as children. It's quite a puzzle.

In the near east and Europe, we can say that the people have been carrying the Spanking Gene since the Neolithic collapse, mostly since at least five thousand years now, and much of the world then only feeling the pressure since the Age of European Expansion, only five hundred years, and I suppose the whole world falls under one of these schedules, or somewhere between.

I'm not saying the solution requires five thousand years of reversing that evolution, of slowly going back the way we came. The epigenetic effect, not setting that option in every child's life could begin immediately. If it's a matter of a gene and so a Neurotype, the kids will still be born genetically that way, Allistic, but . . . with the gene inactivated, dormant. The peak of a wave, when forces cancel and change happens.

Wow, is this really what I think?

That's why we write, to see our thoughts, isn't it.

And yes, yes it is.

It hasn't gotten old for me, it's still a little mind blowing to me too, despite it's what works for me.

Further, I think I have one of these children, I did not spank and tried to forbid everything about it. It's complicated and confusing because I was not hatched, I didn't know about Neurotypes, and all the kids self-diagnosed Autistic, so they won't corroborate.

Maybe they're right, we can't talk long enough to ever get clear about anything, I'm afraid, I don't suppose I'll ever be certain. They're not a fascist, FWIW. Sorry, that's some tortured data, but it's all I got. They think I'm part of the mean Old World, but at least they hate the mean Old World, that's what I wanted.

That's always been my plan, it was very well intuited from the start because everything I learn on this journey only makes it better, only makes more sense of it, it was always my plan, that if we didn't beat the kids, they would have a better mindset and be better equipped to deal with the world than we ever were.

.

Chapter Three

The Essential Difference: Crete

The beauty and mystery of Minoan civilization on Crete, Eisler talks about the art and the lack of fortifications – Crete was where the old world lasted longest, and this is a mystery in the normal world of Allistic science and history. I try to solve it, there is some theory, speculation about how the Minoans could have avoided the Spanking Gene, or that if they didn't, perhaps they nonetheless didn't activate it, per my epigenetics idea.

Gawd, I remember this. So far, seven pages of rubbing our modern, Dominator noses in the beauty of Crete, in what life is apparently supposed to be like.

In shame.

Like, Crete and the prehistoric world are what you get when you take the bonobo path to tech instead of the chimp one (not literal). Apparently the Goddess' world didn't include repressive clothing or censorship, and she offers science to say that when men and women see and share their parts more, that they are less alienated from one another.

The modern surprise and confusion regarding Crete draws the line between Partnership and Dominator modes, between whatever Neurotype or types came before and the modern majority variety we have now. I'm supposed to already be there, telling you about it and Autistic, it's what I was looking for – and still, really?

Still unfortified, still worshipping the Goddess, still living in peace at home at least – fourteen, fifteen hundred years after the entire mainland had already fallen into stone walled cities and constant war? Anybody read that . . . Delaney thing? Aye, and Gomorrah? Sam must have been thinking about Crete. Wait, that was patriarchal as can be, never mind, a modern view, backwards to all the knowledge in the Chalice.

But other than that, the idea of a race of people living in peace and so competent they could hold off the warrior neighbours while they did it – did this happen? For a millennium and a half (from 3,500 BCE to around 2,000 BCE)?

Like I said, this is my agenda, and I still need to wrap my head around that, just wow. But yes, yes it did. Apparently Crete does this to everyone, I'm sure I'm not the first Autistic it's blown away either.

There are a lot of ideas about why the rest of the world had adopted the warrior life, and a lot of them are about technical advancements and about "increased population pressure," in the growing cities – and Crete had those same advancements and cities and no such consequence flowed from it for an age.

The subjugation of women, somehow explained by these factors failed to happen on Crete, despite sharing all of it. I have questions.

Since my idea of the disaster is the relatively sudden dominance of the modern Neurotype, an obvious question is, did the Minoans not breed with the warriors, not acquire the gene for the type that way, for a millennium and a half? Is a female bonded human nation automatically isolationist? I suppose if they weren't subject to the wars, they weren't subject to the way wars spread the warriors' genes? No Dominators raped Cretan women, who weren't disenfranchised and vulnerable?

Alternatively, they traded, if they intermingled, did the husbands move to Crete and adapt, like the males did in Sapolsky's accidentally female bonded baboon troop?

Alternatively again, did they intermingle, acquire the gene and the type – but unconquered, did they not adopt the culture – of spanking? They don't prove my theory that I failed to, do they, that un-spanked, the Spanking Gene is inactivated for warrior mode (Dominator mode), and relatively harmless?

For a millennium and a half?

Wouldn't that be convenient for me. Also convenient though, I don't think anyone else even has a theory for that, so there you go, you're welcome. A better theory throws a wider net. Use the new ideas, they're about the same old world, they're only new to you. Remind me to put this at the end: if it doesn't look possible from here, Crete also doesn't look possible from here, and it didn't from there either.

But it was. It happened.

There were sections. Eisler ends this chapter asking the question and promising to answer, what was the disaster, just what happened five thousand years ago, and what does it mean?

.

Chapter Four

Dark Order Out of Chaos: From the Chalice to the Blade

More about the end of Crete, the Bronze age collapse, before we go back to the Neolithic collapse under the invaders during the fifth and sixth millennia BCE. Eisler busts the usual explanations for why things turned to fairly constant war, the “increased population in the cities,” the “improved weaponry,” of the Copper and Bronze ages and replaces them with the invasions and the culture the invaders brought with them, and of course, I adjust “culture,” for “genetics.”

My method has improved, when I began, I think I stopped reading to write every invasive thought, and lately I’m at least reading the whole chapter first, and then going back and doing that – I say this to say I’m falling off of that wagon, we run into the chaos stuff again in the fourth section, six pages in, so I’m going to treat the first part carrying on with my train of thought before I let that stuff completely derail me.

We begin with some plain round dates, and it eases some of my earlier worries. They say the Paleolithic period goes back thirty thousand years (I think the Dawn of Everything extends this view by an order of magnitude, I believe we are speaking of hundreds of thousands of years of human culture, textiles, etc., these days, of what perhaps should be renamed on some other vector than “lithic,” pre-lithic or something, but sure). They say the “Neolithic age agricultural revolution was over ten thousand years ago, maybe that’s the number that stuck with me, for me, “over ten,” could be fifteen in such matters for me, probably because I know nothing of the details.

Cities, at least Catal Huyuk, were founded eight and half millennia ago.

Crete fell only thirty-two hundred years ago, I assume the point there is that the last of the Neolithic civilizations only fell thirty-two hundred years ago. I may have missed it, did they change before they fell, in the what, eight hundred years between their fifteen hundred year holdout and the fall?

I’d best read back. That’s a long fall, that can’t be right.

OK, no, the Goddess still ruled in 1,400 – 1,500 BCE despite a regime change and foreign domination, what’s that, thirty-six hundred years ago, I’m down to a four hundred year fall, rather than the full cultural change. I saw it again, can’t believe I doubted: there were no fortifications found on Crete.

If those people have been assimilated into the Dominator world, they didn’t assimilate and win, building their own empire of stone and bronze, they faded away or dispersed? I’m not sure what this means for my genetic ideas, I suppose it suggests a diaspora, there are no longer whole nations of Partnership model people, just a few, scattered about the globe, possibly still running from the violent genetic drift of the Dominators.

The final fall of Crete was the same Bronze age collapse got everybody, isn't that the same time, 1,200 BCE?

When the Goddess disappeared, the whole western world fell apart.

(Weird idea: the Minoans, newly in Dominator mode, newly traumatized having lost their battle for the soul of the world and the good life, lose their goddam minds - and they are the Sea People of the Bronze age collapse, absolutely raging out on the world, newly Allistic, like a baby viper that doesn't know it doesn't have to keep pumping all of its venom into you - is THIS what you wanted, Babylon? Egypt? Is THIS what you love? Be careful what you ask for! . . . sorry.

As always, I go too far, but maybe? A little? OK, never mind. I think they've found where they tarred those black ships anyway and it wasn't Crete. Still, a forced diaspora and then a meltdown? I guess if I'm getting psychological, I prefer the first idea, the whole world melted down when the Goddess disappeared, not just the Minoans- but that's the recent time it fell apart, we are supposed to be looking at the beginning of the disaster right now, not the end of it, aren't we.)

.

Chapter Four

Dark Order Out of Chaos: From the Chalice to the Blade

"The Peripheral Invaders"

Apparently, the trouble started seven thousand years ago, with violent incursions as well as natural disasters - these I assume mean global warming, the floods that all the cultures remember, drought . . . I don't think volcanoes and earthquakes move populations around much. In many places, the traditional pottery disappears, indicating the people or the culture disappears. "Bit by devastating bit," it says, over perhaps a millennium, everything stops, the advancement of civilization stops in its tracks.

When, two thousand or more years later, it rises again, it rises in stone, in Sumer and Egypt.

They talked about "Aryans," and "Indo-Europeans," I think these terms are better suited to language talk, that's where they come from, isn't that right? - but before these cultures came to India or Europe they came from "the north," or from, "the deserts of the south," which, is that Africa and Arabia? Before that, the origins of the people who replaced the Neolithic peoples seem to be lost in time, but it's interesting that different peoples, from the north as well as the south, arrived with the same attitude. They suggest some look for a connection between the cultures of these northern Eurasian invaders and the southern ones, like the Hebrew tribes.

I guess my idea prefers contact to parallel evolution for this too.

It says they came for the good life and the better weather, suggesting that the harsher conditions they lived in – squeezed out of the lush zones by farmers? – hardened them somehow.

There is some suggestion that life in the bad weather, where the earth is less amenable to cultivation somehow brought violent power to the centre of their lifestyle, somehow made for Dominator people. I think they are suggesting that some great famine disaster set them all against one another, and once the fighting started, well, then we're fighters, and raising little fighters, is my point, adapting to the fight. I mean that because evolution doesn't stop, that somehow, somewhere, some population got caught up fighting for enough generations and lost enough poor fighters that they became genetically and epigenetically fighters, lost something, or somehow grew a gene for that and it is irresistible and once begun is not easily stopped.

Chapter Four

Dark Order Out of Chaos: From the Chalice to the Blade

“Metallurgy and Male Supremacy”

One of the technologies that was supposed to have caused these negative changes was metalwork, because it made better weapons, but of course it began among the Neolithic peoples with jewelry and tools, and metalwork too went through a repurposing for the new life, so it wasn't causative.

Ah, OK, Eisler actually busted my guess about animal husbandry (since removed), that's another thing that happened in “the west,” in the Neolithic without causing any nasty big changes, and only came later, with the dominators and their herds.

Creeping up on me is the Brave New World idea, that while our Neolithic people were enjoying their good life in the lush valleys, they were squeezing nomadic people out of the world (a process that has not yet ended, but any minute now), that the bright side of this paradise must perhaps have a dark side after all and that is what came back to bite us all between ten and five thousand years ago.

But how, with no weapons and no fortifications? I suppose that is me trying to apply Dominator psychology, and not what applied at the time?

If the Neolithic world was as good as it sounds, I suppose they must have never stopped accommodating migrating people, must have allowed them access and passage, and again, the Dominators imposed the conflict on the nomads, not the previous folks, by building their fences and walls? I mean, the Neolithic may not have had stone walls, but surely the animals required wooden fences? It brings to mind a picture the Davids painted in *The Dawn of Everything*, of cities being seasonal, empty half the time, while

the people hunted and gathered (in summer?), perhaps our Neolithic farmers and our nomads were all one big happy family somehow.

Must have been.

But a major point in this chapter for me is what's missing, we do not know when or where, or among whom the domination of the Spanking Gene and the modern Neurotype began.

I'm still hoping to gather enough to clues to tell myself at least why and how, wherever and whenever it was originally, from her ideas about how and why and exactly what happened when it happened in or "west." It suddenly occurs that we can also perhaps draw from what we know of how it happens most recently, still today, to the last few Indigenous peoples.

That will be another project, likely not mine.

Next, it seems we are going to talk about the transformation.

.

Chapter Four

Dark Order Out of Chaos: From the Chalice to the Blade

I mean, must we?

I can't remember if it horrified me the first time I read it like it's doing this time, I don't want to tell you about it, I feel like I'm sharing poison. Overnight, with the arrival of these other cultures, life goes from something like paradise to something like Hell, from peaceful farming to genocide as the new social norm.

Eisler makes a point to say that the invaders, "were not a different species. But . . . they brought with them an entirely different system of social organization." – and I must invoke genetics and Neurotype, not a different species, no, but we are not all the same between the ears either, a different "Neurospecies," meaning Neurotype is not to be ruled out; they exist. Again, do we humanists think something other than peoples' brains makes their system of social organization? It can't be anything like species, because it *must* be unconnected from biology?

In place of the Goddess, the shrines have either armed male soldier gods, or simply a sword on the altar, like it is the new god. I . . . it's hard to understand, I'll say that.

I don't get it. I'm a self diagnosed Autistic, I sort of discovered "my people," in The Dawn of Everything, in Kandiaronk and his people, in the Columbian Critique, in what they thought of the Europeans, I mean, I don't want to pretend that is an established fact, that the Turtle Islanders were not for the most part Dominators either, it's complicated. It's hard to not count the Incas, etc., and such among the Dominators. I think the picture the Davids painted was of the Turtle Islanders riding a line, falling in

and out of empire, perhaps there is more than the binary and the change isn't always so stark as it was in our past in "the west."

Maybe the Indigenous really did, or do have Two Wolves inside of them, like the teaching, two living, growing wolves.

I mean, I think I'm not a Dominator. I was educated by them, I'm still working through that, as you see, it's the Dominator world they teach – but it never fit my Autistic mind. I think I am a Partnership Human. Nothing about the Dominator model makes any sense to me. I think Dominator mode is likely a suite of genes and a Neurotype, and it was not a sea change, not a hundredth monkey event where everybody changed, rather it runs in families and it has missed some families, comes up recessive in some people. They haven't killed us all yet.

I suppose they have us down to a manageable level, though. It looks, I fear, like genetic drift, violence is irresistible. Perhaps the world will end before it's complete. Perhaps the post apocalyptic Adam and Eve will be Indigenous, or Autistic, or otherwise Partnership sorts and we can have a peaceful start again. How quickly I shut out the awful truth and start spewing utopian dreams, huh. I am sorry. I confess, the other fantasy is what haunts me, that two people crawl out of the nuclear destruction to try to rebuild humanity, but they are normal Dominator sorts and beat that first child of the new world into being just like them and nothing will ever be different. Sorry.

But oh my God, was it stark that time, in the fourth millennium BCE. The Neolithic people were simply slaughtered. Again, civilization falls back, art disappears, for a millennium, and the cities are fortified or gone. I don't want to write more, it's one thing emotionally to listen to someone else say it, it's another thing to think it yourself, I don't want to, I sort of can't afford the negativity.

Apparently, the invaders kept the women and killed the men, ensuring the genetic drift.

Following up on earlier speculations, yes, the Minoan/Mycenaeans began to adapt and join the world of war, but again, then the whole world fell apart and the Greek culture wiped out the last of the Minoans just before the Bronze age collapse.

We end the chapter with the observation that the "west," and Crete seemed to have been the last to fall, and that the world is full of refugees looking for a safe place to land that no longer exists anywhere.

God, this was a sad chapter in the book and in the story of humanity, I am sorry to share it, even without the gory details.

I guess I haven't yet seen any clues to a true genesis for this Dominator business, who these "Kurgan," invaders got it from, or how it came into the world initially. It occurs that perhaps someone has some idea how the madness began in the Americas, that maybe there is a clue a little closer to the present when a culture turned *itself* Dominator?

Again, a different project.

I have said before, not that anyone reads me, and it's been a few years: I don't know how it starts, but I do know how it is maintained, and that is through punishment, through spanking and law, that Dominator culture does not fade, because it abuses its own people first. I mean, between the actual wars. I am certain that these invaders, slaughtering whole towns, were not nice to their children either, in fact I'm certain that their young led the way into every battle less afraid of the enemy before them than of their own silverback father generals behind them.

I don't know how it started, but child abuse spreads it and keeps it going. An environment of violence sets the kids' warrior genes to the "war," positions. Look into your heart; you know it's true. Look who wants fewer Human Rights but more "parents' rights." Haters, right?

.

Chapter Five

Memories of a Lost Age: The Legacy of the Goddess

Eisler spends this one on Systems and Change theories, Chaos theory to explain the extreme social change. I spend some arguing, trying to make a case about genes and evolution, arguing with the very idea of “cultural evolution.”

I spend some time trying parse it and “social models,” and make the case that the “treatment,” of Autistic children proves the existence of the Spanking Gene, that a lack of a normal response to spanking is considered pathological.

OK, now we're talking about why the transformation, and they offer two lines of reasoning, the first of which I already skirted once, the Chaos theory stuff, but let's skirt it again. I mean, I'm not going to attempt to critique Chaos theory, but perhaps some of the reasons they think we need it.

This is a place where we part ways, I think.

It says we have lost the truth of our comparatively pleasant past society, relegated it to myth and/or fantasy, and the way we speak about the world today makes this past sort of impossible to understand or believe. They say people can learn this truth about the past and then forget it again, as it gets re-buried under the modern idea, and this is true, I had slipped back in ways, despite this book basically set my whole path (despite even my divergence, and no, this does not help my general argument, I know). They say they think we need to let it sink in, teach it for a few centuries to make it real, and . . .

. . . and don't anyone tell Eisler from the 80s, this is my speech about evolution, that it doesn't sink in as regards people, at least, and we have been teaching that for a while, nearly two hundred years in spots. I think we were trying to talk about genes and Neurotype here, but we lacked the words and the concepts, much of the world still does.

.

Chapter Five

Memories of a Lost Age:

The Legacy of the Goddess

“Evolution and Transformation”

Caveats again, always, I do not understand the premise, the Chaos theory. I need to argue with the questions, before the answers start. This seems like it will fill an entry:

“In the last chapter we saw the dynamics of the first great social shift in our cultural evolution: how after a period of systems disequilibrium, or chaos, there was a critical bifurcation point out of which an entirely different social system emerged.”

I mean, I don't even like, "cultural evolution." This, from my perspective, is a bit of a copout, this is a term that exists to deny our actual, biological evolution that we put ourselves through with our self created environments, "we," don't evolve anymore, but something is changing – must be the "culture" evolving – like, without us!

I suppose I just weeded out every reader with that, I'm sorry. I'm self-directed.

But I am "right," about that, I swear, within my Neurotype. Creatures evolve. Sure, maybe cultures do too, but not without their creatures, not without the creatures' minds have changed. It *SOUNDS* like evolution, doesn't it, "cultural evolution," but if it needs to exist in a world where there isn't environmental biological evolution of the living things within the system, it's at least a lie of omission, and in the end, "net" creationist, sort of.

Dominator society doesn't think people are subject to evolution, somehow. I don't mean to include Eisler as a Dominator here, only as a modern person, perhaps as Neurotypical, Allistic, and maybe not that either, but the world of this science is absolutely Allistic, I mean it's from the Yes side of the Spanking Gene and it doesn't think humans are evolving today. Neurodiversity theory, at least my version, explains both the situation and the theories: there are sorts who think that way, simple as that, that's the plain, where the rubber meets the road truth about Neurodiversity, different sorts think differently. There is pushback to saying different sorts, different Neurotypes have different thoughts, I think it's misguided, I think it's the entire point.

OK, back to the quote:

I missed the bifurcation point. After, you say, *AFTER* the Neolithic collapse and the long dark period, *AFTER* there was a "bifurcation?" So when they settled down enough to build cities again, *THEN* they faced a choice? I'm confused. I'll finish my thought and then go back looking for it. Won't take long: Dominators arrived and took over, and two thousand years later, Dominators learned to build cities, wasn't the first part the causative thing, their arrival, their deliberate replacing of the whole Neolithic gene pool?

Why a "bifurcation point," that is different from the collapse itself, and if that isn't the point that mattered, why not two thousand years of genetics and evolution? "An entirely different social system," – you mean a third one, not the old one, not the invaders'? It sounds like it's the invaders' "social system," all the way through.

Ah, you know what?

The research is good, the data is good, it's only trying to impose this dynamic change stuff on it that's bad. They lay it all out, I form an understanding, then they say, "we think it's because this," and lose me. This, a little later, gives it the error:

"Biological evolution entails what scientists call speciation: the emergence of a wide variety of progressively more complex forms of life. By contrast, human cultural

evolution relates to the development of *ONE* (italics theirs) highly complex species – ours – that has two different forms: the female and the male.”

Neurodiversity means we are more highly complex than that, and we wouldn't be looking for magic chaos if we weren't stuck on that “one.” When two completely different things, Dominators and Partnership sorts have to be “one,” somehow, you are going to end up referencing the wobbly nature of the universe or some such soft thought to try to make sense of it.

Good Lady, this evolution does diversity, but THIS evolution does the opposite? Really?

Sorry. And this:

“Consequently, the *DIRECTION* (italics theirs) of our cultural evolution – particularly whether it will be peaceful or warlike – depends on which of these models is the guide for evolution.”

There is something sideways about that sentence, but my attempts to break it down go in circles: the model, or the Neurotype, sets the model it pursues. Like addiction psychology, the model would have to want to change. It would have to learn to want something else, like in the case of addiction to pain killer, of wanting some buffer between ourselves and the world, these desires have to be unlearned and connection to people and the world learned in its place.

So what does this model want now?

Killing, by the last chapter, but what is killing emotionally? I think something like revenge, like I always say, spanking creates an unhealthy need. It's clear and horrifying at four thousand BCE, that model wants, perhaps needs, to hurt people.

It's weirdly circular, whatever “model” you choose to chase with your self-directed evolution, the other sort of evolution already set for you, your model is what you evolved to choose . . . I think the thing is, you are the flatworm, not the guy in the lab coat, you are the experiment, not the experimenter. You're not setting any models, only following them.

I think. Not much confidence, it's too convoluted. Certainly things happen when we try to guide our development. Regardless, whether “cultural evolution,” is a thing or not, biological evolution is going to have precedence.

I'm sure it sounds mad to you all, but what would be a better way to create our “Kurgans,” than child abuse? I glimpsed it at the start, that there's not much you can do with the redesignation from social model to Neurotype, this project, this reinterpretation has to be about spanking and the Spanking Gene. It is the logical kernel at the heart of the entire disaster of the human race.

I mean it's both, a chicken and egg thing: spanking makes for the violent Neurotype, is my idea.

Again, I can't say exactly when they became chickens, but they are still chickens for the very good reason that we are still breeding them as such, keeping their environment stable, as I said about Dominators, they are still Dominators for the very good reason that we are still breeding and creating them as such, keeping their environment stable by still dominating the shit out of every one of them at the outset of their lives and holding up the results as the "social model," all ought to follow.

That is spanking.

That it's a matter of Neurotype, the actions of the Allistics who deal in Neurotype are instructive, in a backwards sort of a way, the "Autism doctors," know this, that spanking grows Allists and works on Allists, because they know that the Autistic "patients," lack this response, and require far more abuse to show any of it, and so ABA. They acknowledge that the Allistic has a built in response to abuse, because they pathologize the lack of this response in Autistic children.

The Dominator's world requires this response.

Their data, my read. Autistics sort of have to do that with everything, that's why some developmental delays, Allistic data all has to be processed our way. We need our own science, history, and everything. The Allistic view is a glare that obscures everything and hurts my eyes.

So, thanks for reading this far, nice meeting you all, have a nice life. This is the end for most of you, not that most of you even started. I put it all on the thing you never had a chance to care about, the thing no-one factors into anything. The Road Less Travelled guy has no idea.

No other creature spansks. No, lions do not spank, just they don't like to share food and they have a pecking order. It is not a system of ubiquitous cub abuse.

But even out here on this long limb alone, with no critics, I see I have a problem.

Animal husbandry appears to teach something other than punishment, traditional herders today do not abuse their flocks, or expect sheep or cows to learn from punishments, it is difficult to imagine that our "Kurgan," blade worshipping invaders had any success abusing their animals either, and that a pastoral lifestyle caused this destructive shift. So they brought it with them, but they maybe couldn't have developed it themselves, at least not in this phase of their existence, perhaps before they moved into herding from some other way of life?

I hate to speculate overly, but that one tiny step seems not awful, we'll keep it in mind.

.

Chapter Five

Memories of a Lost Age: The Legacy of the Goddess

“A Golden Race and the Legend of Atlantis”

At the start of the previous section, they said there were two lines of reasoning, the first being some modern theories about how and why such dramatic social changes are possible, as well as the evidence again that some very dramatic change did indeed occur, and this section is to be the second one: the continued existence of the Goddess and her roles well into history, and the examples of goddesses, all likely formerly *THE* Goddess, and her jurisdictions, all central to culture are many and wonderful. Giver of Laws, Bringer of Civilization, Teacher of Farming.

I need to say, I am finally processing it, the error of my numbers, my dates and the disaster did not begin as long ago as I thought and was rather less gradual. I was imagining some start to it fifteen thousand years ago, we really don't get a whiff of the trouble in our “west,” at least until as they say, six thousand years ago, I am three times too far back, two and a quarter to three times too far back, when I imaging the beginning of the end at twelve to fifteen thousand years ago.

It still has to be longer than the six globally, I think, because Dominator society came on horseback, it didn't spring up locally, at least not in the “west.” There is some time during which other parts of the world had already made the shift, and perhaps it was not long or we'd know it by now. But again, it arrived from both the north and the south, was it spontaneous in both directions, or is there some longer history of the gene's domination eating up the rest of the world before it got to Europe and the near east? I assume there must be?

The fact that that society shows up as invaders suggests though, that when it does take hold, it lets the neighbours know about it, so if they were living the constant warfare that they were when we met them when they were still on the steppes for another five thousand years, that they would have come calling then, ten thousand years ago and they didn't so, I suppose the longer history elsewhere is not as long as my dates, perhaps this is something that happened in Asia only generations or centuries, maybe only a millennium or two before?

Just long enough for it to have spread from north to south before turning west? Like that? It's sort of hard to imagine these two worlds living side by side, sharing a border and needing a flood to make invaders invade, I suspect it spreads automatically, sort of, like Ice Nine if you know Vonnegut, at some rate related to generations, and if it took a millennium or three to completely change Europe and Anatolia, that it took the same sort of time to take the same amount of geography in Asia, from wherever it began, at some regular rate.

I suppose if it began in Japan it wouldn't have taken five thousand years to reach the near east at nearly any rate. A real beginning for this human type might be more recent than the agricultural revolution, than the neolithic cities. Like, not twelve or fifteen thousand years ago, as I've been saying, but almost definitely less than ten, again, or it would have found us sooner. Like, seven or eight, tops? It was a fire that consumed

all of Eurasia in two or three thousand years, north to south, I mean it did Europe and the near east in one or three, is the point of Gimbutas' work. So Asia maybe took longer?

I'm spending some time on Wikipedia, looking at maps of the Kurgan/Steppe hypotheses and it does sort of look like the northern steppes are at least a distribution centre for the violent culture changes – but they are already like this when we meet them, apparently the previous population and language maps are lost in time. The maps of the “Kurgan,” do not seem to explain the warlike tribes invading from the “southern deserts,” unless that reference referred to a later millennium, which would be odd, it's on the same page as the Kurgan stuff

You know, I shouldn't dabble like this, I'm having a bit of fun and learning what I'm trying to refute, but beginnings aren't the point. I just thought if I could find the ballpark, I could start talking about generations, and evolution, and genetics and Neurotype, I'm trying to find a context, get a feel for the pace of the drift, one date and one place isn't really enough to triangulate anything, to deduce the universe requires three facts, not two. It's getting less fuzzy, but I admit, not much.

Still gradual. This chapter shows that the goddesses had more power during Sumer's beginning than at its end, and this trend, I assume is evolution, the Dominator thing isn't a static Nature, it grows, like all living things in the world of genes and evolution. There were retro movements, some back and forth, people wanting to go back to the old world, which eventually quiet down, no doubt in the face of bronze swords. Eventually, as the environment changes, people adapt and move “forward.”

Again, the Mother of God still exists for a lot of people, the genetic drift of the Dominator world is not complete yet, time still flows, and while it tries to grow, so do other things.

The point of my overestimation is the implications. I've been saying this mindset lasted fifteen thousand years before the climate succumbed, and it's only been half of that, this version of humanity is only half as viable as I thought, twice as non-viable. Oh!

There was/is a psychologist, one Julian Jaynes, who thought the change signified a move into the left hemisphere of the brain, and the idea that the Neolithic people didn't use theirs is thoroughly trashed by Eisler, all the main advances except violence happened under the Neolithic peoples, not since, but I'll throw that Dominator scientist a bone and say the fellow was onto something, brains changed, not just social models.

Ah, now we add the pen, and go to how the new Dominators write the books and burn anyone else's in Chapter Six, up next.

.

Chapter Six

Reality Stood on its Head: Part One

Here Eisler uses the Greek plays, the Oresteia to show us how the old ways were so high handedly replaced, in the plays, the gods decide Orestes is innocent of murdering his own mother, because motherhood isn't a thing anymore. Eisler's point is this lie is forced in this public way – mine is that to believe that lie, you need a different sort of a brain. There is a lot about women being forced out of every position of power in society.

I spend time trying to apply some broad genetics to the invasions and the millennia following them, advancing a theory of genetic drift, with more than one vector, the immediate slaughter of competing genes, as well as the ongoing growth of the gene within the affected population from the environmental pressure of spanking and law.

I spend some time trying to triangulate a true starting point for it all.

“Mother Murder is Not a Crime”

I keep coming back to write every few pages I read, because it's just so sad, I can't look at it for long, Good Lord, I mean Good Lady. This one's all me, I guess. My Autism's POV.

It's the Greek plays, Aeschylus' “Oresteia.” It describes the Gods all deciding that motherhood doesn't mean anything anymore, and that matricide isn't a thing, because there is no relationship of mother to child, and the Greeks have moved to patrilineage and extreme misogyny. It couldn't be more blatant in its denial of reality and its insistence upon male violence as the new morality.

For me, the rule they exploit, that the play's central mother killing is not a crime because there is no relatedness, this is the core of the Dominator world, that if they are not your blood relatives, it is no crime to slaughter them – like our concept of crime doesn't exist outside the family - and also it states my case about it, that once you decide that harming and killing non-relatives is good, then your relatives will be on the block soon enough. In fact, the causality is the other way about.

The violence begins at home.

The normal, Allistic science talk of in-group good treatment is rubbish to my mind, that any one man is supposed to be an efficient warrior AND a loving husband and father is nonsense. You are what you do, that's evolution, also known as real life. You aren't socialized by the out-group. The school of hard knocks is at home, this is where you learn how to treat the out-group, from Mom and Dad.

Also, how do men hate their mothers so, to legalize matricide if we didn't begin “spanking,” until recently? Surely this hate indicates the men were abused as children? ? That story about the Spartan mother finding a wound on her son's back when he returns

from the wars and killing him suggests “spanking,” was even sometimes lethal. Ha – put him over her knee to treat the wound in his back and then spanked his ass by putting a sword in it! Maybe Orestes, raised with that story, had a scratch on his back and couldn’t trust her not to finish him off if she saw it.

Ha. Trying to turn this tragedy crap into Monty Python, make it hurt a little less. I’m not putting it back on women, I’m putting it on spanking. Imagine what a crap life that Spartan Mother had, one comes home alive and she’s got to kill him or suffer some lethal social shaming. Imagine the early life that made her able to do it. Good Lord, I mean Lady.

It’s obviously tragic all around, I do not see winners. I see men who think they are winning, but I do not wish for their lives. This tragedy, I suppose all of them, they are tragedies because of their own rules, every one. The moral of the story is the confession of an error, held up as someone else’s, the gods’ error. It’s Neurotype, of course, everything the moralizing gods say has some matching . . . structure in the brain of the average listener or it wouldn’t be popular. When you know it’s screwing you, but you can’t think anything else, what’s a smart sounding way they say that, the deconstructionist horizon, when you can’t think anything else from here. When all the options aren’t available to you. Neurotype.

This was not Eisler’s point at all, what I said about Neurotype; they are not saying the Greeks couldn’t think anything different, they’re saying the Greeks consciously created a culture of propaganda to make sure no-one else could ever think anything different. I think tomatato, tomatato maybe, two sides of the same coin, it’s all they can think, so it’s what they teach. It’s all they can learn, so it’s what they teach, maybe. What’s the applicable joke? It’s eluding me just now.

The inverse of that is there are Partnership sorts of people who don’t learn it no matter it is shouted at us all of our lives.

Ah – “But Doctor, we need the eggs?” No, that’s not it. I keep seeing a very obscure version about a teacher with a failing student and it turns out all the teacher knows is the speech he makes to the parents, a poor joke. I heard it this way too, not being told the joke, only being told about the joke. No-one wants to tell that joke, that stuff isn’t funny, matricide is legal now? These errors aren’t funny.

.

Chapter Six

Reality Stood on its Head: Part One

“The Dominator and Partnership Mind”

Ah, there’s a heading, now we’re getting to it, maybe.

It speaks for a bit about patrilineage, about how women were squeezed out life, out of human rights, and of course patrilineage introduces the possibility of lineal error

and lineal crime, if there were no supremacy involved, the move is still an open invitation to bullshit entering everyone's lives that didn't exist before on nearly the same scale, clearly part of reality's headstand, referred to in the heading.

Everybody used to know who your mother is; under patrilineage, your father is only the most powerful man in your life who wants to be your father, because who is going to set him straight.

It's the switch from reality to authority, from real reality to the Dominator's "social reality."

They talk about how the Dominator societies worked to erase the mind of the old world with these new myths back then, five thousand years ago, and then say this work has been going on ever since until we all pretty much believe it. This is maybe self identification, when Eisler says, "To us, after thousands of years of relentless indoctrination, this is simply reality, the way things are," it sounds like they're including themselves, and I insist, this is not true for everyone still, that still today people are being born whose minds cannot "learn," these, to us, falsehoods.

But yes, very much yes, to some, this is "reality." Reality being the theory that matches your neurology, I think. Otherwise, it's "just a theory," if it doesn't. I'm throwing that into the public discussion about what the word, "theory," means, parsing it by Neurotype. What qualifies as "reality," or "just a theory," is surely to some degree a matter of whether the structures in your head are made for that idea or not.

I'm going to have a hard time addressing this teaching/propaganda idea, I think, these seem like "just a theory," to me. I need Neurodiversity and spanking instead, of course, as always.

Oh no, "socialized in such a society," isn't that circular? I need to stop and concentrate, I want so badly not to read this bit again, but it's what we're here for, to improve upon just this. Oh, FGS, "systems." I know that as an Autist, I'm probably supposed to love "systems," but I do not. The term is generic, and now I feel we're talking about empty, context free, "systems," when the point is exactly what sort of a system have you got, not some crap about how generic "systems," interact. "Systems," like "values," and "morals," and "beliefs," these are not things, they are only headings, and when they are employed it is a dodge, dare I say, a Dominator dodge: they are there to hide the specific truth of the matters they supposedly explain, to take the reality and the truth out of it.

Yes, everyone should read this book, don't get me wrong, and I'm ahead of myself here still.

Something is rankling, that this chapter is about a long, ongoing process – but this culture arrived in a fully extreme form at the beginning of this long slow process. About that, a few things, maybe there was one, as I'm already searching for, some long process the "Kurgans," had already been through before they arrived in the Neolithic

“west,” but I keep getting the sense that we want it both ways, it arrived with the invasion, but also, it’s still coming on slow.

It's the same thing I whined about, about the “bifurcation point,” the same thing I’m somehow missing. I mean, “five thousand years,” that’s getting to the end of the “Kurgan,” invasions, we seem to go back and forth as to whether the five thousand year number is before or after the change. Ah.

Not sure how many times I’ve pushed this rock up this hill, but maybe something: two or three causal streams would clear it up, the short term immediate effect of the invasions and slaughters, and the big change in the gene pool after only the first catastrophic “generations, these repeated immediate disasters through the fourth millennium, but then, the long, slow, ongoing change, what she calls cultural evolution after the immediate destructive change . . .

you see, I have a problem, I am trying to prove a matter of evolution, that people have been getting less reasonable and sustainable for, current momentary guess is about eight millennia, it was nine yesterday – but again, these mad “Kurgans,” arrived fully developed as warriors, they couldn’t seem to possibly go any further along that path when we met them, six to five thousand years ago.

But, ah! Again:

While the slaughter of the Neolithic Old Europeans, etc., was a sudden, complete takeover of the existing gene pool of Old Europe, etc., - it was perhaps a massive *DILUTION* of the Kurgans’ warrior genes at the same time? And so, “the west,” seemed to be getting better, we seemed to see the slow peaceful progress of humanity happening again after the disasters, relative to that world destroying trauma of the fourth millennium I mean, but really there had been a straight reset, a plateau when the exponential growth of the Spanking gene dispersed into the existing gene pool of the neolithic Old World.

I’m guessing when all the artifacts of civilization disappeared for a millennium or two, so did war, and there was a lull in the violence also?

My idea is that the Spanking gene is dominance, and once so diluted, it renews its growth and continues its drift towards saturation, and the old genes and the old ways lose ground, over generations in the Dominator’s general environment of abuse. They may have been somewhat pacified having bred with the native old stock, but it seems that as Eisler says, society’s direction had been permanently altered, and it was only a matter of time until war would be the human way of life now.

I assume this momentum involved spanking. Because spanking exists and I think Mom was lying when she told me it didn’t hurt me, I mean with that attitude, Mom would have made a terrible social scientist or historian. We don’t just decide things “don’t matter,” do we? Well, depending on our genes and our brain types: here, in the Autistic science book, we don’t ignore that particular thing.

I'm even going to wax all positive for a second and say that without that, without the epigenetic push of child abuse, things might have gone the other way, the peaceful majority might have won the genetic war. I will reinvoke the mystery of Crete, things maybe can go the other way.

But now we could "culturally" evolve as Eisler says, back towards that Kurgish™ brutality, kicking and screaming and trying intermittently to slow the process all the way along, in every millennium. In the opposite direction, really of our idea of "progress," is the point. I'm afraid that's rather central too.

It's not just messy, we really are going the wrong direction entirely.

And yes, then wherever it came from, those people must have undergone a similar process of drift, over time. I suppose I've just reintroduced the possibility of a start further back then, depending how many cultures it had to nearly fill before it got to the "Kurgans," and then to us. But maybe it all starts with them, too, who knows.

I think, evolution, not cultural evolution. The Dominator sorts select themselves when they have the data, and the cultural pressure, that this chapter I have hardly mentioned yet is about, the mythology and education, is not probably optional, it's all part of the social control and the spanking and causes real evolutionary change too, the environment tweaks genes. Perhaps, in the long view, this is what I'm saying, it's not that the education that changes minds, but the environment that changes the minds of both the educator and the educated. It's that extra step where the human changes, this is what I always feel is missing from the Human sciences, stated previously: that the actual people actually change.

You know what I want, not that the culture, "evolves," but that the culture, rather than being the object of evolution, the evolving thing, the culture is the *ENVIRONMENT*, *CAUSING* the evolution of its members. *THAT'S* what's backwards about "cultural evolution." I mean, it sounds to me like people think of it the other way, like the culture is evolving, in response to itself, and the people all have the forever Human Nature and don't really change.

Am I wrong? Do y'all actually have it my way around?

Saying that if Ishtar etc., the Goddess made it through the dark period and was still present in the first dynasty of Sumer two millennia later, that suggests a genetic persistence, the generations immediately after the slaughters must have still had old neurology, still found the goddess to be true, despite extreme force, but something put her away later, in slow motion, and was that education, or evolution?

You know what I think. Evolution, because the more generations we get spanked for, the less we love our Mother and the more we love our weapons.

.

Chapter Six

Reality Stood on its Head: Part One

“The Metamorphoses of Myth”

In this section, Eisler details the Dominator’s rewriting of the old society’s myths, mostly around serpent imagery and the Hebrew Bible, some very clear stuff about the intent and the desired effects of the changes, and I haven’t much to add or argue with, it’s all good and true.

The rest of this entry is me processing the previous section and chapters, more bird’s eye view again. I think it’s the neurology, everything I am going to learn needs to start at the very start, like a Michener book, I can’t take anybody’s word for anything, this is how it is for a minority Neurotype.

It kind of matters what happened during the post collapse dark period, was it not constant war? Was the collapse so bad that they couldn’t mount a war for two thousand years either? I guess I’m suggesting that they didn’t really want to, until after a period of this “cultural evolution,” I mean actual evolution.

Like, did the first rounds of invader babies, being half genetic Goddess people settle down, and not simply keep conquering further towards the west? Until the environment changed enough and for long enough they evolved back up to that level of aggression, ready again for conquest, is my thought? The thing is, Eisler said after the collapse, there is nothing to find, civilization is gone, I think I may as well continue to sketch this out my way, why not. That is the project.

OK, about the guessed at connection, of both northern and southern barbarian invaders back in the fourth millennium, someone thinks the steppe folks had migrated out of Anatolia, perhaps that’s the connection with the invaders from the southern deserts and I guess it means the trouble started down south?

The picture is almost like it all starts where farming starts and moves north in the same pattern, just lags it by a few millennia. That theory is not big, apparently. But if so, did the same scenario play out when they got to the steppe, a period of having slaughtered the men, bred with the women, and then slowly hyping themselves back up into full warrior mode again, another thousand years before heading west and starting the process again?

This is a pretty cynical little system I’m devising, isn’t it, eish.

I mean, I’d like to think it’s not me, but the drift of a cynical little gene I’m describing. I guess I’m starting to glimpse the two things and the resulting third thing and the time between, what she was saying with the systems change stuff and the bifurcation point, OK, no, I still don’t see a bifurcation, more of a blending. But the rest at last, I guess I do, stated crudely above. Recalls my H.G. Wells, who described this process from a longer perspective, I suppose, they said, the settled areas would suffer repeated invasions, which conquerors would settle in on the good land and the good life and their children would soften up, ready for the next invasion of these hard, expansive

pastoralists, rinse and repeat, but surely that softening was a genetic matter, and I think H.G. said elsewhere, farming is not soft work either.

If not, others have.

I don't think pastoralists' life is automatically harder or rougher, and the farms and cities didn't soften anyone – the softer, Neolithic people built the cities and lived in them and the invaders bred with them and their children softened from their newly acquired soft genes.

Gimbutas' critics, the stodgy men who want to deny invasion and genetic overwhelm and tell a tale of gradual change, of influence and cultural drift, they're wrong in what they refute, that sudden carnage seems clear – but they're not wrong that evolution hasn't stopped for human beings and there is always ongoing incremental change. It is both.

Even if the physical Earth were unchanging, we, and the environments we create for ourselves absolutely have never stopped changing, because when we evolve, the environments we create do too, I suppose that is really cultural evolution, us evolving to adapt to our own self-created environments, to our “culture.”

It ought to mean culturally CAUSED biological evolution, not what is it now – culturally caused cultural evolution? We believe in evolution when it comes to made up things, but not about animals such as ourselves, apparently.

Still, I suppose we'll never know how such a lifestyle began. The hint that the steppe folks had moved from Anatolia, perhaps this indicates some disaster in Anatolia that sent folks away, perhaps this was involved in life becoming about fighting other people instead of simply living, some climate deal that had people fighting over decreasing resources for enough generations that they forgot how to live any other way. Perhaps some bottleneck, where the change happened in a small group, but got them all, and set the plan for when they grew.

Trying not to be too specific about it, but we need something.

For timing, to see how fast this toxic adaptation spreads, but also, everything real exists for a reason, and for “Dominators,” to be real, they need some sort of logic to explain them, some back story – same if they're “Allistics,” too. That it just “came out of the northeast,” this is what we have, but it isn't really an explanation in the long run, is it?

OK, maybe naming the people who “started it,” with you, perhaps in Dominator mode, this is an explanation, LOL. In Partnership mode, I want more of a how and a why than a who. Most modern likely Dominator sorts, Neurotypicals, when they are here, reading, doing science, they're in Partnership mode too, right? A lot of people want to know why things, don't they? Science will want to march on from there, people are trying.

So some such prolonged disaster happens to some group and they make this awful adaptation to a life of war in some drying up waterhole in the near east and then only after being stuck somewhere long enough to change this way, something changes and they are free to move away and take over the world?

In waves, expand and settle, breeding with the locals, settle and then re-evolve back into invaders, then expand. I think? Re-evolve because something like spanking, always the invisible hand in Dominator history, I suspect? Spanking, Chagnon's violent children's group, same thing. I would call what he described as something like self-spanking, when the children set their environment to activate their warrior genes themselves while the adults mostly just watch.

Eisler lays out a millennia long propaganda campaign, starting with the power of the priesthood, the propaganda wing of Dominator governments, and again, all good and true – but if the priesthood had the authority to do it, they were already that type to begin with, and just like dealing with someone dominating you today, the power move comes first, and then, time allowing, they come up with some lie about it afterwards.

And I'm sorry, but to talk about the lie is to talk about the bribe money and not the intimidation, to take the phony bait and miss the point and the causality, which is the whole authoritarian setup, and the brain behind it, not the lesson they force with it. The echoes in today's news are deafening, how we talk about the fascists' "lies," while they do not care what they say or if anyone believes it, debate is not really the functional thing.

My question, as always, is how do textual lies evolve to look like the truth, but in the same period the people, living under Dominator abuse did not evolve? It seems the fascists intuit what the humanists do not, the power of abuse and the relative zero power of words.

Again: the words do not change the culture. The violence changes the people, and the people make the culture, words included. So it doesn't work like the Dominators say, we don't change as they tell us to – but they abuse and we change, maybe even predictably, nonetheless. While the good humanists talk and change nothing, even spanking their own children, even participating in the abuse that is actually defeating their desired lifestyle and destroying the world.

I'm sorry, but . . .

I mean, I used to think words mattered a whole lot more too, before I learned that mine never mean a damned thing to anyone, and that that was because of Neurotype.

So, perhaps the trouble started in Anatolia, but it occurs that the Gobekli Tepe site, a few millennia older than all of this in Anatolia shows no sign of the trouble, dating from 8,000 to 9,500 BCE.

So the trouble began somewhere between 8,000 and what were the first incursions of "Kurgans," 4,300 BCE, and do we have earlier warrior burials in the

Kurgish homeland before they came to the near east? We must, otherwise how do we know it's where they came from, so yes. The maps and wording suggest that we've found it there back to maybe 5,000 BCE, seven thousand years ago, while there weren't shrines to weapons in Anatolia still at 8,000 BCE.

That's three millennia in which for someone to fall into that way of life somehow or other and if we were talking about evolution, and I'm trying to be, this span of three thousand years can perhaps be seen as a moment in time, as close enough to a firm date for my purposes. I mean, who among the modern peoples speak of the evolution of humans in terms of a few thousand years? Most would think it far too *FINE* a resolution.

I think, in practical terms, it means I'll be saying, "give or take a hundred and fifty generations," when I'm trying to count them (at a guessed at twenty years per). It doesn't quite sound like an instant when you put it like that, does it?

I'm sorry, I just can't read anymore yet, it's too sad. More . . . processing.

I mean, not that we know something began immediately in 8,000BCE, it was likely later – but one, two, three millennia, from zero to shrines to swords and genocide on the steppes in something less than three thousand years, this echoes the schedule of the conversion of the near east and old Europe peoples, the Warriors show up in the fifth millennium BCE and in the third, the near east people are building their stone shrines to male gods with swords.

I think I'm looking at a cycle of evolutionary drift, the warrior mode taking over a group, a people, and growing until it basically explodes within the group, it melts down and explodes onto the neighbors, whereupon the warrior genes become diluted by means of their own aggression, by breeding with the un-drifted peoples they conquer – an historical cycle, from a time when there were un-drifted non-warrior people – and we see a time of apparent peace and "progress," while the aggressive gene slowly rebuilds its dominance.

It is a terribly sad thought, because what happens when that cycle ends, when there are no more peaceful genes to draw from?

I think a version of this end of the line, no more Neolithic genes left to conquer thing happened during the Bronze age collapse, and it surely seemed to be the end of the world, certainly the end of "a," world, with the loss of Crete. They had run out of old genetics and we didn't really see any post-collapse peace that time, did we, in the first millennium BCE?

The European Age of Expansion and the enlightenment was such a conquer and reset moment again, though, the Euros encountered another great pool of un-drifted genes and culture in the New World, and the old world (Neolithic) people of the New World perhaps caused another brief reset among the Europeans, and the appearance of the positive, "progress," for a time, the Enlightenment.

Of course in the New World, among the Europeans, there was breeding with the conquered natives as always, just ask them, every other white family on Turtle Island will declare some local ancestry, I mean, they don't call it invader rape when they do, but they claim it nonetheless. So if America ever sounded like a better, more peaceful place, it probably was, for a minute, from the European POV.

But then they evolved again, is the theory.

But wait, no. Five hundred years since it began, twenty, twenty-five generations of the environment of conquest and apartheid while acquiring rather few of the conquered genes perhaps, due to our microbes' conquest, we lost even the conquered women. I hadn't factored that in yet – there probably wasn't much of a peaceful reset this time at all. Which feels right, doesn't it. The Enlightenment wasn't deep.

And again, super sad and frightening though, the pattern, because where is the next influx of legacy human genes? Where is the control group? It exists, but is no longer entire nations or geographical regions, it is what remains of Indigenous culture the world over and perhaps the Neurodivergent, a small to very small percentage of most nations.

I sort of already had a theory of cycles of boom and bust of human violence in my head before this reading of the Chalice, that this century is shaping up to look just like last century, a buildup of bad feelings and a global meltdown that happens over four or five generations.

But the Chalice has raised this issue of turning that over and seeing perhaps also the inverse cycles of peace and some causality there, specifically when the invaders take on half the settled peoples' genetics and lose half of their own - OK, less than half, I'm sure the invaders brought their wives and children along as well as taking over the settled women and children, right? I suppose that's a head start, tilted playing field immediately and both shortens the time from half and also ensures which "half," the big half, wins, every time, or often enough.

I mean, plus the environment of spanking; it's twice tilted.

Again, it seems the large pools of Neolithic genes are gone or splintered, that cycle may have ended in Eurasia between the Bronze age collapse and the Age of European expansion, and then tried to happen again in what, 1492 AD/CE, although any lull in the violence may be difficult to see after that one.

But that one's not over yet either, again, there are un-drifted minds the world over, un-drifted genes still and if people knew what they were and what they are worth, there would be plenty enough of them to begin to solve the problem, and that's before any behavioural change/epigenetic behavioural change.

Plus, it looks like even a full genetic Dominator still has an on switch, "spanking." They turn it on themselves, parent to child, child to child, it's auto-setting at the moment - but the switch is there. That's hope.

.

Chapter Seven

Reality Stood on its Head: Part Two

Eisler continues about the erasure of the Goddess and the old world, moving from Greece to Palestine and the Bible and I spend some more time pondering the Hebrew conquests and the Biblical rules about women and breeding, making my guesses about what they mean about what the Dominator sort seems to understand about genes and evolution, noting some tension between isolationist warrior societies and a gene that simply wants to be everywhere.

Then I talk about creation myths and note the odd truth that the Hebrew invaders count themselves to have been created during the period where we see the sudden rise of violence as religion in the archaeological record, and if we allow for a gene and maybe a Neurotype, we can literally agree.

Eisler says that after multiple edits, that in modern times, the only mere mortal in the Christian Pantheon is the former Goddess, the Mother of God.

Ah, I must have half remembered, Chapter Seven opens with this, that after the invasion, they settle down a bit, but when they build, when they grow, now it is in Dominator mode. They say that gradually and increasingly, after each invasion and the disaster, there is a period of regression and, “the interrupted course of civilization resumed,” and I suppose this makes clear genetic sense, that immediately after the invasion, there are only full Dominator males around, and only after some generations are the men approaching half genetically native?

Of course it all really happened, and it was genetic at the time and also in the 80s when this book came out, it had been genetic in the deep past in the 80s too. I'm not changing any stories, just trying to place them in context of genetics and so eventually, Neurotype.

.

Chapter Seven

Reality Stood on its Head: Part Two

“The Rerouting of Civilization”

This section details the battle for the minds of the people when we were forced into the Dominator lifestyle, the violent replacement of one system with another and the ideological, propaganda, and basically the establishment of capitalism, the system of the past may have served the whole community, but the new system would serve only the men of power, where every economic win was sent up to the castle.

Women were pushed out of any role that touched power, government especially, church. Ideologically, new myths were created depicting the Goddess' brutal fall from grace and the rise of male deities alone.

.

Chapter Seven

Reality Stood on its Head: Part Two

“The Absence of the Goddess”

In the Bible, the heading means. The entire prehistoric world worshipped the Goddess, the Hebrews too, Goddess statues abound in the Bronze age Hebrew sites – but after repeated Dominator edits, she is utterly absent from the modern Bible and with the world in possession of none but male Dominator gods, the women and children of the Bible were all property of men, to be slaughtered along with the sheep for mere disobedience. They mention the story of Abraham preparing to sacrifice his own son. So for me, the Bible is full of infanticide and child abuse – so they were “spanking,” what doubt can there be?

I’m still nervous that when we speak of the Bible, we are almost in modern times and aren’t I looking for something seven to ten thousand years ago, I feel this book skips back and forth and so I am too. I suppose the Bible’s authors are writing backwards, projecting onto that past, but . . . confusing.

But genes, evolution.

Oh, there it is the stuff about virginity, keep only the girls who “have not lain with a man,” this is rancher talk, that if the girl is sexually active, then she is likely pregnant, the point being, with not your invader sperm and genes, every active woman may be carrying one of the males you have orders to kill. It’s a bit odd, they only worry about enemy male genes, they didn’t know women also carry genes, I mean, evidently?

It’s the Dominator side of evolution, they do not seem to grasp the life side, life and change, but they really do understand the part about how dead people don’t breed. Well, again, they get it about men. Perhaps that is another bit of hope, that they seem to let the old genes pass, as long as the women are the ones carrying them. Perhaps this is a weakness in the Dominator armour.

.

Chapter Seven

Reality Stood on its Head: Part Two

“Sex and Economics”

I’m trying to find the genetic sense in things.

The virginity laws and monetary compensations also look genetic to me, like race laws, suppose the man that took your daughter’s virginity were not one of your community, then any child will not be either – again, as though only men have genes – so pay me and keep your offspring, out of my family and my community. If you are

going to dilute our genes, it is going to cost you, and the diluted children will be yours. We shall remain as fierce as our forefathers.

Ah. This is how the Dominator genes spread far and wide, beyond these apparently isolationist tribes, the Dominator genes of banished girls and women? This is why the whole world slides with the Overton Window, and not only the dominants. No name, no title, no inheritance – but the genes for all of it, shed through the general population by the people they toss aside. Yes?

But ah! again – the culture is isolationist, protecting its elite little self – but the gene simply wants to take over the world and happily spreads throughout the population by whatever means necessary. The invaders probably wish the natives stayed passive – but they never do, do we. Ah, and this is why the killing of the adulteress, to keep her Dominator genes escaping into the enemy population, to keep the natives passive, slow their rise to violent competence?

Perhaps the difference, one rapist can pay and keep her, but the married woman's rapist or lover has killed her, perhaps often the first guy is a fellow Hebrew invader and the second one is a native, huh.

It is just hard for me to understand some “value,” in “virginity,” which means only that this woman cannot be pregnant and nothing else, except that this value is genetic, how does some cultural religious matter trump genetics, I don't think it does. The point will be some matter of the bloody Selfish Gene and any ideology will be cobbled onto it after the fact. Even if it's money.

(I say this about today too. The powers that run the media are engaged in some Selfish Gene nightmare, they are not doing it to “sell newspapers.”)

Again, Eisler seems normal, Allistic, and all the talk is cultural, historical, and it's all in an unspoken context that something about it makes sense - I don't mean to Eisler, but to somebody - that the resulting current Dominator world is somehow logical, that we are adding all these things and getting the logical sum of them, uh . . . no. We are describing the genetic drift of a fatal adaptation. It is not going to make sense, that's what's fatal. Unless you think this ending out your window, “makes sense.”

The causality is not of the world, it is contained within the fatal gene.

.

Chapter Seven

Reality Stood on its Head: Part Two

“Dominator Morality”

This section is more of how violence is morality and how morality hates everything about women and children, it has the Sodom and Gomorrah story of a man

feeding an angry mob his daughters, two such stories, and the fate of the girls is not the moral lesson, at all.

You know what I haven't seen in all this sexual scripture, is talk of origin myths. For me, these are central, the existence of an origin story is the core of the trouble for me, that's where they erase the whole world and start building you a fictional one instead, with a story of a beginning that never was and an origin that could never be, we have been cut loose from reality. A mother, giving birth, that is a true and real origin story, in that there is no origin, we are in the middle of time, there are mothers and children, the child comes from the mother and the chicken from the egg and there is no first, nobody built the first chicken or the first human.

When the Dominators start telling you we were born yesterday, get ready for a world of lies. I'm not sure how to say this, that the Dominator sort seem OK with them, with the clearly other worldly creation stories, I mean, I am forever running into how evolution keeps showing up looking more like a creation story even in the science, like something that happened long ago and not anymore, this mind and these stories are a match. I think, and as long as the spanking keeps happening and they keep being warriors, evolution is not going to come back into our species' understanding.

I think I need to insert one of my theories here, origin stories are never about the first people, they are never about hairy people, and there are always people, hairy or otherwise or both, already roaming the Earth during these creation events. I believe they document an invisible creation, the birth of a gene and a Neurotype.

Creation stories aren't about the first humans, they are only about some particular group of people. Remember, Adam and Eve's children found wives. The "First man and woman," lived among people and are surely only the first mythical Hebrews, invading those people. These stories are not about the advent of human beings – only about the advent of a type of human being, the Dominator type, the Allistic . . . Actually, let's check their dates.

from the google:

"The Hebrew calendar has traditionally, since the 4th century AD by Hillel II, dated the creation to 3761 BC."

See, right in the middle of the "Dominator," invasions, it's the creation of the warrior subtype, that particular origin story - but again, it's too recent for a real beginning, the "Kurgan" burials were a millennium and more earlier. I suppose it was probably the beginning of it somewhere?

There's really no archaeology until 2,000 BCE, and no history either, so I assume the date was produced by adding the lifetimes of the list of patriarchs, this is common knowledge, I think.

A long list of sequential kings and no archaeology seems odd, but it would sort of fit my visualization that the divergence moment, when Allistic people became a thing

happened somewhere small and had to brew some before it showed up on the world stage. But you know what I'm saying.

They're not wrong, are they? As long as we allow that they're only talking about themselves, they are pretty darned close with their creation date!

(This is how you know you are onto a better theory, when things that couldn't fit in your old thinking suddenly do, when something that was, had to be a fantasy or a lie, mere mythology suddenly fits in a real way, you may have expanded your world. Many a slip 'twixt a cup and a lip, of course, one ought to tread carefully, and I sure don't for normal people but I think I do for me.)

I see modern calculations of the lineages have been added up to between 4,000 and 5,500 BCE, again, during the "Kurgan," expansions.

They arrived with a story about where they came from, and the creation stories define them still. They didn't say, but there aren't a bunch of Neolithic Goddess creation stories, are there? And if there are, I bet they're different, and there weren't people already in them. Because the Goddess is life, and birth, and evolution, reality, in a word. This disconnect, choosing fiction, this is what's fatal, of course.

There's another section, "Knowledge is Bad, Birth is Dirty, Death is Holy," more about the Jewish and then the Christian church, stuff about how the former Goddess, as Mother Mary, is now the only mere mortal in their central myth. It's all very sad.

.

Chapter Eight

The Other Half of History: Part One

Here Eisler starts again about a social model, about society structuring our relationships and I spend some time trying to turn that upside down and say how our relationships form society instead, and that ours is based in the fundamentally broken relationship between parent and child that is spanking.

In terms of history, Eisler shows how much that the modern Dominators credit to Greece for human advancement were really much earlier, old world innovations. I end with some discussion of the philosophers of fascism as simply the exponents and proponents of the Spanking Gene.

I'm remembering as I go, this book was where I got a lot of good ideas I loved, but it's also where I developed a bad attitude about social science and the existing human sciences in general, that eventually became me deciding it's because it's all Allistic and was never drafted for my brain. This passage:

“So successful had the transformation of reality been that this seemingly self-evident fact - that the way a society structures the most fundamental of human relations profoundly affects all aspects of living and thinking – was in time almost totally obscured.”

The whole paragraph is alright and even this whole sentence is alright, it's all on my side and such, but one of the components is upside down for me, it says it's “ . . . this seemingly self-evident fact – that the way a society structures the most fundamental of human relationships . . . ” and it always jars me, I suppose it's a goal to argue with it.

Are we sure we know what “fundamental,” means here?

It is central – and we're nearly at the page number centre of this book – central to me that society doesn't structure our most fundamental relationships, that in fact, our most fundamental relationships are what give society its structure. At the risk of being childish and sounding catty, that's Dominator talk, WE tell YOU how to “structure your most fundamental relationships.” I don't think that science would fly in a Partnership world, and it does not with me.

Spanking is the main, “fundamental relationship,” and it's what structures Dominator society, not the other way about. You don't beat your own children on somebody else's say so, you got to have your own reasons. Not that they don't say so – but most people eventually do find their own reasons, don't they. Ha – it's “just a theory,” and their parents were wrong to do it to them, until they find their own reasons, until this kid can be hurt and cry, we're sorry, but we have to go to work, don't we?

Ouch. I'm too much for myself too, sometimes.

But yes, same reasons, the model is sort of toxic, just things flow in the other direction and make more sense this way, with the creature's brain or childhood

providing the model, not macrosocial circumstances - and same result too. We didn't have the words for Neurotype, and I still like "Dominator," and "Partnership," alright, I just think they're adjectives for people, not social models.

Ah, they define the two by how the main two genders are defined under each paradigm, and again, man and woman are not the first fundamental relationship, except perhaps ostensibly in Dominator mode, in Partnership mode, it was mother and child, remember?

Spanking first, I'm stuck on it. And perhaps unconsciously, but Dominator society agrees, and spanking is its first, most important fundamental relationship. They never bring it up, they do not speak of it, it is never mentioned in books, except books about how to do it, because it is never up for debate. It is not in psychology books, because Allistic psychology is not concerned with what is the same for everyone and only documents strangeness, weird extreme examples of child abuse are the only ones to qualify, part of the "how to," function, how not to, how much is too much.

To the Allistic, Dominator mind, spanking is fundamental and mission critical. So I am not going to be able to focus on these new terms they're introducing, androcracy and gylany, that's not it, it's genes, Neurotype, and spanking, not only the neurological differences between Allistic men and Allistic women.

Third time I've said, I am sorry, but that is my theme, spanking and the brains it nurtures.

This seems obvious, and it may be today to everyone, Eisler included, I can't say. There is a thirty year anniversary epilogue, and I'm making a point of not reading it first, of working through the original myself first. I suspect there may be passing mention of Neurotype, but I refuse to check, I'd rather work through it and eat my hat later, if need be. I am organizing my own thoughts by doing all of this.

.

Chapter Eight

The Other Half of History: Part One

"Our Hidden Heritage"

Ah, some of the same talk I make today, about how the Dominator calls itself the first, that the pagan Greeks called the monotheism new and strange, when the Goddess used to rule forever, this parallels my Neurodiversity structure, where the Allistic Autism parents call Autism a new broken thing, when I think the whole world was "Autistic," forever and the new thing is Allistics, like since what did I say, a mere seven to ten thousand years ago, a blip.

This section makes the point that much of what gets credited to Greek or Mesopotamian civilizational advances during this period – early Greece - were really simply the persistence of the previous Neolithic cultures, and that Partnership cultures

haven't really gone away, but they have been assimilated and their symbols and goddesses reduced to a secondary status.

.

Chapter Eight

The Other Half of History: Part One

"The Cyclic Unity of Nature and the Harmony of the Spheres"

In this section, Eisler makes direct connections from the Old society to the Greeks, saying that many of the most famous men of the early Greek flowering learned from women, in old institutions, and what was "new," to the Dominators around and before them really wasn't.

The lovely phrases in this section's title clearly echo the Goddess' world, and there were still some famous and important women for a time, the priestesses of the oracles and such, but the androcracy was established and this would fade.

About the Greek "firsts," they used "Pythagoras" theorem to build the bloody ziggurats and whatnot long before him (from today's news, not the book), his teacher was a woman named Themistoclea; Socrates had a woman teacher named Diotema, these women were priestesses from old traditions.

I think I'm arguing when I should be doing something different, reinterpreting, it's not right and wrong that way, no-one is responding to moral lessons, it's Neurotype, it's all "right," to some sorts and wrong to others. We need the conversation to move up a level, where we can . . . no, that's *NOT* it.

I need to not solve it in every sentence. I'm not here to solve the problem, only here to name it, just say, "Can't think outside of hierarchy? That's the Spanking Gene." Not right or wrong, or Here's what you *SHOULD* think, or No, here's what "I" feel in MY bones – just name it: that's an Allistic thought, appropriate perhaps for the warrior caste, perhaps.

Maybe that's still too much. I'm just trying to say that the androcracy is the Spanking Gene, not a social system, but a Neurotype, an animal that really is different between the ears than its predecessors, that it isn't a matter of talk and reason, but of environment and evolution, of the environments that create the minds we are trying to reason with. Genes and Neurotype make better sense of the Dominator situation than a "social model," does, mostly because we have discovered this subtype of human being and everyone therefore falls into one subtype or the other, it exists and must be accounted for.

Spanking, same, it also exists and must be accounted for. Social models that do not account for subtypes and environment or genes are very much, "just a theory," to me.

That's meta, I suppose, and things start to look exponentially more difficult, but it's the reality. Spanking is not a "virtual," thing, the possibility of violence is not a virtual thing and it means all sorts of real, physiological things, the virtual part really means real physiology, so imagine what it means when you follow through. Spanking is the environment that grows Allistic minds.

There is a gene (colloquial use, many genes, alleles, all included) for spanking, maybe for Allism and abuse grows it, this seems not mysterious at all to my neurology. Since the Neolithic collapse where it isn't outright war and chaos, it is law and order and spanking, all must feel the threat, all must grow the gene. They are sure it's in everyone, and also in Autistic children somewhere but that it needs more extreme methods to bring it out. There is a reason for their faith in violence, it never does nothing, it always makes something happen, it always tweaks the gene, grows the gene, causes a little more evolution towards violence, growing their type, and their society.

I mean, if it doesn't make the Autistic kid more normal, it makes the practitioner torturing the kid more . . . something, some professional version of "strong."
"Professional," I guess.

To a Partnership mind, it may not seem to solve many things on the surface, but abuse creates a consensus, makes them all the same, not an endorsement, just an explanation. Allism's violence is irresistible, so that's called genetic drift, unchecked, it will get us all. And arguing with it like it's a "social model," that's not really checking it, is my point, especially if they're all still spanking, is the point, the dare I say, the revolutionary point of this project.

Chapter Eight ends with the later Greek philosopher's describing their mindset, and it's basically fascism, power wins, if you can, you may, power sits in the place I think morality ought to, it is word for word what they still say today, power is the organizing principle, and this is the gene, this is Allism, because my neurology does not see this as "organization," and neither does the world and it's operation, like the climate. This only exists in one place, this "organization," between Allistic ears. That's Neurotype, nothing else.

These philosophers, they plumb their souls, they reach into their minds to give us what they find in there, what they find to be . . . basic, fundamental to their minds, to their neurology – as I do, I have always felt this need, and it has put me at odds with them all, Nietzsche, he plumbed himself and found that power stuff, my man found Allism at his core, is all, just his own sort of mind, nothing bloody universal – except drift, it bloody will be, true or not, sort of thing.

These modern ones, same, Jordan Peterson, simply looking inside and describing the nightmares within his bitter, spanked brain.

Not believing in evolution, I mean, it's like the one about not believing in science, science doesn't care what you believe, science believes in you, evolution believes in you, and living and being active in life while not "believing" in it is like driving your car while

not “believing,” in driving, like you think it’s just the car’s Nature to want to stay on the road or something. Doesn’t matter what you do with that steering wheel thingy.

I trust, that if you don’t believe in driving that you then don’t drive, right? Neurotype is weird, it seems impossible, but there it is anyway, it believes in you.

There were two more sections:

“Ancient Greece” and “Androcratic Right and Wrong.”

.

Chapter Nine

The Other Half of History: Part Two

Here Eisler tells of the pushback, of repeated Partnership sorts of attempts to change the world, starting that even Greece was better than the slaughter and dark time that preceded it and going to the Christian movements. I suggest that the worst of the modern day warrior sorts seem to declare themselves a separate type of human and differentiate themselves from the people they abuse by saying the abused are “suited for it.” That the language of supremacy itself betrays that they have a sort of Neurodiversity theory too.

These two chapters seem to describe a few counter movements, when the Partnership world put up a fight, they say Greece, as bad as it was, was softer and better for women than life among the previous invaders, and they say the early Christian movement seemed to gain some ground before being . . . assimilated, Dominatorized. Eisler even thinks a Partnership version of Christendom might have happened, that it could perhaps have gone the other way.

But of course they’re talking about history, and exceptional people, and I don’t think these movements indicate any real genetic threat to the drift. But it’s good to know Partnership people hadn’t simply disappeared yet.

They mention “The Pendulum Swings Back,” it’s the last section heading in Chapter Nine, and I guess I have to argue, steady drift, no soft, “social model,” pendulum, I’m afraid.

I would pay real money to learn Jesus said “turn the other cheek to your KIDS,” or that it’s in any of the Gnostic texts, THEN I might believe there was a possible change happening, something with power, because I have this idea about the epigenetic function of the environment of threat and violence in which the Dominator raises its children.

If you know something, please tell.

To my mind, the “pendulum,” is two things, the continued presence of the Neolithic Partnership genes, albeit partly diluted, followed by the continued drift of the aggressive Dominator genes along with their control over everyone’s evolution in that direction by imposing an environment of violence. I suppose they’re not wrong to say, “society,” was swinging back and forth, but of course there’s no “back,” with evolution, the Partnership genes swung forward some, and then the Dominator genes swung further forward, outgrew them again, I think, my nasty little system, mentioned previously.

I keep rereading these chapters, looking for some clear signs of a neurological change to make my case, but it’s all intrinsically weak, things do not cross the logical barrier of Neurotype with their meaning or power.

Perhaps a step back, perspective instead of trying to zoom in, something about how you're either a Partnership or Dominator person, that if it were a social model, you'd expect most people to be somewhere in the middle rather than distinctly one or the other, like if it were a social model, you'd have a choice in the matter, but if it's an evolved subtype, a Neurotype, less so, more born this way? Hmmm.

Something about the self-identifying way the Dominator likes to insist that women and the people they conquer are "born passive," and so, "suited for slavery?" I mean, that they themselves seem to make declarations about being a different sort of human, separate themselves ideologically from less aggressive peoples?

Ah, I like that. It's Neurotype because they themselves bloody say so, in not so many words, don't they? Let's quit, that's a win.

(I'm trying to decide if I should comment from what is in my head from the Peshier Technique website, from the work of Barbara Thiering.

Perhaps only one small thing, that Peter, who Eisler has as an early male, Dominator problem in the nascent Partnership Christian church, also looks like a bit of a swine in the Peshier Technique, apparently setting himself up in the rising sun in a gold suit to sell himself as the god or some such rubbish. Ha.

Oh. Well.

Also, Jesus lived to a fairly ripe age and wrote some of those gospels himself and they really do date back to his life, but the stories of miracles are all surface fictions and he was a bit of a hustler. Thiering says he bucked the system because the circumstances of his birth made him not the official first born son, so the system wasn't going to have him anyway.

Perhaps as sometimes happens, he became a champion of women and the sick when he found himself on the outside looking in with them. Still, obviously, it was a Partnership understanding he had anyway. I sort of "believe," the Peshier Technique, but not so as to shut anything else out.)

.

Chapter Ten

The Patterns of the Past: Glyany and History

Eisler shows a pattern, that as a society moves towards war, that it attacks its own, the women, the partnership sorts, that we see waves of social misogyny, followed by some bloody war, again and again. I argue with their explanation as always, but I too see a pattern of people simply getting worse and worse with each other – beginning with spanking and police – until some massive social meltdown, a war or a world war.

Same pattern, almost the same causes, but one detail, children, and the epigenetics of spanking never does make it into modern, normal people's thinking.

Next I spend some time trying to show that much of what we see as political lying and gaslighting likely comes down to neurotype, one type's lie is another type's best guess, making examples of the capitalist's inability to correctly describe the communism they despise. I repeat some stuff about spanking, more theory.

This opens with the Dynamic Change stuff, describing Partnership life as a sometimes Attractor in a dynamic bunch of systems, and I glazed over a little as always, but it goes to cycles, to explaining some ebb and flow in what I am trying to call a steady drift – but it's good, I have something cyclic going on too, maybe these cycles are not a total mismatch with mine, maybe we're still talking about the same thing.

.

Chapter Ten

The Patterns of the Past: Glyany and History

"The "Feminine" as a Force in History"

Ah no, just the push and pull of Partnership/Gylany/Feminine principle vs the Dominator/Androcracy/Masculine principle. I'm disappointed reading, but that's what we're here for.

There's been a lot of talk about how the Dominator state, the church etc., "had to suppress the Partnership side in order to maintain primacy and control," but, this lacks Neurotype rather utterly, doesn't it?

Are we sure they are all that self-aware?

Are we sure it's not a matter of genetics and Neurotype and the Dominator sorts simply do not see or grasp the other mindset or simply grasp their own too well? Again, let's ask them: they don't say they fear the equality of Partnership or collectivism, they call it another form of Domination. Right? Like the capitalist authoritarians call the collectivist experiments, "dictatorships?" Yes, some ended up as that, but it isn't what collectivism *MEANS* and still that's how the Dominator sorts talk about it, as though it's what it means, authoritarianism, despite the descriptive appellatives, right?

If it's a war of brain types and ideologies, the majority don't seem to be aware that they're fighting it, I mean they know they're fighting but they don't seem to know who the enemy is, they're sure the Partnership sorts are just more Dominators, it's some shadow of themselves they're battling. Of course, when the Dominators try to build a collectivist state, that's how it's going to go.

They're "wrong," about the words or the intentions or something, definitions, but they're not "wrong," that dictatorships are what they get, are they?

On the same vector, they don't "fear women," they call them weak, not fear-inspiring enough – they fear some consequence from other Dominators for having allowed any weakness into their midst, is what it is. These always sound like gaslighting lies, when they blame the weak for their war stance, victim blaming BS, but again, there is no room for Neurodiversity at all in that view, in that view, we must be necessarily All the Same for all these to simply be cynical lies.

It hurts me terribly to say that, not going to lie, but it's only fair, I'm here trying to destroy all your comfortable myths, there's no good reason I should escape unhurt. That one did it, no fooling.

Somehow both things have to be true, they are lies that they are able to believe. Trivers says those are the best sorts of lies, the ones you find a way to believe, because then you look for all the world like you're telling the truth.

I think? A lot of them just really do not see an alternative, they haven't evolved to see the sense in the Partnership side. As in the "communist dictatorship," example – ought to be an oxymoron, but is the normal term in America – if we suggest a less competitive model, they don't think you are trying to help them, they just think you're competing with them and their system.

The otherness, the competition is built into their brains and you cannot offer them an alternative to their built in, bottom line, all else is by definition, simply competition. I'm sorry, this is bleeding in from my personal life, once they decide you're Other, you cannot help them, cannot talk to them, it is all just you competing, fighting with them. Offer them healthcare, they fight you. Once they decide you are Not Them, loving them is an evil lie they will not tolerate and will fight you for, I swear to God. But your reasoning's bottom line – that's got to be a neurology matter, right?

It's always odd reading what was "necessary to do," in history, it never sounds right. Always makes me go looking for a reason they didn't find.

This wasn't just an example. It is exactly the natural, Partnership communism that Graeber says ruled the world until about five thousand years ago, and you could pretty much replace "Communism," with "Partnership," and see the same response, they don't argue against the sharing, they call it its opposite, another no sharing dictatorship and argue against that strawman instead. You know every capitalist calls all things collectivist – all as rich as the next, healthcare for all – another, even worse dictatorship.

Are all billion of them getting the dispatches, telling us their identical lies from some warehouse?

Or is it even worse, that they really believe their talk, it actually makes sense to them, somehow? I'm sorry to tell you. When pressed, in other contexts, they will confess that "nobody knows anything," confirming a thing I said already, I think, that the violence is a made-up meaning, an attempt to impose some meaning, having lost the partnership one.

"Somehow," is of course, Neurotype. Oxymoron to you, common sense to me, seriously, and vice versa for something else. Seriously. Magic. A whole other level of code between us and the world.

Back to the book, sorry.

Eisler makes a great case in this section that everything the Church was passionate about killing was some kind of Partnership or female movement, listing, "... the Troubadours, the Cathars, the Baghards, and the various minor sects which preached a chaste love? ..."

Haha. "Baghards."

.

Chapter Ten

The Patterns of the Past: Glyany and History

"History Repeats Itself"

This section lists a number of Partnership movements, women's movements and times when they did indeed move society in a partnership direction, followed by a reactionary bunch of male propaganda followed by a violent putdown of said movement and often enough an overshoot into a war, when the patriarchy reasserts itself, it celebrates with a war or something.

Again, it's all interpreted under the regime of how the different forms, how the Dominators deal with the relationship between men and women, and again, that's only the supposed primary relationship in Dominator world, we are supposed to be speaking from Partnership, where the primary relationship is mother to child.

It is the destruction of that relationship, mother to child, parent to child, that precipitates the rest, not the establishment of anything else after that fact. That's what I'm trying to say with this project, I think. The Spanking Gene tore the family, and so the world apart: not the way the people who say that today say it, not like the Parental Rights people who say that but are protecting the very violence and authoritarianism that tore us apart and tears us apart to this day.

The Parental Rights people are the voice of the Spanking Gene, calling from the Kurgish™ steppes and they will never be finished their demolition project.

You need it all to understand why, epigenetics and Neurotype, history and prehistory, because we are not bred to understand why automatically anymore and again, it's far too much, but that's the first point, a little less about what this disaster did to the Mother and a little more about what it did to the Child, because evolution.

.

Chapter Ten

The Patterns of the Past: Glyany and History

"Women as a Force in History"

Eisler open here asking with so many great starts, why is this matter not studied more, the paradigms that we vacillate between, and I think I just said, it's Neurotype, because they think they already understand it, or they already understand it as much as their neurology needs to. They speak again of a new history that isn't missing half of humanity, and again I must insert, if childhood isn't in it still, theirs is still in a large way, missing all of humanity.

It finishes with Charles Fourier's version of the one about how "... the degree of emancipation of women is an index of the degree of a society's imagination," but somebody else said "the degree with which the least of them," and really, pick any marginalized group, each one is an index, because we are not measuring anything about the victim, we are using them to measure the degree of Dominator dominance, and really, they do it to everyone, because it's part of them, their neurology to do that, not part of you and your gender that they do it to you in particular.

This message was for Autistics too: it's not "about," any marginalized group, it's about all this pathological marginalization going on.

.

Chapter Ten

The Patterns of the Past: Glyany and History

"The Female Ethos"

This section would seem to prove the previous statistic, we can to a great degree track the existence of Partnership minds by tracking women's freedom and influence in the world. Again, they are mostly not the same women from the Goddess' Neolithic world, but from modern male rule to modern female rule would absolutely be a move in the right direction, and something we could maybe wrap our heads around a little.

I do think we might need to take a few steps in that direction before anybody starts to share my worries about spanking, perhaps. It might be a way to start.

.

Chapter Ten

The Patterns of the Past: Glyany and History

“The End of the Line”

As we have all felt since at least the invention of the atomic bomb, the world is at a precipice, while the progressives of the world reach for ever greater heights, the fascists are on the march again, this is the concern here, this chapter detailed a pattern of rising rhetoric that begins against women and all things nice and soft and ends in a war, and the next war could well be the last one.

I hate to tell Eisler from the 80s, but it seems that nuclear weapons only deter nuclear war, and when pressed, this modern human would rather put up with a lot of conventional war rather than exercise that particular deterrent. So far, World War Three looks like World War Two, but with elon’s satellites.

But yes, still, always this precipice, it seems. I see some such cycle also.

.

Chapter Eleven

Breaking Free: The Unfinished Transformation

Here we are almost home in the modern age, starting with the European Enlightenment (by the Turtle Islanders, per The Dawn of Everything), and suggesting that a fine task for us today would be to compete that job, the enlightenment, carry any momentum it had for Partnership forward. For my part, I try to apply the same genetic ideas to this Age of European expansion that I tried to with the previous events.

I have an argument about education, that you can't just teach people anything, it has to match their genes and their brains, their types, and that the arc of society does not follow what the teachers teach, it only follows their methods, which are an environment of abuse that causes adaptations that make some sorts of ideas more likely than others. There is more theory about Neurotype, and a few more theories based in my Divergence, from conservatism, to freedom fighting, to whether feminists spank.

"Ours was to be the modern era, the Age of Reason." Eisler says in her opener, and yes, it was, wasn't it. The aforementioned Enlightenment, with the travelling abilities of the written word – I suppose we learned then and are learning again now with the internet, lies travel faster than real knowledge, these mass media have not been as helpful as they might have been in a Partnership world, of course this is true of a lot of things.

There is a lovely sentence and paragraph listing many male names, philosophers and scientists as the "prophets of the secular Word."

.

Chapter Eleven

Breaking Free: The Unfinished Transformation

"The Failure of Reason"

Unfortunately, things did not change all that much when we stopped calling ourselves semi divine and started calling ourselves, "rational," child abuse and exploitation and war either continued or increased due to improvements in tech. It seems, even Nature was taken down another step, as perhaps no longer officially God's creation or something.

This, perhaps, has people in revival, turning back to what they think of as "old ways," meaning religion. This section ends suggesting that it's not over, the Enlightenment, and that our task is to get it over the line, complete the positive changes we glimpsed then, and . . . OK. That's a step in the right direction. There is some hint in history, perhaps in The Dawn of Everything, that the Columbian Critique is the first time Europeans heard of not spanking, like the first time they ever even thought it was a thing, along with the other more famous memes of other sorts of equality.

I think I have heard it elsewhere, from psychology people, that we think spanking is new, like it *STARTED* in the Enlightenment, along with the nations states – this is what I interpret as Europeans first learning the words, spanking, child abuse, not the behaviour. Again, ever seen the Bible? I want to be even snarkier, but I'll leave it at that.

I would have to say, if that idea, that beating children is wrong got lost in our Enlightenment, that was another androcratic coup. It may be fair to say that children are always the first bargaining chip the modern, wannabe Partnership people give away, in favour of women, in favour of a racial issue perhaps, and I'm here to say, that is the entire game, really.

That's why Partnership never wins, because it doesn't reach the children, who need it most, and who are epigenetically transformed into Dominators by spanking. If we knew this, wouldn't it change everything?

.

Chapter Eleven

Breaking Free: The Unfinished Transformation

"The Challenge to the Androcratic Premises"

Apparently the Columbian Critique was not well known, what was so clear in The Dawn of Everything, and we see the Enlightenment beginning among the women of European society – no conflict, one and then the other, it would appear to make sense that the possibly pre- (or post-) androcratic attitudes of the Turtle Islanders would find more fertile ground among the women of Europe, rather than the men.

It makes a difference in terms of biology or not, however, in terms of getting the bigger picture in focus, that if it really sprung from the minds of European women, then there is no genetic connection, no biology, no evolution – just a steady, forever division of people living between Dominator and Partnership models, as though the whole story never happened, the peaceful Neolithic and the disastrous invasions.

When these ideas came back from the only just contacted people of the New World though, then we were talking about different sorts of people, evolution and possibly Neurotype.

I mean, women, yes, but let's acknowledge the Turtle Island people for people reasons too, not just for my argument.

The talk about how women gaining status in the home averted revolutions – is this supposed to be a good thing or a bad thing? Women gained a little breathing room, so monarchy still? I have a sense that what women gained in this social shift was something children lost, not men. Power is inherently corrupt, if the men gave the women any, it was on the condition that they hurt someone with it probably, it usually is. Ah, there it is - not only children – domestics and slaves, right, your ruling culture women need some power to rule their slaves.

Surely that correlation has already been refuted or established. Anyone? Did women gain status when England started with the African slavery?

.

Chapter Eleven

Breaking Free: The Unfinished Transformation

“The Secular Ideologies”

Capitalism as liberalism, that’s hard to see anymore, better than feudalism, that’s getting harder to see anymore . . . there is some nod to equality about it, but something isn’t equal. Ah, it’s a group inequality still, not the king, but the whole capitalist class we have to deal with now, it’s an equality only for the androcrat, only for the competitive, that’s some first generation equality, ah, Eisler said, this equality is just for the men, true enough.

Ha, again, I got my entire schtick from Dr. Eisler, from this book, they list all the major progressive movements of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, abolitionism, pacifism, anarchism, anticolonialism, etc., and makes the point that all these “separate,” issues have a single enemy, all the same problem they are fighting, the Dominator, the androcrat, the Allistic, spanked and in warrior mode.

Ah, mention of the new Dominator philosophers, Nietzsche, I think I already did, but it bears repeating a little differently, that Eisler says Nietzsche reflects the Dominator “social model,” in its most glaring light. I will say again that Nietzsche didn’t pull that stuff out of the world around him, they pulled it out of their brain, their clearly Allistic, spanked and in warrior mode brain.

Nietzsche is a matter of Neurotype.

.

Chapter Eleven

Breaking Free: The Unfinished Transformation

“The Dominator Model of Human Relations”

I think following the book is keeping me in the proper format for a book, someone once told me that a lesson is three iterations, you tell them what you’re going to tell them, then you tell them, and then you tell them what you told them and the third time it’s supposed to sink in, and clearly Eisler can stick to some such plan, if I can’t by myself.

They said this section heading at the start and I argued then, we do not form our relationships on social models, it’s the other way about. Our relationships make our society and our social models. I don’t hate everything about Chaos theory, it is a fractal

sort of a shape – but there is an hierarchy of causality, and it is bottom up, creatures add to form societies, societies do not create their members.

I mean, the Dominator society tries to mold us, it spends all its energy trying, but we are not molded, we are not the supposedly intended shape, we are only abused by the attempt, which is not counterintuitive, because Dominator society only knows one way to mold you and abuse is the way. We are even mostly all the same shape, but not the intended one, not unless the intended shape was an ungovernable xenophobic child abuser forever cycling into war. Not the ostensibly intended one.

Of course the result is “no-one’s fault,” it’s just Human Nature. So all that control does nothing, apparently, that’s the science: does the environment *DO* anything, and the majority answer is, No, it does not. It is a weird thing to say, the majority doesn’t apparently believe in the environment. Again, evolution is magic, Neurotype looks like bloody magic, and the modern, normal peoples’ science is very skewed.

I’m afraid I’m trying to say that, “social models setting the format for human relationships,” is a Dominator/androcracy/authoritarian idea, top down. Partnership life would start with the relationship.

Again, none of these are gotcha moments on Eisler or anyone else, because Neurodiversity didn’t exist in our minds when this book was written, and it’s not difficult to form these sorts of opinions when it’s not your Neurotype, to say, “that’s an Allistic (Dominator) meme,” anymore than for an Allistic to say, “Autistics generally don’t like noisy crowds,” or something.

Plus, I’m twenty years late to be among the first people making this connection, at least. I mean, I feel if I had known about myself and about Neurodiversity, I could have shown up with this twenty years ago. Thirty, and surely someone else had that information.

Honestly, I have not yet found the authors who talk about Allism this way, the whole world and many Autists only talk about Autism as a thing, and Allism remains simply the norm. Not every Autist is the God’s Fool, Partnership sort either I am given to understand, and so most don’t maybe see the world divided this way, like Eisler and I do, so I’m late by my own self critique, but I still may be in a small minority to think it at all, it’s hard to know.

But when you discover or invent “types,” when you have a system of types, everyone has one, everyone goes in it somewhere. Divergent minds prove that all minds are limited and made for purpose. Allism became a thing the second Autism did – just the world of Allistic science didn’t seem to notice.

Autistic science is going to notice them.

Here, I am normal, and Allists and Dominators are Divergent.

The only “definitions of Allism,” I see are brief and technical, etymology – or jokes, people turning texts about Autism upside down and laughing at Neurotypical foibles, at how they treat Autistics – but the internet doesn’t work anymore either, they could be out there, people talking seriously about it right next door and you’d never know. I’d never know, anyway.

Maybe it’s a group gotcha moment, a gotcha for most of the world’s Neurotype, who think they’re the only Neurotype?

Ah, they’re making a case that the gender supremacy model is the first one and that it gets mapped onto every other marginalized group, that the enmity the androcracy has for women is the one that transfers to every other sort of target in the warrior society – and that’s close to what I’ve been saying, close to what I have been calling my Antisocialization theory, except there is still one lower level in this fractal chain of causality, children. That’s the base unit, and today’s women are mostly Dominator women if that is not the way it looks to them, if they don’t see the importance of what happens to children as central to it all.

.

Chapter Eleven

Breaking Free: The Unfinished Transformation

“Forward or Back?”

They say that once we get past the terms, “liberal,” and, “conservative,” and see things in the larger division of Dominator vs Partnership, things will be clearer – and this seems like time for another one of my Neurodiversity theories, like the one about origin stories, this one about, “conservatism.”

It’s an Allistic meme too, it’s supposed to mean, “keeping things the same,” but things are never the same, the world is not the static creation of some fiction, it is evolution, constant motion – so Conservatism “conserves,” a rate and direction of evolutionary change. This is why our institutions, “fail,” in times of fascist meltdown, because they are built on an assumption of stasis that doesn’t exist and the people that make up the institutions evolve, or rather, de-evolve, as the case may be, at the “conserved,” rate and in the “conserved,” direction.

The cycles of war, that’s what being “conservative,” means. Hold as tight as you dream you can and it will spin out of control every time, because you are in motion, always evolving.

Institutions won’t ever, “hold,” in the downward evolutionary cycle that is the real world for humans today, most of them, forever exercising their Allistic Reverse Evolution – where environments “deter,” us rather than form us, the very opposite of evolution - where they hurt each other to make each other, “better.” I’m sorry. What were we talking about?

It says that we are all fighting the same beast, and I have often worried that when we fight the Good Fight, we are nonetheless fighting, living to fight, raising our children in a fight – an entirely Dominator life, despite the *SIDE* of the issue, and still growing and propagating the warrior genes. I think our warrior genes can sometimes have us, uh . . . settling for the Good Fight, instead of finding a different solution to the problems.

I'm sorry. It's part of the problem. We're all fighting the same beast, plus to a large degree, we are the same beast.

They go on to say that, of all the movements, the only complete one is feminism, the only one qualified to take on the androcracy, and I get it, but again, just almost, they are still missing the epigenetics (and the genetics, and the evolution) that make it all go sideways in the first place.

I understand that for a lot of feminists, spanking is a no-no, if it's a majority, someone, please show me. I mean I know all the good folks know it's SUPPOSED to be a no-no, but in real life, this is not apparent. Something above 85% of Americans self-reported spanking maybe twenty years ago, and America doesn't appear to be softening since. Surely more than the remaining optimistic 15% identify as feminist?

They give us a list of authors espousing ““feminine” values of nonviolence and caring,” and I want to smarmily ask for 85% of American toddlers – you call that nonviolence? I know, Allistic science does, it's only violence if it's lethal, like violence means nothing to the living – sounds like our Dominators forever, doesn't it, like the “Kurgans.” Like the evo bros.

So, this might be a way in which the social sciences' phobia about biology hurts their science and hurts their effort, that they want to talk about social models and education and soft things but ignore the hard biology of the epigenetics of spanking.

Seriously. I am sorry.

Eisler suggests that the move to a Partnership model might be the required evolutionary adaptation coming from the species' survival instinct, and clearly, I'm not all with that, but evolution provides the mechanism for that with diversity, in this case for a diversity that will not appear in the fossil record, Neurodiversity.

But, make the other change, childism can be the movement that really does make the difference – as always, only if they let you do it, of course, and they intuit that this is where the rubber meets the road, things might escalate quickly. We can't sneak it past anyone, we have to talk them into it, somehow, trick them if necessary, I mean, give the spankers of the world their own speech, this hurts me more than it hurts you, and trust me, this will make you a better person.

It's for your own good. You'll understand when your kids grow up that it was good for you to live without this. Ha. That's a chapter. Three more to go.

.

Chapter Twelve

The Breakdown of Evolution: A Dominator Future

Eisler lists some fears of future dystopia scenarios, should we not turn things around – and I bust the idea as fantasies of the Spanking Gene, that no such control is possible in the real world where people do not remain constant but are forever adapting and changing, and as an example, such attempts at nightmarish control in the last century are what we now call a century of simply chaos and war that no-one is claiming to have had any control over.

We do not discuss overpopulation.

I offer a simple, logical argument about the logic of spanking and punishment. Eisler mentions “the power of myth,” and I add the caveat that this power is dependent on there being a resonant string in your brain, that brains make myths, myths don’t make brains.

This chapter seems to be more dire futurism, it opens with telling one Norbert Weiner’s vision of insect societies and says that we will not enjoy being stuck in our castes and functions but that this seems to be where Dominator society is taking us, and I think it’s an out of date image, ants aren’t maybe mindless for all of that and caste perhaps means something like Neurotype, something evolved for, not something forced on them.

But also, about the warnings of an insect-like, mechanical society – it’s time for another theory from the Divergent Side, another me only one: about how dystopian dreams are fantasies, because again, evolution. No sci-fi, stable dystopia is coming, because the pressures that are required to make that happen change people continually, these fears of frozen totalitarian states are nonsense, no such stability, good or bad can ever be achieved because the people change under torture and from delivering torture, it doesn’t stop, evolution doesn’t stop if the stressors don’t stop.

What you get is mass meltdowns, probably a war. Didn’t the people in the same clothes think that was what they were doing last century? THAT’S what happens. I think it’s the same cycle Eisler talks about, the anti-woman propaganda then a war, and the same failure: they don’t get what they’re aiming at, the “control,” they just get a meltdown.

Again, the Dominator’s faith in their methods is erroneous and this fear is a part of it. Control is a Dominator myth, while the utter loss of it seems to be the reality of the Spanking Gene.

.

Chapter Twelve

The Breakdown of Evolution: A Dominator Future

“The Insoluble Problems”

Of course we would be doing well to thrive as long and as well as ants have, and Weiner’s talk of how it’s mindless for them, but not for us is silly, just more of the nineteenth century “rational man,” nonsense. Good Lady, this sentence: By contrast, we humans can if necessary change our patterns of behaviour very fast, even instantly, *BY USING OUR VASTLY SUPERIOR MINDS*.

I’m sorry, pausing to laugh, then cry. I’ll be back in a minute.

Has our fellow ever *MET* humans?

Eisler continues that to do so however requires that we perceive the feedback, interpret it correctly, and then actually use the data to make a change, all of which, sorry, still crying a little. But the very first thing, each step really, is a matter of genetics and Neurotype, mostly the first thing, perception. It’s your brain that decides what you can or cannot perceive, and you can’t tell people what to perceive.

This section then goes on to a thing still in fashion at the time, overpopulation and population, “control.” People have in this millennia decided that it is no longer cool to talk about it, because it only means genocide, and I’ve never been entirely convinced either way, but a few things:

First, some have said it is exactly the threat of hunger and of war and genocide that causes people to breed like rabbits, that we outbreed threats, or try to. Certainly that is what the nations outlawing contraception and abortion are trying to do, breed their way to dominance, as a response to stress and competition (sure, from each other).

Second, whether it was right or wrong to talk about it before, we are not going to engage with “overpopulation,” in the middle of a global culling plague, are we? No, we are bloody not. Someone is already working on that, so to speak.

.

Chapter Twelve

The Breakdown of Evolution: A Dominator Future

“Human Issues and Women’s Issues”

Meh, I got nuthin’, I mean nothing new. Children’s issues, even more so, because of the epigenetic thing, but of course. The issues of the “least of us,” are human issues, all of our issues. We are nearing the end of the Chalice and Eisler is reiterating what they’ve told us already – and I fear I’m running out of corrections to make.

.

Chapter Twelve

The Breakdown of Evolution: A Dominator Future

“The Totalitarian Solution”

I’m sorry, same as the last one, I mean, the same, or I have to write you another Divergent theory, the Punishment Cult, and the logical reversal, and I don’t want to, so I’m going to do it really quickly and poorly.

Punishment is a little bad for a greater good, bad for good – it’s a reversal, a logical reversal, and your brain wants to drop it, but we are not allowed, it is literally forced upon us, the logical reversal, and then these two forms of “logic,” exist in conflict and the new one using force, changes the environment in favour of itself and grows until the old logic, that good is good, is forced out.

This is drift, whether it is genetic or not, the force. But it is genetic.

Eventually, in the mind, and in society, bad is the new good, and there is no will and no money for anything but bad, punishments and deterrents. Feeding people is not bad, so by the logic of the Punishment Cult, no good can come of it, only pain and deterrents can control us, this is the Punishment Cult. They are passing laws in America against giving people food and water and this is not irony, this is happening.

This is how we can even speak about a totalitarian “solution,” because where bad is the only good, death is a “solution,” and we are again, right back with the “Kurgan” chieftains. Punishment takes you there. Ironically, perhaps, it is the grownups, the authorities who drive us to this violent nihilist evolution, not some criminal element, always: those who would “control,” our evolution de-evolve first, and take the rest of us with them, for the simple evolutionary reason that the “deterrent,” they offer the “criminals,” is their own life, their own real environment, and it shapes them.

.

Chapter Twelve

The Breakdown of Evolution: A Dominator Future

“New Realities and Old Myths”

As the example of modern totalitarianism, they’re talking about Nazis, and their propaganda, the symbolism. They mention the “power of myth,” and again, no, this is top down, what power has a myth got if it isn’t a match for your brain? Propaganda pulls you along by the stuff already in your brain, it doesn’t rewrite you. Myths are not social models, they are expressions of Neurotype, expressions of the brain.

I didn’t think that was something from biology, isn’t that Jung?

Not sure how my social scientists missed that.

At the end, they mention the Dominator’s weird faith in the blade, in their violence to fix anything, like it ought to be bizarre that a world war is entered into as a “solution,” for anything, I always thought violence was the scourge of this nasty old world, it’s very alienating to see people thinking the opposite. But I have an idea about

the faith, it's a policy, and the faith is based in the stuff I'm on about, the genetics, the epigenetics, that even if the obvious problems are not fixed, or even get worse, we all "got stronger," or something, for "next time," or something.

.

Chapter Thirteen

Breakthrough in Evolution: Toward a Partnership Future

Winding down. Here at the end of their book, Eisler is reiterating things, and I reiterate some of my arguments. Some visionary is quoted about a “new consciousness,” and I complain that it’s hardly the point, that the whole book says we want the old consciousness back, not another new mistake.

This is the final chapter in the original book, and it’s more of the trouble and their vision for the future, what would change if we could make the move, I guess. It begins by complaining that the big science fiction visions were technical versions of medieval societies, like Dune and Star Wars, and of course I agree, I was so angry at Star Wars, I . . . well, I still am. But I bet they could find some science and speculative fiction of a more social variety now, she already invoke Le Guin earlier and there are more, I know that much, but I haven’t kept up myself.

They suggest that the few Partnership sorts of speculative novels are the all women planets, which, fair enough. Then they remind us that it’s not about your gender, that both sexes are capable of very different behaviours and lives, and I just need to tweak, that yes, but not all people are capable of everything, that there are meaningful divisions about who is prone to think what sorts of thoughts, and gender may have some of that, but so do genes, so does Neurotype.

You know, just we are not All the Same. That is a Dominator meme, We Are All the Same, I think I said once, and it isn’t helpful for Partnership goals. There is mention again, I suppose this is the fourth time, telling us what they told us, of, “. . . the direction, not of our biological evolution, but of our cultural evolution.” And fourth time for me too, I guess: no.

It really is our biological evolution we need to realize. The “culture,” grows out of that. They ask, How do we get there, but they are asking about a purely cultural change, apparently, so I cannot answer that and I’m losing interest in their answers.

It’s “just a theory,” to me.

.

Chapter Thirteen

Breakthrough in Evolution: Toward a Partnership Future

“A New View of Reality”

“. . . the next step . . .” again, evolution is not the army, it doesn’t really take steps, and that sounds like moving forward instead of back, and you can’t say, “moving forward,” to these Dominators, they will go to the closet for their guns, frankly I don’t understand all the “next step,” talk, and the “new consciousness,” noise, wasn’t the whole point of this book that we want the old one back?

That's what's required, not marching onward, that's the Spanking Gene talking, never mind your past, keep moving forward! No, let's go back, back to when things were fine the way they were and we didn't need to go anywhere, when we weren't some herd being driven who knows where, understanding only, Forward!

I'm afraid we're almost done, I've nothing for the rest of this section or the next two sections either.

.

Chapter Thirteen

Breakthrough in Evolution: Toward a Partnership Future

"Transformation"

Here we start to see the word, "children," at last a few times, and there is mention on a list of problems of, "child battering," but this choice of words sets my alarms off, battering is very specific and legal, and it seems to exempt "spanking," as a problem by its mention.

Ah, Eisler's vision, on the second last page of a world where all people are involved and concerned about the care of children is lovely, that is absolutely part of my vision also – but it has to be the beginning, not the carrot on a stick at the end.

.

Special 30th Anniversary Epilogue

30th. Anniversary Epilogue

Thirty years later, when it says, “male female relations,” in this portion, it also says, “and parent-child relations,” as well, and there is even a meta sort of remark I like very much, about how the political Right is smart to focus on parents and children – even if they have it all wrong by my tastes – while the pseudo “Left,” is top down – like social science or something.

Alright, this is better, I have nothing but checkmarks in the opening and in the first three whole sections, clearly Eisler in 2007 has moved along with the rest of us and everywhere they say, “male female relations,” in this portion, it also says, “and parent-child relations,” as well.

There is mention of “punitive families,” and even of the strict methods of American Christians. Of course I approve. Of the mention, not of the methods.

.

Special 30th Anniversary Epilogue

“The Urgent Need for an Integrated partnership Political Agenda”

I agree with the heading, and I have a paragraph circled where they say the political Right has an integrated agenda, and smartly focuses on the family and family relations and is therefore winning the propaganda war, while they say the opposition seems to focus on the social structure top down, and my goodness, has Eisler come all the way to my side in those thirty years?

I don’t think quite all the way, but that is a fundamental shift, and I’m shocked and happy to see it, wow. Like they heard me, LOL.

Not quite all the way, because if I wrote that paragraph, you could fairly accuse me of saying that the Right beats their children harder than the opposition, so things keep going their direction. I mean, that the opposition still beats their at all is equally causative, or even more causative.

There is a final section about Eisler’s life and work, some fan appreciation, and yes, well done and well lived, Doctor, thank you for your service.

OK, So I have a “conclusions” chapter of my own going, and my whole plan has changed and I’m going to go back to the start and rewrite, replacing the first twenty-three posts in the thread as I rewrite, but I suppose I’ll throw what I have for conclusions at this thread first. Next up, Jeff’s conclusions.

Diagnosis and the Prescription

“The Diagnosis”

Since this section is already a summary in every book, I'm just leaving the excerpt in place. It really is the point.

“This is a thing I believe, and I think this is all science that brings me to believe it, that if we somehow managed to stop making our own environment a social Hell, it wouldn't be one anymore, it would change, because we would change. If we grokked evolution, and sought better environments, rather than building nightmares to “deter,” something, we would be happily living in those better environs already.”

A fatal mutation, probably no older than ten thousand years, maybe only seven thousand even, and it is maybe over, I mean things are not looking good on the home planet. The very mindset that has destroyed the Earth for its conflicts and competition is in charge and not only not healing itself, it is actively suppressing every other sort of a mind, pathologizing diversity, which is life, only that. It tends to conformism instead, apparently determined to bring this thing to its logical end as quickly as possible.

It doesn't seem we'll ever know how it began, but it's an aggressive gene or several, making its way through the human species by force since somewhere between seven and ten thousand years ago.

Parts of the New World, of the Americas seemed to have avoided it, or the full version of it until the Europeans found them, it seems the culture there follows a different pattern, perhaps less peaceful than we see Old Europe in places and times, but vast areas appear to never have simply turned full Dominator forever like it seems happened in Eurasia.

I never said, I suppose I had better, that it seems WEIRD (White, English, etc., I forget the rest, knowledge for the ruling race and religion, is the idea, here in America and Canada) that I'm focussed only on Europe and their New World, but Asia, India and China, Africa, I think these are all as written for the near east, these areas fell to the same waves as Europe and the near east, didn't they? Perhaps great swathes of Africa and Asia are on the same schedule as the Americas, only under pressure since Europe stepped up their efforts at pushing the drift, I suppose this is true also even of the arctic, like Siberia? Ah, Australia would be part of the most recent attack too, of course.

Genetic drift is a near impossible puzzle, we have locked it up and swallowed the key. It's a metapuzzle. The addict does not want to change; they are certain it's their survival. If they don't discipline their kids, they won't be “strong,” enough to succeed and survive – but if they do, the kids won't grok evolution and they won't mind the Dominator lifestyle, for the most part, ninety percent of them.

I go too far, but you get it. I've edited four times, to say it so badly and apologize afterwards is the best I got, I'm afraid.

It's not a loss for the normal people if we solve the problem of them. I know they seem to think so, but they are driving this bus straight off the cliff like no lemming would ever dream of (this bit of nature propaganda was surely Allistic/Dominator projection-as-science, same as "Alpha" wolves), this is what they are afraid to lose, this "control," to drive off the cliff. OMG, Ha –

It's the one about asking a person to understand what they're paid not to again, isn't it? We know we're going over, but if we let someone else drive the bus we're sure to lose our job.

Autistic, I see a plummet coming, but they seem to be excited about getting airtime. How dare you talk about pumping the brakes, say the new "leaders." Like the coming trouble is a fight and if they go in hot, they can win. When you're living with the Spanking Gene, every problem is a fight, it's sort of the only language there is.

That's on Aristotle's list, isn't it?

Let's talk about "Human Nature." It's not what you think.

Nothing about being human is sitting still, it is not a created world where anything has a simple Platonic "Nature," and things stay the same. It is evolution, this world, not "Natures." If in some sense, you feel you have a "Nature," well, One, it's yours, as temporary as you are, and even more so for some people who have experiences that change them deeply from psychic ones to brain injuries. In evolution normally though, your Nature is not your parents' Nature, but your own, we change.

Two, mostly what people mean by a shared "Human Nature," is Neurotype.

Your Nature is how you think, right, not how you walk, or eat. Your "Nature," is your Neurotype, and mostly, "Human Nature" is Allism, complete with the Spanking Gene; much of humanity shares a version of it, but not all.

The Human Nature in all the books and movies and TV and philosophy – all this. Autistics all at some point think of themselves as not human because of this, because we hear about Human Nature everywhere and always but we look inside and it is not there, despite we surely have some "Nature," and we are absolutely no other species but human.

Not kidding.

I have an Autistic Nature.

Most folks have an Allistic one, we think, but this is more of a social fact than a scientific one, still, for the most part, we think they are what's Neurotypical, we assume they are in the majority today, some think a super-majority, like ninety percent, and it seems to be true – but they haven't really been defined, Allists.

The definition is "typical," again, we think they are, and "not Autistic," and OK, but don't they have their own "istic?" I think my desk is also not Autistic, but surely

Allism doesn't mean you're a desk? I'm only saying, we'll have a better idea of how many of us are Allistic when we say what it is, what it means – which, it must be clear by now what I think, it means genetically Dominator, carrying some version of the human warrior genes, purpose built for a fight and struggling to calm itself.

I know I said, “same as my Dad,” but I am surely not identical, we grew up in different environments and I'm half Mom – so “an,” Autistic Nature is what I have.

I don't know we're all the same, we Autistics, we don't say we are, most of us. That's an Allistic meme, We are All the Same. They have differences too – but Neurotypes share a lot, personal histories and evolutions aside, the Allists mostly share the All the Same meme, it's one of the traits, it seems to me. Makes the rest of us sort of invisible to them, and again, these are not written in stone, these types: spanking does this, spanking makes people invisible to people.

Types just means it works better on some than others, and again, types grow and fade, all is in motion in the un-created real world.

But the point is, “Natures,” are much smaller than people think, barely a lifetime in duration and everyone's is not the same, and it's not your soul, it's just your brain. The world is evolution, all is in motion. In Partnership mode, we wouldn't think “oh, they are just like that, Human Nature,” we would ask, what made them this way, where did *THIS* “Nature,” come from?

.

Diagnosis and the Prescription

“The Prognosis”

Honestly, I am feeling pretty negative. We are already so far down the road of How did this happen and Shut up and drive the bus already that it's hard to imagine why they wouldn't have changed something already if they possibly ever could.

Like I said, my fear is that some few crawl out of the coming apocalypse to start again, but they are Dominators and start the same thing again. My mad dream is to leave them a roadmap, if any survive who can read it, this philosophy here.

If, however. If somehow the ones crawling out of the wreckage are Partnership sorts, then it would be another “start,” like the one that never happened, the one that simply came down out the trees to retrieve a dropped fruit, not to try to become the lion or something.

If, however.

If, if, somehow, some way, the reverse of the original disaster that happened somewhere between Gobekli Tepe and the “Kurgan,” cultures happened, if somehow there was some unimaginable set of circumstances that caused people to stop with the spanking and the whole human cult of punishment, like the above, the last few just

happened to be Partnership sorts, some situation like the poisoning that took out Sapolsky's troop of baboons' alphas and left the group altered and peacefully bonding going forward for some time, if something like that should happen – then magic.

We could be back in the arms of the Goddess, back in the garden.

This is a thing I believe, and I think this is all science that brings me to believe it, that if we somehow managed to stop making our own environment a social Hell, it wouldn't be one anymore, it would change, because we would change. If we grokked evolution, and sought better environments, rather than building nightmares to “deter,” something, we would be happily living in those better environs already.

I am curious to hear if that makes sense to anybody, if anyone from either side of the gene thinks that makes sense, that when a creature starts making their own environments, they are likely to adapt to them and wind up in some spiral of modifying their environment and adapting to it and modifying it again from their new “Natures,” ad infinitum. I mean, it's a bit meta, as the kids say, but also sort of obvious, isn't it?

I mean, you wouldn't do it if you knew you adapted every time – but if you stopped believing in evolutionary change and kept on modifying your environment, then you would be in real trouble, wouldn't you? I'm sorry to tell you, it's not even just the religious ones, some static, “Human Nature,” rules the science too.

Again, it doesn't bother people, somehow, despite we are living in the bad side of it, and if we saw it the other way, things could spiral out of control in the other direction – towards peace and sustainability and happiness. It is a strange proof of hope, our self created Hell on Earth, what's the meme, a self created Hell presupposes a self created Heaven? It really does, or it does to my mind at least.

To put it another way, who could have bet, between the beginning of time and ten thousand years ago that some ape could kill a whole planet all by itself? Nobody, that's who! And look at us!

Literally anything is possible in evolution.

People reject evolution, insist upon using bad to make good in the form of deterrents and punishments and cannot seem to make the connection between that bad self created environment and this bad old human being that wants to be a billionaire, it's amazing to this Autist, how we can be so . . . disabled. But that's Neurotype, some mix of super abilities, plain abilities and disabilities.

The irony can't get any deeper than the death of a planet, can it, that we have the power to self create, and we're using it, but we don't think we have the power and so we don't use it for good. Also, there is no other sort of creation, self creation is all there is, so this debilitating mindset was also self created, somehow, like I say: we sort of threw away the key, but again, nothing is created, nothing is static, that is merely another level of complexity, and we could regrow the key.

But we do have to, it's what's not viable, you can't fight evolution and thrive, not for long.

Humans are able to set up their own little perceptual "environments," and live quite unnaturally within them, providing their own artificial feedbacks, reinforcements and hazards within these manufactured spaces of perhaps cultural evolution but definitely of social constructions and of rules, of law and punishments – but they lose the feedback of the real world in the process, and this again, is what is not actually viable. Seven to ten thousand years is perhaps a long time for an unworkable adaptation, but you have to give us credit, we're not just taking ourselves out here.

It's a bloody short time in which to take everything out, probably, wouldn't you think? Much of the world is paying for our borrowing from reality this way before we have to, but every one of them makes our ultimate payment nearer and more certain.

.

Diagnosis and the Prescription

"The Prescription"

I can't be the first in what, thirty seven years to want to switch feminists from worrying about women to worrying about children, surely? But I suspect I'm first one with such an elaborate argument about it, aren't I?

I've tried telling people they oughtn't spank; that's no plan, me running around telling people, telling parents. It's actually harmful, more often than not, the gene has a defense mechanism, that when you complain about it to parents, the kids get it harder next time.

Like I said somewhere, you need a lot to know why, and there's just too much. I've scaled back my dreams of this from talking to everyone, parents, to trying to reach my fellow Autistics with it – and maybe the priestly elites of the secular Word, some of which are surely Divergent sorts and might hear something in it others won't. Of course that's not a safe place to put anything in such times either, and they are already being controlled or suppressed. But you have to put it out there, every person it reaches is another chance for it to somehow survive and propagate. In the next cycle, if there is one.

That's my plan, to tell science, sort of, tell the teachers, let them try to tell people.

Plus, I have high toned ideas about how having the moral high ground is not meaningful to someone like Nietzsche, for whom the pit of Hell is the ultimate moral high ground and that we need for Partnership to take the *SCIENTIFIC* high ground, to be the default, for Partnership to be "Human Nature," not some temporary intervention between ourselves and the Allistic "Human Nature." As it was during most of our existence, as it still is for some.

This means to understand kindness, and to demand an explanation for violence instead, the Search for Why Cruelty, instead of the supposed Search for Altruism, like they've never seen it or something.

But, hey, Neurotype, they don't see it, that's the point.

Just because many can't hear me doesn't mean that any plan that doesn't involve not spanking is ever going to work either, mind you. Interestingly, that's a feature of spanking, it happens anyway when nothing was ever going to "work."

I mean, I got nuthin', same as everybody else, something Needs to Happen that isn't Happening. For me, it's that the Allistic somehow needs to see their self in motion, in evolution, and I know, mine is as rainbows and lollipops as everyone else's. It's a very short loop: if they stopped spanking, they could see it; if they could see it, they'd stop spanking, I think. Probably not all of that in the first generation, either, but the epigenetic factor ought to be dramatic immediately too.

If, if, if.

The only thing, free with all utopian ideas, always there for the desperate, is that nothing happens that no-one was able to think of first, that just thinking it is always the first step, and we're doing that now, you and I, if I managed to pull you along some. If I have this framing right, and if it's better, and some people think it, what else can we do, that's how things begin, tiny, fragile, and hopeless. I mean things that aren't violence, that's how GOOD things begin.

Really, all I would change, is focus on the children and stop the epigenetic change. Nothing you say or do about adults is going to have any real effect if we do not change that. So we're back to education, trying to talk the "Parental Rights," people out of their religion that tells them to beat the children, we are full circle, back to the pointlessness, same as everybody else, all I have is if, if, if.

Still, just because many can't hear me doesn't mean that any plan that doesn't involve not spanking is ever going to work either, mind you. It's still the only plan.

I honestly thought I was so different that it might be different, that I might succeed where every other mind in history has failed, in giving humanity a plan, a way forward, but I'm not that special, not the only one, there are many of us and there always were and many of us Autistics have tried before too, of course. I mean, I'm still not just giving it up to "Human Nature," so it was a better try than some, not pride, I lived during the very peak of human knowledge, it was all there for someone who couldn't be told how to read it, for the ultimate contrarian, for someone who looked inside and didn't see the Human Nature they all talk about in the first place.

But we're still here. Same as that Allistic warrior mode still requires the epigenetic on switch, that fact alone is a bit of real, physical hope. What's that, two tiny attractors for hope? No, three, there is the on switch, the continued existence of Partnership genes, and there is this bit of speculation, that if this is real knowledge, or as

close to real knowledge for Autistics as Allistic knowledge is as close to real knowledge for them, and it works for anyone, that changes the world slightly.

Still weak, I know.

What do you want, a call to arms? That would be Donald Sutherland at the end of the movie, only a happy ending for the invader.

Weak is the Partnership way; strength is the road to Hell.

That's the first thing.

But the second thing is that those three weak things seem to have been what the Minoans knew and it stopped their world from turning full, fatal Dominator for more than a millennium, for what, seventy-five generations while fully under attack by Spanking Gene the whole time, surrounded by it.

So they're not nothing.

.

Jeff

Aug. 26th., 2024

Appendix A – Central and South America

Written on social media:

I guess seven generations is a compromise between one life and forever, far enough away to show effects but close enough to remain in the real world and not slip into mythology?

I'm always looking for something, for a diluted version of the Spanking Gene in the Americas, and this is a real stretch, but if the Dominators/Takers of the world don't see past tomorrow, maybe seven generations is what other sorts can see, and not further? Limited, but WAY further?

Problems remain, of course. Central American human sacrifice at such a level has to be the whole gene.

Of course, genetically, a tiny amount of contact could introduce a gene, and if it isn't weeded out quickly, who knows? And the Great Lakes people of the Columbian Critique were/are holdouts against the tide, as Minoan civilization seems to have been.

A diminishing perhaps, but . . . a certain consistency.

Whups, now I've done it, I believe this.

The contact referred to is probably Pacific side, there is known contact and surely some unknown contact between Asiatic/Oceanic (I think I've lost the right word!) people and the west coast of South America.

Plus the time simply hadn't passed yet, the Americas are a few millennia or a few hundred generations behind in the drift of the gene still or were when my euro people arrived.

I think Joseph Campbell said as much, didn't he, that when the Spanish brought Christ to America, that the same religious myth, of the ever dying and resurrected God was already here, having arrived in some form previously from the east.

Ooh, I may be divergent but I do love me when things converge like that.

the thread was dark, but this is dark with punch or something:

Good Lady, if that visual wouldn't have some punch, where the gene and the old world TOUCHES the Americas, the Americas break out in an epidemic of blood sacrifices for made up gods that lasts until the older version arrives from the west to kill it. Oooouuch.

Truth has punch. though.

Eish.

I've been treating Campbell as the enemy, the Town Cryer of Allistic mythology, I wasn't trying to use him. Welcome aboard, Joe.

And now I'm done. Made sense of history, prehistory, and Human Nature for myself, now what.

That was supposed to be impossible, it was meant to keep me busy my whole life, the NTs SAID it was impossible.

I really need to update the book, maybe just create a second entry on the blog for this American contact thing, I had left it as some big hole in the story, a mystery that threatened the whole thing, or a segue to an entirely different story in the Americas, it's none of that, and the data is all there already, it's the same.

And perhaps if Crete is proof of anything against the rest of Europe and the ME, then Kandiaronk and the Columbian Critique against the Central American empires the same way are a whole second proof.

Again, download the book before I pass and stop paying for the domain, or before your government censors it.

Jeff

Nov. 24th., 2024

Appendix B – the Arctic

Appendix B

Written on social media:

I'm cherry picking, I know, but Greta and I'm thinking Sami people in general make my point that the Spanking Gene is not a matter of race, certainly not of skin colour, that the lives of these people seem free of it despite that they are not brown and are thoroughly European.

People can be white and still be Indigenous and all that goes with it. The Spanking Gene isn't colour coded.

Somebody said: White people are only indigenous to Europe.

I'm just saying there are still a few Indigenous white peoples, the Sami, the Ainu (not European but probably were at some point), surely more.

I'm trying to separate my argument from racial matters. My "spanking gene," isn't just code for white people or for hating white people. My theory counts us all as victims, hosts for some destructive parasite and I'm trying to make that case by showing the spread of the gene across time and geography and comparing some possibly unaffected white populations who were the furthest from I guess the Mediterranean Sea. There's no parasite if there's no-one who doesn't have it, that would be a symbiont? At least it would be harder to convince anyone it was one if everyone had it. Unaffected populations make the case by contrast.

And maybe the Assyrians and the Romans never got to the arctic?

Plus, as I try to suggest about the Minoans, and later the east coast and/or Great Lakes Turtle Islanders, something about the Indigenous and Neolithic peoples has its own inertia and slows the spread. It wouldn't explain Crete or Kandiaronk's people, but perhaps the arctic isn't an attractive target for conquest, and if that were a factor, maybe it makes some sense that they are still here, and still largely Indigenous, the people of the arctic.

Ooh, there's a nasty thought, that global warming is placing these areas as targets now, listen to him about Greenland. I am very worried, this looks like endgame in many ways these days.

Jeff

Feb. 20, 2025

Appendix C – Allism as Alphaism

Written on social media:

. . . a thought just crossed my mind as though it were new, that Allism is a development of alpha-ism, and Allists all behave as though they have the alpha mentality to a degree, they all understand alpha-ism, and maybe that suggests a genesis, where some bottleneck happened and only a single family (or relatively so) of alphas made it through?

I don't mean the whole species bottlenecked at once, I'm pretty sure that didn't happen at the end of the ice age, but (as I pondered in the book, free and downloadable on profile), some localized little bottleneck, some population that got stranded somewhere by global warming. Then, when the peaceful sorts were pared away, something changed and this group of all alphas began to conquer the world.

I've seen things about genetic differences being found with alpha chimps or something, I think - so maybe I just found the gene for Allism. That's not the worst just so story I ever heard, I don't think, and in hindsight, how did it take me this long to take that rather obvious little step?

I blame the delays on the world swallowing obfuscation of Allistic thought. And also, I got some seriously short spikes on my ball.

Seriously, does it ever explain this aspect of their natures, that they always think they can force one another into everything, as though they are all born bosses, but all their positive hopes always go to social breakdown and war because it is in none of their natures to be subjugated, they all expect the freedom of alphas, and the authority of alphas, but their target audience are alphas too.

There is still the epigenetic toggle switch, alpha-ism is at least partially transmitted by spanking. I could tell the serving, top alphas of the world, if you want a docile population, abuse is not how you get that. You have to leave the herd alone. You abuse an alpha, you get a fight.

I don't like where this is going either, kids, eish, but you have to be able to think about these sorts of things.

Yeah, I must have thought this before and dismissed it as too easy, I suppose it was before the rest of the scenario fell into place for me, but this alpha thing fits too well, my problem solving daemon can't ignore it anymore.

So the majority has some alpha versions of genes, and perhaps everyone isn't full on, but without the old majority of passive sorts around there aren't the other versions of those genes also propagating, so with every generation of drift, mostly only the alpha versions grow and spread. Maybe everyone isn't full on alpha but full on everything else is disappearing. Not all by accident, the alphas find the betas etc., to be a liability in their

wars and having peaceful people around is less of an option to an aggressive alpha sort than living in constant war. Apparently.

As always, my point is constant war is NOT an option, we are too good at it, the planet is dying collaterally.

But the majority carries the genes and the tendencies - and then they are spanked, they are raised in an atmosphere of threat and violence. Spanking is one, abusive, with the psychological effects, and two - literal fight training, beginning about the time they learn to walk.

You hit an alpha, they learn what their genes are made to learn, to hit.

I'm not over excited, I realize this is still only a just so story, that's all we homespun sorts get to declare - but it's a good one and dare I say, anything is better for my mind than the existing just so stories of the majority. It's testable too, but they aren't looking for the genes for themselves and if they find them by accident they'll probably sterilize everyone without them.

The situation is hard to understand and problematic as Hell; it's at once deliberate as can be and also utterly unconscious.

You realize this is the opposite of the (deleted derogatory adjective) self-domestication theory as well?- it just struck me that that idea, while reasonable and all that, is part of them saying we're improving morally, like we're "getting better," because we're ordering ourselves to.

Back to genes for a quick update, if the majority carries something like alpha genes, that would explain no-one identifying them, they would dismiss what everyone has, the alphas are assumed to be a minority. That's still the geneticist's main tool, right, finding what stands out against the background, find what is not common, they're not mostly picking a common one and figuring out what it does to everyone, right?

Not sure about that, but I think it's still impossible to do that? I've sent a question to Sapolsky's podcast, asking him questions about alphas, like do they ever have it all their way, and everyone is a child of the alpha, and I wanted to wait for an answer to complete this chapter, but I don't think there's an answer coming, he hasn't answered any of my questions yet, I mean, it makes sense, mine will almost be definition not be the popular questions.

Again, download the book before I pass and stop paying for the domain, or before your government censors it.

Jeff

Nov. 5th., 2025

Note about history and theory: Crete took some leap in 3,000 BCE – the same time the rest of the world started looking warlike, like, I think I have to allow for a positive side of the gene? In the book I tried to explain the Cretan holdout against the pre-Greek until nearly the bronze age collapse, sure that the gene was present by then, there wasn't really isolation all that time, but it seems somewhat more of a stretch the further back I go, I feel like I'm asking y'all to just, "take it from me," the further back I go. And maybe the leap forward happened before any genetic mixing too.

Someone in a book I'm reading says you can see the roots of it all, but still, things simply suddenly seem to flower like that, they didn't need a reason, developments add up, sometimes all at once. It's about Crete, and it's the new stuff, about women, but it still sounds like a sort of serendipity.

Jeff

Dec. 5th., 2025

Appendix D - Allistics DGAF

I don't know how to tell you that you should care.

That's a thing that all the nice folks say to the trolls on social media, and it challenges me, it has been very hard to answer, but despite my failure to date, I cannot accept that it's impossible. I'm not saying that if a thing is possible that means I'm the guy who can do it, but it means somebody ought to try, and I'm afraid I am all I got. If I crash and burn, then you're not seeing this.

First, let's establish the problem: Allistic people do not give a fuck, they can't, they're not allowed, giving a fuck isn't, "strong," and they're all depending on each other to be strong. If they were born with any fucks to give, they quickly fall into debt, their fucks, past, present, and future become property of the powerful, stated in more biological terms, of the group. They are all robbed of their fucks, robbed of their caring – and also of an unobstructed sense of reality, of how things work.

It's a terrible double whammy, if they could see clearly, they'd know to care, if they cared, they would try to see better.

Allistics do not give a fuck about anything. I mean, not about anything real, like the actual future or the environment. They can get awfully passionate about bullshit like the afterlife, their mythological future, and their nations and parties, the political environment, but the real things, please be serious, they don't give a fuck about that. They don't have time for anything but human concerns, social matters and authority.

It's their own fault, not caring or seeing straight, I mean, if they knew it. We're talking about humans, caring about nothing but the orders and concerns of other humans – is there some other species with a role in this story, someone else to blame?

Ah, now, that would be rhetorical, and proper science requires answering the obvious ones at least once.

A lack of fucks is lethal

When an animal turns fearless, sometimes there is another species to blame, isn't there?

I don't remember the name of the creature, or the part of the world, but it's out there, there's a parasite that lives its cycle in birds and snails, and what the parasite does to the snail is hijacks its brain to send it straight into the mouths of the birds, drives the snail out of the litter on the ground and to the treetops where the birds feast on them, ingesting the parasite for its next stage – now I'm not certain everyone will grant the snail much of an inner life, but its behaviour looks like it lost its life-critical fear of open spaces and heights.

Then there's toxoplasmosis, which lives its stages in cats and rats, the rats apparently lose their fear of open spaces also, and even specifically of the urine smell of a major one of their predators, cats, so the parasite kills the rats' fear responses, making it easy for the cats to eat them and the parasite, it's the circle of life! People can also catch toxoplasmosis and there is a literature about people becoming fearless from it, walking into machine gun fire and whatnot, maybe daredevils.

So my thought is, we look like such a host, and is it really us, really our interests being looked after when we march fearlessly into our wars, directly like that, like the snail, as though some parasite wants our corpses?

But also, who seems to want us to be fearless more than we do?

It rather looks like we are at once the doomed host, driven toward the business end of the gatling gun, but also the parasite, driving one another to it, making ourselves fearless!

I wrote a book length book report and laid it out as a metaphor, Invasion of the Body Snatchers, kind of thing, but I was thinking about aggression, not fearlessness, and I hadn't thought of caring as fear, if you care, you fear for the object, care is fear - and then it looks just like those famous parasites, a shut down fear response more than a "lack of caring," which might not be a biology concept as much as a social one.

Thinking of it this way, like toxoplasmosis, I'm starting to wonder if it isn't somehow more than metaphor.

I wouldn't know how, it's genetics. I carry the metaphor on in the book like there is some sort of genetic entity, that the grouping of genes that makes the Allistic subtype somehow has its own agenda, its own path. I'm not trying to make a case for a "genetic parasite," that's quite a leap and I don't know enough to even play there.

I'm just saying, humankind at this moment does look like a snail racing up a tree or a rat sniffing around the sandbox in broad daylight, screaming about strength and freedom and burning the last of the crops for their wars before the water runs out. The worm tells the snail, No fear! Onwards and upwards!, and the microbe tells the rat, No fear! The world is yours!, and something is telling the majority human type, No fear! - and then what? Well, it's the actuarial sense that's missing, so I guess it's, No fear! You aren't causing the problems? Violence is good, actually?

I'm just saying that like parasites or saprophytes, something about Allism interferes with fear, making the species unable to see the dangers of what it does, hardening people against fear of . . . not heights, where birds find you, not the barn floor where the cat finds you, but . . . but I'm sorry, apparently against fear of the future?

I mean, it predisposes people away from worrying about the real future, perhaps replacing it with something to do with religion, a mythological future? Sometimes it seems like it messes with causality in general, I mean, I'll send you back to the top, they

DGAF about anything, they don't seem to fear anything. They watch their own kind being slaughtered on television for, "fun."

But it's usually specific, climb a tree, leave your burrow. Any biologist have an idea exactly what . . . control it might interfere with?

I'm sorry, we'll see this again. Let's leave it there, as metaphor, it just really, really looks like that. As for the question, is there another thing to blame, it's either this bit of fantasy, my genetic group parasite, or it's a simple no, this is simply people doing it to themselves. Not really very different, I suppose.

Right? Where were we?

Design intent

The definition of apathy, I don't know and I don't care, is a lock with no apparent key, in this case, an evolutionary blind alley.

It's nobody's, "fault," if you ask them, I mean, it's not a "fault," not a mistake, not by their reckoning, no-one is apologizing for it and no-one is coming to fix it, it's . . . design intent. When you don't care about anything, no-one can frighten you, people who do not give a fuck are very effective on the battlefield. It's a warrior mentality, a soldier is not supposed to care about anything but orders, and they mostly come from long lines of people who worked hard to create this dearth of fucks, to make sure they would be strong and wouldn't care about anything.

This is the only place they are allowed to put their fucks, no room for luxuries, it takes all your caring to fight the war, to stay alive, because wars are what keep us all alive, this is what the warrior caste knows, and so "caring," becomes fighting, and peace becomes, "violence," I mean, that soundbite has already been all over the news here on Turtle Island as the world melts down. I'm not going to engage in their fallacy of authority, but I'm not the only one to formulate such things, love is hate, war is peace, like that, am I? I know I read that sort of thing in a book once.

It was, "on purpose," as much as anything is, and as far as I can tell, they all think it's working, they're all "strong," which remains the goal, and I suppose not caring about anything is also why they don't learn anything, why "science," i.e. how things work, seems optional to them. They have no fucks to give, so it doesn't matter whether things are real or not?

I don't know how to tell you that that you should want to know what's going on. But I'll keep trying.

Nothing is real to normal people.

It's all some interactive storybook, they think they have free will to believe what they like about how the world was made, how people were made, and how the world works, and the cynicism in that, the lack of fucks given about that! I think I'll believe the world is a personality test for the next life, or no, I think I'll believe we're trapped souls from another planet, having previously failed testing, or no again, I think I'll believe we look different, but we are still exactly chimpanzees on the inside!

Plus, having chosen the fiction they like best, they think they can make it true by force. If you think it's up to you, what the world is, or if you think it doesn't matter, I don't know how to tell you a lot of things.

They write laws telling everyone what sort of people must exist (chimpanzees) and which sort are not allowed to be born (bonobos), they seem to believe how the world works is up to them, and if unauthorized things continue to happen, they'll just pass another law, tell them not to. Again, not any one of their own faults, there's no-one alive who started it – but having said that, no-one else can fix it for them. It's not their fault, but it's their opportunity, theirs alone, I fear, and so it's their goddam responsibility.

If they can find their way to it.

And maybe they can, in theory they could - but they fucking won't, for the reasons above, they don't know to care, or care to know.

Unfortunately, they've locked it up and thrown away the key: when their best self is to not care about anything and they don't need to learn anything, how can they be reached? They've tossed away their hearing aid and they're not answering our calls – and always today, and in every way, a record storm is coming and they don't care to hear about that either. The scientists, and the reality based people with their eyes on worldly things, we are trying to save them, if they only cared to hear.

Creating their own problems

It's not an easy matter showing the responsibility factor, they don't really know all this is going on, but it is their own behaviour making it happen and their own behaviour that makes them unable to perceive it – again, they've locked the note with the combination in the safe. They don't feel it's their fault that they require the hearing aid, and again, maybe that much is sort of true, but who else can solve their hearing for them, it's their opportunity to find it and put in, again, their responsibility and no-one else's, if only they knew it.

Wait. You don't necessarily know what I mean, how they're causing it, do you. No-one does, it's been left out of the conversation since “normal” people arrived. I suppose most people haven't been listening to me, I've said it a million times, I just haven't said it to anybody. Fair enough, my bad, I ain't exactly ruling the airwaves.

It's spanking

It's the cult of punishment, abuse hurts learning outcomes and when you have, "abuse is good for you," forced into your brain early, nothing real is ever going to fit right, and you are not allowed to redress the fault, on pain of punishment. Allistics DGAF about anything because after their abusive epigenesis (if you need a second to process that word, take it, I'm using it to mean when the environment gets its say in your development and you make environment appropriate choices from your genetic options as you grow up), after surviving the human environment of punitive abuse, they think bad is good and good is bad, so "good," people don't GAF.

They call this being, "strong," when abuse isn't "bad," or, "wrong," anymore in their minds, when it's necessary for life instead.

Reality in general doesn't fit after that, under that regime, so life becomes a purely social matter, reality can't be squared with social matters, so they simply live on the social side of life, where things don't have to be reconciled. Nothing matters but what people say and do, nothing is real, like the actual climate doesn't get a voice, only what humans say about the climate is real.

So, that's a problem, and if child abuse were against the law or something, perhaps they might think it matters but it's not illegal because they don't think it matters . . . someone invoked the film, *The Life of David Gale* online today, and that works too, they have handcuffed themselves and swallowed the key with that first and last lesson they get about life, that abuse is good for you. The examples keep coming, I'm sorry if I'm mixing them.

These humans take charge of one another's environments this way, providing the constant conformist pressure, the threat of punishment, but they cannot perceive the adaptations that result from these controlled spaces, they have the reigns and are pulling hard, but are apparently unaware that the horses are indeed turning – the Allistic knows they can't be, you see.

They have an opposing idea, Human Nature, which apparently is not subject to evolution or adaptation. Allistic people seem certain of two mutually exclusive things, that they must apply this punitive and selective pressure, but that Human Nature never changes.

I don't know what you can say about that, when people believe mutually exclusive things, but the point is they're rarely both true, and in this case, it's evolution that's real, and contrary to popular belief, Human Nature changes with every generation. A few murdered corpses in the deep past and the twentieth century's hundreds of millions of them do not indicate the same Nature, murder is not a binary, one is not the same as a million. People changed.

Human Nature

This last bit, I'm sorry all you clever, Allistic atheists, is identical to how theists think about people. Your difference regarding the man in the sky is pretty meaningless if you believe in some Human Nature where people must be controlled, yet do not change and adapt, if you and the theists are in agreement about real things, real, living human beings - and of course it doesn't make the theists right, it means you're all wrong, I mean all Allistic.

Allistic people DGAF, because as Jane Goodall liked to say, they don't believe what they do matters. Back to me, they don't realize that what they do changes what people are going to be, that's why it matters - and Jane is right, the majority sort do not seem to think it about themselves, you can't change people, they say. Totally normal thing to say, but it means evolution isn't real, adaptation isn't real, genetics aren't real - you have to leave the entire world out of the conversation to say that - but the majority type say it to each other all day long, repetition and consensus, these cognitive superpowers leave the real world far behind in the Allistic mind. "Good," people know you can't change people.

Right?

After they are forced to absorb how their child abuse is good for them, all real knowledge regarding ourselves, regarding people is unavailable to the Allistic mind, and they are left with the barren moonscape of Human Nature instead, where first we're all horrible, get used to it, and second, it does not change, so stop complaining, you're immutable, you're fine. You're horrible and you're fine.

Human Nature, the meme, lacks causality, and as normal a thing as it is to invoke, it's quite obviously not literally a real thing. Of course we all have some "Nature," that's a made up thing we can always apply - but people change, our natures change. The forever, "Human Nature," the meme, the idea, the brain path, represents a disability, an inability to perceive change.

This is impossible.

I'm trying to shock people, trying to slap them in the face, make them perhaps get a glimpse of what the trouble is and just how bad things really are, trying not to fawn and let everyone off the hook as I do it - but of course at least some will feel I'm simply slinging insults and picking a fight - I would assure them, my tiny percentage of the population is not trying to provoke the vast majority into a fight, please. This train of thought began more than fifty years ago, and for most of that time, I thought I was one of them, I thought, as they teach, that we were All the Same, and the idea has always been to solve this puzzle and so save us all - it has never been and still isn't about trying to hurt anyone or get rid of anyone - that's the Allistic solution, and to me, it's no solution but rather the entire problem and the solution means the opposite, it would be love and life.

I don't say that from a moral stance, I don't think it's unimpeachable, I think it needs an explanation and I will explain, if in negative exposure; that's the rest of this thing.

If they could stop the spanking, they could break the bind, they could know and care, if they stopped hurting they could care and if they cared they could know. But they don't so they don't so they don't. It's not a small matter, it's everything, different from the very bottom up from my non-Allistic mind.

Progress meme/what is "natural," is where you're headed?

If your mind is naturally biased towards a recent creation event (or if your mind isn't but that's what the whole world seems to think and alternatives never find you), then that's like a journey, it has a beginning, and first steps, and perhaps you feel that there will then be a destination, an ending, but you'd also want to think you're traveling from bad to good, from the jungle to some Heaven on Earth or other, perhaps a high tech Brave New World. You may talk about the past as though it were "nature," and rough and brutal and life not guaranteed . . . and you'd be hoping to break your programming and improve upon that nasty old natural way of life.

This is the progress idea, we may have been animals, and nasty and amoral, but we are ascending some ladder towards the bright future where we won't have to be like that, getting smarter and finding better ways to get along.

Right?

But what if that's not it?

I mean, not "if," is it. Creationism has been largely debunked, and evolution is what is real instead. I mean, it's evolution, and so what you think is, "natural," is what you're in serious danger of becoming. If that's "natural," you're in serious danger of allowing it, accepting it, and therefore selecting for it, and the supposed goal of the progress meme, new ways, become "unnatural," ways and will have an uphill battle - and all that would be the case if we were All the Same and if our brains lacked any biases - of course that is not the situation.

The progress meme is part of the false model, the creationist one, in that it postulates some initial state of things.

I'm sorry, but in real, evolving life, where we are all self creations, the progress meme is poison. The progress meme is a low self image rather than aspirational, and someone telling you used to be horrible but you're getting better after your punishments is like narcissistic gaslighting. Telling yourself that is self-gaslighting.

So if peace and reason are the destination and we all agree we are not there yet, but "Nature, rough in tooth and claw," is what is "natural," and our, "genetic legacy," then through selection, by accepting it - selection works, whether it's "natural," or not -

we are creating ourselves in the image of beasts, that's where our species is headed. That term, "genetic legacy," gives the whole game away; it's the opposite of evolutionary innovation.

This is exactly what the powers that be are doing, all over the white, western world right now, defending what they think is, "natural," a supremacy of, "strength," meaning a violent, chaotic world - and fighting progress as, "unnatural." Bad is good and good is bad in the cult of punishment, did I say that already, they think they are defending against some unravelling from some vague, previous created state, some initial condition, but a winnowing isn't what happens in a real, living and evolving world.

It's not some "purification," like they think, but an evolutionary selection event towards a world, "rough in tooth and claw," towards what they think is the awful past. In a created world, perhaps a purge makes things relatively better, if you purge the right thing - but in an evolving world, it isn't about the dead, it's about the living, and the living who perform purges are selecting themselves for violence and hatred, for rough old nature's main things - to be exactly the supposed past, to be more so like the awful "past," every generation.

So with every purge, the population becomes more warlike, the average majority type person feels angrier, less satisfied, more aggressive - besides being a huge tragedy, every genocide makes the conqueror feel worse, more frustrated, more like lashing out - it's a complete waste of effort and doesn't solve the dominant sort's perceived problems, in fact it makes them feel worse, less happy and more angry, every time.

Will they have to kill the whole world before they realize they carry their own problems with them, that it's their own evolution driving them mad, will they need that whole process of elimination? Thinking "creation," in an evolutionary world is poison, everything you do will make everything worse - and if you think, "creation," you won't even notice when it does. And here we are.

Do I have to say it, this is the opposite of the progress we are all hoping for. Third time: the progress idea is toxic gaslighting.

This is my frustration, that this framing of thinking we're getting better indicates a poor self image and then forgives us for it, and seems to insure that we never stop getting worse. Again, establishes you were worthless before but that they will make something useful of you, like the army, or a cult, or the criminal life, the formula for gaslighting abuse. The majority type, maybe seven billion of them, agree to see life this way.

I am sorry. That is the opposite of the whole world's hope, isn't it, but as they say, I suppose as we say, rather - hope is not a plan.

Not that there's a plan. It's still in the dreaming stages, I'm afraid: if they stopped being hurt, they could care, if they cared, they could learn and know, if they could learn

and know, they could stop hurting themselves, rinse and repeat. I can sort of describe the Gordian knot, but honestly, I have yet to find a way in. I've wasted my life thinking that they could know if only someone told them, I've learned the hard way and then solidified it with what I think is science, about neurotype that this is not the case, and now this is the knot I see and I know that sometimes there is no use for what your studies find when you find them, but that perhaps later someone else can do something with them.

Your endings have to be pathetic when you're trying to be honest.

LOL.

Jeff

Dec. 2nd., 2025

Appendix E - Religion, explained, or Evolution as Religion

It's not the afterlife, it's the next life, the next generation.

It's not your soul, it's your genes you need to be protecting, and not the way the warriors think, the way you would protect your soul is the way you protect your genes, by getting right with the world.

This is what the prophets have been trying to tell you when they talk about changing your ways, when you abuse, you harm your genes and so we are punished in the "next," life, meaning the next generation.

"Soul," in this sense, is a better definition for genes than the popular version, which is what, atoms, molecules, building blocks of some sort. This is life as religion here, in theory, how things may have been understood in the deeper past, before we became the warriors and lost the sense of things.

It's been a minute since any of my silly declarations like this excited me, but this seems like where I've always been heading, it's abysmal that it took so long.

This seems like where religion and reality have only just parted ways, where they are still nearly the same thing, religion and truth, maybe Allism and Autism, religion and evolution, your soul and your ever-adapting genes. It's always the differences we need to be talking about, but this what is almost common, two versions of what you do in this life creating what we get in the next, right? It seems like the crux of the problem.

I would have us do one long find and replace text, find "soul," and replace it with "genes," and somehow make it real for people, this would be my, If I could change one thing answer.

First I found an ironic way that the Adam and Eve creation business can be "true," because that's the story of the beginning of Allistic people, and now I think I've done the same for Heaven and Hell, the afterlife, that's "true," too, if you're talking about genes and a human Heaven or Hell that we see in the next actual life, in the lives of our descendants.

I mean, I'm surprised to see that the religious ideas are quite so parallel to the real ones, that the idea of sin and punishment is the same . . . shape, same configuration as creating a bad environment and adapting to it, surprised that the difference can be so textually small, next life for afterlife, like an error in translation. I fancy we've followed a divergence right back to the point where it began here, when both minds only just stopped working the same way.

Something goes badly when we codify how to live, when we attempt to record this knowledge and teach it it becomes fiction, optional, at least for the modern sort. Somehow real knowledge became, "just religion."

It's like when the Historical Age Humans [™] and God created each other, they stopped believing, stopped believing that what we do in this life makes our future life and this truth became fiction, became something the obviously fictional Man in the Sky said instead of the reality we lived in.

(I'm having an insight that folks are going to read this backwards, like I'm religious, lamenting the loss of religion, like Nietzsche, no, it's the opposite, I'm lamenting God and modern humankind's birth, not His death, I'm crying over the loss of the pre-religious truth we used to share with Earthbound life before God showed up and made fiction of the real world.

I confess, it sounds like Freddy, topics and language.

I think your soul is really your genes, but then I would have to rewrite the Ten Commandments, the rules could use a few more mentions of violence as that doesn't seem like a problem for your soul but it sure is for your genes.

"Thou shalt not kill," looks a bit lonely and irrelevant all by itself on that list, and it doesn't seem like the main theme, and anyway the dead don't have a real next life, it's the living whose progeny will be a little further from Heaven and closer to Hell, the commandments ought to have some focus on the violence practiced upon the living. Because evolution.

Such a small textual difference, soul for genes, afterlife for next life - but from some angles the difference seems no less than a focus on death over life.

It would seem more helpful if the basis for law banned things like beatings and torture as well, for your genes, both as punisher and as victim. It hurts more than the punisher's fictional eternal soul, it is a hazardous environment and affects their actual, physical, worldly genes in the next generations.

They don't call that "hurt," they figure they're adapting. But long view, we can see the human world is not on the path of healing. Some humans are adapting, but most of the world is just dying instead. We started talking about the afterlife and lost the real future, because protecting your obviously fictional soul has always been entirely optional.

My idea is that if mythology shows us the workings of the mind, and if humans can be organized into neurotypes, both of which I believe, then mythology is almost certainly neurotype dependent and the Bible and the Greek myths, etc., are probably not for Autistics or other sorts, those would be at least mostly Allistic myths.

The Chalice and Blade describes how the people of those times pointedly wrote new myths, upon the dominance of their, well, Eisler said, "social model," but neurotype seems far more real to me. It's what I rewrote the Chalice for. I think that the appearance of a new set of myths since the fifth millennium BCE points to a new dominant neurotype. I think we have to count afterlife schemes among the replacement myths, is today's rant, count them as something new and strange and . . . well, there is

no other word, and equal and opposite, if we were the doctors and they were the patients . . . patho . . . patholo . . . problematic. Maybe there has to be another word for a little longer, ha.

But I'm not here to condemn, the point is only to resurrect what was replaced. I just want the real next life back.

. . . processing . . . processing . . .

So what I'm after, I guess, is your "soul," would be your own, it's the individualist framing - whereas your "genes," means your children and all of humanity into the future, it's communal.

If we actually protect this thing, call it what you will, you are protecting community, and if you decide it's "just religion," and blow it off while still somehow telling yourself you're saving your own soul through some side deal with God, you are abandoning community, making life an everyone for themselves situation.

You know I think it's the state of human childhood that forces us all to choose this, that when your own genes, your own parents attack you, that is the most logical conclusion you can draw, is that you're on your own.

So it's genes, it's neurotype - but it's not just hardware, it's environment - and we control our environment, which puts us in control of our genes and our neurotype. It is our actions and choices that have made us what we are and we could turn this around, turn it any direction we like, if we could only know we're doing it, if we could only pull our heads out of our fictions.

It's frustrating to glimpse this double bind, to see this logical trap, this Murphy's Law joke we live in, but I can't find another path to real hope.

Thanks for listening, if you did. I'll repeat the punchline: not here to condemn.

I just want the real next life back. Wanted, maybe.

Jeff

Dec. 26th., 2025

Open Letter to the Power

There is no quick way to say this stuff; please bear with me.

I think I know what's going on, you're scared. We're all in this jar together and it's shaking, so you're looking at me, I mean the party is over, there are no more unexploited horizons and resources are limited, so you're looking at me and what was it, me and seven billion other folks? I get it. I mean you have all the data in the world, you ought to be scared. All I have is your scraps that you want me to have, and reading between your lines of propaganda, and I know enough to be scared.

And so you're going traditional, applying the tried and true response, it's never let you down. Or you wouldn't be here, right? And I know, you wouldn't have to do it, if only they would bloody do what they're meant to, but they're forever going mad and trying to bite the feeding hand, aren't they?

Hmm. That rolled off the tongue a little too easily, but really, it's no secret how the ruling classes think, is it?

Bear with me, I think I have something, I think I've figured something out. Despite that you and your sort have nearly obscured every last bit of what is real from people, I think I have managed to read between the lines and figured out what is really going on, and in that framing, surprisingly, we all sort of want the same thing, we could all benefit from the same knowledge and the same actions. I know, and despite it's where I've always been heading, I'm surprised too. The journey is long but eventually, suddenly you're there.

Why do the subjects constantly reject their station? Why are they so sure they can do better and when have their revolutions made things better? Am I right?

I think I can answer these eternal questions.

I'll have to retract, "eternal," in the process, but you know what I mean.

First of all, humans are not all one sort, there has never been any study or any scientific theories to prove humans are all one sort, that's not a science argument, not a reality based argument, that's just a property of one of the types to think it, to apparently be born certain of it, or at least certain that it ought to be that way. It's not an argument, it's a clash of genes, and different sorts of humans, importantly, different between the ears.

I'll have to modify, "born certain of it," at some point, it suggests forever, and that's not true, but it's close enough. If it were really that simple, if they were truly certain, one would have to question why they feel they constantly have to reiterate it to everyone and to themselves. But you know what I mean: it's practically the only available thought on the subject, that people are all the same, because your born certain of it type rules the world.

All of the majority sort's wisdom regarding people falls under that certainty. I suspect it is definitive of neurotype, what we think about people, how we think about people, and as I said, I'm certain it is definitive of the majority type. But this is not to expand and globalize here.

There's a particular bit of people knowledge we are concerned with regarding the question of the great, untameable unwashed, and it is the authoritarian, alphabetical social structure of many intelligent creatures. The alpha/leader model that we see in mostly mammals, and perhaps most saliently in primates. Not everyone thinks humans have alphas, I think that's what the scientists say, we don't - but you think we do, don't you?

A lot of people do, and an outsize number of them think the alpha is them, and this is funny, of course it's the men. You don't hear much about human female alphas, do you? Do today's alpha men seem to prefer a passive wife? That's a new thought, maybe a distraction, if it doesn't go anywhere, we'll edit that out. My line of thinking is always finding more and when I edit to purge, the thing gets longer.

A lot of people think that, surely the Power thinks humans have alphas and they are it. That science says, "no," is understandable, the normal signs may not be present, the Illuminati are not necessarily bigger and stronger than anyone else, heredity of the alpha is never clear . . . I think they've identified alpha genes in some primate, maybe chimpanzees? some difference from the zeta sorts and found no such difference in us.

Nevertheless, many of are born certain about it, aren't we? This is what I think I can answer.

Humans do have alphas, they don't have zetas. I mean, not anymore, almost.

The majority sort, eighty-five percent of current humankind are alphas. Women too. Of course an alpha is born certain of their own existence. Of course they wouldn't find a genetic difference if it were just about everyone.

Have you heard about the orangutans' situation regarding the alpha business?

I only heard it very recently, on Sapolsky's podcast, apparently orangutans are alpha-flexible like those tropical fish are gender-flexible. Orangutans lose an alpha, somebody else steps up, and grows all the signs, the big face: they all have the alpha genes. There is cheating, like among the baboons and the chimpanzees (well, not exactly like that), but it doesn't slow the drift of the alphas genes, it's too late, at some point in orangutan history, the alphas had it all their way and all of today's orangutans are the alpha's children.

You see where we're going?

The proletariat cannot learn their place because it is not their place, not biologically. They are not zetas or any such, it's the old saying, every Greek is a king - because nearly every human is an alpha. It is in human history too (perhaps nearly

within memory). At some point the alphas had it all their way, and most of humankind are their children. Most, because there are still a few uncontacted families in the world, plus different currents of human genetics, families of the majority, alpha sort can still produce passive sorts, somehow. Still, it looks like evolutionary drift, the alpha genes want us all, and given time, they will get us. Again, the point here is they already got most of us.

Perhaps a tangent, but necessary: the orangutan population has been considerably pared down; perhaps this wasn't very long ago in their history, either, and there is a hint from anthropology, about violent social disintegration as an effect of violent colonization, and my writing, usually directed less specifically would even ask if our change this way has somehow caused theirs? Good Lord, the things this thinking allows me to say!

You, the actual current serving alphas are living an alpha's worst nightmare, as an orangutan or a currently "normal," human, you have no willing subjects, and every other ape of your species out there wants your wife and your head and your job, no wonder you're scared. You should be. I am. I have said throughout my search, that spanking is the great equalizer, that even the super rich have a real reason to be aggrieved. The myth that you're happy hides the truth, no human is allowed to be happy and no alpha can be happy in a world of alphas where their even their parents greet them into the world with a fight.

I'm not going to talk about what's right and wrong, this isn't a moral appeal, I'm just telling you how things work and what happens, everyone is a moralist, you can decide for yourself, but so far, you haven't had the right information and so you've been making all the wrong choices.

Here's the thing. You can't fail, tried and true response is what got you here. Your purges, abuse, and threats pare the population down to nothing but aggressive alpha competitors, because evolution.

If it's a tournament, with a limited number of entrants and a time limit, sure, fight and kill your way to life, but that is not the situation, is it? The problem is these living, unruly humans, and you don't make them passive by beating and killing them, that's fight training and it's an evolutionary filter that produces nothing but alphas, and they get more alpha all the time. Every time you purge them, first, you get the easy ones first, the real threats are harder to kill, concentrating and growing strength in your supposed enemies, and also the survivors get sharper and your situation gets more dangerous. You are providing exactly the environment to make people ungovernable, indeed, unsustainable.

Most of my blogs end in the mandatory, "When you succeed in killing the world, you'll die too," trying to make it in your interest to change in Darwinian terms, but truly if things don't end and manage to continue, they will still just keep getting worse for the living, more hungry alpha warriors with fewer zetas to grow the food.

If you're born certain that people are all the same, then it is part and parcel of it that you are certain they don't change, or how then would they all stay the same? It's creationism or something very closely related to it that is the premise of the human alpha brain, and I suppose the alphabetical social structure is part of it, it's a common genetic alpha brain path, but you Illuminati, the Power, you need to alter that path, you've missed the history and that world is in the past. You need to understand that you cannot treat a population of alphas like you would a population of zetas and expect anything to work the same way.

Every king surely tells his children, know your people, but if you think they are born with a passive response, you do not know your people. As long as you think that but they are actually born with an aggressive one, you will use the stick, picking a fight and brewing revolution when the carrot would bring the passive response you probably actually wanted. This premise in your mind, that there are natural subjects, isn't true. It obviously isn't working, but it's one of those ideas that isn't getting reasoned away because it isn't reason that put it there, it comes with the alpha gene set.

This is the bit, the common ground.

It could be true. You could stop breeding dictators and revolutionaries, you could shut down your alpha factory and see the resurgence of a more passive and sustainable human, a human who you don't have to be too afraid of to take your boot off of their neck. Wouldn't that be lovely? Even in the alphabetical model, aren't there supposed to be a majority of people simply living there lives, like that was worth doing in itself? Isn't the fighting just supposed to be your job, so most of us can just keep doing that?

I think even if we found our way back that simple, brutal animal arrangement, it would be an improvement. I think even having some alphas wouldn't be as bad as having all alphas, so I think my desire for some peace and the current serving alpha's desire for power with some order - I think we want the same thing, a passive population. I know, crazy.

I'm going to lose my red card over this, aren't I?

I mean, it doesn't look like that now, presently, we look dedicated to the alpha factory. I'm trying to cover both possibilities, that as alphas, you think that having so many wars that you just start to say, "the" war, like "the sea," is good, you are sure that war is your best life, and the chance that it's a series of misunderstandings, again, even the scientists seem to say there's a world of zetas out there to be ruled when they say we have no alphas. If you knew different, you'd try to change your approach, wouldn't you?

Could you?

I'm saying, even your cynical, brutal vision of primal man with one big boss and everyone in their place would be better than what we actually have now thanks to your ham handed attempts to create it out of the wrong genetic material.

What those attempts have been comprised of, again, that's usually framed in a moral manner, which the Power simply has their own moral answers for, but it's simply been violence, your one size fits all answer for everything, and it's been giving you the opposite of what you supposedly want, your precious supremacy is gone, you've made equals of them, trained them how to be strong. You gave away your special genes with your prima nocta, banging the slave girl behaviour, and now despite that is only half of a social equation and the other half is nearly gone, you are still busy growing your half of a whole that no longer exists.

If you do this, your usual response when the jar shakes, if you continue as you are, the living and your problems with the living only get worse. Your call, of course.

Jeff

Dec. 22nd., 2025