

A. We Are Self-Domesticated Animals

According to the theory of evolution, we didn't evolve from animals—we still are animals. Moreover, while there has been undeniable progress for the species as a whole in a number of areas (e.g., population growth, life spans), science also indicates this progress was purchased at a high price with a wide disparity in its beneficiaries. For the great majority of our time as a species, we were hunter-gatherers that belonged to small tribes of rough equals with little disparity in wealth, ate a diet that we had evolved to eat, and spent only four or five hours a day “working.” We also spent a great deal of time alone in nature, believed on a fundamental level that we were spiritually connected with each other, nature and the Universe (i.e., though calling it many names we all believed in the Force), and went through involved initiation ceremonies that largely mirrored the hero's journey that transformed us from children into full members of the tribe, from juvenile caterpillars into adult butterflies.

This situation changed dramatically, however, with the widespread introduction of sedentary agriculture. As noted in his book *Sapiens* on the history of our species, Yuval Harari stated:

Rather than heralding a new era of easy living, the Agricultural Revolution left farmers with lives generally more difficult and less satisfying than those of foragers. Hunter-gatherers spent their time in more stimulating and varied ways, and were less in danger of starvation and disease. The Agricultural Revolution certainly enlarged the sum total of food at the disposal of humankind, but the extra food did not translate into a better diet or more leisure. Rather, it translated into population explosions and pampered elites. The average farmer worked harder than the average forager, and got a worse diet in return. The Agricultural Revolution was history's biggest fraud.

[YNHarari](#)

Professors Gregory Cochran and Henry Harpending described hunter-gatherer society in *The 10,000 Year Explosion* (10,000 Year):

In the days before agriculture, governments didn't really exist. Most hunter-gatherers were egalitarian anarchists: They didn't have chiefs or bosses, and they didn't have much use for anyone who tried to be boss. [10,000 Year](#) at 105.

Hunter-gatherers routinely shared resources, partly in order to cement relations with other members of the tribe, partly because there wasn't anything else to do with those resources. ...Foragers aren't selfish.... If they had full stomachs and their tools and weapons were in good shape, hunter-gatherers didn't work. They hung out: They talked, they gossiped, and sang. They were lazy and they should have been: Being lazy made biological sense. [10,000 Year](#) at 115.

This is in stark contrast to the consequences of sedentary farming:

The population expansion associated with farming increased crowding, while farming itself made people sedentary. Mountains of garbage and water supplies contaminated with human waste favored the spread of infectious disease. [10,000 Year](#) at 86

But farmers do have chiefs...Elites, defined as those who live off the productive work of others, came into existence in farming societies because they could. [10,000 Year](#) at 105.

Governments, especially good governments, eventually led to decreased standards of living, at least in terms of calories. [10,000 Year](#) at 110.

Farmers, in contrast [to hunter-gatherers], have to be selfish. Id. at 115.

When law and order let human density increase, farmers eventually had to work harder and harder just to survive. Here again, selection must have favored those odd people who *like* to work, even when there was enough to eat. Ultimately, this meant that both sexes had to work hard. In fact, for most people, that became the only way to produce enough to feed and raise a family. Id. at 116.

In his article *The Worst Mistake in the History of the Human Race*, Jared Diamond stated that sedentary agriculture had more impact than just life style:

Now archaeology is demolishing another sacred belief: that human history over the past million years has been a long tale of progress. In particular, recent discoveries suggest that the adoption of agriculture, supposedly our most decisive step toward a better life, was in many ways a catastrophe from which we have never recovered. With agriculture came the gross social and sexual inequality, the disease and despotism that curse our existence....

Skeletons from Greece and Turkey show that the average height of hunter-gatherers toward the end of the ice ages was a generous 5' 9" for men, 5' 5" for women. With the adoption of agriculture, height crashed, and by 3000 B.C. had reached a low of only 5' 3" for men, 5' for women. By classical times heights were very slowly on the rise again, but modern Greeks and Turks have still not regained the average height of their distant ancestors.

[Mistake](#)

As Amanda Mummert and her colleagues found this loss of height was a global phenomena:

In total, we identified 14 studies that observed stature to decline in relation to the transition from foraging to agricultural subsistence. The impact of agriculture, accompanied by increasing population density and a rise in infectious disease, was observed to decrease stature in populations from across the globe, including Europe, Africa, the Middle East, Asia, Central and South America, and North America. [Stature](#) (citations omitted)

More troubling, we have suffered an even larger proportional decline in brain size than we have in stature. As reported in Discovery magazine:

Over the past 20,000 years, the average volume of the human male brain has decreased from 1,500 cubic centimeters to 1,350 cc, losing a chunk the size of a tennis ball. The female brain has shrunk by about the same proportion. “I’d call that major downsizing in an evolutionary eye blink,” [Anthropology Professor John Hawks] says. “This happened in China, Europe, Africa—everywhere we look.” If our brain keeps dwindling at that rate over the next 20,000 years, it will start to approach the size of that found in *Homo erectus*, a relative that lived half a million years ago and had a brain volume of only 1,100 cc...

“Since the Bronze Age, the brain shrank a lot more than you would expect based on the decrease in body size,” Hawks reports. “For a brain as small as that found in the average European male today, the body would have to shrink to the size of a pygmy” to maintain proportional scaling. [Discover](#)

Hawks suggested that the reduction of brain size reflected an increase in its efficiency and thus we are just as intelligent as our pre-agricultural forbearers; recent studies, however, have established that brain size and intelligence are strongly linked and thus puts that assertion in serious doubt. [Big Brain](#)

Drew Bailey and David Geary suggested a different theory after finding a similar reduction in brain size and a surprising correlation with population density:

When population numbers were low, as was the case for most of our evolution, the cranium kept getting bigger. But as population went from sparse to dense in a given area, cranial size declined, highlighted by a sudden 3 to 4 percent drop in EQ [the ratio of brain volume to body mass] starting around 15,000 to 10,000 years ago. “We saw that trend in Europe, China, Africa, Malaysia—everywhere we looked,” Geary says.... In terms of raw innate smarts, he believes, they probably were as “bright as today’s brightest” and might even have surpassed us.

Still, Geary hesitates to use words like genius or brilliant in describing them. “Practically speaking,” he explains, “our ancestors were not our intellectual or creative equals because they lacked the same kind of cultural support. The rise of agriculture and modern cities based on economic specialization has

allowed the very brightest people to focus their efforts in the sciences, the arts, and other fields. Their ancient counterparts didn't have that infrastructure to support them. It took all their efforts just to get through life." [Discover](#)

In addition to reductions in stature and brain size, we've endured a number of other changes since the advent of sedentary agriculture that all point to a well-known evolutionary process not typically associated with humans:

In essence, we domesticated ourselves, according to Richard Wrangham, a primatologist at Harvard University and a leading proponent of this view.

Some 30 animals have been domesticated, he notes, and in the process every one of them has lost brain volume—typically a 10 to 15 percent reduction compared with their wild progenitors. Domesticated animals also have more gracile builds, smaller teeth, flatter faces, a more striking range of coloration and hair types—and, in many breeds, floppy ears and curly tails. Except for those last two traits, the domesticated breeds sound a lot like us.

"When you select against aggression, you get some surprising traits that come along with it," Wrangham says. "My suspicion is that the easiest way for natural selection to reduce aggressiveness is to favor those individuals whose brains develop relatively slowly in relation to their bodies." When fully grown, such an animal does not display as much aggression because it has a more juvenile brain, which tends to be less aggressive than that of an adult. "This is a very easy target for natural selection," Wrangham argues, because it probably does not depend on numerous mutations but rather on the tweaking of one or two regulatory genes that determine the timing of a whole cascade of developmental events. For that reason, he says, "It happens consistently." The result, he believes, is an adult possessing a suite of juvenile characteristics, including a very different [more docile] temperament.

[Discover](#)

Helen Leach confirmed that humans display many of the same physical changes that distinguish domestic populations from wild species, but also clarified that these changes can occur through unconscious selection as well deliberate intervention. [Human Domestication](#) Citing the fact that the house sparrow and the house mouse have gone through the same changes as species intentionally domesticated, Leach suggested that it is the new environment created by agriculture that selects for these new traits and that humans were equally affected. Id.

In reporting on a 2014 symposium on human domestication, Ann Gibbons wrote:

Like dogs, cows, and horses, we show many of the physical traits that emerge during animal domestication. The accompanying changes in behavior, especially among men, might have helped humans evolve more complex

language, live atop each other in cities, and work together to create sophisticated cultures. No one set out to domesticate humans, of course. But at the first-ever [symposium](#) on self-domestication of humans held here at the Salk Institute for Biological Studies, researchers outlined a set of linked behavioral and anatomical changes seen in animals that humans have tamed as well as in creatures that have tamed themselves. [Gibbons](#)

Beyond physical changes, domestication also changes behavior. Wrangham and his colleague Brian Hare pointed to the results of studies comparing the cognitive abilities of wolves and dogs:

Wolves, with their larger brains, are more prone to flashes of insight, allowing them to solve problems on their own; dogs, with smaller brains, excel at using humans to help them. 'Wolves seem to be a little bit more persistent than dogs in solving simple problems like how to open a box or navigate a detour,' Hare says. 'Wolves persevere when dogs readily give up.' On the flip side, dogs leave wolves in the dust when it comes to tracking the gaze and gestures of their masters—or as Hare puts it, 'They are very good at using humans as tools to solve problems for them.' [Discover](#)

Cochran and Harpending described some of the behavioral changes from human domestication:

Since the elites were in a very real sense raising peasants, just as peasants, raised cows, there must have been a tendency for them to cull individuals who were more aggressive than average. [10,000 Year](#) at 111.

If your ancestors were farmers for a long time, you've descended from people who decided it was better to live on their knees than to die on their feet. [10,000 Year](#) at 110.

Agriculture itself, and the particular form it took in state societies, must have selected for personalities that can only be called bourgeois, characterized by traits that make a man successful rather than interesting. Id. at 113-14.

At first, all of these pro-agricultural behaviors must have run against the grain: It's unlikely that humans were comfortable doing things that had never made sense in the past. But over time, [genes] that induced this kind of ant like behavior must have increased in frequency, until eventually, after millennia, selfish, hard working, self-denying people were far more common than they had been among hunter-gatherers. Acting like ants rather than grasshoppers didn't improve the average standard of living over the long haul, ... [but eventually] there must have been many people with personality types that hadn't existed at all among our forager ancestors. Id. at 117-18.

Bruce Hood in his book *Domesticated Brain* stated, "Domestication not only makes the animal more socially skilled, it also makes it more dependent on others." [Domesticated Brain](#) Chimps and pre-school children both mimic the actions of others in order to learn a new skill. But a chimp will imitate only the motions necessary to achieve the goal, whereas a child also mimics steps clearly unrelated to the task. Hood suggested that children over-imitate a pointless action because they are more interested in fitting in than in learning how best to solve the task:

The social pressure to conform involves being valued by the group because, after all, most success is really defined by what others think... For humans, being social requires skills of perception and comprehension when it comes to recognizing and interpreting the activity of others but it also requires changing our own thoughts and behaviors to coordinate with theirs so that we can be accepted.... [The] danger of rejection is the flipside of the benefit of living in a group and the devastating consequences of becoming an outsider... Deliberate ostracization can be the cruelest punishment to inflict on an individual, short of physical harm. Like domesticated foxes that escaped into the wild, we invariably need to return to the company of others. Id.

In sum, our hunter gather ancestors lived in their natural environment in an egalitarian fashion that resembled an animal herd. Through sedentary agriculture, food surpluses, and the increase in population density, small number of elites emerged that forced the large majority of the population to work the farms and our new stratified social structure began to resemble an insect hive with distinct castes more than a herd of equals. At each stage of development, the powerful and the intelligent imposed the ideologies that justified the status quo and thus kept them in their high caste status. This hive structure in effect domesticated humans to be among the first farm animals and treated them accordingly.

Like bees, each knew what their small role was but no one, not even the elite, understood how the parts really fit together. But while individual members diminished due to domestication, the over all knowledge and technologies of the human collective grew with the contribution of each scientist, explorer, and artist, especially with the advent of the printing press.

Thus, agriculture caused a rarely acknowledged trade-off: the hive as a whole has become much larger, more technologically adept, and culturally skilled through food surpluses, specialization, and comparative advantage that agriculture allowed, but during most of its history the vast majority of its individual members have been made substantially worse off. We were taken from our natural habitat and forced to live in dirty, crowded, and disease-filled environments. Instead of the stimulating activities of hunting and gathering, the great majority of us were forced into backbreaking, mindless, and never-ending farm work. Instead of a varied and healthy diet, we ate little beside starchy and less nutritional grain. As a result of these conditions, we shrank in both stature and brain mass; psychologically, we became more docile, timid, and dependent on others; and while we became more

adept at copying the solutions of others, our ability to solve new problems, to persevere in challenging circumstances, or to think or do anything original was reduced. In addition to losing our physical and intellectual freedom, we have sacrificed our ability to grow up from perpetual adolescence and kept ignorant about our true situation and fundamental connection with each other, nature, and the Universe.

B. We Are Also Self-Deceiving Animals

Our dependency on the hive creates an enormous incentive for us to appear as socially valuable to others as possible. As a result, we have developed the ability to routinely deceive ourselves so we can better deceive others that we are more competent, good looking, intelligent, and moral than we in fact are. In his article *The Elements of a Scientific Theory of Self-Deception*, Professor Robert Trivers stated:

Another major source of self-deception has to do with self-promotion, self-exaggeration on the positive side, denial on the negative, all in the name of producing an image that we are “beneffective,” to use Anthony Greenwald’s apt term, toward others. That is, we benefit others and are effective when we do it. If you ask high school seniors in the United States to rank themselves on leadership ability, fully 80% say they have better than average abilities, but for true feats of self-deception you can hardly beat the academic profession. When you ask professors to rate themselves, an almost unanimous 94% say they are in the top half of the profession! ... Tricks of the trade are biased memory, biased computation, changing from active to passive voice when changing from describing positive to negative outcomes, and so on.

...

Self-deception appears to be a universal human trait, which touches our lives at all levels—from our innermost thoughts to the chance that we will be annihilated together in warfare. It affects the relative development of intellectual disciplines (the more social the content, the less developed the discipline: contrast physics and sociology) as well as the relative degree of consciousness of individuals (generally, more self-deceived, less conscious). An evolutionary analysis suggests that the root cause is social, including selection to deceive others, selection on others to manipulate and deceive oneself, and selection on competing sections of one’s own genotype. [Self Deception](#)

In his book *The Folly of Fools: The Logic of Deceit and Self Deception in Human Life*, Trivers further found that the more power and intelligence individuals have the more likely they are to deceive themselves and others, including flat out cheating. Id. at 20, 37. In another paper, he also noted “since humor often involves seeing life or a person from a novel angle and self-deception tends to reduce such angles, self-

deception will naturally tend to reduce one's sense of humor." [Self-deception Inhibits Laughter](#)

Thus, those who objectively have been in the best position socially and intellectually to see the true nature of the human condition have been subjectively the least likely to recognize it or challenge the status quo. Rather, as the ones most invested and most benefitted by whatever ideology was in place that gave them their high status positions, the powerful and intelligent have uniformly been its biggest champions (embodying the bureaucratic principal known as Mile's Law that "where you stand depends on where you sit" and the scientific principal enunciated by Max Planck that "science advances one funeral at a time.")

C. Modernity's Narrative Is All We've Ever Known

As the winners in today's society, then, the people leading corporations, educational institutions, government, and media are currently modernity's main cheerleaders and have been instrumental in convincing the masses and themselves that our materialistic, hive-like existence is the best of all possible worlds. Since their power depends on unquestioning acceptance of the modern narrative, they have incessantly reinforced its messages -- the present has always been better than the past, our technology and capitalism have given us a Golden Age, and we are smart, independent, rational individuals, the moral equivalent of butterflies that just need to work hard to be happy—while suppressing, ignoring, or ridiculing any positions to the contrary. As a member of a hive, we have little over-all perspective beyond our own small day-to-day world and rely on the information the hive itself provides. Like Truman in Seahaven, we have thus spent a lifetime entirely submerged in this narrative without encountering a single viable alternative or credible dissent.

Further, over the last 10,000 years, our capacity and desire to think for ourselves has decreased while our need for acceptance and ability to self-deceive has increased. Most of us have therefore accepted this social programming without question and very reasonably have convinced ourselves that we must be free and intelligent butterflies in the best of all worlds if society and everyone else who isn't a kook tells us so. Moreover, in good faith and total reliance on this belief we have made enormous investments in time, money, and emotional capital to become the people that society, our parents, and our peers tell us we should be. We've suppressed whatever inner voice we might have had that told us something seemed off and internalized the hive's mental "operating system" with its various rules and controls.

Like fish unaware that they are in water since they've never known anything else, we aren't even aware this operating system has been installed. As Morpheus described:

The Matrix is everywhere. It is all around us. Even now, in this very room. You can see it when you look out your window or when you turn on your

television. You can feel it when you go to work... when you go to church... when you pay your taxes. It is the world that has been pulled over your eyes to blind you from the truth...[t]hat you are a slave, Neo. Like everyone else you were born into bondage. Into a prison that you cannot taste or see or touch. A prison for your mind. [Morpheus](#)

Or as Goethe observed, “None are more hopelessly enslaved than those who falsely believe they are free.”

But while Morpheus described a prison and Goethe enslavement, very few if any of us are conscious of any such constraints. If pointed out, the vast majority would be insulted and vigorously defend the status quo. Modernity and its narrative have brought major scientific advancements, medical breakthroughs, and an explosion of material advancements. There are far more people living far longer lives in far greater comfort than ever before. After several hundred generations of living in civilization, most are grateful for the guaranteed necessities, creature comforts, and security the modern world has bestowed and couldn't imagine living in any other fashion. While we may be the moral equivalents of work animals in a factory farm that have been bred and trained to accept our routinized and mindless captivity, it doesn't feel that way to normal people, especially those in positions of power.

As Lucas intimated, most of us would find it extremely painful even to consider the possibility that we might be wrong about such fundamental assumptions. At least since adolescence, we have categorically dismissed or repressed any thoughts to the contrary as counterproductive nonsense. To paraphrase the Jack Nicholson character in *A Few Good Men*, “We don't want to know the truth. We can't handle the truth.” On a practical level, even if true, what can be done about it? If the rat race is all there is, why worry about how we got here? Just run the damn race as well as you can and call it a life. As Benjamin Franklin observed, “However as matters now stand with us, care and industry seem absolutely necessary to our well being; they should therefore have every Encouragement we can invent, and not one Motive to diligence be subtracted.” Letter to Peter Collinson Why not just conform?

D. Some Are Less Domesticated Than Others

The simple answer is that every generation there are those who can't or won't. While all have the wild still in them to some extent, some are born less domesticated than others, evolutionary throwbacks that show certain atavistic, wolf-like tendencies such as imagination, perseverance, and independence. Like largely unbroken animals sprinkled in an otherwise domesticated flock, these individuals have been the prodigal sons that explored the world, the one sheep in a hundred that wandered away to see what was on the other side of the hill. As among the few capable of independent thought, they have been the primary source of the world's scientific, philosophic, and artistic advancements. As Max Planck said:

New scientific ideas never spring from a communal body, however organized, but rather from the head of an individually inspired researcher who struggles with his problems in lonely thought and unites all his thought on one single point which is his whole world for the moment. [Planck](#)

They are also frequently chronic malcontents that don't feel at home in the modern era. In his 1956 book, Colin Wilson examined the lives of a number of these types, including Vincent Van Gogh, Nietzsche, T.E. Lawrence ("of Arabia"), Sartre, and Hesse, and coined the term Outsider to describe such individuals. As Wilson said:

A small number of human beings differ from their fellows in feeling basically dissatisfied with what living in this world has to offer them. They suffer from that same discontent as Bunyan's hero who could think of nothing but 'What can I do to be saved?' I must emphasize immediately that such people do not necessarily regard themselves as religious.... But whether they know it or not, they are reacting to the same peculiar dissatisfaction that has characterized truly religious people throughout the ages. They are revolted and enraged by the hymn that declares:

*The trivial round, the common task
Should furnish all we ought to ask*

As far as they are concerned, a life devoted to 'the trivial round' is not worth living. [Secret History of Consciousness](#)

Wilson further found that such Outsiders have been generally dissatisfied with "established" religions as well:

I have tried to show how religion, the backbone of civilization, hardens into a Church that is unacceptable to Outsiders, and the Outsiders — the men who strive to become visionaries — become the Rebels. In our case, the scientific progress that has brought us closer than ever before to conquering the problems of civilization, has also robbed us of spiritual drive; and the Outsider is doubly a rebel: a rebel against the Established Church, a rebel against the unestablished church of materialism. Yet for all this, he is the real spiritual heir of the prophets, of Jesus and St. Peter, of St. Augustine and Peter Waldo. The purest religion of any age lies in the hands of its spiritual rebels. The twentieth century is no exception. [Religion and the Rebel](#)

In a recent biography of Wilson, Gary Lachman summarized the situation that such individuals confront:

In *The Outsider* Wilson made his first attempt at analyzing a character he felt was peculiar to our age, a person with a pressing hunger for meaning and spiritual purpose in a world seemingly bent on denying him these. ... That purpose was to become something greater than himself, to work against the

laziness and complacency that keeps him second-rate and allows him to be satisfied with being “only human” [N.B., he recognizes that he is a caterpillar and wants to be a butterfly].

But today, in our modern society, geared toward comfort and security and motivated by purely material aims, there is no place for such a person, and his spiritual seriousness is a liability. His or her desire to be something more than a happy, well-fed animal, puts him at odds with the world around him. This type is driven by needs that the people he knows do not understand.... He is not at home in the world, his permanent sense of self-dissatisfaction does not allow him to be [N.B., most others think they are already butterflies and don't understand how someone could think there was something more].

This dissatisfaction cannot be met by any changes to the social or economic system.... “The question of freedom,” Wilson writes, “is not a social problem.” Only by the long, difficult, personal struggle to self-realization can the Outsider realize his goal [N.B., the Monomyth's hero's journey, the Q Script's path of personal redemption]...

Wilson's notebooks were full of observations of such figures, of Outsiders who were not able to survive their clashes with the world and who succumbed to illness, suicide or madness, who were not quite strong enough to impose their vision on their contemporaries....

All were infused with the Romantic vision that burst upon western consciousness in the late eighteenth century, the insight that informed the music of Beethoven and the poetry of Blake. This was the sense, lost in the modern age, that human beings are really gods, or at least are meant to be, if only they could overcome their laziness and timidity. The Outsider is an exploration of the psychological and spiritual stresses that these and other men of genius faced in the search for their true selves. “The Outsider,” Wilson tells us, “is not sure who he is. He has found an ‘I’, but it is not his true ‘I’. His main business is to find his way back to himself.” [Beyond the Robot](#)

As Wilson put it:

[Insiders] are in prison: that is the Outsider's verdict. They are quite contented in prison—caged animals who have never known freedom; but it is prison all the same. And the Outsider? He is in prison too: nearly every Outsider in this book has told us so in a different language; but he knows it. His desire is to escape. But a prison-break is not an easy matter; you must know all about your prison, otherwise you might spend years in tunneling, like the Abbey in *The Count of Monte Cristo*, and only find yourself in the next cell. [Outsider](#)

Like most traits, there are not two distinct populations of Insiders versus Outsiders but a bell curve across a spectrum. The most domesticated Insiders that are perfectly content with modernity and have fully and happily accepted its programming are on one end, the least domesticated Outsiders that are chronic malcontents and are struggling with the programming on the other end, and most of us somewhere in the middle.

On the Outsider's side of the curve, there is a significant minority (Religious/Romantics) that are still capable of hearing the call of the wild but do not exhibit as much of the internal strife as the true Outsiders that lie farther out on the spectrum. After several thousand years in captivity, however, the curve has shifted dramatically towards the Insider end with fewer Religious/Romantics and Outsiders born with each passing generation. As Nietzsche expressed it more than 130 years ago:

And thus spoke Zarathustra to the people:

It is time for man to fix his goal. It is time for man to plant the seed of his highest hope. His soil is still rich enough for it. But that soil will one day be poor and domesticated, and no lofty tree will any longer be able to grow there. Alas! There comes the time when man will no longer launch the arrow of his longing beyond man -- and the string of his bow will have unlearned to whiz!

I tell you: one must still have chaos in oneself, to give birth to a dancing star. I tell you: you have still chaos in yourselves. Alas! There comes the time when man will no longer give birth to any star. Alas! There comes the time of the most despicable man, who can no longer despise himself.

Lo! I show you the Last Man. 'What is love? What is creation? What is longing? What is a star?' -- so asks the Last Man, and blinks. The earth has become small, and on it hops the Last Man, who makes everything small. His species is ineradicable as the flea; the Last Man lives longest. 'We have discovered happiness' -- say the Last Men, and they blink....No shepherd, and one herd! Everyone wants the same; everyone is the same: he who feels differently goes voluntarily into the madhouse. [Zarathustra](#)

E. A Summary of the Proposed Model

Under the framework proposed above, then, we are killer apes that domesticated ourselves from egalitarian, herd-like tribes living in our natural habitat with a high individual fitness and quality of life but with low technology and population ceilings into stratified, hive-like states in artificial habitats with low individual fitness and quality of life but with very high technology and population ceilings. Put more starkly, pursuant to the suggested model we have broken ourselves from a few proud, aggressive, intelligent, technically limited but spiritually conscious, self-

aware and free killer apes that were fully integrated into the living Universe into a very large number of timid, docile, diminished, technically savvy but spiritually stunted, self-deluding, and mentally caged cubicle monkeys that have unknowingly locked ourselves in a materialistic hive-like factory farm and are thus in perpetual exile from ourselves and the rest of life.

The model further proposes that most of us have completely accepted modernity's imprinting and are totally unaware of our situation (at least on a conscious level). It further suggests that very few of us are capable of even acknowledging that the framework might be true much less overcoming our programming because, among other reasons, of our enormous investment costs in time, money, and emotion into the persona that the hive has programmed us to be; our emotional dependency on the hive and need to maintain our status within it; our general inability to think for ourselves; our propensity to delude ourselves as to what we truly are to better rise within the hierarchy of the hive; the almost total absence of publicly available credible evidence backed by recognized authorities to the contrary; and the lack of any apparent and viable alternatives even if we did suspect something was amiss. Most are firmly Insiders that aren't going to change and it is probably best that they stay that way.

According to the framework, however, there are a number of Religious/Romantics that generally accept the programming but have a vague disquiet while a few Outsiders acutely feel that something is wrong with society and themselves. Very few Outsiders understand the source of their malcontent while most Insiders can't even imagine feeling such emotions and thus have little sympathy for them.