

Cryptic Anthropos

*Mythopoetic CosmoGenesis
for the Post-Global Man*

All rights reserved by
Khepri Rising Enterprises
Published in X Isle
Copyright 2011
ISBN # 978-1-257-65769-8

1st edition 2011

Introduction:

How exactly is property created? It appears that there is a finely divided line drawn in the proverbial sand. It puts into focus a frame for people as it does for animals; it says this is mine, and this is not mine, or that is yours and this is not yours. The creation of property is in essence one of these walls that we have evolved to place and promulgate throughout much of society. Its features are two-fold, it helps to create society, however it can also have an antithetical swing when marauders see the wealth gained from walls and seek to pirate it for themselves. What is needed then is increasingly un-climbable walls. Some walls we can see, others are more conceptual structures. A wall could be a tunnel, or an occult initiation ritual. A wall could be our token economy and how we are reliant on money or powerless by an absence of it; a mob mentality during times of war or peace that we are unable to rise above, or a paradigm that eludes our visual perception of it. A wall could be the structures instituted to keep the have-nots from getting things what the haves already have. How the haves have, and whether they have swindled or killed for it is of little consequence. The fact is that they have, and would like to continue their evolutionary advantage over others in their species that have not.

In “Guns Germs and Steel”, Jared Diamond wonders why it was that the army of Cortez conquered the Mayans and not the other way around. How was it that the Spanish sailed to South America and conquered the Mayans mostly with their germs rather than the other way around? In the conceptualization of the factors that

combined to give the Europeans an unchallengeable advantage by crops, livestock, timing, and geography; add to this Alexander the Great conquering nearly the entire known world; and the ways that the people that he conquered would be greatly enhanced by the spread of Hellenistic thought, philosophy, and culture. Later Rome would have their own insidious dialectic of civilizing features combined with that of destruction, even the very creation of Roman citizenry would itself act as a great wall for those not considered a citizen, and protected by the Roman legion.

This leads me to ponder: “Why the Europeans rather than the Chinese?” And I think here the answer is elusive but in the end rather simple. The tower of Babylon was said to reach to the sky as it was meaning to be built before it crumbled to the ground. The foundation that it was built upon was not strong enough to withstand the weight. The most important thing in building structures is often enough that which is never seen, but lies below ground. Without a proper footing and foundation the physics of weight displacement crumbles. Weight spreads at equal dimensions much as a pyramid stands. Perhaps we may never figure out exactly how the Egyptians built the pyramids but sure as shit we don’t have to look very far to understand why they are still standing.

The dimensions of proportional weight distribution are nearly flawless, and so the foundation is essentially seamless. The weight distribution of a wall is somewhat different. The metaphorical weight distribution of a wall stands as apportioned directly on backs of slaves that were used to build the wall, and remains standing as long as there are slaves for which to prop the wall up. The creation of walls, by their very essence implies a citizenry which has been degraded and manipulated for the promulgation of those belonging to the elite classes of societies. Where with the old world the human species was dependent more or less on the physical punishments and

rewards, uses of chains, flogging devices, and the noticability of their skin color if they defected and tried to run away; today its much simpler. Slaves can essentially move around at will, unless they go past a boundary which not a wall serves as the obstacle, but instead a law, and the enforcement of it.

Herein lies for me one of greatest ethical conundrums of the 21st century, as I have written already in **‘Meaning and Relatedness’**: “One has either to accept the Holocaust as an abomination against humanity or condone and absolve it of any true value judgment. To one who accepts the Holocaust as morally repugnant there are essentially 2 things that one must learn from the Holocaust: that the Holocaust represents the purest source of evil known in human history and everything that happened in the Holocaust was essentially “legal” according to German Parliamentary government record; in as such the principle to be learned is that: *being lawful does not equate with being ethical.*”.

It is one of the goals of this work to educate, elucidate and make connections to further understand our place and position; and what the Holocaust should have served to illuminate, but heretofore has been ill coming, essentially: How should one separate and define “the sacred difference between what is ethical and what is in accordance with the law, however unethical... or to intuit and serve with justice the boundary?”, (Meaning and Relatedness). Naturally what is ethical has found little common ground in a culture predisposed to relativistic, plural truths, quantum physics, and postmodern man as we have found him. Postmodern man’s ethics were simply blown away. All of sudden Lao Tzu seemed to sound better and better “*decrease and decrease again until you reach non action, and through non action no action will be left undone*”, therefore he proposed, since progress was impossible that there was no reason for action, and

therefore that ethical action consists in to “sit and make progress in this”, (Tao Te Ching, Lao Tzu) .

After the bombs hit Nagasaki and Hiroshima, or through the demolition of the architecture of Cecil De Mile; through the “art works” of Marcel DuChamp or Baudrillard’s “self referentiality” of the media, we understood the impossibility of the pure and untouched, reality or any sense at all of what was formerly believed to be “progress”. With increased capabilities of technology, there lies an increased potentiality for destruction and evil. And I guess even evil is a rather relativistic term, so by evil I will clarify and say that what I mean when I use the term “evil”, may be compared to its purest incarnation available to my knowledge through intuition, that which was manifested in the Nazi Concentration camps. I think that they should serve a purpose, to further understand the nature of evil, if one accepts this; and to try to as a species gain a greater paradigm; *that we are all responsible for our actions.*

And I think that what lie within this responsibility is that we educate ourselves so that we can be more informed and be able to make more qualitatively distinctive decisions, and thereby have more tools to apply better methodologies and eventually make even better decisions. Logically speaking I’m torn by ethics in a Lao Tzu dilemma, however as the human species is a particular species, and as the works of Richard Dawkins (The Selfish Gene and The Blind Watchmaker) and Edward O Wilson (On Human Nature and Sociobiology) demonstrate, nature and society and the way that we relate to each other is based primarily on a biologically-evolutionary basis and that our social context has revolved around our biological and vice versa.

It seems that there is an order given by way of ethics as that to which we are naturally evolved and evolving. By this I mean to say,

you can't tell a squirrel to just stop eating acorns, or to sprout a peacock's feathers. They are as they have evolved. Maybe he will eat carrots if you take away the nuts and he gets hungry enough, but generally the animal is composed as such so that he can manipulate a niche within the environment, because 1) if they stopping doing this, the use of their "instinct", that they will find themselves "extinct"; and 2) the basis of their evolution itself was that there was a niche to exploit; that is, that they fulfilled a purpose. With this in mind I would like to present what I believe is a "New Creation Story" or a "Mythopoeic-CosmoGenesis for the Post-Global Man" and that which I believe is necessary for the coming generation to understand before it is too late and *love itself is destroyed*.

I herein propose an utter novelty of conceptualization; that it was the sexual mutation known as "**cryptic ovulation**" that would change forever what we know as our very unique species. For an understanding of why I believe that this is by Occam's Razor the best answer, I will attempt to demonstrate the unique faculties of our human species as they relate to other species and through a theoretical model of plausibility suggest that the simplest answer and solution to the enigma of our evolution is in fact "cryptic ovulation". As for an overview, the key factors which discriminate us from the rest of the animal kingdom are these: "cryptic ovulation", the existence of fathers, the existence of marriage, and various physical differences including the size of genitals as well as the size of brains, species specific sexual strategies and mating rituals.

The basis of sex and how these factors relate to our sense of civilization will act as markers to plot the landscape of our unique transformation. The possible repercussions for a study such as this I believe can have the effect so as to lead to a more understood species,

a greater freedom in understanding, a change in paradigm and even perhaps the faith to believe in something. I herein propose that this creation story which has considerable plausibility be the basis of a new understanding of our species, and as the Bible and other Religions have offered cosmological and theological reasons for the way things are and few people believe them in earnest because as with the advent of the scientific revolution and the big bang theory, they carry not hermeneutic plausibility. I think what is common sensical and easily understood, as a superior idea has the chance of changing all our ethics, and could theoretically bridge the existent gap that pervades like the abyss Da'ath between law, ethics, and biology. And herewith we enter our new model, a creation story for the "Post-Global man".

Cryptic Ovulation, Our New Creation Story

About 7 million years ago, the beginnings of what would become “man the tool maker” separated from his primate ancestry; the questions are how and why? Something happened and it necessarily changed the entire way that we are, the way we perceive things, how we relate to each other and essentially that which we know of as “reality”. It wasn’t necessarily intentional beyond nature creating mutations to our complex being as a vehicle of change. The change was by necessity nature’s work; that it survived and what was born from it is the most spectacular of achievements. History will bear that in that age we evolved the facets of distinction which though unforeseeable, would guide the very relatedness that a being of self-transcendence and transformation, would emerge from and through that would emerge civilization itself. And out of civilization and the civilizing nature that became of this mutation, arose nearly everything that we have as humans, even our very sense of self and our ability to stretch our minds in our attempt to contemplate our own evolution.

What could this mutation have been? What could change a species to the point where they may fight wars by pushing buttons, extract energy by breaking up and containing the energy within atomic fission, for benevolent ends, or ends of war; to destroy life

itself; or to be able to use micro-waves to heat food, assembly lines, engines, the harnessing of different types of energy and their capabilities, engineering, logic, law, a sense of order, auditory language, our token economy, written language, complex rites of passage, both mythical and liturgical; existential ruminations, epiphanies of transcendence, religion, cosmology, debates about the meaning of life, propaganda and people control, invention which can propel us into outer space, the ability to manipulate plastic so that one can gain knowledge instantaneously by pushing buttons, or talk to someone in nearly real time who is near a half globe away by cellular technology and satellites planted in outer space, brain surgery and the synergistic creation of drugs to change ones mood, being, or personality; the understanding of elements through chemistry, to the mastery over the reproductive cycle, the production of books, communication and transliteration of meaning through different languages, complex understandings, cross cultural moral relativism and arguments between fellows who lived centuries and even millennia apart, to man's historiographical search for freedom over the multitude of junctions, of which have made themselves apparent and this even the grasping of an understanding which is capable of synthesizing what it is about life and how we may relate to it over the course of the last 7 million years through fossil evidence, the procuring of carbon dating, philosophies, heresies, civilizations discontents, marauders, pirates, saboteurs, and genocidal maniacs, to sit as we now sit, between a one living and a one dead, talking about the meaning of meaning and its meaning.

What could this mutation have been to create such an absolute difference in a species as compared to its progenitors? And at the beginning of everything we must in the end search, apprise and evaluate the elements, that made us this way; honor and hold them as sacred. One of the thesis's of this chapter is that sex differences that evolved within the human species have created the socio-biological

basis which have in turn created the world, and each other as we currently understand them to be: that inherent within these sex changes, the father was born as Khepri-Rising out of the primordial soup of the species of which the female conned to make the male stay and father his children and I say this not by way of absolutist condemnation, but in praise of its absolute ingenuity and resourcefulness of values. In no other species is the male involved to such a degree and interaction, in areas of protection, and guarding, through the creation of an acceptable moral standard and agreeance within societies about acceptable behavior; and that have organized primates, the first of its kind in the raising of a species of late developing to adult stages and by having an exclusive relationship that can and may consist of a task master, trade apprentice, moral guru, key resource, friend, judge, arbiter, the all important role model, among many others not mentioned and perhaps not conceived of as yet.

The influence of the father staying around a mother and their children; and cooperating with each other for mutual benefit is what might be considered our first instance of a **“Corporation”**. The mates are tied together through kin, marred, married, destroyed, and become one, half of a whole; for the greater realization that monogamous human pair bonds stretch throughout the life of the individuals, parents, children and grandparents alike; multi-generationality allowed for many new innovations to happen. The game theory additive is that the two people and two families coalesced in furthering the influences and the chances of prosperity through many different devices. Dowries, social support, work connections, information sharing, trading, bartering, opportunities through an expanded network, and the value of a social structure which can allow for individuals to feel protected and due respect as one has done in deed, and to demand this respect, if need be by male aggression.

What occurred at the tribal level is the very theory of property; that which was off-bounds to others, while at the same time belonged to one; was valued by others, and yet not taken by them. How did this evolve? Without a suitable amount of aggressive reservoir, the ape does not achieve the needed threat to deter others from taking from him his property. The threat can be utilized in a number of ways, and of infinite ingenuity. Property is here defined as that which belongs to another, but is not limited to that of land, food, or home. Property is and has always included from nearly its very conception, beyond the immediate needs, those of sex and food, which are temporary and fleeting, including the likes of other beings, other humans, and pre-humans alike.

In view of today's current child support laws, the child has the right to the same standard of living as they would have had, had the family remained intact; that is that they have property even as infants equal to the property lost of *will and choice* formerly possessed by the man. Current political debates circle around whether or not a fetus or embryo should be considered a human being and afforded with due regard, the rights in the prochoice v prolife battle. It is a profound dynamic which recognizes the female's soul choice to abort and gives men not the same choice to abort support. Why? We recognize this, the child's right to maintenance, support and the ability to become, because it is engrained in our very being. The question is "how did this come about?"

Perhaps our very first understood property was as libertarian ethics would support our very own selves. We had the right to resist oppressors, and likewise the freedom to attempt at oppressing others. We owned our choice, and our ingenuity to react to our environment, and the strategies we used to succeed, survive and thrive. In a very general sense, property could be considered food, but I would here like to make a qualitative difference and state that it appears to me

that *the access to food rather than the food itself is a property*. Some items of worth are simply transitory and need not be possessed over long durations of time. In Lawrence of Arabia₂, it was the Bedouin well which was held in high regard, and it was protected by penalty of death which was seen in the death of the Hazame of the BediSalem, (a competing Arab faction). "He knew he could not drink from our well. He was nothing. The well is everything" (words of Omar Sharif's character).

So where as a temporary copulation is the temporary usury of another's reproductive cycle, or a meal is the temporary using of a resource and/or resourcefulness; property would instead be looked at as both the right to the exclusive or near exclusive right to a valued commodity over a length of time and as well the prevention of another from defiling or using the commodity without due permission. So to use the Jane Goodall's chimps of Gombe as an example, the stick that they used to fish insects from the hole of rotted trees is not a property, because its value lies only in its use by the particular chimpanzee. He can find many other quite useful sticks, he just happened to grab the one he did. Whereas the stick is a tool, it is not really a property. It is not something that the chimp values enough to exclusively possess and keep other chimps from using it. Now take the same chimp, and place him in a drought, and hard times where he stands at the only rotted tree, and the only insect bearing hole, and the only food source available to other hungry chimps and what we have here in this tree and insect bearing hole is a very valued commodity. Now if he could hold onto this commodity and use it and prevent others from using it, then he has essentially achieved a property. It is the game theory dynamics of survival and the need to procreate which determines what is and is not properly understood to be a property. *To be a property the entity must be something which has value with relative longevity, and can be possessed. This is what transforms an entity into a commodity.*

Why “cryptic ovulation” was so essential to the human species was that it essentially created the two most important commodities and necessitated the need for trade. This trade came in the form of a relationship between chimps which was exclusive, or nearly exclusive, and of considerably significant duration. The trade was essentially that the male gave his access to future resources to the female, and in return he received continual sexual access to her. How and why did this happen? Again the answer appears to be “cryptic ovulation”. In the *Origin of Species*, Darwin focused almost exclusively on Natural Selection as the model through which evolution was propelled, but as an avid collector of the different kinds of beetles since he was a child, he could not explain their diversity through Natural Selection alone. In his later work, the *Descent of Man*, he dedicated the last two thirds of the work to Sexual Selection as the motivating factor driving species differentiation and evolution. For some 70 years this mode of evolutionary change was largely ignored by the scientific community. It was not until the later work of August Weisman in “*The Evolutionary Theory*” was published in 1904 that Sexual Selection would resurface as a creditable element in theory.

Perhaps the most familiar example of Sexual Selection was that of the colorful plumage of the Peacock. The female peahen chooses her mate by the colorful display of his feathers as he struts to best attract ovulating peahens. The most successful male can and often does mate with many females, who because they do not depend upon him for anything other than his genetics truly have no other basis for selection other than the quality of his proud display. One of the more popular theories of this is WD Hamilton’s “attractive son theory”, which states that if the female has a son, that if she chooses the best available specimen, than he will more likely be able to likewise mate with other peahens in adulthood as his superior colors and designs will be genetically carried from the male.

Other theories include the “Fishers Runaway Model” which denotes that species selection can follow many different paths, but that the qualities selected lead down a particular path which will reinforce certain characteristics, which over time show a progressive propensity to change in a certain and distinctive direction. There have been a number of prominent scientists who have tried unsuccessfully to apply this theory to human evolution. The list includes the likes of E O Wilson, Richard Dawkins, Nicholas Humprey, Andy Hiten and Richard Alexander. But as Geoffery Miller has shown in his fresh new look at Evolution “a single sustained runaway event would have been at least a hundred times too fast to explain human brain evolution”, (Miller, The Mating Mind 2000).

Briefly, what we know of the human species; that which differentiates it so critically and biologically from other species are these facts: the *size of the brain* is abnormally large in matter, quality and potentiality; the female illustrates an ovulatory exception to the animal kingdom known as “*cryptic or concealed ovulation*”; the male becomes a *father* rather than just a sperm donor is unique; and our species specific *desire to copulate* whether or not the female is showing that she is fertile is also something that is rarely found elsewhere. What my brave new theory would like to expose is that these elements that are unique to the constitution of human beings, are not isolated in their relationship to each other, and form the most interesting of all theories in my view as to the very basis of our evolution. But before we begin I would first like to counter one of the main objections to this theory as I see it. It is the brain’s evolution as being in two very pronounced eras, and these being in the last 2 and half million years.

The size of the brain organ inside the human skull is absolutely astounding. If one were to comparatively view other animals of similar sizes one is immediately awed by the sheer

awesomeness of the human brain. By way of analogy, it would be like comparing the shits and brains of humans and dinosaurs. To look at a human's brain and shits is to look at an inverse chart of a dinosaurs shits and brains, which leads us to conclude that they really did have "shit for brains". Can you even imagine the quantity or the size of the flies that would have taken to eat a single turd laid by either a Brontosaurus or a T-Rex? Holy mud pies, right? (and just for further reference, the new depiction and model of the T-Rex is almost undecipherable in appearance from the mother of my child's divorce attorney, I actually call him Peter when I see him).

As the human brain grew *a cubic inch every hundred thousand years*; according to EO Wilson, "*No organ in the history of life has grown faster*", (Wilson, Human Nature p 87), the need for menopause grew with the increasing mortality for females in child birth, as the head of the baby grew to proportions which made child birth increasingly more dangerous. A sperm whale has a brain of 18 pounds, humans by comparison have a brain which characteristically weighs 3 pounds. The proportionate nature of the brain to body mass is exponentially greater than any other species.

The incidence of menopause does not happen anywhere else within the entire animal kingdom, yet it happens as a fact within our own. Females can bear children to a certain age and no longer. The socio biological value of this feature is that within a species that has a high mortality rate in child birth, that if the mother died while in older pregnancy, she would not be able to care for the children that she had already. So the termination of the reproductive cycle actually enhances evolutionary fitness. I posit an incomprehensibility of how this evolved universally within the human species, and yet it would only make sense that something like this could have possibly found a niche within a species that was evolving brain capabilities at such a warp speed and rate as that life had never before witnessed.

If the initial catalyst for our evolution was cryptic ovulation, why did the brain take so long to develop in brain mass so much later in its evolution? Think of the brain as a computer. The memory and operating systems of a computer are at first limited by its hardware. The computer need not use all of its capacities on the hard drive, but as more and more software is installed, an increase in the hardware will need to be built not only to store what is currently capable within by the software already in use; but must as well prepare for new updates on new software, increased need for RAM, and other software that must need be booted into the computer. It is always safer to have more hardware then you need, this way you don't need to worry about system shutdown, freeze ups, slowing down, or even the presence of viruses which can with increased hardware simply be partitioned off, isolated and separated so the system does not incur any serious setbacks.

Setbacks in evolutionary terms could mean death for the individual, or extinction for the species. Current estimates judge that we use 3 percent of our brain. That is, that we have a far larger hard drive than we currently have software for. The need for more hard drive space presents itself only when the available space and cooling system of our brain necessitates. Here I am proposing that the rapid incline in our brain development was in itself a delayed reaction set off by an event millions of years beforehand and that it was only by the increased demand for and use of the brain that somehow caused the evolutionary expansion to further encompass the ever growing faculties necessitated by an increasingly complex understanding and interrelatedness to both the world around pre hominid man, and the inter relatedness of the species itself increasing in complexity never before known. With that said let us begin this wonderful exploration into the very roots of our separation and creation as unique among the animal kingdom, and let us commence with “cryptic ovulation”. And for illustration, we will use a socio biological comparison to see

how these and other peripheral elements and events collide, collude, run in correlation, and are contrasted with that of our primate ancestors. The comparison is very illustrative.

Ovulatory Signaling: is used as the basis in which a primate becomes aware that a female is in the “heat” of her reproductive cycle and may be fertilized. It is necessary for this awareness to happen, otherwise if the male knew not when to fertilize the female, reason would say that no offspring would be born, and therefore the species would go extinct. Every other known species on this Earth has the ability to instinctively distinguish periods of fertility because the ovulatory cycle is distinguishable. Let me further clarify this, there are a few lower forms of life where the male is uncertain exactly when the female is fertile, but in these species the female does know, therefore it is not completely concealed from the species as it is in humans. I think this fact has been overlooked for too long, as it is startling to say the least and hardly a coincidence within our evolutionary history.

One could even say that cryptic ovulation as a mutation is anti evolutionary. What benefit exactly would cryptic ovulation provide? The irony of nature is that DNA is subject to copying errors or mutations, which may or may not have a value. Some mutations which don't show an increased value and advantage in evolutionary fitness simply will not increase disproportionately as compared to those mutations which do show a value. The value is not an abstract value, premeditated or by design, but rather a chance phenomenon. If it adds value it survives and perhaps thrives, and if it is maladaptive it is simply discounted and thrown into the evolutionary ash heap of extinct species and useless mutations.

In the primate order of which we evolved from, our 2 closest genetic forebears are the chimpanzee, which we share a genetic

similarity of 98 percent, and the gorilla, which is thought to have broken off from the chimpanzee strain some 2 million or so years before the human species did. The chimpanzee was still evolving and different in ways than how we currently understand them to be; much as the 2000 or so breeds of dogs came from the archetypal wolf; so too this chimpanzee strain which would form the deviations of the Bonobo, or pygmy chimpanzee, those which would eventually become homo sapiens, and those which would morph to become the gorilla, amongst others which perhaps became not because their deviations did not find quite as successful a niche within their respective environments. What is startling is that these three bi-products of the morphable chimpanzee type primates have something in common. They all have different shades of **ovulatory noticability**, and *as well these shades have taken part in adapting species specific mating and social structures which complement this, their unique ovulatory differentiation.*

Amongst the 3 primates mentioned, there are 3 types of ovulatory signaling. "Slight ovulation" is exemplified by the Gorilla, which separated itself from the Chimpanzee approximately 2 million years before what would eventually become homo sapiens separated itself from the chimpanzee strain. The female gorilla's derriere swells up to an attractive pinkish red such as to signal to other gorillas that she can be impregnated. The 'harem' became the designated social sexual mating strategy of the Gorilla. The size of the testicles of a gorilla are relatively minute, just half the size of mans; whereas the size of the gorilla is 2 ½ to 3 times the size of a man by body mass. Nature works by the principle of efficiency; investing resources only when they can reap gains. The male gorilla doesn't need large testicles because they are not involved in 'sperm wars' with other males and females. He impregnates by securing control of an average of 3 females, and sometimes more, with whom he alone will copulate.

He procedurally initiates sexual intercourse only when the female's derrière indicates that the female is in the fertile cycle.

This mastery for being the dominant male, as such, aided to the increased size difference of the gorilla as more and more offspring ascended as the bigger and more dominant males bred more and more, and smaller breeds were generally bred out. Sex for the Gorilla became very valuable, and the tool used to secure access to it was one of brawn. The simplest answer in understanding how this happened is that a mutation of ovulatory signaling determined and was the impetus for the future evolution of what would become of the species, and simultaneously that it was necessitated by the changed structure of societal mating. By contrast, the Chimpanzee demonstrates a more overt and noticeable ovulation; and are polygamous by nature, meaning they all copulate with a female when she is "in heat". The chimpanzee's penis is an average of 1 ½ inches, far below humans who average between 5 and 6 inches; curious not in and of itself, but juxtaposed with the contrary finding in testicle size; we see that the chimpanzees developed in an entirely different manner than did either humans or gorillas. Unlike the gorilla, the chimpanzee does not use the sexual strategy of dominating other males near as exclusively as does the gorilla. Instead *they promote and ensure the issuance of their seed, and evolutionary fitness by simply producing more of it.*

Whereas the gorilla evolved into a bigger species, the chimpanzee grew into a bigger balled species averaging 4 ½ ounces, 3 times the average size of a human, and 9 times that of the Gorilla. If all the chimpanzees mate with the same female chimp in heat, it would only make sense that eventually the chimpanzees with the highest amounts of sperm production would further this trait for sperm production more than any of the other characteristics that these animals manifested, thus leading to an increased size of the

chimpanzee scrotum. The quantitative production of sperm led to an evolutionary differentiation, which determined the mating structure (polygamous), and thus the “sexual strategy”: (which was I believe the more natural state of things in the primate world). The sexual strategy naturally determines how the sexes related to each other, which further determined the evolution of the species.

Perhaps the slight noticability which occurred within the gorilla subset could have been a response to the decreased need to advertise times of sexual fertility. If the male gorilla mutated first, so as to make a more belligerent and controlling male, even of slight disproportionality in relation to his peers, then the value inherently related to this mutation could have found its way into the gene pool and progressed and further evolved very quickly as the larger offspring of this mutation would have usurped power over female harems and likewise their reproductive potential.

Females likewise would have become larger as we see with the gorilla, and likewise the size of the gorilla’s testicles would not have found any evolutionary benefit, in that *brawn* rather than *sperm wars* decided who would further carry on their genes. In the case of the Gorilla, ovulatory signaling could have theoretically resulted from a female directed mutation, or from a decreased need for its use as advertising bait. This alternate scenario whereby the harem came before the decreased ovulatory noticeability would to my mind become more plausible within a scenario in which a small group of chimpanzees wandered off the proverbial reservation into a remote area and/or the group caught a disease eliminating most of the females which necessitated or provided the impetus for a particular male within the group to usurp access to all the fertile females, which could have through many generations easily have taken on the characteristics of how we understand the Gorilla to be and operate.

This would make sense from the aspect that the mutations of the female and the male gorillas could correlate with how we understand their mating strategy, that said, it still seems to miss the point that there is a specific evolutionary desire for the female primate chimpanzee to blatantly advertise their reproductive wares, which to my mind should not have gotten less noticeable. If this last sentence were valid it would be plausible that the slight noticability of the Gorilla is closer to how the chimpanzees ovulatory signaling was at the time of the species schism, and that the chimpanzees form of high noticeability is derived from their continuing evolution whereby high ovulatory signaling was by the process of several million years selected for.

Playing detective, this appears in fact to be the most likely scenario for to assume that the chimpanzee did not continue to select for reproductive fitness as the Gorilla and the human did would be absurd. From this it is easier to see that were there at the time of the Gorillas schism with the species merely slight noticeability, had the chimpanzees had a few mutants which did not show at all it would be less of a surprise. Perhaps this reasoning also might be applied to the testicle size of the Gorillas having been closer in size to that of the chimpanzee originally, thus when the schism came in respect to man's separation from the monkey (to become for several million years the evolving monkey-man) that the size of our testicles perhaps were as well close to the size of the chimpanzees were at the time of the split.

One of the most fascinating aspects of human sexuality is that we use a system of completely concealed or "cryptic" ovulation. What this means is that men do not know when the female is ready to be impregnated, and as I have already stated the female is likewise unaware, which necessitates a state of confusion and a heightened need to have intercourse more frequently so that her cycle is not

missed. For the male, the solution to the problem of evolutionary fitness is to gain complete access to the female sexually and to inject lively doses of sperm continually until conception is reached. This requires that the male also prevent other males from sneaking by him to drop one in the evolutionary cash register.

Thus *paternal certainty* became for humans a worry and a worthy evolutionary need, for it would serve to focus man's need for evolutionary fitness. To underscore this point, consider the foreskin of the human male's penis, as it is shaped like a shovel to "bail out" the previous man's sperm. Curiously, the root: bail= bale (a little devil). (By way of comparison, in our own time there is much talk of big business being "bailed out", when really they are being "baled in" while it is the rest of us who are being "bailed out" of the evolutionary pool by their deceptive and criminal schemes. It is our genes who are being denied the right to reproduce because we simply can no longer afford to as they have by 'legal' means stolen from us our source of evolutionary prosperity).

The chimpanzees alternately evolved as a roulette wheel of sorts, banking their evolutionary fitness on chance much as a lottery relies on the individual numbers of balls which fall in by chance alone; that is in a game of sixty balls each with a single number on them, the chance of the ball dropping is 1 in 60. If the chimpanzees all had sex with a female, and all had a chance; necessarily some numbers had more balls in the lottery, and those were the ones who produced more sperm or in this case had larger testicles. The Gorilla and the Human evolved likewise from the chimpanzee strain and adapted its polygamous nature to fit the individual needs of the changed environment created by the mutational and/or environmental adaptations. So although size is always a big advantage, humans did not exclusively consider males to usurp this for breeding, more exclusively than others such as Gorillas.

Getting back to Cryptic Ovulation, it is one thing for the male not to be cognizant of a female's fertility; this happens elsewhere in animal kingdom though rare. By contrast, a species where the female cannot realize when they are fertile, is an absolute abnormality, and almost incredulous to think of. For many humans it is quite a disturbing fact to learn that the rest of the animal kingdom primarily mates only when the female is fertile, and no other time, (what do they do for fun? we ponder). But, in retrospect of the changed circumstances it only makes perfect sense. Not knowing when to have sex, she naturally would have experienced a heightened sense of anxiety and would have sought to have sex more often. Perhaps this may in part explain what we understand as the mood changes and anxiety inherent within premenstrual syndrome which by all rights of nature would be her only clue as to her cycles. Note, even the females selection of mates seems to change the closer she gets to her cycle. One would think that the mutation simply would have died off; however, chimpanzees are known to at times copulate even when the female is not showing, so it is reasonable to assume under those circumstances that it could have survived. This is one explanation which is to my mind plausible enough to allow the gene to be passed on. The gene must have been further passed on to the female's children and their children and eventually became partitioned off from the chimpanzee species as a select group which did not show noticeable ovulation.

Out of studies in sociobiology and game theory we can make the leap that as more and more females gained this mutation, the females who had cryptic ovulation gained an increased benefit beyond those that did not receive it. Whereas the chimpanzee could simply just mount another chimpanzee that showed fertility; by comparison, in order to mate with those that did not, they eventually as the progeny of the mutation grew larger and larger, had to work harder for this access. In a species which was changed by a mutation

such as cryptic ovulation, it would be reasonable to expect that we would see signs of sexual ornamentation in the opposite sex: the male. As the human had grown to be a species which became consumed with sex, it appears that the female's choice became highly responsible for the mates that were allowed to reproduce with them.

This is somehow apolitically correct to assert because it goes counter to the feminists assertion that women have suffered the continual oppression of the tyrannical evil patriarchy to our present day; yet when we look for signs of male ornamentation, it is really quite obvious in the statement "size matters". If the chimpanzee only needed a penis 1 ½ inches long, why is the humans on average 5.5 inches? I think that this is a clear instance of *female choice*, as for the most part it still is; likewise it appears reasonable to observe that a complimentary feature of the human female is her increased sexual sensitivity in the clitoral and labial areas which have 3-4 times as many cells which can detect and lead to a heightened experience of pleasure than the male does during intercourse. I propose that there must be a reasonable reason why this is so.

Imagine the ramifications of *paternal certainty* as an instrument of evolutionary fitness. The chimpanzee cares very little for paternal certainty, because they don't have any need to care. It is simply out of their control. In fact it has been theorized that the female will mate with the whole tribe to ensure that none of the adult males will have reason to injure her young because none of them will know who the father really is. This increases her evolutionary fitness, and as well her kin. This is the exact opposite in how we understand the subtleties of our own reproductive strategy and sex psychology. The male chimp likewise adapted to this by growing larger and larger testicles, because statistically if every chimp is inseminating a particular female the chimps that have the largest testicles will produce the most sperm. Thus the trait or mutation of large testicles

is rewarded by living on, and eventually those with smaller testicles are eliminated from the genetic pool.

So what happens when males cannot tell when to have sex with a female? They must simply keep copulating with them and hope for the best. But two other things would become necessary; the male would need to both keep copulating with her and as well keep other males from copulating with her. Was there increased violence between the males by the extenuating circumstances caused by competition for cryptic ovulating females? It seems reasonable to think so, a history of violence and intra species belligerence has gone back very far into the primate species, but it seems the need to control and the use of violence becomes manifest when the tool for the evolutionary fitness is upset and the status quo adopted by the chimpanzee is no longer determined by the chance of pure lottery; and therefore neither balls nor brawn but brains must rule out.

Although aggressiveness in human males has roots that go back perhaps as far as evolutionary theory itself, it can only be assumed that such an occurrence as cryptic ovulation would have a debilitating confusion on the males; comparative evidence suggests that aggression was not the primary result. Firstly, we did not evolve as the gorilla, and our mating strategy became one of pseudo-monogamy and not one of harems. Secondly, if physical aggression were the result, the physical mass of the male in comparison to the female would have been of a far larger proportional difference then the 20 percent that it currently is. The fact that male humans are only 20 percent larger than females indicates with comparative studies and comports with how we understand our species to be as pseudo-monogamous. And thirdly, I would draw specific attention to the inordinate size of the male's penis. We are as a species consumed with the size of penises. From the tribes in Africa, to Greek Dionysian festivals, to the creation of sky scrapers, to our obsession for

pornography; *size matters* and we in all respects appear to be obsessed with it. Think, even if a female says that she is not interested in size; the male has anxiety over the size of his phallus regardless. In relationships one of the first things that a female may do to assuage the male's anxiety would be to comment on the awesome size of the male's penis. It is of great anxiety, because the anxiety is evolutionarily based.

For chimpanzees, their mating structure and the nature of their outright licentious polygamy, size matters not. The female is more concerned with all the chimps being able to think that her offspring might be theirs, so she is not choosy. (And thus one can see why high ovulatory noticability would be of even greater interest to female chimps, thus by prolifically advertising she made sure to copulate with all males and thus this trait would have offered a benefit and would have had an increased propensity of surviving as all the chimps had an equal share in the young chimps fatherhood). In not being choosy, the size of the chimp's penis never was a motivating factor, and so therefore never got any bigger. Its use is purely pragmatic. It is the size of testicles which have *value*, and thus this feature was accentuated and not penis size. Today we still regard rape as a crime, as it steals from a woman her evolutionary property, and her *choice* to use it as she may. **It is her choice alone that has made it her property, and it is the values laden within our very evolution which determines her choice.** Why would a human female have sex with many men, if by doing so her offspring will receive less of a chance of survival? When a male rapes, he is essentially stealing this choice from her, and thus we view it as a very grievous crime innately.

Robin Baker has illustrated a provocative study showing that males who are unsuccessful at rape are scorned by the female, but by the very success of the rape, many females choose to have sex with

the rapist again as he has shown a verifiable sexual strategy by overpowering the female and as such his genes would have potential to further themselves. I must state that I am more than a little suspicious of his stated studies, but I report them as they are just the same, for the purpose of adding a rich contextual structure to the discussion (so don't shoot the messenger). It would seem that the female's choice has been an evolutionary factor, and the penis is much as the peacock's plumage, an ornament which attracts. It would only make sense that as the female began to copulate more and more, that they would be increasingly interested, and perhaps increasingly pleased by larger rather than smaller penises.

The Catalyst

The early cryptic-protohuman had seemingly rewritten all the rules that nature had afforded itself by making the process of reproduction invisible from the species which first manifested it. It was a preeminent moment in human history. It was in a great many ways as momentous as Prometheus stealing from the gods the immortal fire for man. But as like Prometheus, man itself became chained by the existential abandon of its new freedom. No longer would man simply be as the likes of an animal and live in the pattern determined solely by the selfish gene alone. **It was at this moment that man became a psychologist and a psychologist became an uber-ape**, and perhaps in the surreal annals of where anthropological prehistory serendipitously meets a post-modern pop culture myth, the ubermench's only weakness was Kryptonite, (the words 'cryptic' is derived from the Greek work Kryptos or κρυπτος meaning "that which is hidden").

In the beginning, the cryptic-protohuman female had many males willing to copulate with her, so the question is, which did she choose, when and why? Likewise, a male that survived the initial trials of the cryptic-protohuman revolution faced an entirely different dynamic than did his cousin chimpanzee forbears. Naturally, the first ramification of this paradigm shift in human history was to give a decisive advantage to those members of the group, both male and female who copulated the most such that this trait was the first to find a benefit by way of evolutionary fitness. This was more or less like moving the pawns in a game of chess to begin the game. Those

that were not overly precocious failed to make the first cut, and I am certain that this went on for several to several thousand generations. To some extent, this cutting factor is still with us today, however after the pawns played their initial few moves, as the game goes, it got a bit more interesting. The next question which I seek to answer is what happened next; for this we must piece through the archeological record of nearly everything we have every known about the human being.

First off, what we know is that humans became a “sexy” species, in that we became crazy about fucking. The question is who got to fuck who, when and why? In the case of males, how did they increase their chances of mating with the female who can either choose to copulate with them, or not? Initially, we have many leads for which to analyze this epic meta-historical crypto-mythological passage. The anthropologist WD Hamilton’s work on altruism would point to the occurrence of females having sex more often with successful hunters. If this is so, hunters would increase their evolutionary fitness by being generous and giving to others especially females, thereby insuring sexual access to them. This is part of the solution to the enigma of how the human species developed but in order to go further we must first realize a larger and expanded community of cryptic chimpanzee-protohumans and males who sought to have sex with them.

Socio-biologically speaking, the ways that we evolved socially are due in part to our biological nature, and in part in how our biological nature inter-relates with other social and environmental factors. Many socio-biologists would just care to stay within the realm of science and dare not apply the discoveries that they have made to the world of ethics because they are ‘politically unpalatable’. Some of them seem to just want to wish away the ramifications for their studies or say that somehow ‘this doesn’t apply to us’ or the

like; or use the actions of Nazi eugenicists as an example of what happens when people try to get from biological realities to producing comparative ethics; or they will posit an absolute absurdity which is beyond any real comprehension and rational analysis just to wish away something which is right in front of their faces or downgrade its importance.

Allow me to rebut. The Nazi eugenicists and Social-Darwinists were not really applying scientific methodology to the problems they saw but instead manufactured the results they wished already to see. So if they wanted whites to be superior to blacks, thus Social-Darwinism fulfilled for them this role and the justification for thinking so. My argument would be that these men were influenced more by their racism than by any scientifically based analysis. Likewise many would like to wish away the fact that rape has in the past been a quasi-formidable Evolutionary Stable Strategy, something which has been successful in promoting the genes of certain men because that would therein say that rape was in some way natural and therefore not wrong. I will not belabor the point of why rape is wrong here because I handle it more completely later in this work however it is an idiocy to say such a thing and nearly everyone knows this rather innately. Here are two more examples of the socio-biologically based and 'politically unpalatable': that female choice and not male choice has been a highly influential factor in our evolution; and get this but hold on to your drawers: it is the female who is the more rational sex and the male that is the more emotional. As linguistic-computer-jargon might opine: WTF am I talking about? Brain Hemispheres baby, brain hemispheres. See, if we ascribed females with the evolved sense of *choice* than the feminists couldn't have their way in demonizing men for the "evil patriarchy" that they have brain washed so many people into believing. And if women were really the logical ones then why are they so emotional? Let me explain.

The male has a larger and more fully developed and mature right hemisphere of the brain, which controls emotions and creativity. Women instead have a larger and more fully developed and more mature left hemisphere, which controls logic, language and math. These are sex based brain differences. The female as well has a thicker corpus collosum, the dividing fibrous connective tissue which regulates how the hemispheres communicate with each other, which would indicate that although they do have a less mature faculty of the right hemisphere, they can communicate quite good with it and use it when it is advantageous. Further, brain studies show that the female uses the cerebral cortex a great deal more than the more phylogenecally primordial aperture of the hippocampus available to the male.

As brain physiology reveals itself as opposite as to how we relate to each other, it begs the question: *"what is going on?"* Sociologists intend to do the end around in explaining why we understand each other as apparently opposite to how our brain chemistries show that we should operate. The politically correct understanding is that it is a patriarchal society that has stolen from the female her natural capacities of logic and math and taken likewise from men his emotionalism and "feminine side". They are missing the fatal understanding of ethics. As most learning has branched from the discipline of Philosophy and the general questions regarding life, most scholars have become highly specialized without involving themselves in the annals and mysteries of Philosophy, which is the very the love of wisdom itself.

Males evolved increases in emotion because they had a reproductive value in evolutionary fitness. A "Father" rather than being just another male in the animal kingdom, could care for a woman and children and protect them better with high emotion, higher levels of testosterone, and higher levels of aggression; and

perhaps most importantly, the caring faculties that he evolved would serve as a feature which would be attractive to females because it provided them the evolutionary clues that they needed to discern if he would stay to take care of them. Women contrarily evolved increases in logical and rational functions and thereby the capabilities to be psycho-socially manipulative because it furthered their own need in the search for “qualitative” rather than “quantitative” males. Having only a certain number of eggs and a rather long gestation period they needed “maternal certainty” that the males that they mated with would help with the rearing of their children. They therefore needed to discern the true intentions of prospective suitors, to psychoanalyze them a bit to make sure that they were worthy to mate with. They needed to do this because the very reproductive goals of the males were diametrically opposite to that of the female; with an endless reservoir of sperm, “quantitative” rather than “qualitative” has been the norm for males throughout the animal kingdom, and in social primates little different.

So why is it that we understand each other as being entirely the opposite, or such is the myth that pervades societies that women are “emotional” or that men are “rational” if the brain chemistry shows just the opposite? Well, what you see isn’t always what you get. In short, the basis for man’s logic is emotion, and the basis for a woman’s emotion is logical. Sounds crazy I know. But let’s for a moment apply the Chinese philosophy of Taoism. Lao Tzu said “decrease and decrease again until you reach non action, and through non action, no action is left undone.” The reason that he said this was that there is no logical reason for action. Therefore he advised to “sit and make progress in this”, (Lao Tzu, Tao Te Ching). When I was a little child, about the age of 5 as I remember, I would ask my mother a question to which she would give me an answer. But then I had to ask “why?”, to which she would give me another answer, to which I had to ask “why?” and this went on until she would get so frustrated

that she would want to hit me with a frying pan and would say “that’s just the way it is and I don’t know ‘why?’”. This happened a couple of times until I learned not to ask her anymore “why?” questions. But within me the desire to know “why?” never died. The truth of the matter is, there is no logical reason for action and this is precisely what drove her crazy. Even if one were to posit that “to live-itself” for instance would be an answer for the question of “why not step in front of a bus or eat food?” I would ask “why?”, and truly I still cannot arrive at a “logical” answer that does not decry yet another “why?”.

The ways that men and women compartmentalize the data-set that they are given are diametrically opposite. Take for instance the sociological phenomena of the question that two lovers pose to each other after a day of work. The differences in how the two sexes relate to each other is called the “repose/report” dynamic, so where as the man will recite facts of what actually happened, the woman is more frequently interested in the very repose between her and her mate. I guess perhaps it tells her clues as to whether to believe the words that are coming out of his mouth to cover having an affair with a girl down the street that he doesn’t want to divulge to her for obvious reasons. Likewise, it has been held that the male lives in a world of more or less “black and white” whereas the woman lives in “various shades of grey”. This can be easily understood as by understanding what each sex must accomplish to be reproductively successful. So whereas it is more important that the man simply spread his seed, the woman has evolved various nuances to decipher who it is that would best promote her own reproductive success. This took the shape of analysis and choice, and the *chosen weapons of emotion* and to a reasonable degree being able to manipulate the man to do what she wanted him to do. This goes against the political grain of our day because it says 3 things, that men have not orchestrated the “evil patriarchy” that has been espoused by the radical feminists; two that

they have been instead rather foolish ponds at times to garnish a woman's favors, and three, because women truly don't want the secret out of the bag that they are not at all as emotional as they would like men to believe. I can hear a 50's song ringing in my head "Big girls don't cry".

Still aren't buying it? Why do guys watch sports games or go to war or spend their money so frivolously on women that they are trying to attract? Are these signs of rational behavior? Ok you say, then what about all the logical constructs, inventions, sciences, and mathematics dominated throughout the centuries mostly by men; how would this comport to men as the emotional one rather than the logical one? Great question, but the answer is actually really quite simple. The pendulum bearer of philosophy and reason and perhaps the most influential "philosopher" over the last millennium was a man by the name of Immanuel Kant. The man was so logical that attempts at reading his seminal treatise "The Critique of Pure Reason" have been known to cause temporary insanity, and frankly being quite crazy enough as it is, I will not even attempt it; however Kant explicitly states (and I believe this to be true) that the very basis of logic is "intuition". Call it what you will, "intuition", "instinct", "emotion"; they all add up to the same thing; that it is "emotion" which allows us the realization of the black and white as differentiated from shades of grey.

As by way of contextual analysis, consider the deviations laden within how we intake data from our environment differently by way of our sensory perceptions. As I have already written in 'Meaning and Relatedness': "The ear is an 'analytic' organ (it picks things apart), while the eye is a 'synthetic' organ (which instead blends things together). The eye synthesizes (green and red) so that it sees things as one (brown). It says "*this is it*". One may discover the ear only by: *depriving synthetic perception and closing ones eyes*. The ear

exhibits more humility, in that when it hears, it hears the mystery (something of which it does not claim knowledge of). In a piece of music it can distinguish between the different instruments and pick them apart (analyze them), unlike the eye. Remove language, labels, and symbols as such and you might hear the ear muttering "*what is it?*" The ear conquers with feminine passivity like radar; by enveloping it understands the shape of things and as such can exhibit its control with more finesse. The ear is the more primordially phylogenic sensory perception of the two. Since evolution's introduction of the eye, organisms have become more reliant on it, and its inherent structural reality; and conversely less reliant on the blinded radar of the ear and its antithetical structure of reality. Hence we see a movement in myth descending from plurality to oneness, pagan gods to a monotheistic One; from many more humble reasons to explain cosmology, gravity, the earth and action, to one "*this is it*".

Likewise, the male nearly from the time of birth is fascinated by action because the conical deviation within the eye makes action more intriguing, whereas for a little girl deviations in color or facial expressions rather than action are more interesting. The male's sensory perception and the very way that he intakes data are dominated by the black/white realism as exhibited by the eye, whereas the female's sense of grey comes forcibly from her heightened sense of auditory perceptions. Studies have indicated that an adolescent female has an auditory sensitivity 7 times that of her male counterparts. It only makes sense; the Buddha knew that the sensory data of the "eye" is illusory and thus his chosen form of information gathering was instead to close his eyes in meditation so as not to be a fool to that which he saw.

The Date

For the purpose of finding clues: how does a man enhance his chances of mating in our own day? Well, often times it comes by way

of a chance meeting, and a date whereby he will buy dinner for a female. This is the first step to the female, because it shows a male's generosity and resourcefulness with evidence, as well as the male's desire of further resource provision. When a fly seeks to copulate with another fly he will likewise bring a present of food, and while the female eats the male will mount her from behind. Likewise, however dissimilar we see the copulation ritual of the prey mantis, whom after the male is finished copulating, he will lean his head towards the females so that she can bite it off; then lay her eggs on his dead carcass. His carcass provides the food for which to nurture her brood. It is natural and desirable to procreate, and to the prey mantis the gift of his life seems a fair trade to further his genes. Thus appears the persistence of Richard Dawkin's "Selfish Gene".

So the instinct of fear became transferred as from a survival instinct to a reproductive instinct, and an extreme one at that. The dynamics of human evolution would reward the males that worried about whether the children that they fed were theirs, by reproducing more than males that did not. Paternal certainty became a facet of human nature and the male's psychology, as he persistently manifested fear that the young he fed and provided for were not his, and that he was somehow squandering his evolutionary resources to further another man's genes. Worry and mental exertion itself about sexuality and reproduction has become in this quasi-transcendent act a very unique tool to ensure evolutionary fitness. Take the prey mantis, you don't see a male prey mantis enlisting surrogate male prey mantises for the female to kill and lay her eggs on, because why would a male prey mantis give his life for that which he would receive no reward? This is a problem, and a worry that chimpanzees knew not. So why did monogamy evolve rather than polygamy?

Well technically humans are considered "pseudo-monogamous", and as such it is illustrative of the very need for

paternal certainty. The female can and will copulate with males other than the male who provides resources for her, just as the male may try to give some of his resources to another female for a chance to copulate and deceive another male to raise his children. These are both Evolutionary Stable Strategies which further the promotion of self interested genes. Hypothetically, let's say that there is a community of 50 males and 50 females. A man gains access to the female by providing gifts and showing his generosity, and so thereby if successful, these genes of generosity are further propelled into the future. The male however must compete with other males who would likewise compete as suitors pining for access to highly valued females. Once the female has chosen, the male has two worries, one to further get more meat or presents for the female in order to continue to have sexual access to her, and as well to prevent other males from gaining access to the female whom he is exclusively providing resources for. The necessary complexity, worry and thoughts of this male are increased exponentially as he has many other things to worry about than former non cryptic chimps. **These increased needs in thinking necessitated the increased need for a larger and more complex brain.**

In the Bible, adultery is defined as sleeping with another's wife, not sleeping with another's husband. These rules for respecting another male's female seem to have a long history. If the male mated with another female it didn't hurt his primary female, unless for this sex he gave the second female meat that would have gone to his "primary female". By contrast, if a female had sex with another male, it could ruin all the resources that the male had given her up to that point, and as well perhaps the irreparable trust that he had in her. However, resources are not the only thing that a gigolo-early-human-hominid had to offer. There is also the possibility that the "sexy son" theory may come into play here. For although he may not have given meat to her, perhaps his penis was bigger than the male that

provided for her. I don't think that this is an entirely unreasonable supposition, under the scenario of evolution by cryptic ovulation. The search for superior genes is a common postulate and the penis is a female chosen sexual ornament. If this was the case, this would provide further understanding in current man's evolutionary anxiety about the size of his penis. Even though a woman has sex with a man, there is "always a bigger fish", as Qui Gon would say in episode 1 of Star Wars. Perhaps this would be the basis for why the Bible sites that adultery is one sided, and that moral stigma is associated with gender, and opposite for the sexes. A man that sleeps with many women is a "stud", whereas the female has historically been regarded, very pejoratively as a "whore". I think that this comports very nicely with an understanding of evolution by way of cryptic ovulation

Inter-Species- Sex Strategy

The greatest esteem in hunter and gathering cultures is believed to be bestowed on the most successful hunters; however the hunter is successful some days and other days they just come home drunk with the guys. Humans did not enter into the agricultural

phase of our development until some 7 to 12 thousand years ago, (or thus is the proposition Jared Diamond purports in his Guns, Germs and Steel). Being able to outfox prey would seem to have elements that would further enhance and separate by sexual distinction the difference in brain makeup, constitution and differentials. I gather female and male brains, like computers became partitioned along the lines of the hemispheres which are connected by the corpus coliseum.

So as the male must now worry about going out and hunting, and finding meat to bring back to his lover and companion: he also must worry about others who would mate with his lover while he was out hunting. This further illustrates the propensity and separation of the sexes as the male could not trust other males to be around his female while he was out hunting, so instead of going out separately, they would instead go out as a pack, leaving the females to rear the children amongst themselves. Thus we see 'male bonding' developed. Certainly I am not proposing that this was the only reason. Yes another possible reason might be that the animals they were hunting were large or fast, or deceptive and required more men; but many hunters going out together, rather than separately would not necessarily bring back more meat, as their energy was concentrated on one area rather than many areas. Splitting up would devise a better strategy, but yet these things are not always thought out so exactly.

Further, by meat sharing, the primates would be able to eat whether or not they were successful that particular day. There has been always the increased value attributed to guarding the boundaries of the village from dangers, animals, and other primates that might otherwise ransack, thief, kill and/or rape and steal the females. Females became a property worth protecting by hunting males, for if they were stolen, or killed, they would have no recourse but to try to do likewise to another village's females, which if given

the chance many I'm sure did just that. One must only think of the spoils of war throughout history dating back to the rape of the Sabine women in early Roman Empire. (Interestingly, very little is changed as we will see, no-fault divorce is essentially little different from the rape and pillage of apes millions of years ago, however more sophisticated as muscle becomes money, and technique the obscurity of the law, hence lawyers become the elite tribal clubs for which to bludgeon weaker and less wealthy primates, aka the "middle class" and the "lower class").

I am not saying that paternal certainty is the only factor inherent within groups of males traveling together, but certainly at the very least it is an added benefit not to have to worry about these males having sex with their own particular female when they were away from them. As such, there is a mutual advantage in agreement and understanding between the males when together. Their bond ensured them that they could distrust none of them, while they were with them. It is perhaps these factors which would contribute to the rise of a patriarchal hierarchy as we have understood our species to be for nearly all of known written and oral history, with perhaps the exception of the Mycenaean culture of Crete.

Again, why did monogamy, or pseudo monogamy evolve? Or more precisely, how did marriage and the families develop out of all this? Well, take 50 males and 50 females operating within the context herein described, through evolution by way of cryptic ovulation and the female becomes the epitome of choice, and the male is essentially resigned to one who must work to gain her favors. His primary ornament and tool to which leads him to further his genes is his brain. The brain did not evolve different in males then females, in as much that one is smart and the other dumb. They are both intelligent, however the intelligence necessarily differs. Whereas the male is more consumed with the aspects of finding a mate, providing for her,

and ensuring paternal certainty, the female is concerned with finding a mate whom she can trust, and who will provide for her and her young over a duration of time. So the brain grew differently out of differing reproductive concerns, though similarly within the context of being intelligent. The female became “coy”, and sensitive as to others motives, more sociable, and perhaps “socially manipulative”. The male became aggressive, and creative both, and as well generous and somewhat nurturing as he became more and more exclusively involved over larger and larger lengths of time in helping to raise his children. Thus was born the basis of what we know as the human family.

As opposed to being in a dissociative setting of a tribe, and not having an exclusive relationship with any one primate, it seems that this exclusive and close monogamous or pseudo-monogamous relationship between the male and female must have necessitated **language**. Why? It would appear at it's root level, that symbolism of any form, and a common understanding of symbolism of any form; be the gestural, verbal, or written could only have begun had there been two people in continual contact with each other for a duration long enough for a common understanding to develop. The bonding of male hunters and the sociability of the females left in the village to raise the children would likewise have further progressed this evolution of language and the symbolism within language, but it is critical to my mind that this first happened within the context of the intimate relationship between a man and woman.

Perhaps it was another male that he was mad at for having sex with her that was the first word; maybe the first word was a mimicking of their baby crying or something very simple like “meat” or maybe it was a sound mimicking the sounds of sex or him telling her “meat”, that that was where he was going so she understood that he was coming back, and so not to be with another male. Whatever it

was, it was important to them, and rather simple in complexity. By the nature of the increased contact, and the quality of its exclusivity, the foundation for intimacy between the sexes was created. The increased time together led to increased relatedness, intimacy, connection, language, family, invention, and perhaps everything that we know of as civilization and even ourselves.

The male and female had to for the first time look at each other *differently*. Sex became highly valued for itself for two reasons; the phenomena of biologically based “sperm wars” described within the work of zoologist Robin Baker, and that overtime it served to strengthen the bond between the male and female, and two, that which is termed one of the “oldest professions”, prostitution, seems to serve as evidence which would impart corroborate our biological need to have sex for sex-sake alone. Pornography offers yet another path of fascination mostly by males to sustain a fascination with sex. Whereas other species have sex when there is promised reward for the sex, humans here differ qualitatively speaking. Essentially humans do as well, however not in such linear fashion as other species. The male might think that if he has sex, even though it might not immediately improve his chances of furthering his seed, it may eventually. For most of the rest of the species on earth, mating bears a cost, which could in many instances bear the cost of the animal’s life.

The sexes appear to have evolved by the dialectical nature inherent within and caused by the increased importance and value of sex as necessitated by *cryptic ovulation*. The all important and differentiating gene which determined ovulatory signaling seems to be the simplest solution to understand the varying structures of mating systems and strategies which came by way of the metamorphosis of the human genome. These sex differences changed the essential ways that human beings as well as primates along the chimpanzee/ gorilla strain related to each other. The gorillas did not

change to become un-primate like, but changed the essential mating strategies within their species, which in turn changed social strategies and the acceptable rules of property and territory. Hence it may be reasonably assumed that among the very *first properties* as constituted as something which can be used on an exclusive basis over time, however transitory in nature within differing primate orders, is that of *the mate*, (other primate examples include the Gibbon which form long term monogamous pair bonds over the course of their lives).

The interesting part of the human adaptation, is that it essentially allowed us to take longer to mature, and by doing this, use that reservoir of evolutionary energy in creating something different, new, steadily evolving, and somewhat chaotic in its newly found absence of homeostasis, and mutating morph-ability. With the increased need for thought created by cryptic ovulation, the mass of the brain continued to develop, and with it, the necessity that the human child, unlike its chimpanzee forebear, took far longer to mature to the state where they can be self sufficient. This in itself created a further necessity for the female to choose a male who would be resourceful *over time*, which created the increased need for more thought and brain mass within the female, an increased level of intra-sex competition within males, and perhaps as Geoffery Miller has propounded perhaps personality itself evolved as an ornamental tool for sexual attraction; thus in time effecting the brain mass of the child and further delaying the age of its maturity, thus extenuating the necessity for females to be choosier in their mates. Theoretically this cycle repeated itself until we see the beginnings of human nature as we have come to know it.

With this increased power in thought, it is not difficult to imagine that this may have had an effect on standing upright, for the concerns of survival and reproduction, as the brain became more and more adapted, it became more and more concerned with the life “out

there” rather than near at hand, especially a concern for what exactly their mate was doing and with whom. Thus we gained foresight, as opposed to just hindsight (this would make sense seeing as the brain power became more concerned with psychoanalyzing their mates; that they would have been keenly interested in what they were doing and using their visual apparatus to attain this goal, really we are doing the same thing today only instead of standing more upright to peep into our partners lives, we crouch down before the screen of their computers to break into their email accounts in order to make sure they are keeping their end of the bargain). This would also go to further explain the males heightened sensitivity to that which is visual as apart from the female, and even his interest in watching pornography to make sure that the female who is copulating is not his own or one he likes. Most importantly for this study, what emerged out of this most complex evolution of ours, was the necessity and creation of the family unit, and what would emerge as one of the most unique facets of humanity, that of *fatherhood*.

In order to gain sexual access and to maintain it, it was necessary to have sex many times over, which is costly. In order to have sex with a female, earlier evolutionary man probably brought her meat, much as today we still do. However, the present of meat may be good for more than one day of intercourse. So whereas in order for the male to have sex with ten different females, in ten days, twice each he might have needed to provide ten meals, if sex=meal, whereas the male who provided meat for a single female twice within 10 days could maintain sexual access to her reasonably easy, (it is a linguistic irony that we refer to males and meals as nearly indistinct, much as the natives of New Guinea might pronounce the words for snake and mother-in-law as nearly indistinguishable from western ears). With this he could ensure that his sperm stayed within her reservoir tract long enough so that he would have certainty that he was the father whenever she did get pregnant. So we now have

established an evolutionary adaptation through game theory, and an incentivization for the monogamous pair bonds of the human family.

It is also reasonable to see that as there was increased sperm levels as compared to the Gorilla (as illustrated by humans larger testicle size); increased sperm, non exclusive male dominance, over one another evolved, and as such, that the ability to nurture a relationship nearly exclusive did. And how does such a relationship work? Well for beginners the male advertises himself to the females as a dedicated and resourceful individual. If he offers other things beneficial they as well become peripheral benefits. These may include, being funny, or nice, a good father, or a strong protector to name a few. Through concealed ovulation women became very choosy, and there evolved a consort-ship of increasing complexity, and with the more interactions that male and female had, their sense of relatedness between them evolved within the nature of the increased continual knowledge of each other. In Genesis it is said that “Adam knew Eve, and Eve knew Adam”, I don’t think by mistake. “Knowing” each other by way of sexual intercourse was the primal gnosis as well as the foundation of the relatedness that which they shared.

As the men had property in the women, the women had property in the men, (although by differing qualitative distinctions by necessity of the difference between the sexes). Hence the *children also gained a property in having two parents* who evolved to love, provide, care for, protect, teach, and sacrifice for them. There was a wealth transferred both in economy and as well through moral guidance, the learning of trades, acceptable behavior, how to think, and various theories about people and situations. Eventually through the gradual transmission of knowledge within this base of the family, multi-generations and extended families, people began to feel more secure, as their more basic needs were taken care of. Hence,

we extended our knowledge of tool making and the manipulation of our environment. Discovery and invention were literally at our fingertips. Even our hands evolved to more ably manipulate the objects that our minds sought use for by the eventual adaptation of the opposable thumb (which very well might have begun many millions of years before as the primate *Edi* was found, a nearly perfectly maintained fossil carbon dated 47 million years ago with opposable thumbs presumably for to grab onto tree branches and swing for protection).

For a one still cynical of evolution through cryptic ovulation, I ask; **why when these facets within the existence of humans being developed, did they not develop within other primates?** There are a number of interesting facets in evolutionary development that play into how we changed our mating ritual and how the male was given the incentive to stay with the female, and become a father rather than as a mere chromosomal protein additive to an egg. Incentive is a very interesting concept and plays out in game theory. Studies in game theory and behavioral psychology indicate that individuals will base their behavior on the set of circumstances available to them. So if you were told that you didn't really have to pay for groceries; that you could just walk out every time without paying, at first you might be a bit skeptical. But if you saw that others were just walking out without paying, the trend would soon follow, because why would anyone pay if they did not have to? What if upon not paying they were additionally given a reward upon departing from the exit door? If this were the case, people would walk into the stores and take things whether they needed them or not, just to get more of the reward if it was desirable enough to do so.

Jared Diamond in his "Why is Sex is Fun?" compares the genetic and reproductive interests of the male and the female to a complex game of chicken, where the participants are essentially

daring each other that they will be the first to walk away from their genetic offspring, even from the very moment of conception. *This is what makes the human institution of fatherhood so very unique.* Why would parents of an animal species do this to each other, or more importantly to their young? By “*foisting the obligation of parental care onto the other parent and then going off in search of a new sex partner, the foister will have advanced hers or his genetic interests at the expense of the abandoned parent. The foister will really promote his or her selfish evolutionary goals by deserting his or her mate and offspring*”, (Diamond, The Third Chimpanzee 1997). So essentially the reasoning is that the parent who has more investment inherent within the creation of the young, is generally the one who is responsible for it's upbringing simply by the fact that they have more to lose. Thus, in the great many cases throughout the animal kingdom it is the female who is essentially the caregiver for the offspring. And yet the human species is different in this matter because fathers exist and are extremely involved in their offspring's well being; the question is *why?*

History is replete with instances which show ways in which a particular sex is marginalized, operated on, made crippled and otherwise abused, by what is commonly believed to be widely acceptable standards as to the specific culture of which they arise. African based cliterectomies and Asian based foot binding are two that immediately spring to mind. In both of these instances we see that the *weaker sex is made powerless by the dominating sex, to the point where they must consent in having a part of themselves destroyed.* What is perhaps one of the most fascinating aspects of anthropological studies on areas such as these is that the victims generally are not outraged at their predicaments, and generally believe in the rituals, and their value to society as a whole, (much as most men in today's society might believe in child support though it is little different).

In cliterectomies we see that large portions and parts of a female's labia and clitoris are removed, eliminating the ability to enjoy sex, (talk about the anxiety of paternal certainty!). Their vagina is subsequently sewn up making it impossible to have sex, with a piece of straw graciously left so that the woman may pee through it. The ordeal is a rite of passage for females, and thereby it is important in its meaning giving; however to societies who do not practice such standards, cliterectomy and all genital mutilation is abhorrent and repugnant at base. And yet these females willingly submit to this dictum laid out before them by their tribal peers. Foot binding is likewise a crippling event which may entail in many cases the woman nearly losing the very ability to walk so that man may be fancied and may be increased by the societal prestige of having a wife with such dainty feet. *It seems to be a characteristic that the more physically or socially powerful sex tends to make the weaker sex submit to its demands.* Here again, I repeat as to highlight the ironic nature that humans are capable of accepting the dictates that a particular grouping of mammals decide as to how they should be treated, even when they are essentially being raped and viciously mutilated by their own family and community; who do such things under the auspice of caring, culture, and protection, (likewise today they would refer to crippling, dismemberment, stigmatization, jailment and evolutionary rape of men as being "in the best interest of the child"), continue to exist?

In the western hemisphere, we can see that feminists have repeatedly lamented the nature of what they have termed a "patriarchic despotism". But it is by way of comparison that we can peek into nature to illuminate how the sexes throughout the entire animal kingdom manipulate each other as their species specific circumstances have evolved and thereby determine for ourselves more precisely what **sex based despotism** truly is. In the Caribbean, there exists a tropical bird called the Jacana, the female of which

grows to proportions which are one and a half times that of the male Jacana. Instead of the male pursuing the female, the females in these species have adapted to grow larger and compete fiercely for the reproductive resources of individual males. A flock of Jacanas are known to chase a male for as long as needed, and the one that finally catches him, wins the prize. She guards him against other females fiercely much as a male in our species has been known to do with his female. It is so antithetical to many of the other instances of species reproduction strategies that it begs the question; how could this be?

Well after she mates with him, she will deliver a brood of eggs within a day, and then *she will make him sit on them until they hatch*. Her job is done after she lays her eggs. She gains no reward from helping him to support feeding the little chicks. The fact that she rather than another female has caught up to him, and generally made him submit has proved her evolutionary value to the male (much as Baker's instance of the rape victim who will have sex with her abductor as he has proven by the rape his fitness, and I am still suspicious however the link is fascinating; or again compare Weatherford and Robertson's "Sexy Son theory"), in that the females that are born will be as she is, fast, strong and large enough to catch up to and mate with other males. The slower Jacanas simply don't find mates, and therefore will not reproduce. This further works for the female of this species because as with her ability to reproduce again is so fast, that she can just go in search of another mate rather than worry about the chicks that are about to hatch, and likewise make the male Jacana do all the hard work of raising and feeding the young. Again, an instance such as this could not be found in an environment that required that both parents must search for food were it more scarce, but this strategy thrives in the plentiful nature of the Caribbean.

Robert Trivers' theory of the investment of males and females here is reversed. The parallel with the attractive son theory is simply remarkable. After she lays her eggs, she is off to find another mate and is capable of mating with another in less than a week later. Ultimately the female in this species have taken on the aptitudes normally associated throughout the animal kingdom with male behavior. Her investment is small, and so she competes more fiercely with her own sex for access to the highly valued males who will raise her young. What mutation could have caused such a complete reversal of how we understand the animal kingdom to be? This is certainly the subject of another paper, yet it is similarly interesting to contemplate, but it is now that we turn our attention to the nature of *slavery*, before we can come to see how all of these pieces begin to fit together.

In closing I would once again desire that the reader confront the violence and destruction that we inflict upon one another, as when a woman is raped. In African and Muslim societies somewhere between a half million to a million women per year undergo a ritual/surgery called a "cliterectomy" which transforms them both as a spiritual being, a member of society, physically, sexually, and emotionally; and something which is at the same time a traumatic event which would make most physical rapes of women from the western hemisphere pale in comparison in its character of utter brutality and callousness. *As such, it furthers a new understanding, much like the Holocaust does and offers us a stepping stone for which to further extrapolate by way of comparative evolutionary analysis, our ethics and values in relation to the events we deem egregious, and those we accept as part of society.* That is, if the treatment is accepted by the wider community and condemnation of the brutal treatment of human individuals is not forth coming; and if this can happen in other parts of the world where we can see as yet that which they cannot see, who is to say that our own society is not taking part in a similar ritual

which though brutal in character is generally accepted, and which if put into another perspective would nakedly show the deplorable condition of the ritual and/or surgery? It is clear that such things can and do exist, because they have existed again and again. What is startling is that nearly anytime people pick up a history book, they are stunned at the treatment of people and peculiar beliefs in times past, yet fail to apply this knowledge to the ignorance, brutality and propensity that their society inflicts upon its members.

Crucial in my mind, as the next phases of this exposition I hope will elaborate and further build on, is the very basis of rape and its qualitative dissimilarity as between the sexes. *As adultery only applied to woman, so rape seems only to apply to men or said another way a man steals fertility whilst a woman steals resources.* There are few cases of men being physically raped, (other than by another male) typically because it is simply not how a woman would victimize a male. Adultery is on the other hand an example of the victimization of men by the opposite sex. It is therefore, in a very real sense an instance of male rape. Consider again the evolutionary trade; the woman offer fertility, the male his resources. **If we understand rape as the violation of a female's evolutionary bartering tool, as it is taken from her rather than chosen by her and thereby it is forcibly stolen from her** and perhaps most egregiously, leaving the woman with the baby of the rapist to take care of alone, making the rapist an even more detestable creature as he profits genetically by making her life harder and her search for prospective mates near impossible by having already a child to support by the rapist.

By creating society, our ancestors created and were created by an ethic which evolved harmoniously with their evolution itself. Adultery was seen as a sin because in the days before DNA evidence was procured by science, adultery was in essence "male

rape” in the same way as unwillful sexual penetration is female rape, because it is taking from a man his evolutionary property; that which is his resourcefulness which by adultery he is mislead into providing for a child that will not carry forth his genes, much as a woman who was raped may provide fertility to a male who does not provide “maternal certainty” to her, or continued resourcefulness.

And yet stories such as Shakespeare’s Hamlet point to a hidden domestic violence, the guile of a woman to poison her husband so as to move up in the world by making use of his resources without his consent. It is interesting to point out the clear lack of such stories and myths of men poisoning their wives because the male depended on the female to take care of his children and it would be self defeating to kill one’s wife unless she was barren, which was by way of coincidence why Henry the VIII axed so many of his wives. A woman inwardly craves the *expression of love*; whilst a man conversely craves the *property of love*. Paternal certainty requires the property of certainty, Maternal certainty requires the expression of the males love. One of the ways to show this is by being resourceful, but it is not the only way that a man expresses his love for a woman.

A man can express his love for a woman by showing her attention, by laying with her, or otherwise by showing her that she is very valuable to him. These are the expressions of drama in every couples life, whether present in large amounts or in meager, but they are the glue which holds a couple together. In a word it is: Romance. A woman’s fascination with the aspect of what we refer to as “romance” is less realized or expressed within the psyche of the male. The woman may ask “why can’t you be more romantic?” or worse yet “why can’t you be more like Elaine’s husband Bill”. Girlfriends may gloat when they discuss the romantic display of one of their

perspective suitors. A male doesn't understand the whole process, but goes through the motions necessary to attract and hold on to their desired mate. Romance is part of the human male's "peacock strut", however because humans build a family together unlike the peacock, it is the promise of family that he offers.

A finch on the other hand will build a nest for to attract a willing female. Birds of the Finch's sort may go around to inspect various nests by various male suitors to see which were best built, thus the ability to build a nest to the approval of a female is highly valued and a genetic component that has become highly developed in that species. Humans are in a sense a bird of two feathers, for though the females are concerned about the nest building ability of their prospective mates, they are also concerned about his proud display and expression of romantic love. This is why woman read Romance novels and men require women to sign prenuptial agreements, so that if she strays, that she will not take with her his ability fulfill his own genetic and evolutionary needs and desires.

To reiterate, Male Rape can be any event which disproportionately cripples or maims a male's ability to further his evolutionary goals set forth and proscribed by his own freedom to act as a vessel of free will so long as he is not hurting another; as or related specifically to the procurement of his resources for any reason to be used at the discretion other than by his sole non-coerced consent and that which removes by the necessity of his non-consent any reciprocation evolutionarily and reproductively speaking from members of the opposite sex for which the resources have traditionally and evolutionarily been traded for the fertility and sexual access by way of evolution through cryptic ovulation and all other peripheral benefits that go with having a mutual relationship by consenting adults over the course of whatever time the mutual consent is conceived and brought about by the

individuals participating through contract, ritual, contractual ritual or otherwise, including, but not limited to, child support itself.

To be utterly clear, to advocate for the value inherent within marriage and a family not only for the benefit of children, but as well for all members of a family unit, to exist as a self sufficient unit which can appropriate its resources by mutual consent, and be held responsible for the governance of its own genetic forebears is not to, in my opinion advocate in any way for an understanding that males should not be responsible for bringing up their young; nay, it is an advocacy to revoke for once and for all an intrusion upon the human species by governmental and political bodies upon the lives of the individuals it governs, and the usurpation by these governmental bodies and political legislatures upon the freedom, the will, the safety at the naked root of our evolution to our humanity, and which seeks to defrock with spite and condemnation the institution which has most uprightly dragged us from our pre-transcendent slumbers; that rite which we understand to be marriage and a family proper; a doctrine which states that we are foremost before anything else a member of a species that has evolved by a certain and unmistakable predisposition of light, through the prised relatedness that binds us as members of something larger, that unites us towards what Stephen Dedalus would call that "secret cause", as Shakespeare might opine "that all journeys end in lovers arms", so does every life journey end in the radiating brilliance of a happiness that we, as parents, and no one else, have given to our children, and that love that we made, is that which we leave with and give to the eternity of the infinite that we are born and by the fire of Heraclitus, we die unto.

Khepri Rising is also the author of :

Meaning and Relatedness and **Beadle Scat, Cipher-Dios**
and **Baptism of Fire**.

