

MY HEAD A HUNTER



MY HEART A FARMER



Understanding Identities and Relationships

Hamid S. Atiyyah Ph.D.

2019

MY HEAD A HUNTER, MY HEART A FARMER

**UNDERSTANDING IDENTITIES AND
RELATIONSHIPS**

Hamid S. Atiyah, Ph.D.

2019

MY HEAD A HUNTER, MY HEART A FARMER

UNDERSTANDING IDENTITIES AND

RELATIONSHIPS

copyright@ 2019

All rights reserved. This book is the property of the author. Readers may download, display, use and save it on their computers or other electronic access devices, distribute copies of it but may not alter, amend, modify, translate, sell, republish or make any commercial use of it.

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	6
Chapter One: The Making of Hunters and Farmers: A Brief History.....	13
The making of hunters	14
The emergence of farmers	18
The rise of hunter states.....	23
The ‘noble’ hunters	28
Colonial hunters.....	32
World wars of hunters	34
The capitalist hunter	36
Were there farmer communities?	37
Chapter Two: Are You a Hunter or a Farmer?.....	41
The hunter: A profile	44
The hunters’ power urge.....	45
The rational hunter	50
Are hunters immoral?	52
Compete or perish	57
The hunter’s fear of failure.....	59
The hunter’s tools	62
Verbal power.....	65
Mirror, who is more beautiful than the hunter?	66
The respectable hunter.....	68
The aggressive hunter	70
Wars without bloodshed	74
The Dark Triad.....	76
The Farmer	78
The Farmer’s social urge	79
The moral farmer.....	81
Are women also hunters and farmers?.....	84

Chapter Three: Religion, Philosophy and the Social Sciences: Pro-hunter or Farmer?	88
Religion: The champion of the farmer?	89
The other face of religion	92
Philosophy: Between the Hunter’s Realism and the Farmer’s Utopia	96
Humans as part-hunter and part-farmer	96
Hunters in philosophy	100
Farmer philosophy	106
Hunters and farmers in the social sciences	111
Chapter Four: Hunters and Farmers in Relationships	121
Relationships: The essential knots	122
The unsociable hunter	125
Are hunters friends in deeds?	131
Lonely hunters	132
The sociable farmer	135
Chapter Five: A Successful Marriage	139
Choosing the right marriage partner	140
Failed marriages: reasons and consequences	142
Hunters and the future of the family	143
Choosing a marriage partner	145
Hunters and women	149
Hunters’ love	152
Choosing a hunter	154
Hunters and infidelity	161
Hunters and the future of the family	163
Choosing a farmer	164
Different combinations in marriages	166
Two hunters in marriage	167
A union of extremes	175
Passionate farmer meets mild hunter	177
Is marriage between two farmers made in heaven?	178
Making the best of marriage	179
Chapter Six: Raising children	182
Hunter parenting	182
Hunters’ love kicks	185

Hunters' neglect and abuse of their children	195
Farmer parenting	200
Chapter 5: Hunters and Farmers at Work.....	204
Occupational choices of the hunter	204
Occupational preferences of the farmer	215
Hunters in the workplace.....	218
Do hunters make better managers?	223
Hunter manager ethics	231
Farmers in organizations	236
Chapter Six: Do You Dare to Change?.....	240
A hunter or a farmer lifestyle.....	241
On becoming a farmer	247
Bibliography	257

Introduction

Long before the brief but insightful message “Gnothi seauton” or know thyself was inscribed on the temple of Apollo, man began his long, persistent search for self-knowledge. Human beings in every society and community throughout the ages were puzzled by fundamental questions about their nature, origin, death, and social relationships, and whether there are supernatural forces and an afterlife. The answers to these questions or the outcome of mankind’s quest for self-knowledge can be found all around us: in magic, religion, philosophy and the social sciences. Indeed, all the elements of our socio-cultural heritage are the products of this quest in which all of mankind participated.

This search is certainly not a specialized exclusive endeavor that only full-time philosophers and tenured academics can find the time, resources and contemplative mood to indulge in. Every person, including those who claim to be overwhelmed by the humdrum of daily life, occasionally pause to ponder their identities and wonder about the forces and motives that shape and drive them. Self-knowledge is indeed a necessity. We need it to identify, understand, and justify our beliefs, attitudes, motives, sentiments and behavior. It is also immensely important for knowing others in order to correctly perceive and interpret their behavior and motives, and to establish and maintain meaningful and productive relationships with them.

This experiential learning process begins early in our infancy, perhaps as early as day one in our lives, and continues for the duration of our lives.

Much of our knowledge in this field does not come from books and journals but from sources that are personal and closer to us. Our principal experts on human identities and relationships are our parents, siblings, spouses, close friends, teachers, work associates and, of course, ourselves as we perceive, experience and interact with the world around us. The products of this on-going socialization process are the beliefs, values, and attitudes which we proudly claim and defend as our own but are, in fact, mostly acquired from our society and culture. These beliefs and principles concern us, others and the world at large and include such things as religious dogma on the nature of our deity and moral and ethical principles commanding us to do or refrain from certain acts. Some of these beliefs and principles are regarded as immutable, unquestionable, everlasting – in short sacred. Most people strongly believe in the rationality, practicality and usefulness of their beliefs and values and, thus, rarely stop to question, analyze or change them. Often, they stubbornly refuse to change even the most trivial of their customs and habits because these have become integral components of their identities.

These beliefs and customs are important for us because they define our characters and identities as adjusted, functional members of our societies, upholding and practicing their cherished values regarding social relationships, family life and work, and eventually passing them on to future generations. Our societies encourage and reward us for conforming to their values and customs and ostracize us for failing to do so. Of course, there is usually some tolerance for individual differences and latitude for

change and development, otherwise we would still be living in the Neolithic age.

The objective of this book is to offer a new perspective for viewing and analyzing lifestyles to achieve a better understanding of identities and relationships. Social scientists and philosophers often make use of models or constructs in representing and explaining natural and social phenomena. For example, the biological world is said to be host to two types of forces: productive forces like photosynthesis and degenerative forces such as degradation or decomposition of organic matter. Religious interpretations of human behavior are often based on the duality of good and evil. In the ancient Zoroastrian faith, for example, the world is the stage for a struggle between the supreme being Ahura Mazda and the evil spirit Ahriman. Many religions also classify supernatural beings into angelic or demonic creatures and characterize their deeds and influences on human beings as good or evil. In some religions, philosophies and moralistic writings, a person is said to have a virtuous, moral side as well as a darker or evil one. The German poet and thinker Goethe expressed this viewpoint by writing that each one of us carries within him or her all of humanity, the sinner as well as the saint. Similarly, the Russian novelist Alexander Solzhenitsyn stated that “the line dividing good and evil cuts through the heart of every being.” Accordingly, there is a sinister Hyde in every one of us, who is the antithesis of our upright Jekyll.

Differences in human behavior have also been explained by using typologies such as the Apollonian and Dionysian suggested by Nietzsche. The Apollonian type represents the remote, objective, and rational side in

us while the Dionysian is the warm and emotional part of our persona. Femininity and masculinity make up another duality and while the former stands for care, love, and other feminine emotions and dispositions, the latter embodies ambition, rationality, aggression, and other so-called masculine characteristics. It is often suggested that every man possess subtle feminine qualities within his personality and vice versa. Social scientists have also classified personalities and behavior into types such as introverts and extroverts, authoritarian and non-authoritarian personalities and open and closed minds. In the same manner, the hunter and farmer types are used here to analyze, understand and hopefully also to predict attitudes and behavior.

The perspective of this book conceives of humans as having two dimensions or clusters of beliefs, attitudes and behaviors labeled as the 'hunter' and the 'farmer'. It is a fact that our ancestors survived first and for a very long time as hunters and then, for the last ten millennia only, as farmers. However, the use of these two types is not an attempt to advance a specific theory of socio-cultural evolution.

All of us are part-hunter and part-farmer. How much each of us acquires and assimilates of the two types determines and defines our identities and lifestyles. The distinguishing characteristics of the hunter in us are his individualism, egoism and pursuit of power while the quintessential trait of the farmer is his propensity to relate to and cooperate with others. Since we are both farmers and hunters, the urge to be independent coexists side by side in us with our pride of belonging to a family, a community and a nation. Both competition and cooperation govern our behavior at home,

school, and the workplace. We compete and cooperate to survive and achieve our objectives. If we were to compete and never cooperate with each other, group activities would cease and eventually our society or community would weaken and disintegrate. On the other hand, communities whose members cooperate and never compete exist only in the minds and writings of some utopians. Such a community is thought to be too idealistic and unearthly to be realized in this world.

The first chapter in this book briefly traces the rise and development of our hunting and farming ancestors. It will be shown that hunting and food gathering imposed its own imperatives on the lives of early hunters and their primitive social structures. The discovery and spread of agriculture radically improved the survival prospects of humanity, brought larger numbers of people together to form villages, cities and eventually nations and led to the emergence of new values, customs and social structures. However, this did not mean the end of the hunter's lifestyle. Hunting as a method of obtaining food diminished in importance after the advent of agriculture, but the hunter's lifestyle and values endured. It is my assumption that the hunter in us has been and remains firmly in control of our world.

The distinguishing characteristics and behavior patterns of our hunter and farmer sides are presented in chapter Two. This chapter will assist the reader in finding out to what extent his head follows the lead of the hunter in pursuing his own selfish interests and how much attention his heart gives to the farmer's counsel. Though we all share the common heritage of our hunting and farming forefathers, we are individually influenced by our

institutions, circumstances, events as well as our choices to lean toward our hunter or farmer side.

As shown in chapter Three, this duality in human character is also reflected in our religious beliefs and philosophical discourses throughout the ages. While major religions essentially favored and encouraged our farmer side, their teachings and institutions were often influenced by powerful hunters to justify their claims to high status and power. Philosophers debated human nature, character and ethics and while some conceived of humans as having both a hunter and a farmer side, others were convinced that great achievements could not have been realized without the selfishness, power urge and aggressiveness of our hunter side. Some called for making the farmer's lifestyle and values the foundation of human communities to save mankind from bloodshed, oppression and misery for which they blamed our hunter side.

Chapter Four presents an analysis of social relationships inside and outside marriage using the perspective suggested here. Wide differences in expectations, attitudes and behavior between married farmers and hunters may explain the increasing fragility of marriage bonds in our times. Why a marriage between a hunter and farmer is judged to be unsuccessful even if it does not end up in divorce is one of the cases discussed in this chapter. And while it is possible for partners to adjust and cope inside an unsuccessful marriage, a happy and durable union could only be based on compatible lifestyles. However, there are exceptions to this rule; a person high on the hunter dimension or scale may share similar values and goals with another hunter, but it is questionable whether a non-exploitative and

mutually satisfactory relationship between the two is sustainable. The child-rearing practices of the hunter and farming parents and their short and long-term consequences are also discussed in this chapter.

Many of us nowadays work in organizations where we interact with others and play different roles. Chapter Five will show how the perspective suggested here can be effectively used to understand the motives of various actors in the workplace. Every organization member needs this insight to understand his or her behavior and that of others in order to develop better and effective interpersonal skills and establish harmonious and productive relationships with co-workers.

The final chapter deals with personal change. At this stage, the enthusiastic reader may be wondering whether a change in lifestyle in favor of his hunter or farmer side is necessary or desirable. Some contend that without the competitive and aggressive spirit of the hunter, civilization would stagnate, and humankind may even regress into a new dark age. On the other hand, there is the counter argument that if most people were to move further toward the farmer side, the dangers of war, violence, famine, pollution and other social evils would be considerably reduced. Those who seek to become powerful hunters are advised to consult the numerous handbooks, articles, videotapes and specialists on this subject. My own preference is for the farmer style and this chapter includes guidelines on how to develop our farmer side.

Chapter One: The Making of Hunters and Farmers: A Brief History

Survival is the primary need and motive of all human beings and food is the first requirement for survival. So far, mankind has known only two methods of food production, namely food collection and agriculture. For most of the time of their existence spanning about 40,000 years, Homo sapiens obtained their food through hunting and food gathering. The discovery of agriculture is relatively recent, only 10,000 years ago. This shift in the method of food production from hunting and gathering to farming was a major step in the evolution of human society resulting in wide-range changes in our social structures and value systems. Many of our cultural traditions such as social stratification, kinship and religion have been shaped or deeply influenced by this development. However, as will be argued in this chapter, the hunter lifestyle within us has not only survived this radical techno-social transformation through successful adaptation but has also maintained its dominant position and even gained further strength. Tiger and Fox (1971; p.22) arrived at a similar conclusion: "Agricultural and industrial civilizations have put nothing into the basic wiring of the human animal. We are wired for hunting... for the emotions, the excitements, the curiosities, the regularities, the fears, and the social relationships that were needed to survive in the hunting way of life." The lifestyle of our savage ancestors, in the view of Pfeiffer (1972), left a lasting

impact of on us. Nelson and Greene (2003) also drew a causal line between the survival needs of our hunting and gathering ancestors and our behavior the influences of in specific.

The making of hunters

There are few hunting and gathering communities left in the world today but for early humans hunting, fishing and gathering roots and edibles were the only means of obtaining food. The division of labor in these communities was simple: the men hunted, and the women collected edibles. A typical day in the lives of these small communities or bands began with men leaving the campsite to search for game. Hunting was strictly a male activity. Women stayed at home to look after the children or went out to collect seeds and fruits. After the men returned with their catch, they would sit to eat their meal and listen to tales of the hunt told by the proud, successful hunters. Primitive artworks in the form of drawings of hunting scenes on caves' walls testify to the importance of this activity for our early ancestors.

Social relationships among these hunters did not vary much from those observed among animal packs. These primitive relationships were probably governed by the exchange and reciprocity rule. After keeping for himself the best part of the catch, the strongest hunter may share the rest with members of his family and less fortunate hunters. In return for this, he won their loyalty and the favors of the women. Available information on contemporary hunting-gathering tribes confirms this. Wright (1994:

237-8) found that the generous hunter among the Ache of South America reaped the fruits of his generosity by enjoying more sexual liaisons and fathering more children than other males.

Similarly, the chief hunter or Kombeti of the Aka pygmies of central Africa retained a major share of the food and had more wives and children. More recently, Alvard and Gillespie (2004) found that harpooners among the Lamalera whale hunters of Indonesia generally marry earlier and have more children than other hunters. These powerful males with proven superior hunting and fighting skills were naturally favored for leadership positions in their bands.

Hunters were violent and engaged in warfare. Trueman and Trueman (1982) reported that members of the Yanomamo tribe in the Amazon area who fought and killed others had more wives and offspring than others. This strong propensity to violence explains the high incidence of violent death in the tribe which, according to Clagnon (1983) exceeds one fourth of the adult male population. The headhunting Jivaro males of the Amazon jungle saw killing others as necessary to acquire new souls to replace their old souls which they believe are lost every four to five years. Marcus (1980) reported that Jivaro warriors not only killed their enemies but also severed and shrank their heads.

There is no consensus among anthropologists on the prevalence of aggression and violence among primitive tribes. Some such as Robarchek and Robarchek (1988) concluded that these tribes were generally peaceful based on evidence from studying contemporary tribes who maintained a lifestyle reminiscent of the hunting-gathering era. Others, however, are

convinced that our distant ancestors were aggressive and frequently resorted to violence and war. Even present-day hunting and gathering tribes practice some degree of violence with other groups according to Harris (1977). Keeley (1996) estimated that our ancestors are even more violent than us and their victims per population exceeded those in later times including the present. Homicide rates per population in hunter groups for instance were higher than those in modern industrial societies (Gat, 2006). Le Blanc (2004) concluded in his book *Constant Battles* that the noble savage hypothesis is a myth because violence and wars are intrinsic propensities since ancient times.

Wrangham and Peterson (1966) argued that the violence in human beings is an inherited trait from our hunting ancestors and continues to profoundly influence our thinking and behavior. We are still hunters from the stone age and respond with the same fervor to battle cries, according to Tiger and Fox (1971). In Dutton's (2008) view, our extreme violence inherited from the hunting era is based on the trilogy of pain, blood and death. His advice to all of us is to acknowledge our readiness to commit extremely violent acts and not deceive ourselves by claiming to be civilized.

Hunting required strength, stamina and intelligence and a large measure of aggressiveness. Hunters hunted and killed animals and other hunters who trespassed on their territories or challenged their leadership positions. They also had to fight to acquire and control new territories. Indeed, our territoriality probably developed during this hunting stage in our social evolution. Persistent hunting eventually drove game from a group's territory forcing them to enlarge it or move to a new one. Also, the pursuit

of wounded animals made it necessary for the hunter to control a large territory.

Natural selection favored the aggressive hunter among these primitive groups and according to evolutionary theory aggressiveness may have been bred into humans at this early stage. Under these harsh conditions, only strong and aggressive hunters survived and succeeded in passing their genes to future generations while the weak and handicapped mostly perished. Among the Caribou Indians of Hudson Bay, old people were expected to voluntarily commit suicide when the reindeer herds failed to appear and the whole community was facing imminent starvation. After all the old people had killed themselves, it was the turn of the female newborns to be put to death by their own families. It was customary among the Eskimos in northern America to expose the old, the sick, the weak, and infants to the elements whenever food supplies fell short of supporting everyone according to Mowat (1952).

A community surviving mainly on hunting and gathering probably led a nomadic life. When hunted animals became scarce and collected edibles were depleted in their territory, the hunter and his dependents were forced to move to another location. This nomadic or semi-nomadic life made it impossible for them to settle down in one place and establish sedentary communities and civilizations.

The limited supply of food for hunting and gathering in any one location put a severe limitation on the optimal size of the nomadic hunting bands. Each band was probably made up of few families, according to Thomas (1979). Available evidence on the few communities which subsisted on

food gathering in the twentieth century supported this conclusion. Von Fürer-Haimendorf, (1967) observed that the Chinchis of India lived in groups of three to twelve primary families. In the case of the Shoshone Indians of Nevada, the community was divided into small family units to effectively collect their food and may come together only for brief periods during antelope hunts or to arrange marriages. Evidently, for most of the time the individual hunter or a small band of hunters equipped with their primitive weapons of spears, bows and axes obtained their food without the help of a large organized group. In summary, dependence on hunting and food gathering hindered the formation of large communities and offered few incentives or opportunities for cooperative efforts. It also fostered selfishness and aggressiveness but according to Collins (1975) even the strongest and most vigilant hunter would not have escaped fear, anxiety and suspicion.

The emergence of farmers

Women who collected seeds and fruits probably discovered farming and made possible the greatest advance in human history so far. Citing archaeological evidence, experts estimate that this event occurred about ten thousand years ago. The shift from hunting to farming was undoubtedly the biggest step in the evolution of human society; it did not only bring about a change in the methods of food production but also transformed our way of living, social structures, values, and relations with each other. This unique revolutionary discovery, MacNeesh (1992) noted,

allowed people to devote more of their time and energy to pursuits other than the search for food.

Agriculture revolutionized humans' relations with nature and fellow human beings. A more harmonious and productive relationship with nature replaced the essentially parasitic existence of his hunting days. It also brought more people together than ever before and encouraged them to cooperate with each other. Instead of viewing fellow human beings as essentially rivals in the bitter struggle for survival, the hunter began to appreciate them as potential associates and partners. It must have been a difficult and painful change for the hunter who had become accustomed to his millennia-old lifestyle and customs. However, his survival instinct and persistent fear of hunger and starvation must have been stronger than any initial reservations he had and eventually convinced him to endorse farming and the values and customs that came with it.

Survival of the new agricultural communities depended on a higher level of cooperation than was needed and practiced during the hunting era. Traditional farming practices, some of which survived well into the twentieth century, required the cooperation of several persons and sometimes a whole community in the performance of labor-intensive tasks such as draining swamps, reclaiming land, erecting flood barriers, opening irrigation canals, combating pests, and harvesting crops. In southern Iraq, tribal peasants of recent nomadic origin call these communal efforts *hashar*, a massive gathering, and regard them with the typical hunter's dislike of cooperative group labor.

This new technological stage called for a higher degree of cohesiveness and integration among group members giving meaning and significance to group membership, loyalty and boundaries. The nomadic way of life of the hunter gave way to sedentary existence in permanent settlements near the land. According to Mumford (1961:12), the women who discovered farming also invented the village as a “collective nest for the care and nurture of the young,” and this strong feminine influence is also manifest in the abundance of vats, urns and other pottery utensils among the relics of this period. Formation of villages began when small farming settlements joined together to achieve the security and higher productivity of large-size groups. Villages eventually grew into cities and the first city-states were probably established in Mesopotamia. Victor Hugo wrote in his novel *Les Misérables* the following remarkable description of the influence of city life on humans which was and remains valid: “Cities produce ferocious men, because they produce corrupt men; the mountains, the forest, and the sea, render men savage; they develop the fierce, but yet do not destroy the human.”

These early states developed systems of politics, justice and ownership. The first political institution formed by these early agricultural settlements was a form of citizen’s assembly. These assemblies enacted simple legal codes to meet their newly arisen secular and security requirements. More complex religions with elaborate dogma, teachings, and rituals emerged to organize and control social life, personal and group behavior. These religions consecrated and institutionalized the farming values of mutual help, cooperation and social cohesion. Undoubtedly, religion was

instrumental in strengthening social bonds in these communities, and therefore undermining the indigenous religion of a traditional community often threatened its continuity and survival. Social and business life in these communities also became more differentiated, specialized, and complex as new professions and skills emerged to satisfy the needs of these communities. Artisans specialized in making and repairing farmers' tools and few household wares and utensils. Merchants, middlemen and storekeepers bought and sold their agricultural surplus.

Hunting as a way of life and its values did not altogether vanish after the spread of agriculture and the establishment of large organized communities. The domestication of the horse, camel and sheep offered the hunter a new lease of life and an alternative to farming in the form of herding. Some hunting and herding tribes maintained their aggressive way of life well into the twentieth century. At different stages in history, these warring tribes joined together into formidable organized forces which in the case of the Huns and the Mongols overran states, sacked cities and farming communities and brought many civilizations in the Middle Ages to an abrupt end.

Agriculture also produced crop surpluses and thus land acquired a higher value than was known during the hunting stage. These new sources of value and power became the focus of competition and conflict among farmers. According to Ignatieff (1984: 111), "by the time mankind has passed from the stage of hunters and gatherers to the period of settled agriculture, the human race was already divided between those who had property and those who were obliged to sell their labor."

Hunters who became farmers, and adapted some aspects of their thinking and behaving, found new outlets for their egoistic and aggressive drives in the social, political, economic, and religious hierarchies of the new agricultural community. Individuals who were closer in character and temperament to the hunter than the farmer became rulers, high priests, generals and landowners and managed to create and maintain the foundations for their continued monopoly of power, status and wealth through empires, institutions, laws, rituals, superstition and wars. Farmers stood to lose much more in war than their hunting predecessors but apparently engaged in it more often. Some believe that while hunters had little cause to go to war with their neighbors, farmers often needed to acquire more land to compensate for the declining fertility of acreage under cultivation. This appears to be a plausible explanation, but it does not account for the formation of empires which was obviously motivated by more than a reasonable need for additional farming land. A more convincing justification was offered by Lenski and Lenski (1978) who observed that these people simply could not disassociate themselves from their old hunting and raiding lifestyle. In accordance with this interpretation, it is argued here that farmers and their lifestyle was no match for the selfish and aggressive hunters, and consequently hunters dominated these early farming settlements. This domination continued unchallenged throughout history until the present day.

The rise of hunter states

History is the chronicle of hunters' persistent quests for power, control and glory and of their deeds and achievements—especially their wars—and of their triumph over all challenges and adversaries so far. As Docker (2006) put it, history of mankind is a chronicle of violence in all its forms of wars, occupation, colonization and massacres.

Hunters have been and remain in control of all human societies and institutions despite all the relentless efforts by prophets, thinkers and social reformers who sought to gain a voice and more influence for the farmer within us. Our thoughts and deeds are dictated more by our calculating hunter 'heads' rather than by our emotional, feeling 'hearts'

Historical records on early agricultural Mesopotamian settlements indicate that a formal system of kingship and government was unknown to these communities. In the beginning, local assemblies of elders administered civic affairs in Sumerian cities. In terms of our modern standards, this arrangement looked very much like a primitive form of democracy. Even more remarkably, these communities had a custom of electing a *Lugal*, or warrior chief to deal with a crisis or an emergency. The authority and term of office of a Lugal were limited, as reported by Roux (1964). When the crisis was over, he returned to the ranks of ordinary citizens, an arrangement that contemporary politicians would undoubtedly find abhorrent. Eventually, elected power-hungry Lugal refused to relinquish his position and authority, assumed control of his city-state and established a precedent for other rulers with similar aspirations. At first,

these rulers-heroes who were according to Mumford (1961: 23) “soiled by sadistic lust for power,” retained citizens’ assemblies as consultative bodies but later they declared themselves kings. They also introduced the concept of the divine rule of kings by claiming that the gods ordained kingship and specifically it descended from heaven in the city of Eridu in Mesopotamia. Their government was also the first theocracy in human history since these kings served both as political rulers and high priests. In this way these hunters successfully subverted the first democratic system of government known to mankind and imposed their absolute rule over the people of Mesopotamia.

The hunter’s scheme to control these ancient states also manifested itself in new social structures and stratification. According to Collins (1975), the first aristocracy was also formed in Mesopotamia. It was made up of priests who owned much of the agricultural land amounting to one third of the total arable area around a city. Their religious authority and control over magic and rituals provided them with powerful means for legitimizing and safeguarding their possessions and privileges. If this was not enough to discourage challenges to their authority and position, swift and ruthless force was readily brought against dissenters.

Codes of law were among the remarkable achievements of these ancient agrarian states. One of the earliest of these was the code of Hammurabi, which according to local legends was bestowed by the Babylon’s patron god Merduck on King Hammurabi. It included the famous dictum: “an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth.” These laws defined the rights and responsibilities of citizens, regulated property rights and the conduct of

commercial transactions, enacted procedures for the settlement of disputes and laid down penalties for various crimes. From the perspective of destitute peasants, laborers and slaves, these codes provided legal protection for the new hunter elite, their privileges, and possessions and of their monopoly over political, social, and economic power. Equal treatment and protection under these laws were not guaranteed to all the citizenry, and slaves and female infants were usually excluded. Often, the transgressions of the powerful were overlooked while the aberrant powerless were severely punished.

Ancient states in Mesopotamia and Egypt were essentially militant, aggressive and expansionist and frequently engaged in wars or skirmishes with their neighbors. Conflicts between these states usually arose over sovereignty and territory. They organized armies, which often included large numbers of slaves and mercenaries in their ranks, to defend their territories and conquer and annex new lands and to repel nomadic marauders who become formidable warriors after domesticating the horse and the camel. When these armies were unleashed on external or internal enemies they killed, raped, pillaged, burned, and destroyed without mercy. Conquered cities like Carthage were sometimes sacked and leveled to the ground while their vanquished population were massacred or enslaved.

The legends and sacred stories of ancient cultures glorified war and the hunter's ideals of physical power, beauty, and aggressiveness. Heroes in such legends as the Sumerian epic of Gilgamesh and the Greek Odyssey and the Iliad were driven by the urge to win power, glory, and fame. They endured extremely adverse circumstances, performed extraordinary

deeds, and fought bravely with natural and supernatural beings to defend their communities, to avenge an injustice or an insult by an enemy, or to gain the favor of a deity, a ruler or a beautiful woman. In addition to the power and glory they obtained in this life, they were rewarded in the afterlife with immortality and sublime positions among the gods or the lofty stars in the heavens.

The hunters among men ruled and controlled almost every ancient state. They achieved this through social stratification, religion, ideology, economic power, and the threat and use of force. In all of Greece, the princes who owned weapons monopolized power. Weapons such as long rapiers, metal shields and war chariots were prohibitively expensive, and only the rich and powerful could afford them. Childe (1942) revealed that Greek conquerors prohibited the manufacture and possession of weapons in their colonies to preclude any possible rebellion against their Greek masters.

Sparta as pictured by Cartledge (2002) embodied all the values and customs that ruling hunters would like to see in a city-state. The highest value in Sparta was accorded to power and physical strength. The survival of the fittest, which is the basic law of the hunter, became the supreme law of the city-state. Convinced that a strong population trained in the arts and skills of war was the only guarantee of the security of the state and its possessions, the Spartan rulers created and imposed a harsh militaristic order upon their subjects. Spartan men lived in military barracks until they had children. Weak children who did not meet the Spartan standards were cruelly abandoned and left to die of exposure. At the age of seven, boys

were taken from their homes to live and train in military camps and even girls were trained in martial arts. It was incumbent upon Spartan men to produce healthy and strong specimens for the Spartan army. Those who failed to do so were expected to find more qualified mates for their wives or allow them to conduct the search themselves. Marriage in the hunter-dominated Sparta was, thus, transformed into a breeding institution.

Powerful rulers and an aristocratic class also dominated the political, social and economic life in the Roman Empire. Roman jurists decreed that the wishes of the ruler were the highest laws of the land. They also recognized the absolute authority of the patriarch in his household that included the right to kill a family member in some cases as reported by Boak and Sinnigen (1969). Several of the Roman rulers were ruthless tyrants and the worst of them was the Emperor Caligula. Reading his biography by Suetonius (1931) would make any sane person nauseous. Caligula entertained his guests at his table with scenes of torture and beheadings. The Emperor Nero was equally brutal, and his murderous appetite did not spare even his close family members; after his three attempts to assassinate his mother he condemned her to death. Roman rulers used military power to subdue other nations and maintain their empire and for this reason they regarded military service as a great honor and a prequalification for assuming public office. Any citizen who aspired to an official position in the Roman government was required to serve in ten military campaigns at least.

Pampered Romans became intolerant of the toil and sweat of a farmer's life and opted instead to rely on slaves for cultivating their lands. Many of these slaves like the famous rebel Spartacus were deserters from the Roman army or citizens of the enemies of Rome like Carthage and Corinth whose lives were spared only to be sold as slaves. According to Reade (1945), the burden of feeding the army and sustaining the Empire fell on the shoulders of the farmers, and when this burden became too heavy Rome lost much of its strength. This factor and the excesses of tyrannical rulers further weakened the Empire. Other empires also paid the heavy price of its warring policies; wars hastened the demise of the New Kingdom in Egypt according to Trueman and Trueman (1982).

The 'noble' hunters

Exploitation of farmers continued in Europe throughout the Middle Ages. The peasants produced the wealth that was then consumed and extravagantly squandered by the powerful, idle nobility. Tracing the origins of the feudal or landholding aristocracy in Europe reveals that these were originally commanders of warriors who demonstrated their mastery of fighting skills and bravery in battle. This is not surprising since according to Corvisier (1979) military power and skills were accorded the highest respect among all human activities at that time. In return for their loyalty and services to their European princes, these war lords received large tracts

of land or fiefs. The new landlords, their appetite for land whetted, resorted to keeping small armies to protect their fiefs and expand them at the expense of powerless peasants who lacked fighting skills and could not muster a force to defend themselves against the well-organized, professional armies of greedy landlords. European peasants stood almost defenseless while these warriors raided their villages, killing and plundering at will. Additional threat to their lives and properties came from marauding tribes such as the Ostrogoths, the Huns, the Lombards, and the Saxons who wandered around from one place to another, pillaging and plundering. The helpless peasants had no recourse but to turn to the nearest landlord-warlord for protection. The price of this protection was, however, very high as found by Herlihy (1970) In return for this protection, entire villages had to surrender their property to their new master and agree to work as serfs on the land, which was previously their own. The right to cultivate a piece of land in their feudal master's estate was called a *precarium*, which is derived from the word *preca*, i.e. to beg for. This is how the warrior class in Europe became landed gentry who, by the twelfth century, were recognized as a hereditary class or nobility that could transmit its economic, social and political privileges to its descendants.

Similar developments are observed elsewhere. In the Islamic empires of the Umayyad, the Abbasids and later the Ottomans, military leaders played a significant role in the political, social and economic spheres, and during times of political decline they wielded enough power to appoint and dismiss caliphs. It was also the custom in these states to award loyal and obedient military commanders large tracts of agricultural land, and

eventually they became landed gentry. In Japan also, the Samurai warriors were transformed into a class of officials responsible for controlling the countryside and collecting taxes and dues from farmers.

The powerful nobility or aristocratic classes in mediaeval Europe created belief systems and social structures to legitimize and maintain their hold on power and impede others from competing with them. There was a clear separation at birth between those who were destined to rule and have influence and riches and those who must resign themselves to a life of subsistence and powerlessness. The monarch who occupied the highest strata was divinely chosen and bestowed status, privileges and honor on the nobility. Religious teachings supported this by preaching acceptance of one's social position as a religious and moral duty. The poor and powerless were told to accept and endure their misery and exploitation by the powerful with patience to qualify for the heavenly reward in the afterlife (Stewart, 1994). Social positions were, thus, fixed and rarely a person from a low class rose to a high position and only with the help of divine providence and extraordinary fortitude and skills.

While the poor were strictly excluded from this power system, a place was reserved for those who sought and won the patronage of a powerful, honorable person. In this relationship, the aristocrat acted as a patron of another person who humbly admitted his inferior status and accepted the duties and responsibilities emanating from such an arrangement. Both parties benefited from this; the client by earning access to power and favors and the patron by enhancing his power.

The rise of the merchant class and their intellectual allies challenged the nobility's monopoly over privileges and status. Since the nobility could not defeat these rivals by resorting to violence, co-optation was inevitable. Entry into the upper class became possible through the purchase of a title. Marriage between an impoverished member of the nobility and the son or daughter of a wealthy merchant or financier provided another channel for upward class mobility. Unsurprisingly, these new members of the powerful class who earlier had vehemently opposed the nobility's monopoly of power jealously guarded their new privileges by limiting suffrage to property owners.

History has proven one social axiom to be always correct: the powerful and privileged classes and elites never concede their power, and those who compete with them over it must be prepared for a struggle. After industrialization and the social and economic forces unleashed by it eroded much of the remaining power bases of European upper classes, it was the turn of the working classes to begin a long struggle to win their political and economic rights from their capitalist employers and their political allies.

Women were generally denied their basic political and other rights until the beginning of the twentieth century and gaining these rights in Western countries was not achieved without a struggle. In order to draw attention to their cause, women rights activists had to organize marches and protests, chain themselves to fences, go on hunger strikes, endure force-feeding, and even commit suicide. Contemporary feminine activists believe that members of their gender are still being harassed, persecuted, and

deprived of their basic rights by their more powerful male partners in humanity.

Colonial hunters

European powers colonized the entire continents of the Americas and Australia and much of Asia and Africa. By the end of the nineteenth century, the white settlers in North and South America, Australia and parts of Africa succeeded in subduing the native people of these lands and depriving them of their basic rights and properties. European slave traders abducted fifteen million Africans and killed many more millions. Toynbee (1947) observed that Westerners typically viewed these indigenous people as no better than wild animals that must either be domesticated or exterminated. Keal (2003) observed that European settlers did not regard indigenous people as equal but different and sought to either destroy them or enforce their way of life upon them. In Canada, children of indigenous peoples were taken from their families and inducted into the infamous residential schools under management by Christian priests. These children were forced to convert to Christianity, forbidden to speak their native languages or wear their traditional attires. Survivors of these harrowed experience reported cases of abuse and murder. Recently, The Canadian government recently admitted the fact that these schools constituted 'cultural genocide'. Winston Churchill unashamedly justified the annihilation and or displacement of indigenous people in Africa, the Americas and Palestine by declaring: "I do not admit for instance, that a

great wrong has been done to the Red Indians of America or the black people of Australia. I do not admit that a wrong has been done to these people by the fact that a stronger race, a higher-grade race, a more worldly wise race to put it that way, has come in and taken their place." In contrast, Michelet (1846:142), a French thinker and historian of the nineteenth century, commented on the sad fate of the natives of North America as follows: "The Anglo-American traders and puritans, in the density of their unsympathetic ignorance, have trampled upon, famished, and will soon have annihilated these heroic races, who will leave a void forever upon earth, and a lasting regret to humanity."

At the turn of the twentieth century, Great Britain, France, Belgium, Holland, Russia, and Turkey were the major colonial powers. Colonies were sought by European nations not only for political, economic and strategic reasons but also for their prestige value, and rivalries among them over colonial possessions were very intense. They disguised their real motives and their racist attitudes toward the natives of their colonies under benevolent rhetoric such as their description of subjugated nations as "the white man's burden." Indigenous people in these colonies were often deprived of their basic rights including the rights to speak their native languages and practice their religions. Their natural resources were plundered; their labor force was exploited; and the more competitive European products bankrupted their native craft industries. When these peoples dared to protest these injustices or demanded the restoration of their basic rights, they were harshly suppressed. Native rebels were jailed, tortured, banished or executed. Most colonized nations with a total

population of almost one billion in the mid-twentieth century had to resort to violent means to win their freedom and independence. The human, social and economic cost of their liberation movements was enormous, and this probably brought about the rise of new modernized elites of power-seekers in these societies.

The case of the Congo serves as a gruesome example of the evils of colonialism. In late nineteenth century, European powers recognized the Belgian King Leopold as 'proprietor' of the Congo according to Renton, Seddon and Zeilig (2007). Representatives of the King were instructed to use all means to maximize exploitation of Congolese rubber. An estimated ten million Congolese lost their lives and many others had their hands amputated to satisfy the King's lust for riches. In Algeria, more than a million persons, most of them unarmed civilians, perished at the hands of French colonial forces, less than two decades after the French themselves had experienced the bitter taste of defeat, occupation, humiliation and oppression by German Nazi forces.

World wars of hunters

Powerful nations have not only sought to control less powerful nations but also each other. In the competition among them for world domination and spheres of influence, these nations used military force, economic power and diplomatic pressures. Wars among these nations in the twentieth century were unprecedented in terms of the resulting human casualties, destruction of cities and properties, and their impact on social,

political and economic systems. Two of these wars were described as world wars to distinguish them from regional and bilateral wars, and in these two wars millions of people perished and scores of cities were obliterated. Hostilities became total in the sense that not only armed soldiers were killed, wounded or captured but civilian populations also suffered tremendous losses in life and hardship. In World War I, naval blockades stopped shipments of food from reaching hungry civilians and the aerial bombardment in World War II killed millions of civilians. It is estimated that about 110 million military and civilian persons died in hostilities in the twentieth century. After World War I, the Chinese thinker Yen Fu, who until then had been a strong admirer of Western culture and achievements, wrote (as quoted by Kahn and Wiener, 1967, p. 18):

It seems to me that in three centuries of progress, the peoples of the West have achieved four principles: to be selfish, to kill others, to have little integrity, and to feel little shame.

According to our perspective, these 'principles' are the core characteristics of the hunter in all of us. Have we become more civilized since Yen Fu wrote his bitter commentary on the moral state of Western nations? Not according to Dutton (2008: xii) who warned:

If we delude ourselves that we are the civilized entity we appear to be on the surface, we are doomed to repeat the mistakes of the past, only with more powerful and devastating weapons.

Hunters choose to neglect these dire warnings and insist on pursuing their selfish objectives at all cost.

The capitalist hunter

In the last three centuries, three major factors influenced human life: the industrial revolution, struggle over control of natural resources and markets and scientific advances. All of these factors entrenched the power of hunters. Alton Mayo (1960) observed that the industrial revolution weakened traditional social ties which he thought necessary for meaningful group cooperation. This development left the individual with no option but to pursue selfish gains at the expense of group activities.

The present corporate society is the latest creation of the hunter in us. In it, power, wealth and resources are owned by a privileged small minority. The rest of the population are consumers who in the words of Perelman (2005: 2) "exist to serve the needs of the corporation".

Corporate society is the latest addition to the hunter's control tools. In such a society, a small group monopolizes all instruments of authority, power and wealth and exercise control over the rest of the population. Perelman (2005:2) contends that all of us serve the ends and interests of public and private corporations.

Fukuyama (1999) warns of the destructive impact of extreme individualism on societies. While this individualism resulted in economic growth and unprecedented scientific and technological advances it eroded all forms of authority and weakened family and social ties. Is the hunter in us willing to continue on this self-destructive path?

The predominance of the hunter's values and lifestyle in all human societies have made the establishment and maintenance of alternative forms of social structures and relationships based on the farmer's ideals and values almost impossible.

Were there farmer communities?

The code of the hunter, which emphasized the value of power and control, dictated the basic law of survival for individuals as well as communities. Any community which refused or failed to abide by this code exposed itself to serious threats from external enemies who viewed it, and often quite correctly, as an easy target for expansion and domination. Only communities residing in remote, inaccessible areas could possibly escape occupation and destruction by an aggressive neighbor or marauder. According to the following quotation from Mumford (1961:43), the human type identified here as the farmer, being unfavored by natural selection, was virtually destined for extinction from the very beginning:

The doctrine of natural selection worked with classic exactitude, for in the course of five or six thousand years many of the milder, gentler, more co-operative stocks were killed off or discouraged from breeding, while the more aggressive, bellicose types survived and flourished at the centers of civilization.

Farmer communities existed in different parts of the world, but usually for relatively short periods of time. One of these societies is the Minoan

civilization which thrived in the Mediterranean island of Crete until about 140 AD. The peaceful Minoans upheld the rule of law and rejected tyranny and wars.

Elements of the farmer lifestyle and values existed in all states and communities throughout the ages but seldom became dominant. Even in ancient civilizations such as those of Egypt, Mesopotamia and India where hunters ruled absolutely and their wishes were the laws of the land, farmers managed to make an impact on laws, institutions and behavior. For example, judges in Egypt were obliged by their oaths of office to uphold the laws even if it contradicted the king's orders. (Reade, 1945)

Beliefs and values in farmer societies insured the legitimacy and continuity of their institutions and way of life. Moral standards preached equality, brotherhood and cooperation. Leveling mechanisms impeded the accumulation of excess power in the hands of one individual or an oligarchy, and hence the emergence of a hunter class or tyranny was deterred. Amassing resources became impossible since using these resources for the common good was obligatory. For example, a person was expected to share his good fortunes by giving away a large portion of it to his relatives and neighbors in the form of loans, gifts of cattle and goods, and large sumptuous meals.

Hunters who conquered and controlled a farmer community recognized the importance of culture and social institutions and values as social safeguards and means of control. According to Max Weber (1864-1920), farmers living within the social structure imposed by foreign conquerors were usually demoted to a lower class below an upper class of aristocrats

and warriors. Their traditional religion was also replaced by a new system of beliefs to legitimize the new social order. The importance of native religions as cohesive social forces was not lost to European colonial powers that sought to replace them with their own Christian faith. According to Childe (1942), the suppression of religious beliefs of primitive societies after their encounter with white people hastened their decline.

The presence of stranger among farmer societies that escaped domination and subsequent social engineering by foreign conquerors often had a disruptive effect on these societies. In these close-knit communities where clans provided the structure for economic activities, the introduction of foreign commercial and economic transactions and standards led sometimes to the collapse of their indigenous social and economic systems. Examples of these strangers are the Europeans and Indians in Eastern Africa and the Syrians and Lebanese in Southern America. These foreign merchants settled down with the native peoples but refused to abide by the social and ethical standards of their hosts. They bought and sold goods and lent money for the sole purpose of making profit. This exploitation contributed to the gradual erosion of the native social and economic systems. It is no wonder that distrust of and contempt for traders and moneylenders are still strong in some traditional communities.

At the social level, these powerful strangers did not hide their indifferent or even disrespectful attitude toward local values and customs and sometimes selfishly exploited them and thus further weakened the native social order. For example, Australian aborigines had no objection to a man

cohabiting with their women but expected them to respect their customs regarding marriage. However, white settlers whose marriage institution was different and believed in their racial superiority took advantage of this situation, which they misconstrued as another proof of their hosts' inferiority, as confirmed by Mead (1972).

Hunters have not only contributed to the disappearance of traditional farmer societies but also made it impossible for modern versions of them to survive. Alternative social systems inspired and established by farmers such as the Oneida Movement and the Hopedale and Brook farms failed to operate and continue as viable cooperative communities. On the positive side, some societies, which had previously followed the code of the hunter, succeeded in moving closer to the farmer side. In specific, Scandinavian countries whose Viking ancestors terrorized Europe serve now as peacemakers of the world. This, however, does not change the fact that the hunter within us dominates the world and his values govern our attitudes and behavior.

Chapter Two: Are You a Hunter or a Farmer?

We all share in the hunting and farming heritage and it follows that we are all conditioned by it. This leads us to generalize that we are all potentially farmers and hunters but differ in how much of each side is internalized within us. This generalization applies to all individuals in all societies and communities. We are not born either hunters or farmers but with a readiness to embrace and practice either lifestyle. During our entire life, we acquire from our parents, friends, teachers, and other mentors' beliefs, values, and attitudes that profoundly influence us and shape our lifestyles. However, mature human minds are not *tabula rasa*; they are malleable and susceptible to social influences but not totally. The latitude of independent thinking and choice allowed to us in choosing our lifestyle varies from one society to another and is also exercised in different degrees by different individuals within the same society. It is suggested here that during these processes of socialization and individuation we come to learn, assimilate and internalize both sides of the behavioral coin, i.e. the hunter and the farmer lifestyles and choose one of them.

A lifestyle is a complex system of beliefs, values, motives and propensities that influence and shape human attitudes and behavior. These beliefs and values also define our self-images and shape our perception of the world and our relationships with others. Some of these

beliefs or dogmas also provide legitimacy to our lifestyles, which is needed as a defense against self-doubt, fears and guilt feelings.

There are no pure hunters or pure farmers in this world and what makes us different and unique is the degree of our commitment to the hunter and farmer lifestyles. These two lifestyles can be visualized as occupying the terminal points of a graded scale or continuum. At any moment in a person's life, his or her lifestyle corresponds to a specific point on the scale. This point is not fixed for life and could change as a result of external pressures and personal choices. A person close to the hunter end of the scale is expected to show the characteristics of the hunter but individuals whose lifestyles occupy points on the scale closer to the farmer's side tend to think and behave more like the farmer.

Also, under normal conditions, a person cannot be high on both lifestyles because this would contradict the principle of cognitive consistency. According to this principle, a person cannot uphold and practice inconsistent or contradictory beliefs all the time. And although our positions on this scale are potentially changeable, this should not imply that individuals can switch from one style to another easily and readily. However, under extreme conditions of deprivation or in life-threatening situations most of us would probably behave as typical hunters. In such cases, our personal survival and safety need would take precedence over all other considerations. Therefore, an act of self-defense including killing an assailant is socially and legally recognized as a basic individual right and even praised as heroic in most societies.

Our ability to behave as a hunter or a farmer is part of our human experience. Thus, while a person having a hunter lifestyle may exhibit in some situations the altruism and care for others typical of a farmer, a person who generally follows a farmer's lifestyle is capable of interacting with others and behaving in a typical hunter fashion because he or she has a weaker hunter side. These variations in a person's conduct are made possible by our internalization of both lifestyles but do not change the fact that a person commits to one lifestyle only. This is illustrated by the case of Rudolph Hoes, the notorious chief of the Auschwitz extermination camp, who was also reported to be a devoted family man. The explanation offered by our perspective for this apparently contradictory behavior is that Hoes was high on the hunter scale which accounted for his role as chief executioner, but at the same he was low on the farmer scale or lifestyle and that enabled him to lead an apparently normal family life. In the same manner, the Nazi and Japanese doctors who conducted unethical and cruel experiments on prisoners of war were essentially hunters, and their choice of this lifestyle and suppression of their farmer side made it possible for them to commit these atrocities without feeling guilt or suffering remorse. When these and other war criminals were accused of wrongdoing, their hunter-conditioned minds typically responded with denial or rationalization.

A person who is undecided about his preferred lifestyle will occupy a point near the middle of the scale. The absence of a strong commitment to either lifestyle allows him or her to play it safe by moving in either direction and adjusting his lifestyle to meet different needs and circumstances. This

low-hunter and low-farmer variety makes the third major lifestyle in addition to the high hunter and high farmer. A characterization of the hunter and farmer follows.

The hunter: A profile

“Man, the hunter,” Tiger and Fox (1971:21) asserted, “is not an episode in our distant past; we are still man the hunter.” The hunters’ primary motive is self-interest and their distinguishing characteristic is selfishness. They selfishly pursue their objectives with little or no consideration for the interest and welfare of others. For their life journey there is one major destination: the maximization of self-interest. Egoism, power, and independence are basic interrelated means of survival in what hunters perceives to be a treacherous and dangerous world. *Animus dominandi*, or the desire for power is the principal motive that drives them. Power for them is both an end and a means to other desirable goals. The more power they have the less is their dependence on others and the higher is their self-satisfaction. Gaining and holding power distinguishes them from the less powerful and powerless and elevates them to higher positions on the political, economic, and social hierarchies. Wealth, position, status and fame are the things of value to them because these coveted objectives increase their personal power. Contrary to their critics’ claim, this lifestyle provides hunters with satisfaction and fulfillment. Their life may be emotionally barren, and they may appear to be lonesome, but rational

hunters consciously prefer their lifestyle and believes it to be superior in merits to other alternatives.

The hunters' power urge

Hunters are attracted to power in all its forms: social, political, and economic. The hero-kings of ancient states, the kings and barons of medieval times, and contemporary politicians and corporate executives all share in possessing this urge to power. This urge is probably what led ancient hunter-rulers like the Egyptian Pharaohs to declare themselves gods, of godly descent or holy messengers and coerced their subjects to treat them with commensurate respect and devotion. To safeguard his hold on power against possible rivals, Muhammed the Third, the Ottoman Sultan, ordered the killing of 19 of his brothers by asphyxiation and the murder of seven pregnant concubines of his father Sultan Murad. Medieval kings were also moved by the same urge to proclaim their divine right to rule and impose it on their subjects as a religious duty. In present-day societies, the means of legitimizing power are different, but the inclination is still the same. At the international level, countries are classified into superpowers like the United States, medium-size powers like France and the United Kingdom, and regional powers like India and Iran. Political, military and business elite govern every country. Powerful individuals such as successful politicians, famous performers, and vocalists attract large numbers of followers and admirers.

The main preoccupation of the hunter is accumulating as much power as possible before the onset of old age and ultimately the loss of everything to death. Obviously, not all hunters become very powerful and many of them must resign themselves to having little or no power. But why does the hunter in all of us seek power and then more? Prophets, philosophers and social scientists have put forward many reasons and explanations for this propensity. Listing some of these explanations may help us to understand the mentality and psychology of the hunter who is a significant player in the lives and destinies of all of us. To begin with, many social scientists believe that the urge to express and assert oneself through power and control is a natural trait in every human being. After conducting his famous study on the need for power, McClelland (1975) concluded that humans are by nature attracted to power. Robert Greene (2000) in his book entitled *The 48 Laws of Power* generalizes that all of us seek more power and no one accepts less of it. Korda (1975) saw power as the means which humans pursue to achieve desirable aims such as money, sex, security and fame.

The value of power and assertiveness is learned in every society whether it is a modern and industrialized nation or the traditional and less developed Kayah village in Burma. Kayah villagers, as reported by Von Furer-Heimendorf (1967), respond to assertive and loud persons with submission and deference and are more likely to follow their commands because they believe that those behaving in this manner must be endowed with natural leadership or magical powers. How do these villagers or any one of us become conditioned to appreciate the value of power and

develop the urge to power? This trait is learned in the same way that other social and cultural values and customs are learned through socialization. It does not require more than modest intelligence for any person to associate all materialistic objectives such as wealth, fame, influence and sexual appeal with power. Indeed, all these desirable objectives are synonymous with power. Given a choice between joining the powerful in their ivory tower or languishing among the ranks of the powerless, how many of us would inevitably opt for the first option? I can hazard a guess and say most of mankind, including those who may justify this to themselves and others by claiming that they would use their power for the good of all. And since an individual needs power to achieve anything of value, many modern-day experts on personal and professional success and fulfillment are advocating “empowerment” for all and encouraging us to become assertive.

“Get rich,” was the advice given by Francois Guizot a minister for King Louis Philippe I almost a century and a half ago as a solution for all human problems (Sonn, 2010). All hunters who firmly believe that affluence is equivalent to power and a prerequisite to happiness would share his belief. Few of them are probably aware of the opinion of the prophet of capitalism Adam Smith on the overpowering passion for possessions and wealth. He called this passion a “deception,” because, in his opinion, more possessions do not necessarily lead to happiness. However, he believed that it is “well that nature imposes on us in this manner. It is this deception which rouses and keeps in continual motion the industry of mankind.” (Ignatieff 1984:

111) Greedy hunters are unaware that they cannot have the pot of gold and the rainbow as well.

Hunters may justify their search for power by claiming that it is only a means to higher purposes. In view of the overpowering selfish nature and other motives of hunters, this can only be another deception. For example, the Nazis justified their aspiration to world domination by arguing that this was the logical and natural fulfillment of the destiny of the German people as the supreme nation. Championing the interests of the working people worldwide was the guise under which the Communist Russian leaders implemented their expansionist policies. Similarly, protection of the free world and support for international human rights and freedoms are the slogans frequently raised by the United States government to selectively pressure and interfere in the internal affairs of other states and impose its policies on them. Some of us also resort to such rationalizations to justify or legitimize their pursuit of power. Regular buyers of lottery tickets may convince themselves that they are doing it for higher causes by promising to spend some of the prize money, if won, on poor relations or charity.

Hunters value power because it frees them from dependence on others. Goutler and Minninger (1993) argued that the urge to power and control in humans stems not from internal strength but rather from weakness. What power-seeking men fear most is falling under the influence and control of women in their lives, and especially their mothers. Accordingly, a person needs power to successfully develop into an independent, 'whole' individual because anyone without power would lack real freedom and independence and remains essentially a 'mama's boy'.

It is typical of hunters to view and evaluate all relationships inside and outside the family in terms of power. According to this view, humankind is divided into the independent powerful and the dependent powerless. All hunters would probably agree with Robert Hawk, an ex-prime minister of Australia who believed that this dependency relationship between the powerful and the powerless is inevitable. According to Pilger (1972), Hawk scoffed at the heavenly promise of the meek inheriting the earth asserting that the weak will always depend on the strong for survival.

Finally, hunters may seek power for power sake. Some individuals appear to be obsessed with power and expend all their efforts to gain more of it. Numerous rulers throughout history were dedicated to the pursuit of power and were willing to sacrifice the lives and welfare of their loyal subjects for its sake. The excesses of these tyrants have moved thinkers and reformers to warn of the dangers of tyranny and to urge preventing any concentration of powers within the hands of a ruler or an oligarchy. The following self-analysis by Lair (1977:12) provides us with an intimate view of the subconscious of a person seeking power as an end in itself: "My goals were to impress other people, put other people down, intimidate them, and put them in a subsidiary position." Fromm (1977:383) saw a strong association between the desire for power and control in its extreme form and sadism which he defined as "the passion to have absolute and unrestricted control over a being, whether an animal, a child, a man or a woman." The teachings of several religions portray Satan or a similar supreme evil creature as the epitome of sadism and megalomania and in

Milton's *Paradise Lost*, Satan makes his stand on power very clear: "Better to reign in Hell than serve in Heaven".

Literature is also full of examples of hunters with uncontrollable greed or passion for power such as the fisherman's wife in William and Jacob Grimm's fairy tale, *The Fisherman and His Wife*. She persistently pestered her husband to ask for one wish after another from the generous fish that was an enchanted prince. At first, she wished for a humble cottage, and then a stone castle, a kingdom, an empire, a papacy and all these wishes were fulfilled. But when she finally asked for "the power of making the sun and moon rise when I want them," i.e. to have supernatural powers, she learned that the sky is the limit and ended up where she started: in her old hovel. This is of course a farmer's tale and its message is lost on hunters who refuse to be distracted from their passionate search for power in all its forms.

The rational hunter

Hunters, by their own definition, are rational persons and pride themselves on their rationality. But what is rationality? Essentially, rationality means the use of reason or mental faculties in analyzing phenomena and making decisions. It is granted that there are universal principles of rationality, but pure reason is a myth. Our subjectivity or value judgments influence our conception of rationality and therefore it sometimes means different things to different individuals. Was Luther justified in calling reason a whore? While reason does not follow any

master, it is bound to be on the side of the powerful. Since the powerful have a greater say in deciding meanings, the prevailing understanding of rationality or -to use the scientific jargon- the accepted paradigm regarding rationality usually reflects the values and beliefs of the dominant hunter.

Rationality dictates that states pursue their national interests, organizations their shareholders' and institutional interests and individuals their self-interests. Hunters tend to behave rationally and to base their choices and decisions on self-interest and give little, if any, consideration to other considerations. In dealing with personal and non-personal problems, they insist on finding rational, effective, and efficient solutions for them. Hunters present themselves as the champions of the rational method, but they use it only when it serves their interests.

The rational method, which is regarded as the distinguishing characteristic of the modern industrial-scientific age, requires the decision maker to detach himself, his thinking, and judgment from moral duties, emotions and personal ties. According to the hunters' perspective, the opposite of rationality or irrationality is frequently equated with sentimentality or the rule of emotions. Also, the basic principle in the hunters' rationality is objectivity and the opposite of this or irrationality results from the influence of prejudices or what they would call value judgments.

Our primitive hunting ancestors exhibited this 'rationality' in their treatment of the elderly and other unproductive members of their communities which most of us would judge to be cruel and inhumane. Dwindling food resources weakened the whole community or tribe and

exposed it to external threats and mass famine. Faced with such a crisis, tribal leaders 'rationally' looked upon elderly members of their community as a liability and were thus abandoned to the elements or required to commit suicide. Old age is still associated in the hunter side of our character with all the qualities our ancestors dreaded. It denotes sickness, infirmity, inability to earn a living and greater or even total dependence on others, i.e. all the abhorred symptoms of the powerless. As in the distant past, the increasing number of old people surviving beyond the age of retirement in industrial nations is seen as a major social and economic 'graying' problem and a serious burden on their welfare systems. Although they are no longer required to commit voluntary suicide, suicide is one of the major causes of death among those over 65 years old according to Tobias, Parry and Lippman (1992). Mercy killing of the disabled elderly is increasingly tolerated and the lucky among them are banished to the dubious comfort of nursing homes.

Are hunters immoral?

Does adherence to rationality make the hunter immoral? A hunter is not necessarily immoral or unethical, and many hunters appear to be law-abiding citizens who respect and follow the legal and moral codes of their societies. Hunters would probably agree with Ringer (2007) that ethical principles are personal choices which no one has the right to impose on others. Prinz (2007) reflected the hunter's belief in writing that moral rules are 'artificial' creations of our selfish minds. Hunters subscribe to a

utilitarian view of morality; they judge things and acts useful or beneficial to them as good and virtuous and disadvantageous acts as bad and immoral. As such, championing justice serves the hunters' purposes in society; they outlaw theft not because it is an 'evil' act but to protect their own properties. In his seminal book on the theory of justice, Rawls (1971) distinguished between three types of immoral persons; the unjust, the bad and the evil. These could be labeled here as extreme cases of the hunter type who differ in the degree of opposition to justice and morality but like all hunters share a fervent pursuit of power and domination.

In the hunters' gray code of morality, there is no clear line separating good from evil because this is contingent upon their subjective evaluation of the outcome. Hunters are more interested in the contribution of justice and the rule of law toward maintaining their cherished social order and regulating personal and group behavior than in their eternal value as moral and ethical principles. Similarly, they tolerate these restrictions and other social, political and economic limitations on the pursuit of power and self-interest as necessary mechanisms to protect them against the tyranny of more powerful persons and to guarantee, at least in theory, their free and equal access to the competitive processes.

The hunter believes that selfish ends often justify the means. These means may even involve breaking the law and committing murder because as Raskolnikov in Dostoevsky's *Crime and Punishment* argued: "extraordinary men have the right to commit crime and to transgress the law just because they are extraordinary." Needless to say, all hunters are convinced that they are extraordinary persons who should not bother

about morality because as Tacitus said two thousand years ago: “the gods are on the side of the stronger,” Daniel Defoe (1706) echoed the same conviction when he wrote: “Religion's always on the strongest side.” Frederick the Great also claimed: “God is always with the strongest battalion.” But giving lip service to religion was not important for the twentieth century arch-hunter Hitler because he believed that: “in waging war, it is not right that matters but victory.”

Since the powerful claim to be extraordinary and favored by divine providence, they attempt, and often succeed, in gaining preferential treatment before the law. Those among them whose deeds put them on the wrong side of the law may discover the existence of a double standard of justice, one for the powerful and another for the powerless. Prophet Muhammad saw this as a disastrous flaw in the fabrics of ancient civilizations. King Lear, one of Shakespeare’s most tragic characters, discovered it after becoming powerless and it moved him to observe:

Plate sin with gold

And the strong lance of justice hurtless breaks

Arm it in rags, a pygmy’s straw does

Pierce it

More recently, evidence of such a double standard was observed in America by Viano and Cohen (1975) in the form of mild treatment for respectable wealthy offenders in contrast to the harsh treatment received by poor transgressors. In the aftermath of the 9/11 terrorist attacks, Dews (2008) noted a significant difference in attitudes toward victims of these attacks and of subsequent military operations in Afghanistan and Iraq.

American victims received much attention, publicity and sympathy compared to Iraqi and Afghani civilian casualties of American forces and their allies.

Since victory or serving the hunters' personal interest is more important than morality, righteousness and integrity, they are more likely than not to change their beliefs, values and loyalties whenever it served their purposes. This is often witnessed after a sudden or drastic political change such as a revolution. According to Miller (1977), many people change their beliefs and ideological commitments for the sake of preserving their interests without admitting or even being aware of the change sometimes. Apparently, hunters place a higher value on their lives than those of others.

The hunters' relative or 'elastic' moral code may also account for their apparently muddled and inconsistent views and stands on issues. For example, President Truman justified the fire raid on Tokyo which incinerated almost two hundred thousand Japanese civilians and the nuclear bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki but condemned hunting. He is reported to have said that "one should not shoot at animals that can't shoot back". Lacking in humane consideration, his argument absurdly echoes the thinking of the 'noble' hunter, represented historically by the knight, the gentleman and more recently by the cowboy, whose codes of honor forbade them from engaging in duels with unarmed opponents or their social inferiors.

In the final analysis, hunters consider conformity to a fixed moral code naive and impractical. It is naive because these principles were laid down by hunters like themselves to safeguard their power and privileges and

impractical because it does not always serve their ends. If dishonesty, cheating or lying could help to bring them closer to their objectives or to escape a difficult situation, they may rationalize resorting to them as lesser evils. Like the young scholar in Henry James's *The Aspen Papers*, hunters would scheme, flatter, lie and steal to achieve their 'worthy' objective. They have what Sinclair Lewis called the 'dollar ethics' and what Lair (1977:22) described as a 'cash register' honesty which is "only the narrowest and most legalistic interpretations of what honesty means." A hunter probably coined the expression a 'white lie.' Interestingly, M. Scott Peck who studied the reaction of American soldiers responsible for the My Lai massacre in Vietnam and their refusal to admit wrongdoing presented his findings in a book aptly entitled *People of the Lie*.

Also, hunters are prone to use and relish flattery which is either partly or totally fabricated. Like Lady Britomart in Shaw's *Major Barbara*, they believe in the usefulness of hypocrisy as a social lubricant. Hunter routinely uses it to win the favor and patronage of more powerful hunters ignoring the selfish motives of the sycophants. According to Maccoby (1976:78), Andrew Carnegie had an "insatiable narcissism" which explained his preference for subordinates who pampered his ego. Finally, these tendencies in our hunter-dominated world have led Fromm (1947:69) to pessimistically observe that "only in exceptional cases is success predominantly the result of skill and certain other human qualities like honesty, decency and integrity."

Compete or perish

Competition is now regarded as the one best method for achieving the greatest good for the individual and the community and an ideal recipe for ordering social, political and economic life that is more important than most moral and religious standards. It is recognized by hunters and their institutions as the essence and moving force of modern life and civilized existence without which progress would halt and society may even regress. The progressiveness of a political, social or economic system is evaluated by the extent to which it satisfies the conditions most conducive to the competitive process. Ideally, no laws or other restrictions should be imposed on this process except those guaranteeing equal access to the process and laying down minimal essential rules of conduct. If a person does not break those rules, he or she should not be encumbered by other social, moral or religious restrictions.

Hunters are fond of describing life as a game in which one must compete with others in order to survive and succeed. While their ancestors may have inherited their power as a class or caste privilege, they must now compete with others over it. They prefer competition over cooperation because the latter entails sharing their gains with others. A person is continuously reminded, exhorted and lectured at home, school and place of work to become more competitive and develop the requisite attitudes and skills. Anyone who refuses to compete is not only branded as a failure but also diagnosed as a social and psychological misfit in need of therapy. Firms and individuals seeking to enhance their competitiveness or

competitive edge can now benefit from the services of experts in this field. These experts annually earn fortunes from conducting training and providing consultations on this topic. In short, there is no alternative to competing in our modern hunter world because you either compete or perish.

Hunters support the principle of equal opportunity and free access to the competitive process as long it serves their interests. If these interests are threatened, powerful hunters may not hesitate to restrict or even deny participation to certain individuals or groups. This has been achieved through a variety of subtle and unsubtle means ranging from disguised discrimination to outright racism. Upward mobility remains difficult for some minorities, females and the elderly in industrialized Western countries. In the United States, immigration laws in earlier times classified some ethnic groups as 'inferior' and banned their entry. It has been reported that the political and economic status of each American group varies not in accordance with merit and achievements but with its phenotypic similarity to the English and the length of its history in the country. Ornstein and Ehrlich (1989) observed that every ethnic group that has settled in America has been the target of prejudice and ethnic stereotypes.

Hunters are also ethnocentric. Ethnocentric hunters hold positive sentiments toward their ethnic group and see them as superior to others in all qualities. This attitude justifies helping members of the same ethnic group and cooperating with them while withholding this from other

groups. According to Hammond and Axlerod (2006), ethnocentrism is one of the causes of conflicts and wars.

Racism has been effectively used by hunters to exclude others from the competitive process. Adler (1979) described it as the easiest way for a person to gain self-esteem in modern society without expending money, effort or producing evidence of superiority. The racist's belief in the superiority of his racial group justifies assigning a higher status and more privileges to his group and discriminating against other groups. How many of us who ritually proclaim our opposition to racism and scorn racists can successfully resist the temptation to fall on racist stereotyping when threatened or even annoyed by a member of another race?

The legitimization of the hunter's racist beliefs and sentiments often resulted in tragic consequences. According to Eysenck (1973), early immigration laws enacted by the American Congress served the hunter's purposes at one time by restricting the number of immigrants from among those considered racially 'inferior'. Legislation in some American states upheld discrimination against African Americans long after the abolition of slavery. European governments ignored or even encouraged systematic persecution of European Jews culminating in the Nazi's 'final solution' to 'the Jewish problem' and the genocide of millions of them. The last, but not necessarily the final, chapter in this hunter's scheme to remove potential competitors was ethnic cleansing of Bosnian Muslims in former Yugoslavia.

The hunter's fear of failure

The hunter in all of us is conditioned to seek and enjoy the thrill of competition and to derive intense physical and emotional satisfaction from taking part in it, and especially from winning. This is evident in sporting events in which winning the trophy and other rewards is the objective of all players.

Hunters have a strong need to win and an equally powerful fear of failure. They perceive the world as a field of opportunities in which the highest gains are obtained by bold risk-takers. Those unwilling to take the risk, endure the anguish of uncertainty, and accept the possibility of failure and its aftermath must downgrade their ambitions and objectives toward the low end of the hunter scale. Whether it is a battle, a joust, an athletic contest, a business deal or even a minor argument, hunters are in it to win. Napoleon spoke as a true hunter when he said, "to die defeated is to die every day." He also said that soldiers are willing to fight and risk death for the sake of earning a medal.

For the sake of winning, some hunters would not hesitate to break the rules of the competitive game. The unlawful use of performance-improving drugs or doping is currently a major problem in athletic competitions. Many international teams and athletes were banned from participation in international athletic events for this reason. One of these renowned sportsmen is the American cyclist Lance Armstrong whose doping history led to his loss of seven Tour de France titles and a life-time ban from sport events.

Modern hunters seek to realize their objectives and earn their trophies within the shortest period possible. Time is seen as a severe constraint

against which they must work hard to achieve their goals before the onset of old age and eventually death. Indeed, time is one of their strongest and most feared competitors or enemies. Time 'flies' and sooner or later 'runs out' for hunters who are terrified of being overtaken by time and old age. This explains their insistence on promptness, efficiency and lately on time management. Anything that can perform a vital function or deliver a service faster such as rapid means of communication, high-speed computers, speed reading, instant soups and beverages and fast food restaurants are appreciated by impatient self-hurried hunters. This obsession with time efficiency has left them blind to the apparent absurdity of the promise of a recent best-selling business publication to teach him one-minute management. As will be shown in Chapter Four, they may even rush their children through their 'unproductive' childhood and adolescence to hasten their premature entry into the competitive and gainful adult world. Some of these ambitious and highly dedicated hunters run the risk of overaccelerating the pace of their own lives into early graves.

Titles, rewards and trophies are immensely valued by hunters as proofs of their accomplishments and victories. Our primitive ancestors proudly depicted their hunting achievements on the walls of their caves. In some primitive societies that survived into the twentieth century, heads of slain enemy tribesmen were shrunk and worn as ornaments. Trophies collected by soldiers from modern, developed countries included the ears and noses of dead enemy soldiers. Like their ancient forefathers, many contemporary hunters display their macabre trophies of embalmed animals' heads on the walls of their homes for their visitors to view and

admire. The hero of Hemingway's *The Old Man and the Sea* behaves more like a hunter sportsman, as his creator was, interested mainly in going back with a trophy to show to the villagers rather than catching fish to make a living.

The winners in the competitive process reap not only the trophies and material rewards but also status, prestige, and even moral worthiness. In praising the achievements of a successful basketball player, a sport commentator declared that he had finally won respectability. While in the past only members of the upper classes were entitled to respectability, it is now equated with success. These contemporary winners can now claim to have earned their trophies and respect with skills and efforts and not class membership or hereditary privileges.

Winners need not feel any compassion or even pity toward the losers who must silently accept the outcome of the competition and its consequences. In specific, the losers must resign themselves to the low status assigned to them by the rules of the competitive game. The permanent losers who occupy skid row are all poor, unemployed, powerless and unable to protect themselves.

The hunter's tools

In order to win, hunters need suitable tools or means and perhaps the most obvious of these are weapons beginning with the Neolithic primitive axe and bow and ending presently with their arsenal of chemical, biological and atomic weapons. Other tools include the belief systems and social

structures created by hunters to serve their purposes in different times and under specific circumstances. But perhaps more important than all these tools were developing the proper attitudes and cultivating the right images for achieving their ends.

The hunters' faith in the effect of having the right attitude and image cannot be overemphasized. They learned this lesson, as well as many others, from the school of nature and in specific the lion's ferocious posture, the peacock's impressive feather display and similar powerful images. While the elephant is bigger in size, stronger, and more intelligent and resourceful than the lion, the undisputed king of the jungle has the advantage of projecting the image of a powerful, aggressive carnivore. It is undoubtedly the hunter in us that bestowed this title on the lion out of admiration for his status and image. Similarly, hunters may not be the most intelligent or resourceful persons, but their deep appreciation and relentless pursuit of power give them a tremendous advantage over others. And since an image is often as impressive as, and occasionally more prominent than, reality projecting an image of potency, capability and resourcefulness may be enough to achieve approval, admiration and success.

According to Fromm (1947:68), modern man focuses his efforts on selling himself because he experiences himself as a commodity with a value determined by market forces. Selling themselves is a talent in which all hunters excel. In ancient times, hunters presented themselves as heroes and supermen and sometimes elevated themselves to the lofty ranks of deities. Their charismatic characters were praised as flawless, their

utterances as eternal wisdom and their deeds as immaculate. As recently as the mid-twentieth century, Henry Goring and fellow members of the German Nazi party portrayed their Fuhrer as the infallible leader whose decisions served the interests of the German people perfectly. Nowadays, job hunters seek the help of professional resume writers to compose an impressive presentation of their qualifications and skills. A recent immigrant in Canada told me to follow his example and embellish my resume to attract the attention of recruiters. Lying on resumes is a widespread practice among job seekers according to results of an OfficeTeam survey.

Hunters are aware that their projected images are part-real and part-fiction, but in some cases the picture is displayed and replayed so many times that even the very person who touched it up will believe it to be true. The self-delusion of Cain in Shaw's *Back to Methuselah* convinced him that he is truly a higher being than other men. After making his immense fortune from society, the late American businessman Andrew Carnegie behaved in a typical hunter fashion by elevating himself, above the common needs of ordinary men for each other; according to Maccoby (1976:79) he regarded himself as an exceptional person like "the wildflower.... found in the woods all by itself, needing no help from society." If it serves their purposes, hunters may tarnish and undermine their rivals' public images by branding them as weak, incompetent or even evil.

For the sake of improving their images, hunters are prepared to invest much time, effort and money. They aspire to enroll in the most prestigious

schools and universities, obtain the highest academic honors, excel in athletic competitions and other extracurricular activities and occupy a leadership positions among their colleagues. Studying in renowned academic institutions is expected to offer them not only an advantage over their less fortunate peers but also the opportunity to mingle and associate with future rich and powerful individuals. Until recently, enrollment in institutions such as Oxford, Cambridge, Harvard and Yale were practically reserved to the sons and daughters of the rich and powerful. More recently, giving bribes or making donations secured the entry of sons and daughters of some rich and famous American families in respected universities and colleges.

Verbal power

One of the important skills acquired by hunters in educational institutions are language proficiency. Language is “power” according to Lakoff (1990:13) who defined it as a “change-creating force and therefore to be feared”. Men and women distinguished by their command of their languages such as poets and orators occupied high positions in ancient Greece, Persia and Arabia. Arab poets acted as spokesmen for their tribes glorifying their ancestries and victories and denigrating their enemies. The persuasive power of language is strongly appreciated by political leaders who hire expensive professional speech analysts and writers to prepare their speeches. Influential hosts of radio and television programs and their guests often appear to concentrate less on content and more on their

manners of speech, eloquence and wittiness. Like other media personalities, famous evangelists attract millions of followers and much more in donations by the power of their charisma and sermons, and sometimes despite their flagrant and gross moral and ethical aberrations. All these persons are the living proof of Benjamin Disraeli's saying that men govern with words.

Mirror, who is more beautiful than the hunter?

Physical features are also crucially important for the hunter searching for approval, admiration and success. Narcissus became preoccupied with his looks and kept looking at his reflection in a pool until he died of thirst and starvation. The narcissist in psychology, according to Jonason and others (2012) is a deviant person with delusions of grandeur, egoism and low empathy. Roman statutes attest to their obsession with the human physical form and beauty. It is the hunter in these ancient peoples as well as in us who has looked upon the muscular male body as an object of strength and beauty. Hunters appreciate the power of beauty, and this explains their more than average interest in improving their features and the shapes of their bodies throughout history.

Standards for female beauty have changed and varied but all societies appear to have them. Male and female beauty is in the eyes of the beholder, i.e. the hunter-dominated society. The hunter seeks to fulfill these ideal beauty standards not just to win the affection of a person or attract a potential spouse but to hopefully become, like a movie star or

beauty queen, the idol of millions. While cultivating a wide girth may still be desirable in some traditional communities as an indicator of wealth and affluence, Western beauty standards appear to have gained international recognition in this century. To achieve this coveted image, hunters may die their hair, take medication to stop hair loss, enlist in a rigorous physical fitness and diet program, sometimes to the extent of falling ill with anorexia or bulimia, and submit to the scalpel of a plastic surgeon to remedy any physical defect inherited or produced by aging. All these expensive and often painful measures are expected to pay high dividends in terms of personal power.

The phrase: 'Beautiful is good' sums up the hunter's view on beauty. It is also the title of a research paper by Dion, Berscheid and Walster (1972) in which they showed that attractive people are thought to have positive qualities while unattractive people do not. Langlois and others (2000) found that attractive children and adults are viewed positively and receive preferential treatment. In the 1974 Canadian elections, good-looking candidates won more than twice the number of votes given to unattractive candidates. The good looks and verbal ability of Oliver North, according to Ornstein and Ehrlich (1989), impressed many of his compatriots to the extent of nominating him for the presidency of the United States despite his self-confessed unethical conduct in the Iran- Contra scandal.

Lack of these beauty features or standards may drive the self-conscious hunter to depression, despair and even suicide. His unshapely nose devastated Cyrano's life and led him to suppress his love for Roxane in Edmond Rostand's *Cyrano de Bergerac*. He was bound to consider himself

a failure and have low self-esteem because, according to Bach and Torbet (1983), people are told that measuring up to beauty and other standards is necessary for their well-being.

Like Snow White's wicked stepmother, every hunter has a magic mirror of a kind to look at regularly and to persistently query: Who is the most powerful, the wealthiest, or the most beautiful etc. of them all? The most dreaded reply is to see the name of another person on Forbes's list of the wealthiest persons, the New York Times best-seller list or the Oscar nominations. Unlike Snow White's stepmother, hunters lack magical powers or poisoned apples to do away with the competition, although some of them are prepared to resort to criminal measures such as breaking the knee of a rival athlete.

The respectable hunter

Respectability is an integral part of hunters' image and their social armor behind which they hide their pretensions, weaknesses and aberrations. Throughout history rulers, aristocrats, priests, military officers and all other hunters demanded difference and respect from others. Ancient rulers imposed respect rituals on subjects including proper address, bowing deeply and prostrating oneself on the ground. Refusal to abide by these rules was regarded as a disrespectful and mutinous act and was severely punished. For example, Wright (1994) reported that guests at the King of the Zulu's dining table were required by local customs to refrain from coughing or sneezing and disobedience was punishable by death.

Similarly, the upper classes laid down elaborate rules of conduct and etiquette for social and nonconformity was dealt with harshly. While the offending member of a lower class was put in the stockade, whipped or incarcerated, a social equal was challenged to a duel. Southern gentlemen in the United States where honor and respectability were often defended with the sword or gun perpetuated this practice. In Iraq, public expression of disrespect toward a tribal chief obliges him and his tribe to demand redress including formal apology and financial or other compensation. Iraqi media still report several cases of slander settled outside the courts by tribal leaders. Even criminal gang leaders are reported in real life incidents and portrayed in novels and films to react swiftly and harshly to any show of disrespect.

The story of the Greek hero Ajax best illustrates the importance of respectability to powerful persons. Ajax was a proud man, and when his pride was offended, he vented his wrath on his people's livestock. This rashness, however, robbed him of their respect and the despondent Ajax committed suicide.

Hunters reserve their respect for other hunters, and especially those who are more powerful than them. The less powerful and powerless, on the other hand, are intentionally treated with indifference or even disrespect to show them their 'proper place'. While in the past they were addressed insolently, nowadays they may be subjected to black and hostile humor. Powerful hunters release their suppressed aggression by ridiculing people's weaknesses, race, and ethnic origin. Less powerful hunters who also need such outlets and are aware of the symbolic significance of respect

resort sometimes to what Collins (1975) called humiliation rituals. These rituals observed among powerless minorities in Western countries vary from the every-day use of cursing and obscene language to violent anti-social crimes such as drug trafficking, rape, and murder.

The aggressive hunter

Aggressiveness and violence are two distinguishing characteristics of humans as perceived by Lorenz (1969) and McClelland (1975). Dutton (2008) described humanity as the most destructive force in history. Oakley (2008) ascribed this aggressive and violent streak to an 'evil' gene in all of us.

We are all conditioned by our societies to become aggressive if the situation calls for it. All of us are aggressive, but some are more than others. According to Wiener (2004: 1), "a mass of scientific study has established that from birth, males on average tend to be more aggressive, restless and risk-taking than females, and in general less amenable to socialization." This male aggressiveness and risk taking manifest itself soon after birth and explain their weaker social interactions and bonding. Socialization encourages us to become aggressive; research results obtained by Rodkin et al (2000) show that aggressive elementary students are more popular. Societies appear to favor aggressive persons; Prinstein and Cillessen (2003) drew attention to abundant evidence of higher aggressiveness among

upper classes. Aggressiveness served to lift these elites to their higher status and naturally they use it to safeguard their positions and privileges.

War, according to the American anthropologist Clyde Kluckhohn (1949) is the strongest manifestation of our aggressive nature. Keely (1997) refuted the myth of the noble savage by tracing the history of war to pre-civilization times. According to Gat (2006:13), our hunter-gatherers fought with each other and that homicide rates among them were probably higher than in any modern society. Ferrill (1977) thought that wars in these ancient times led to the building of fortified cities and the discovery of agriculture.

The history of many nations is also the record of its wars, according to Kohn (1986). Wars have been fought for a variety of causes, but all wars are essentially violent struggles over power and domination instigated, justified and conducted by the hunter within us. This brutal proclivity is manifested in Shaw's play *Back to Methuselah* by the character Cain who is driven by his obsession with war glories to ask Eve to give birth to more men so that he can fight with them. The question has been frequently raised whether a dispute among nations or groups could be settled through a duel and with much less bloodshed. For example, wouldn't a swordfight between Helen's husband and her abductor be the best and least costly way to resolve the crisis between the ruling families in Troy and the Greeks? This is of course a naïve question because it ignores the fact that the Trojan War was a struggle between powerful hunters and their followers over power and control.

Killing an enemy was not only praised as an act of bravery but also believed by some people to increase the killer's power. And throughout history different cultures have effectively socialized their members to act aggressively and kill other human beings because warfare obviously favors the more aggressive. In the Aztec society, men were expected to demonstrate their aggressiveness by taking part in hostile activities against their enemies. Aztec women contributed to the war effort by mocking those who fail to take part in their wars. This humiliation ritual designed to arouse feelings of shame and guilt was also practiced by other communities such as Arab tribes before Islam. While Arab warriors rode to meet their enemy in battle their women followed in the rear encouraging them with war cries and scolding and stoning those who fled the battlefield. An additional incentive for warriors of these times was the fear of losing battle and risking the enslavement of their women and resulting loss of face. War cries, according to Tiger and Fox (1971: 216), still put men in a frenzy of excitement because "they are stone-age hunters with stone-age emotions and ways of interest."

In wars, the losing side faces dire consequences. Andromache in Euripides's play *Andromache* written in the fifth century B.C. represented all surviving victims of war. Ten years after the conclusion of the Trojan War, she was still languishing in her misery: orphaned, widowed and enslaved by the enemy.

The hunter within us, however, has not been moved by countless real war tragedies over the centuries and the propensity to aggression and violence remains undiminished. Tens of millions perished in the world wars

of the last century, border wars and internal conflicts. In the mid-20th century, the Nazi and fascist movements which advocated the mass murder of minorities and disabled persons succeeded in attracting millions of Europeans who willingly took part in these genocides. According to Taylor (1945), the German Nazis were driven by their cruel and racist tendencies to commit these atrocities. Goldhagen (1997) observed that these cruel Nazis regarded mass executions as entertaining events to which they accompanied their wives. All the nations participating in World War II committed atrocities against civilian populations. Before the end of the last century, the Hutu of Rwanda massacred hundreds of thousands of their fellow Tutsi. Romeo Dallaire, the Canadian head of the UN force in Rwanda, expressed his concern that this genocide was ignored by countries like the United States, France and Belgium because the victims were black Africans (Thompson. 2000). Less than ten years later, the people of Darfur in Sudan suffered a similar genocide by the Sudanese military forces and the Janjaweed militia. In Vietnam, Afghanistan and Iraq, millions lost their lives as a result of American aggressive policies.

Economic exploitations and sanctions killed more millions. Personal acts of violence ranging from drunken driving to premeditated murder continue to impose a high and undiminished toll on human life. The United States which is the most technologically advanced and wealthiest of all Western nations has the highest murder rate in history. American culture, as described by Viano and Cohn (1975: 131), is “interlaced with threads of violence.” This culture according to Aladjem (2008) corrupted the concept

of justice among Americans who favor the code of vengeance and support capital punishment.

Zizek (2008) enlarged the list of violence types. In addition to what he classified as subjective violence such as crime and terror, he distinguished between objective violence including racism, hate speech and discrimination and systemic violence resulting from economic and political systems.

The hunter's aggression and violence have targeted other humans as well as animals and nature in general. While our ancestors hunted animals primarily to obtain food or to protect themselves, modern men kill and encourage the slaughter of wild animals for totally selfish and trivial purposes such as amusing themselves with 'blood sports' like fox-hunting, making clothes, bags and shoes from their furs and hides, concocting expensive aphrodisiacs from their grounded horns and genitals, or carving their tusks into statuettes, pill boxes and other trivial souvenirs. It is believed that wanton violence against animals in this century brought more wild species to extinction or near extinction than in all the history of mankind.

Wars without bloodshed

Competitive mock war games have been recently added to the aggression-releasing leisure activities of Western men and women. Every year, thousands of them take part in these war and survival games that involve the use of guns and ammunitions of fireballs filled with watercolor paint. The special attire worn by players includes helmets, face masks and

camouflage clothes serve to put them in a war-like mood. As in real wars, the objective of the combatants or players is to capture the enemy's flag and inflict the highest number of casualties on their ranks. Conn et al (2004) reported that the number of casualties in this game requiring hospital treatment in the US between 1997 and 2001 was close to twelve thousand.

The hunter also enjoys playing and watching violent sports like hockey, American football, boxing and wrestling. "The game," wrote Bach and Goldberg (1974:147), "becomes a war in miniature, and our aggression is directed at the hated 'things' - the other players or teams to be 'killed' or 'destroyed'." Most of us have unashamedly experienced the excitement and thrill of observing two men in a ring bludgeoning each other into submission or unconsciousness and sometimes permanent disability or death. The sight of blood oozing from their faces does not annoy or repel us but, on the contrary, seems to attract and evoke in us some perverse enjoyment. Mussolini declared his admiration of boxing because in his view it expressed the fascist' inner self. Millions of avid fans attend bullfights in which bullfighters and their assistants in regalia test their courage and maneuvering skills against bulls in what could be described as a pathetic stage play of a primitive hunt. Who can deny that the spectators follow it to the gory end for the purpose of experiencing by proxy the thrill of the confrontation and the climax of the kill, emotions closely associated with the hunt? These spectators, it can be argued, identify with the bullfighter who must prove his - and by substitution their human- superiority over the bull that stands for the animal kingdom. Unsurprisingly, persons who enjoy

playing and watching these violent sports were found by McClelland (1973) to be young men who score high on the power scale.

Acts of violence by heroes and criminals make up a significant proportion of the themes of best-selling books, movies and television programs. Such themes attract larger audiences and earn higher revenues; scenes of violence resulting in destruction, horrible body mutilations and gruesome death obviously appeal to many of us. Indeed, millions regularly watch and enjoy real or enacted acts of violence in movies, television programs and news. This macabre taste may explain why criminals and their deeds receive a wide coverage in the news. The recent addition of warning messages about the contents of television programs indicates that violent themes will continue regardless of serious reservations by numerous specialists such as Yusef and Santrock (1978:11) who reported that watching violence on television makes it more acceptable to spectators.

The Dark Triad

Psychologists and social psychologist use the term dark triad to refer to three personality disorders: narcissist, Machiavellian and psychopath. These types live among us in all societies and share traits that put them close to the hunter lifestyle. The narcissist tends to be pompous, selfish, vain, arrogant, and incapable of empathy. According to Bushman and Baumeister (1998), a narcissist is intolerant of any criticism that blemishes his inflated self-image and may resort to violence in response. Narcissists

are widely present in societies, governments, novels and movie characters such as James Bond.

The Machiavellian seeks to achieve his or her goals by all possible means. Niccolò Machiavelli (1469- 1527), the Italian statesman, is credited with the motto: the ends justify the means. These means may include manipulating, deceiving and exploiting others. Competition attract the Machiavellian with the aim of winning by any means including the use of violence and other immoral means.

The main traits of a psychopath are egoism, narcissism and cruelty. Lacking any feelings of guilt and empathy the psychopath may charm and beguile others or threaten and harm them if necessary, to obtain satisfaction.

Jonason, Webster, Crysel, Schmitt and Norman (2012) identified the following common traits among the dark triads: aggressiveness, deception, impertinence and abusiveness. Results of a survey by Twenge, Konrath, Foster, Campbell and Bushman (2008) indicated a rising trend in the numbers of these deviant persons in the United States. Between 1979 and 2006, narcissistic cases in American universities and colleges increased by 30%. These results support earlier findings which showed an increase of 80% between the 1950s and 1980s in the number of respondents who agreed with the statement: I am an important person. In the eyes of other nations, the United States appears to be a narcissistic state intent on imposing its way of life and policies over the world.

Why the hunter side in all us is has this selfish and violent streak? The general rational assumption is that people are conditioned by their

environment to become aggressive. Oakley (2008) takes issue with this and hypothesizes the presence of 'evil' genes which compel some of us to behave badly. Another explanation which resonates with the general thesis used here is observed by Dutton (2008:x); "Sociobiologists tend to view extreme violence as an inherited and vestigial remnant of our predator past, of the "pain-blood-death" complex, a set of associations with successful hunting".

Finally, it must be remembered that the hunter in us is not simply a problem case conditioned by an evil gene, abusive parents, deviant peer pressures or bad choices. The hunter's lifestyle, in its modular version, is universally regarded as the best grand strategy for success at all levels in life, and a hunter is judged as an adjusted, productive person. This lifestyle is the outcome first of purposeful upbringing by caring parents and socialization by responsible educational and other social institutions and, second, of individual choice and conviction. Of course, there are no pure-type hunters and all hunters have a farmer side to which our attention now turns.

The Farmer

Imagine a world where family ties are weak, community bonds are almost nonexistent and only hierarchies thrive. This is how the world would be without the farmer. The missing ingredient in this precarious, dark world would be the farmers' vital contributions to their communities and the world, and in specific their readiness to cooperate with others and

their genuine empathy and active concern for their welfare. In the absence of the farmer type, even these who speak the same language, and share the same ethnic roots and national sentiments will find it difficult to live and work together. They are the cementing factor that maintains social bonds and keeps communities alive. And it is the farmer side in most of us that compels us to cooperate with and help others. In a world devoid of farmers there would be no Mother Teresa, Good Samaritans and charities.

The Farmer's social urge

The farmers' personal objectives may not be much different from those of hunters, i.e. security and happiness. However, they differ sharply in their choice of means for achieving these objectives. While selfish hunters firmly believe in power and possessions as their only sources of security and happiness in a hostile world populated by other selfish and greedy hunters, farmers base their personal security, prosperity and fulfillment on the security and prosperity of others and their community. By cooperating with others, helping them to realize their objectives or sometimes even by simply living and letting others live, they believe that they will have a better chance of enjoying a secure and happy life. Associating and cooperating with others, thus, becomes a basic propensity of farmers. "Contribute to the happiness of at least a few people," was the answer of one manager to Maccoby's (1976:57) question: "What is your goal in life?" This is a typical farmer's reply and it is no wonder that this manager was leading a simple life augmenting his salary by farming with his wife.

Does the farmer type exist in the real world or are they perhaps the human or image of human whom the Greek philosopher Diogenes went looking for him carrying a lantern in daylight? There is some research evidence supporting the existence of the farmer and his way of life. Wilson (1993) reported that studies on children at play indicate that residents of rural communities show more concern and care for others than urban children. The former is prepared to help, give comfort to their neighbors and cooperate with them more than the latter. The explanation offered by the researchers is that the need for cooperation and the value of altruism are stronger in agricultural communities while individual achievement is emphasized in urban societies.

The farmers' definition or image of the community reflects more their opinions on what it should be rather than what it is. According to this image, bonds of cooperation, mutual care and trust must unite the community. But since reality falls short of their expectations, they are often accused of being dreamers or utopians. Farmers, however, maintain their faith in this image believing that it is not a Shangri-La and can be realized if most people share and practice their values. Most people, the farmer argues, subscribe or at least give lip service to these values and acknowledge their moral superiority but claim that living by them is impractical given the state of the world in which money and their values are in control.

The moral farmer

The sources of farmers' moral and ethical values are the family and the community. Since they derive their satisfaction from working, cooperating and associating with others they regard all beliefs, values and sentiments that support or encourage these behaviors to be positive and constructive. These values and sentiments are rooted in their belief in the intrinsic goodness of human nature and their optimistic faith in society and the world becoming a better place to live in. They view all human beings as equal partners in this world regardless of their race, color or creed. All of them have the rights to live freely, securely and happily. Accordingly, there is no difference in basic moral worth between the elite and ordinary people, the educated and uneducated, and the powerful and the powerless. They would strongly agree with William Morris (1834-1896) that "no man is good enough to be another man's master."

Every human being is believed to be capable of attaining and practicing all the qualities which the farmer regards as virtues. All of us have an intrinsically good nature but socialization and social environments influence and compel us to behave contrary to it. An end to hunter-dictated social constraints would allow humans to express their good and virtuous nature. The only acceptable way for achieving this is persuasion.

Farmers achieve their objectives through their labor and in cooperation and harmony with others and never by exploitation or deception. The main distinguishing moral values of farmers are altruism, empathy and compassion. Farmers' altruism impels them to help others even at the

expense of their resources and time. Good deeds are self-satisfying in themselves for farmers without expecting recognition or gratitude.

Social psychologists offer different explanations of altruism. A person may help his kin to ensure that their common genes are passed to the next generation. Expectation of reciprocity or one good deed leading to another is another explanation. Some behave altruistically because it satisfies them but there are also those who do it regardless of any reward. Batson (2011) believes that all human beings and not just saints and Good Samaritans are altruistic because evolution ingrained in us to look after our offspring. Sussman and Cloninger saw in altruism and cooperation as necessary human traits to discourage extreme competition. Oliner and Oliner (1988) maintained that an altruistic personality does exist and is distinguished by strong bonds with non-family members and strangers and feelings of responsibility toward them.

The farmer's basic sentiments are love, compassion, forgiveness and forbearance. Compassion is the manifestation of the farmer's developed capacity to empathize with others, or what Emile Durkheim (1858-1917) called the sentiments of sympathy and solidarity. The farmers' ability to identify with others and understand their motives, limitations and shortcomings compel them to forgive and forget their transgressions. In prolonging animosities and weakening social ties, revenge can only undermine the farmer's lifestyle.

In Cleopatra's comparison between the characters of Caesar and herself in Shaw's play *Caesar and Cleopatra*, Caesar appears to be surprisingly more of a farmer rather than a hunter. She finds Caesar different from

herself and other people who regard and treat fellow human beings as either friends and allies entitled to their love, or adversaries to be feared and hated. Unlike her and many others, Caesar befriends everyone even children and dogs. In her words: "His kindness to me is a wonder neither mother, father, no nurse has ever taken so much care for me or thrown open their thoughts to me so freely." To a farmer, care and love are necessary to achieve a level of a harmony and cooperation unobtainable with the presence of selfish interest or coercion. The farmer's love is a universal proactive sentiment. It is not romantic love but the love of humanity encompassing all as illustrated by the sentiments and actions of the reformed ex-convict Jean Valjean and the priest in Victor Hugo's *Les Misérables*.

The farmer in all of us is a dedicated community member and a true citizen of the whole world. As such, human suffering close to and far from home genuinely moves farmers, and their reaction to such misfortune typically exceed the mere expression of grief and compassion to the expenditure of energy, time, and money to alleviate the suffering. Donating to charities, doing volunteer work and sharing with others in any way possible are some of the ways in which they express their solidarity with their communities and the world. As Good Samaritans, they do favors not only to friends but also to acquaintances and even strangers without seeking or expecting gratitude or recognition in return. Being altruistic and virtuous is not only self-rewarding but also encourages others to reciprocate by adopting and practicing the same values and sentiments. In the farmer's view, the world is circular-shaped both geometrically and

socially and, thus, every deed, whether it is good or bad, has this boomerang effect on the individual, the community and the world.

The limited resources and suppressed voices of farmers do not stop them from expressing their dissatisfaction with the hunter's world and their reservations on the social, political and economic order created by hunters. Despite their deep frustration and disappointment with the state of the world, they are unlikely to vent these feeling through acts of aggression. Instead, you may encounter them in a protest meeting or rally voicing their strong anti-war beliefs or campaigning against abuses of human rights, or cruelty to animals or environmental pollution. They are also expected to act upon their convictions by refusing military conscription on principle and to bravely accept the social and legal repercussions. Only if faced with life-threatening conditions, they may resort to rehearsal, drama and other escape tactics to hide their true beliefs and sentiments otherwise, they can be counted upon to give an honest opinion, tell the truth and keep their promises.

Finally, although the hunter usually takes credit for all the achievements of mankind so far, it is our farmer side that has made possible sedentary life, cooperation, kindness and morality and championed the causes of peace and peaceful resolution of conflicts and is, thus, responsible directly or indirectly for our survival, development and progress.

Are women also hunters and farmers?

Women are also part-hunter and part-farmer. The only difference between them and men in this regard is that, until recently, most women

were deprived of the social training and incentives to develop high levels of the hunter lifestyle and the opportunities to live accordingly. Women have been traditionally socialized to subordinate their minds and wills to the men in their families, i.e. their fathers, brothers, uncles and husbands, and not to seek domination over them. They have been trained and conditioned to perform the domestic roles of wives, mothers and homemakers and to accept a second-degree status in private and public affairs. By enforcing this double standard, the hunter within us has cleverly eliminated them from the competitive process in human society. The only exception to this male domination state were matriarchal communities in which women used monopoly over primitive religious beliefs, ritual and magic to gain the upper hand. It remains the norm in almost every society that men including those who occupy the lowest positions on the power hierarchies could satisfy their hunter urges by at least dominating the lives of their household females.

In the past, discrimination against women took the form of exclusion from powerful professions in the government, the administration, the military and the priesthood, and this was justified by branding them as unclean, or physically weak and mentally inferior. Unable to compete with men on equal footing, women had to rely on their intelligence and sexual charm to win leverage over their brute partners in humanity. They schemed, plotted and seduced to satisfy their power urges.

It is interesting to note that religious beliefs and folk tales in many societies blame females for much of the power mongering and evil in this world. This is typical of the hunter who refuses to admit his weaknesses

and shortcomings, and instead of shouldering responsibility for them blames scapegoats. According to these beliefs and traditions, it is this dark characteristic in women which prompted Eve to disobey God's commandment and encourage Adam to follow suit. In Greek mythology Pandora committed another gross act of disobedience by opening the infamous box and letting out all forms of evil into the world. Delilah deceived and robbed Samson of his power. Also, the popular saying that there is a woman behind every great man alludes to the alleged role of women in fueling the ambitions of their sons or husbands to achieve what they cannot directly aspire to. Even the female's developed social skills are seen by Lerner (1989:6) as necessary "to 'hook,' 'snare,' or 'catch,' a husband who would provide her with access to economic security and social status.

It is still widely believed in many societies that men must guard against the scheming and treachery of women and especially the seductive power of beautiful women who seek to dominate them. Surprisingly, such beliefs and stereotypes are preserved and transmitted by women themselves who traditionally performed the roles of narrators of folk tales. In traditional societies, mothers do their best to convince their sons to ward off the persistent attempts of their wives to control their lives. All these beliefs and traditions claim that women also have power urges which they attempt to satisfy in ways different from those used by men.

The fact that the world has been so far a man's world in which women were coerced into playing a secondary role and were deprived of the opportunity to compete directly for power may explain the suppression of

the hunter side in many women. In contrast to men who must live up to the image of an independent, powerful male, women are expected to accept a dependent status and relate to others. Their continued identification with their mothers and their loving care for their parents, spouses and children place them closer to the farmer's rather than the hunter's lifestyle. This, according to Wilson (1993) also explains why women consider moral principles as fixed obligations to help others and refrain from harming them while men generally consider them as relative obligations determined by reciprocity.

Having a relatively stronger farmer side may also make women less suicidal than men; male suicide rate is more than double that of females in Western countries. Also, the propensity of the adolescent male hunter to release his aggression through gang crimes, underage drinking and drug abuse is less evident among women. However, these significant differences in lifestyles may be disappearing; Fishbein (1992) predicts that rates of female delinquency and crimes will steadily rise as a result of the changing family roles, and indeed such increases have been reported since the 1980's. Apparently, opportunities to develop and express the hunter side in women are increasing.

Chapter Three: Religion, Philosophy and the Social Sciences: Pro-hunter or Farmer?

“Vain is the word of a philosopher which does not heal any suffering of man. For just as there is no profit in medicine if it does not expel the diseases of the body, so there is no profit in philosophy either, if it does not expel the suffering of the mind.”

Epicurus

We are surrounded by uncertainties which arouse in us questions, doubts and fears about the natural and social worlds around us, our physical and psychological well-being and even about our beliefs and innermost thoughts. Modern humans have put their trust in science and the scientific method to dispel these doubts and fears and to achieve a comprehensive understanding of the natural and social worlds and to solve all our social and personal problems. They believe that all the answers to their questions about human motivation and behavior can be provided by social or behavioral scientists. As a result of this, their faith in the eternal truths and principles revealed by religion and the value of philosophy as a principal source of knowledge has diminished. However, for much of our recorded history, these two basic pillars of our universal culture have been the depositories of beliefs and ideas in the social, political, and personal spheres. What interests us here in particular is whether religious

commandments and beliefs, philosophical thoughts and the theories and findings of the social sciences support the hunter or farmer within us.

Religion: The champion of the farmer?

The teachings of many religions and religious movements preach cooperation, brotherly love, and compassion and censure selfishness and aggressions. These religions praise the life of struggle, toil, cooperation and mutual help which is characteristic of the farmer and farming communities. Believers are called upon to practice mercy, compassion and care for others, especially the needy and helpless. These practices are assigned a high moral worthiness while the selfish pursuit of power, wealth and social status are scorned.

Some of these farmer's virtues are emphasized in the following 'Council of Wisdom' which dates to the Babylonian times (Roux, 1964:102):

To the feeble show kindness

Do not insult the downtrodden

Do charitable deeds; render service all your days

Do not utter libel; speak what is of good report

Do not say evil things, speak well of people

In Babylon also, King Hammurabi code of laws enacted in 1754 BC provided protection for ordinary citizens from the possible exploitation and oppression of powerful individuals.

The Old Testament urges people to socialize and interact with each other: "For to him that is joined to all the living there is hope." (Ecclesiastes 9:4). This is essential for man to achieve his salvation argued the New Testament because "what shall it profit a man, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul" (Mark 8:36). Islamic teachings also preach that the faithful who are as equal like "the teeth of a comb must be united as bricks in a wall."

In his elaboration of the Christian faith, Saint Augustine made his well-known distinction between the city of men and the city of God. Selfishness, ambition and pride characterize the inhabitants of the city of men while love of God and other virtues distinguish the thoughts and conduct of the citizens of the heavenly city. Saint Augustine regarded the lust for power as one of the three most deadly sins.

The establishment of the Social Gospel Movement in the 19th century was a turning point in the history of Protestantism in northern America. It helped in the introduction of several social reforms such as retirement wages, minimum and fair wages and health care. The core message of the Movement stressed the religious duty of all to help each other (White and Hopkins, 1976). In her book on the Quakers or The Religious Society of Friends, Hirst (1923) reported that in their conference in 1920 they called upon all to abandon selfishness and practice trust, cooperation and altruism.

In Islam, the faithful who seek Allah's forgiveness, mercy and eternal reward in Paradise must cultivate in themselves the traits of humility, modesty and steadfastness. In behaving toward others, they must also

practice fairness, truthfulness, generosity, and empathy. Commandments prohibiting raids, looting and murder and requiring the faithful to perform ritual ablutions for daily prayers made it practically impossible for the converted Bedouins to preserve their nomadic hunter way of life. By also preaching equality and justice and banning economic exploitation, hoarding of gold and silver, extravagance, drinking alcohol, gambling, hunting for sport and amusement, Islam deprived the hunters of much of their coveted goals, pleasures and the means of achieving them.

Eastern religions teach that selfishness can be overcome with spiritual training, meditation and performance of good deeds. Buddhist teachings affirm that all people are born equal and must live in peace and universal love. Adherence to this principle will lead believers from egoism to compassion, ignorance to knowledge and from suffering and dissatisfaction to equanimity. The result of this process of refinement of human thoughts and deeds culminate in achieving the true noble nature of humans or nirvana. Yutang (1937) quotes Confucius as advising the young to respect their parents, respect others, act consciously, be honest, love all and associate with respected, kind persons. After fulfilling all these duties, they should devote their energies to education. The Taoist creed considers selfishness as the source of all disagreements and conflicts and the cause of all human sufferings. All followers of Taoism are urged to rid themselves of selfishness to achieve peace of mind

Most religions warn the unjust, the murderers, and tyrannical rulers of severe punishment if they refuse to repent and persist in their ungodly behavior. Even if they emerge victorious in this world and escape

retribution, they shall be punished in the afterlife in eternal Gehenna or Hell, reincarnation into a lower caste or animal form or other forms of punishment. The faithful, on the other hand, are advised to forbear and preserve in their ways in this evil-dominated world so that they may qualify for heaven or paradise in the afterlife.

One of them was Dostoevsky who warned through the character Ivan Karamazov in his novel *The Brothers Karamazov* that “if there is no God, everything is possible.” Adler (1973) also believed that the concept of God is functional because it represents a desired state of perfection and greatness that can positively influence behavior.

The other face of religion

Religions have another unsavory face. On one side, religions advocate equality, justice, amity and peace for all but on the other side some religious scholars and leaders justify oppression, schism, aggression and wars. In my opinion, the former is the true face of religions while the latter is the creation of hunters to justify their aggressive tendencies and selfish interests. Religions like all social phenomena fell under the influences and corruption of hunters.

Some religious beliefs or interpretations appear to favor the hunter’s values and lifestyles. The idea of a chosen people suggests a hierarchy in which one nation only occupies the highest human strata closer to their deity and granting itself more rights and privileges than other nations and even at their expense. Coward (2008) observed that Western thought generally holds human nature to be imperfect. The belief in the original sin

teaches that all people are born evil and sinful and must, therefore, seek redemption through conviction and ritual. Only with the help of God's grace a person can get rid of sins and personality flaws. The ritual of confession offers sinners absolution through repentance and prayer without necessarily redressing their injustices toward their victims or community. Thomas Paine (1737-1809) criticized some of the Biblical stories for being a history of human evils that contributed to the corruption and sufferings of humanity. He hated all forms of cruelty and regarded religious institutions as artificial creations for control and power monopoly.

Saint Paul justified obedience to secular authority, regardless of whether it is just or unjust, by proclaiming that: "Everyone must submit to the governing authorities, for there is no authority except from God, and all authority that exists is established by God"(Romans 13:1). The Puritans believed that wealthy people are divinely chosen. Some Islamic jurists interpreted or rather misinterpreted religious verses to rationalize submission to an unjust ruler, a usurper or other illegitimate regimes as a religious duty necessary to avoid schism, rebellion and bloodshed.

Religious scriptures that preached love, kindness and forgiveness toward fellow humans were also interpreted to justify war. In *Contra Faustum Manichaeum*, Saint Augustine regarded wars waged against enemies of God or the Roman Catholic Church as 'just' and 'moral'. This dictum was used to rally Europeans to join the Crusades. More recently, President Bush claimed that he was guided by religious conviction to attack and invade Iraq. Some religious leaders in Islam also found support in religious scriptures for jihad or holy war which was not exclusive to self-

defense. Zionist Jews usually quotes verses from the Bible in defending their occupation of Palestine, displacement of most of its original inhabitants by force, possession of weapons of mass destruction and generally destabilizing the Middle East. Many political groups and individuals in western countries support the Zionist claim to the land of the Palestinians on religious grounds.

In the Aztec religion, priests ordained blood sacrifices to placate their angry gods. In addition to animals, humans were also killed, and their hearts offered to the gods. Aztec warriors waged wars for the main purpose of capturing prisoners for these macabre rituals.

The Hindu caste system limits access to power and social privileges by caste origin. According to the Dharma Sutra, individuals can never cross caste borders during their lifetime, but if they perform good deeds, they may be reborn in the next life as members of a higher caste. Sinful persons, on the other hand, may be reincarnated into a lower caste or even as animals. Severe rules are imposed on relations between members of different castes including such details as the physical distance to be maintained between them and the handling of food and drink. Failure to observe these rules is regarded as an insult to the upper-caste person requiring him to perform ritual purification.

Hierarchies of power and privileges were established in many religions attracting power-hungry individuals in society. Catholic popes in the Middle Ages kept mercenary armies and waged wars over land and spheres of influence. Many wars were fought over religious differences, and religious rivalries were frequently exploited by secular leaders to further

their interests. Under the banner of liberating the holy land from Muslim rule but motivated mainly by the objectives of conquest and material gains, the Crusaders massacred mainly Muslims but sometimes also Jews and occasionally other Christians. Thousands perished at the pyres and in the torture chambers of the Inquisition. Numerous religious minorities in many parts of the world are still subjected to persecution and discrimination.

It appears that the hunter side in all of us, whether in secular or clerical guise, has succeeded in dominating religious establishments and hierarchies. Consequently, moral and ethical values in religions have been buried under mountains of dogma and ritual and in effect, the appeal of religion has waned. Moreover, many nowadays consider religious values to be idealistic for our materialistic world. One of these staunch critics was Sigmund Freud who called religion an illusion. Karl Marx also denigrated religion by calling it the opiate of the people. Others fear the destabilizing effect of some religious movement on their cherished social institutions. According to Lopreato (1984), Western opposition and antagonism toward some oriental religious movements stem from the belief that their principles contradict the values of Western society especially personal ambition, individual competition and mass consumption. In contrast, defenders of religion and its positive impact on social relationships and behavior have been fewer.

Philosophy: Between the Hunter's Realism and the Farmer's Utopia

Different conceptions of man, his urges and behavior have been advanced by philosophers. Some of them recognized and discussed the influences of both the hunter and farmer sides on human personality and behavior while others favored the hunter or farmer as having a stronger and more positive impact on human thinking and conduct.

Humans as part-hunter and part-farmer

A complex image of humans as being influenced and driven by their selfishness and urge to power and domination as well as the need to associate and cooperate with others is found in the thoughts of the Greek and Arab philosophers, Kant, Hume, Rousseau, Spinoza, Bentham and Hospers.

Power, wealth and the urges to acquire them have been central themes in philosophy since Aristotle who saw these as the sources of the conflict between the rich and the poor. Plato warned of the power seeker who is the vilest of all men, capable of killing and enslaving others and as a result leading a precarious, insecure life constantly threatened by relatives and friends of his victims. The Epicureans, according to Plamentaz (1992) believed that human beings have passions and evil tendencies and without the protection of laws there is no happiness.

A group of Greek philosophers known as the Stoics distinguished between the human propensities to wisdom and foolishness. They equated

wisdom with knowing one's duties toward others, i.e. being socially responsible and behaving accordingly, while the absence of this sense of social responsibility was foolishness. They argued that if all humans were wise there would be no need for the state's coercive system of authority.

Many philosophers, on the other hand, used the same or similar arguments to justify the establishment and continuity of states and governments. These higher authorities, they argued, are necessary to reconcile the conflicting interests of selfish, greedy and power-seeking individuals and to prevent the competition among them from deteriorating into violent conflict.

According to the Arab philosopher and historian Ibn Khaldun (1332-1406), humans are born equal and capable of practicing cooperation as well as competition. Individual differences stem from upbringing and socialization in their communities. If they are treated with kindness, they will become decent and sociable. If the upbringing is harsh and devoid of mercy, they are more likely to be lazy and apathetic or otherwise antisocial. Governments are necessary for civilization and regulation of aggression and cooperation and rulers must be just because unjust rulers instill fear and submission in their subjects and resort to lying and subterfuge to escape oppression and ultimate corruption and immorality (Ibn Khaldun, p. 149).

In addition to being selfish and anti-social, human beings, according to the French philosopher Immanuel Kant (1724-1804), are also sociable and responsible. Our anti-social side is seen to be the root of many evils and specifically tyranny, oppression or anarchy. He also maintained that both

the social and its antithetical passions act upon us concurrently, and the conflict resulting from this is not a bad thing, but the source of social progress provided we are allowed the greatest possible degree of freedom.

The Scottish philosopher David Hume (1711-1776) also believed that human beings are influenced by different needs. Some of these needs such as sexual desire attract them to each other while other needs especially the “insatiable and perpetual” craving for property and wealth pull them apart and could even prove to be “destructive of society,” Individuals seek to maximize gains for themselves and their friends but since the valuable objects of their passions and desires are scarce, social conflict is inevitable. Consequently, society needs to control and regulate this urge to possess or acquisitiveness.

The image of humans drawn by the French philosopher Jean Jacques Rousseau (1712-1778) emphasized their overpowering passions for material possessions and comfort. After satisfying their basic needs, they turn their attention to the superfluous, the delights, wealth, subjects and slaves. They are never satisfied with whatever they gain, and surprisingly the less urgent the things they seek the stronger is their passion for obtaining them. Society according to Rousseau is created by humans for the sake of imposing limits on their quest for power. These limits, however, should not mean that all humans must have the same power or wealth but that no citizen should be powerful enough to enslave another and no one poor and powerless to the extent of selling his or her freedom. In his book *Emile*, Rousseau emphasized that the greatest principle should be liberty and not authority. Accordingly, dependence among individuals must be

abolished or at least controlled and regulated to maintain liberty. If, however, this state of dependence persists, Rousseau warned, authority will degenerate into domination and obedience into servitude. Collective control of inequalities in power and wealth agreed upon within a democratic process are necessary to protect the powerless from the powerful and the powerful from the envy of the poor. Power and wealth may be the primary objectives of most people but not Rousseau who believed that the simple country life and its virtues are by far superior.

According to the philosophy of Baruch Spinoza (1632-1677), humans have two masters: passions and reason, but they are more partial and subservient to the former rather the latter. Their strongest passion is to become the first among fellow humans and this drives them to compete and quarrel with them. Although cooperation serves better their survival and prosperity, they choose to inflict harm upon them and take pride in it. Spinoza pessimistically concluded his analysis of humans by predicting that they will always obey their passion rather than reason.

The English philosopher Jeremy Bentham (1748-1832) believed that individuals in society compete and collaborate with each other to satisfy their needs. Bentham and fellow Utilitarian philosophers argued that the greatest happiness for the greatest number can only be achieved by curtailing individualistic tendencies in humans. He predicted that eventually we will become more virtuous and the human condition in general will improve.

More recently, John Hospers (1982) observed that human beings are both egoistic and altruistic. He called this altruistic tendency "limited

benevolence,” or “the impulse to help.” This impulse is what makes people help others, especially in a crisis, without expecting anything in return except to fulfill their “sense of duty.”

Hunters in philosophy

Several philosophers and thinkers believe that human beings are motivated only or primarily by selfishness and the urges to acquire wealth and power. While some of them warned of the dangers of selfishness, others praised its positive and constructive qualities and advocated its perpetuation and legitimation by social institutions and values. Hunter philosophies also stressed our intellectual side and supported the sovereignty of reason and power over passions or emotions. Some philosophers considered sharp inequalities between classes and individuals as part of the natural order and their manifestations in the social, economic and political systems in are inevitable. Hobbes, Nietzsche and Pareto explained human behavior by drawing parallels between it and the survival and hunting habits of carnivores such as lions, wolves and foxes. Many of the characteristics of the hunter are manifested in Plato’s ruler, Nietzsche’s superman and De Sade’s strong man.

The Cynics, a group of Greek philosophers, praised individualism because men by nature seek independence from each other and refuse to be burdened by moral obligations. The influence of our hunter side’s lifestyle and beliefs is also evident in Frances Bacon’s observation that man’s highest ambition is to exert his control and domination over all things in this world.

According to the Italian political and military thinker Niccolò Machiavelli (1469-1527) the basic needs and motives of human beings are self-preservation, security and the desire to impress others with their deeds and accomplishments. Humans exhibit their evil nature in their excessive ambitions and desires. States and individuals alike are driven by their urges to obtain power and domination which are the main causes of war and internal conflicts. Conflict and struggle also characterize the relationship between the powerful elites and the common people in all states. The tendency of common people to follow and imitate authority figures is exploited by the strong civic leaders who seek to manipulate the powerless. Given these conditions, men cooperate only when it is essential for their survival.

Machiavelli disapproved of Christian moral standards which, in his opinion, deprived human beings of pride and self-assertiveness. The practice of such standards is also unsupported by common sense because he wrote “a man who wishes to make a profession of goodness in everything must necessarily come to grief among so many who are not so good.

According to the English philosopher Thomas Hobbes (1588-1679), men seek power to obtain security in a world populated by selfish, power seekers. Without a political coercive system, life is “solitary, poor, nasty, brutish and short.” He coined the expression “homo homini lupus,” which means that every man acts like a wolf in his relationships and transactions with fellow human beings. Those ‘wolves’ are constantly competing over gain, safety and glory. Driven by insecurity feelings, every man in what he

called the state of nature believes that he has a right to everything. His quest for power and all things associated with it such as wealth, command and honor are insatiable, and since he cannot have enough of them, he enters competition with other men, regarding all of them as his rivals. The principles of justice and fairness are seen by him as meaningless, mere cultural artifacts. In order to achieve security, man is willing to forsake the freedom of the state of nature for the organized sociopolitical order of the coercive state. His only guarantee against other's selfishness and their ruthless pursuit of their objectives is the rule of law and the strength of their commitment to it.

In 1761 Adam Ferguson (1978: 19) thought of man as a selfish being motivated by profit making: "...he deals with his fellow creatures as he does with his cattle for the sake of the profits they bring." And in pursuing his selfish interests, man is prepared to sacrifice social bonds.

Kant, Burke and Locke defended the interests and privileges of powerful elites in society. Immanuel Kant (1724-1804) who saw human nature as a mixture of what we call here hunter and farmer values and motives subscribed to an extremely pessimistic view of the human experience. He wrote: "Out of the crooked timber of humanity, no straight thing was ever made." He also supported total submission to all authority systems including tyranny and condoned suppression of rebellions and execution of any rebel who dares to rise against authority. His advice to those who do not want to be stepped upon by others is to avoid becoming 'worms'.

The English philosopher Edmund Burke (1729-1797) believed that inequality is inevitable in all societies. He defended the status and

privileges of the aristocracy by arguing that they are the best qualified to represent and champion the public interest. Their social commitment and sense of responsibility stem from the high value put by them on social honors and their concern for their reputation which lead them to adopt the public interest as their own.

John Locke (1632-1704) also defended the established powers and privileges of the upper classes in his contemporary society by using a different argument from that of Burke. He believed that property is the source of all political rights. Accordingly, the landowners possessed political rights and authority which they exercise over the masses that lacked political rights. In his opinion, those without property could only be a subject or a slave. The German philosopher G. W. F. Hegel (1770-1831) branded rulers as the evil history-makers but he supported hereditary monarchs and their monopoly of power and privileges who must not be hampered by personal virtues or moral and ethical considerations.

Another German philosopher Friedrich Nietzsche (1844-1900) argued that moral standards are laid down by the powerful to maintain and protect their positions and privileges. He compared man to a wolf obsessed with the desire to dominate everyone and everything around him. Nietzsche criticized Christian morality for preaching compassion, mercy, and selflessness and condemning selfishness and the urge to power. He scorned it as a "slave" morality and labeled love and self-sacrifice as weaknesses. He maintained that only an impotent weak person unable to seek revenge would forgive his enemies. He advocated going back to what he called the "aristocratic", pre-Christian, Greek morality in which the

“good” were the aristocracy distinguished by their high energy, power and strong desire to win and rule in contrast with the “bad” elements who because of their lack of power and energy lost the fight and became the defeated lower social strata. The superiority of the aristocracy also stems from their readiness to sacrifice others for the sake of promoting their own interests without giving any thought to the fate and suffering of the underdogs. His ideal society is that in which *ubermensch* or supermen distinguish themselves from ordinary men by their extraordinary ability to master their passions, to abandon the common slave morality and its sham virtues of altruism and compassion, and to endorse the ‘virtue’ of cruelty and the will to power. According to him, the conflict of wills and the emotions engendered by it are prerequisites for the establishment and continuity of creative civilizations. Nietzsche’s ideas are valued by some for its exposition of the real Western culture and power structure.

Conflict is also central to Marxism and its dialectic materialism. Carl Marx (1818-1883) and his followers believed that change can only come out of conflict and class struggle and, therefore, the process itself is positive and constructive. Marxist beliefs served as the ideological and intellectual foundation for communist regimes in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe until recently and are still recognized as the official dogma in China, Cuba and North Korea.

The struggle for dominance is also the central theme in Vilfredo Pareto’s (1848-1923) philosophy. In every society, individuals differ in physical strength, intelligence and strength of will and in the inevitable struggle between them for control, the strong and/or intelligent individuals are

bound to emerge victorious. He called these individuals the foxes. However, these foxes may be challenged by the lions that are stronger than them but more conservative, and less creative and rational. Even if the foxes lose their positions of authority to the lions, this is bound to be temporary because, sooner or later, the foxes will use their intelligence to undermine the lions' authority and replace them. In any society whether ruled by lions or foxes, the elites will always be in control.

In this conflict-ridden world with control being eagerly and sometimes violently contested between classes, elites, lions, wolves and foxes, fewer beliefs and principles will remain constant or unanimously accepted and honored. This viewpoint was advanced by German philosopher Karl Mannheim (1893-1947) who argued that since moral values vary from one age to another and from one group to the next, these values can no longer be regarded as absolute or timeless.

Not only social values but all human history, according to Adolph Hitler, have been shaped by the superior race that proves its supremacy through victory in war. This superior race is populated by the strongest and fittest who alone deserve to live and propagate themselves. He decreed that for the superior Teutonic race to fulfill its destiny, the German young must be "undismayed, domineering, violent and cruel." According to Smith (1981), Mussolini shared Hitler's adoration of aggression and violence and condemned religious values that taught predestination, cowardice and submission.

It is not surprising for Hans Morgenthau (1946) to conclude that man is egoistic and has always been driven by an insatiable lust for power. In his

perpetual effort to satisfy this power urge, he has corrupted everything around him, changing churches into political organizations and revolutions to dictatorships. In his book *Critique of Dialectical Reason*, Sartre concluded that all people are competing rivals.

Do hunters have a utopian vision? The idea of a utopian society itself runs contrary to the beliefs of hunters and their intellectual champions. Indeed, utopian movements are looked upon with suspicion and distrust. Karl Popper (1902-1994) warned that those who want to realize their utopian dreams will probably manage to create hell rather than heaven on earth.

Farmer philosophy

Several philosophers stressed humans' commitment to higher values and principles like justice, equality, and brotherly love, and their propensity to care for and cooperate with fellow human beings. They focused our attention on our good innate nature and strong social need which compel us to interact, exchange with and relate to others in order to establish harmonious, cooperative, productive and secure communities.

Aristotle and Plato considered cooperation to be the foundation of any good state. The weakness of this foundation and the domination of the selfish and the powerful were lamented by several philosophers. They wanted individuals and societies to change so that a better social order can be established. The Stoic called on humans to give up their pursuit of fame and fortune because these are not worth pursuing (Irvine, 2009).

Ibn Miskawayh (932-1030), a Muslim Persian philosopher considered justice to be the best method to achieve the supreme virtue of love. He called upon rulers to establish justice, avoid oppression and respect laws.

Mary Wollstonecraft (1759-1797) criticized Edmund Burke's defense of aristocracy because it establishes a social hierarchy that leads to moral degeneration among rich and poor people. She supported providing for the livelihood of poor people and the elimination of all causes of exploitation, rivalry and hatred inside the family so that positive sentiments dominate inter-family relations. According to Botting (2006), she went further than Rousseau in defending women rights in education and public life.

Charles Fourier (1772-1837) expressed his faith in human nature as being instinctively good and rejected the Christian doctrine of the original sin. He considered harmony to be a universal law because what is good for nature is good for society as well. To achieve social reforms, leaders must be free, mature and organized and the principles of cooperation and care for others must be enshrined. Many were impressed with his ideas and sought to implement them by establishing agricultural communes in France and the US. His ideas also led to the rise of cooperatives.

Farmer thinkers insisted that all sources of social injustice and oppression especially institutionalized forms must be abolished. Michel Montaigne (1533-1592) branded all forms of man's cruelty to fellow human beings as the most cardinal of all sins. William Godwin (1756-1836), an early advocate of anarchism, was critical of the laws for taking the side of the rich and powerful and oppressing the poor. Alexander Pope (1688-1744) argued that wealth and possession will never bring man closer to

true happiness. Acquisitiveness and the unjust distribution of wealth which gave laborers only a small portion of the fruits of their labor were criticized by Pierre Joseph Proudhon (1809-1865). His condemnation of property was absolute: "property is theft." Anatole France (1844-1924) criticized the laws which punished stealing bread and sleeping under bridges and even applied equally to the rich and the poor obviously favored the rich.

The French philosopher Comte de Saint-Simon (1760-1825) identified a trend in the evolution of human society from the rule by powerful individuals to that of human morality and productive cooperation. He predicted that this new civilization will be born out of great enlightenment that will first be experienced and promoted by elites and later adopted by popular institutions (Durkheim, 1975; Taylor, 2009).

The French thinker August Comte (1798-1857), known as the father of modern sociology, went even further in envisioning a future state of the world in which mankind would eventually break free from their materialistic bondage to move toward a higher level of spirituality. In that future stage, Comte predicted, human beings would even reproduce without sexual intercourse.

The socialist movement of the nineteenth century expressed its dissatisfaction with the human condition and called for the creation of a new social order based on rejection of avarice, love of neighbors and community spirit. John Stuart Mill (1806-1873) rejected the religious beliefs in the original sin and the wickedness of human nature and took issue with philosophers who justified and defended competition and strife as creative forces. He strongly criticized those who praised the existing

state of human relationships based on “trampling, crushing, elbowing, and treading on each other’s heels,” as “the most desirable lot of humankind.” Mills also attacked the treatment of women by men at his times and called for the application of “the principle of perfect equality, admitting no power or privilege on the one side, or disability on the other.”(Mill 2001: 193) On the positive side, he identified in every one of us a propensity to sympathize with others, i.e. to share in their happiness and sorrows, which he considered to be the foundation of mankind’s moral capacity.

Jules Michelet (1798-1874), a French historian and thinker, disagreed with philosophers who regarded humans as unsociable by nature and therefore need to exert tremendous efforts to overcome their unsociability. Contrary to this assumption, he believed that all humans are not only born sociable but also heroic, generous and virtuous, and only later they learn to become excessively selfish and to value wealth and status above all other things.

In a clear departure from the philosophical paradigms of his times, the Russian thinker Prince Peter Kropotkin (1842-1921) wrote that the fittest human beings are not the strongest but those with the most inclination to cooperate. The cooperative kind, he predicted, will ultimately become more numerous and prosperous than the uncooperative type who will face the risk of extinction. According to him, our instinctive sense of solidarity and cooperation is the foundation of our altruism and love (Kropotkin, 1972).

The Russian thinker and novelist Leo Tolstoy (1828-1910) laid down his recipe on how mankind can achieve happiness. First, human beings must

rid themselves of greed and lust which are the principal sources of discord and conflict. Discrepancies in ownership engender greed which, in turn, leads to violence. Count Tolstoy believed that property belongs to all humans equally, and he acted on this belief by distributing his own estate. Other sources of injustice rejected by Tolstoy are systems and institutions based on force such as the state and church. However, he opposed using any form of violence against the state and, instead, favored acts of civil disobedience such as resisting conscription. The only acceptable methods for implementing the moral revolution advocated by him are persuasion, setting example, and alternative forms of communal living. Eventually, love rather than aggression will become the central sentiment in men's lives.

Tolstoy's philosophy deeply influenced the renowned Indian leader Mahatma Gandhi's thinking. He called for civil disobedience as the only legitimate instrument of his political struggle. Resistance to unjust authority should not only be nonviolent but must also be free of feelings of hatred toward the oppressors since love of fellow human beings must prevail at all time. Unfavorable consequence of civil disobedience must also be accepted with patience and dignity.

Abdul Ghafar Shah was a contemporary and friend of Gandhi. Some claim that he was the first to call for nonviolence in resisting British occupation and social reform. According to Milton Edwards (2000), Khan's movement reflected the peaceful message of Islam and succeeded in attracting many supporters who swore to serve humanity, shun violence and revenge, avoid disagreements and schisms, forgive transgressors and oppressors and free their nation. British forces killed hundreds of his followers and after

independence the Pakistani government banned his movement and jailed him.

Hunters and farmers in the social sciences

The philosophers' quest for knowledge and understanding of society, social relationships and human behavior has been inherited or taken over by social scientists. The methods of the social sciences based on the collection, analysis and interpretation of data are thought to be more rigorous, reliable and, thus, more scientific than the contemplative, armchair thought processes of philosophers. Impressed with achievements in the physical and natural sciences early social scientists searched for laws governing and predicting social systems and behavior like Newton's laws or the law of gravity. They attempted to copy the scientific methods and allotted much of their time and efforts to this objective. One of the products of these efforts was social Darwinism based on Darwin's theory of natural selection.

Supporters of Social Darwinism believed that men in society, as other beings in nature, compete over the means of survival, and only the fittest among them survive. This theory did not stop at describing what there is but went further to prescribe what there should be in affirming as a natural law that only the fittest of humans deserve to survive. It is only natural, Herbert Spencer (1820-1903) argued, for talented people to become rich and powerful while the untalented and unskilled languish in deprivation and poverty, and possibly to die of it because they are unfit to survive.

Spencer opposed government intervention in this process such as improving living conditions of the poor in the home country or the natives in the colonies. On the other hand, he supported measures such as prohibiting the insane and criminal from reproducing.

Thomas Malthus (1766-1834) believed that some people are bound to die of starvation because not enough food is produced to feed all. He considered this an advantage because it served to rid society of the weak and unfit. It is also a just punishment for those who cannot control their sexual urges, and as a result multiply and become impoverished.

David Ricardo (1772-1823) and Malthus were friends who shared a strong opposition to the Poor Law which offered the British poor financial aid. Ricardo regarded labor as a tool for use by successful entrepreneurs and their miserable conditions are the results of natural laws governing human nature.

The anti-imperialism position of William Sumner (1840-1910), an American academic and sociologist deserves our praise and admiration. But he was also a Social Darwinist who believed that social evolution is governed by a competitive process between individuals with different abilities. This natural process favored the fittest among social members who became rich and powerful while those lacking the necessary talents and capacities became impoverished or remained poor.

In the late nineteenth century, studies were conducted to prove that a causal relationship exists between natural traits and achievements. Results of these studies were interpreted to show that those judged to be 'superior' in terms of their height, weight and general health were more

likely to succeed in life and become wealthier than 'inferior' persons. Collins and Makowsky (1984) believed that such ideas encouraged American racism, anti-Semitism in Germany, France and Russia, and provided the intellectual foundation of capitalism. In summary, the social Darwinists, like many hunter philosophers, believed that the fittest and not the meek shall inherit the earth and that everything including moral values, apart from the law of natural selection, is relative products of the times in which we live.

Following the lead of social Darwinism, classical economists conceived of society as a congregation of self-interested individuals brought together by ties of impersonal competition. An effective competitive process required in turn a laissez-faire or free market economy. The pursuit of self-interest within this economy will lead to a maximization of benefits for all and a harmonization of interests. But this situation results in a dilemma: if all are engaged in competition then none will be willing to cooperate. Adam Smith (1723-1790), the founder of the free market economics, offered a solution to this.

In his first book *The Theory of Moral Sentiments* Adam Smith concentrated on explaining the process by which man developed moral judgment. In his second work *The Wealth of Nations* he turned to the issue of reconciling self-interest and social interest. He argued that while competition will benefit all by keeping prices within the reach of many, the selfish quest for personal gain - and not benevolence - will encourage men to cooperate. Moreover, the wealth and prosperity produced by competition will also serve to satisfy a wide range of non-economic

objectives such as the urges to power and respect. Sooner or later, the dream of prosperity will be realized by everyone, and since this futuristic state is inevitable, the repugnant means for achieving it are justified and must be tolerated according to John Maynard Keynes. He (1963:372) wrote that eventually the love of money for its sake would be rejected as immoral and even criminal but, in the meantime, it must be allowed to serve its purposes:

For at least another hundred years we must pretend to ourselves and to everyone that fair is foul, and foul is fair, for foul is useful and fair is not. Avarice and usury and precaution must be our gods for a little longer still. For only they can lead us out of the tunnel of economic necessity into daylight.

Two centuries have gone by since the publication of Malthus' Social Darwinism, but his ideas appear to be still alive as demonstrated by Hardin (1968). Hardin called for the revision of immigration laws and aid policies in developed nations that are harmful to their economies and welfare. He rejects thinking of the earth as a spaceship because there is no single command and instead suggests countries are like lifeboats. While lifeboats of rich countries are spacious, comfortable and stocked with ample resources those of poor countries are small, crowded and have few resources for survival. Hardin argues that aid from rich to poor countries is an unwise policy that can only lead to population growth and increased poverty and his proof is the common land which those entitled to benefit

from it would sooner than later exhaust its resources. He wrote addressing the Americans that we are all except for native peoples are descendants of thieves and morally guilty but who among you is willing to give the land back to its rightful people? His motive behind putting this question is to challenge any opposition to his idea on moral ground. Hardin ignores the fact that not all countries stolen from its original owners and American history is not the norm. Moreover, USA and other rich countries are extravagantly consuming the earth's resources and if other nations were to copy American consumption rates, we would need not one but several earths. Finally, contrary to Malthus and Hardin pessimistic predictions, the end of available resources and major famines have not occurred.

Explanations of human behavior in the emerging field of psychology also stressed our hunter's selfishness, competitiveness and aggressiveness. Sigmund Freud (1959) believed that powerful individuals dominated societies throughout the ages and that the tools of their control were invariably brute force and violence. In this endeavor, the role of human intellect was limited to supporting the essentially violence-based power of these individuals. He also proposed that aggression is instinctive and propels human beings to commit acts of violence, destruction, and evil. Given this human nature, it would be foolish to love thy neighbor as thyself because this neighbor may very well be the person who will humiliate, exploit or even kill you.

According to McClelland (1973), this Freudian image of man as a beast or a wolf capable of destroying others has profoundly influenced Western psychology. Driven by his primitive urge to dominate, this wolf-man will go

as far as cheating, raping and murdering to satisfy this incessant urge, and when his attempts in this regard are hindered, he resorts to sublimation. Evolutionary biologists oppose the hypothesis of aggression being a human instinct because it fails to explain the clear differences in aggression levels between societies and individuals. Instead, they suggest a model combining human nature and external influences. Muss and Shachelford (1997) identified two factors behind human behavior: internal propensity and external motives. This propensity is acquired through the process of natural selection and genetics. In other words, aggression is hereditary and passed from one generation to another and this is corroborated by age-old humans' readiness to kill and being a carnivore. Humans also kill members of their own species, a rare phenomenon among other carnivorous species.

This line of thinking in the social sciences has led to the conclusion that competition and aggression are necessary conditions for the survival and progress of humanity. A corollary of this theory is that the absence of struggle and competition may result in the stagnation and possibly the destruction of human civilization. Some social scientists claim that aggression is an innate characteristic of the human species transmitted genetically. They trace man's aggressiveness and ability to kill back to a long history of carnivorous existence and his unique readiness, rarely witnessed in other carnivores, to kill members of his own species. Desmond Morris argues in *The Naked Ape* (1963) that our aggressiveness is an essential ingredient for self-preservation originating in our ancestor's

need to ward off threats. This characteristic also explains our drive to dominate and control others and protect our territory.

Bach and Goldberg (1974) saw aggression as an innate propensity in all human beings that is also necessary and functional. Even the act of sex, they maintained, is less enjoyable if it lacks aggression regardless of the amount of affection involved. The negative consequences of repressing aggression by social norms can range from random acts of violence to serious illnesses such as cancer.

According to Lorenz (1966), aggression plays an important role in natural selection by allowing only the fittest to breed and pass on their genes to future generations. Those who share this viewpoint are concerned with the impact of better health services and social welfare programs on the process of biological selection. They warn that such measures enhance the prospects of survival for handicapped persons, and humans will eventually be overburdened with a large population of unfit persons. Instead, they call on governments and societies to maintain and enhance the genetic traits of population. Taking an active control of the genetic process and evolution known as eugenics is accomplished by, among other things, establishing banks of semen taken from powerful, biologically superior persons to be used for inseminating women. This recalls a suggestion by Dr. Strangelove in the film *Dr. Strangelove or How I learned to stop worrying and Love the Bomb* (1964) directed by Stanley Kubrick. Dr. Strangelove, an ex-Nazi scientist working for the US government, advised polygamous mating between fine human specimen to repopulate humanity after a maniacal US military commander started a nuclear war with the Soviet Union. The

eugenic movement found support among a few western governments; Sweden selectively sterilized persons judged to be socially, psychologically or mentally unfit and Canada did the same to many of its aborigines.

Not just aggression but also all other human emotions were thought by social scientists to have been shaped by evolution. Barasch (1980) extended the list of alleged evolution-dictated emotions to include parental love and the parents' readiness to make great sacrifices for the sake of their children's welfare. He thought parental love grew out of our selfish need to ensure that our genes are carried by our children and passed on to future generations. This is seen as analogous to the behavior of a bee which instinctively attacks an intruder, stings it, and thus sacrifices its life to protect other bees carrying its genes.

Other acts of altruism are also analyzed in accordance with the selfishly-motivated reciprocity principle. Thus, a person would help another if and only if his behavior would increase the likelihood of a repayment of the favor. What emerges from this is that all of us are calculating, rational beings who analyze the benefits and costs of our intended acts before acting. In the hunter's world cooperation without reciprocity is almost impossible. All social units whether it is a criminal gang or the US Senate act on this basis. Criminals would not cooperate with each other unless they are assured that all would benefit from it and 'cheaters' who break this rule are punished. Similarly, US Senators whom Axelrod (1981) describe as 'egoists' developed informal rules which allow them to cooperate through trading votes. According to Bateson (2000), if the benefits a person receives from cooperation are less than the cost incurred,

he will probably withhold his cooperation and become a free rider. Dawkins (1989) concluded that all acts of altruism are motivated by selfishness and concepts such as universal love that lack a selfish base or justification are fictitious.

In a hunter world dominated by the powerful, their laws and values, the powerless have no option but to be on the defensive all the time, according to Carl Jung (1977). In their interactions with the powerful, the less powerful and the powerless must wear masks to hide their inner feeling and present to the outside world an impressive or at least an acceptable veneer of ideas, behavior, language and appearance. Almost all of us are, thus, actors, and the world is our stage.

In the selfish, aggressive, rational model of man, there is no role for the spirit or genuine human emotions. This modern one-dimensional man, as described by Herbert Marcuse (1964), has lost touch with all values such as responsibility, concern for others and love which he considers to be nothing more than relics of his pre-industrial culture. It appears that, in effect, the social sciences have finally given the hunter within us, what he has always lacked, justification and legitimacy for his beliefs and lifestyles. Whether this can grant him success in his relationships with others and happiness in his private life is the topic of the next chapter.

Cooperation is a necessity for our survival and according to Johnson and Bering (2006) it occurs even between strangers who do not expect to achieve any benefit from it. They concluded that religious convictions may explain such cooperation. Another plausible explanation considers trust to be a basic trait compelling us to trust others and cooperate with them even

if they take advantage of us. Trust is certainly an important prerequisite for the success of relationships as the next chapter shows.

Chapter Four: Hunters and Farmers in Relationships

Humans have social needs which they seek to satisfy by associating with others. Hunters and farmers alike are born into relationships and very early in their childhood learn that they are related to their parents, siblings and relatives. As they grow up and become more active socially their social bonds increase in number, scope and diversity to include spouses, children, friends, neighbors, work associates and others. Most of these adult-stage relationships are not dictated by kinship or parental preferences but are made voluntary. These also vary in duration and intensity from the lifelong, intimate marriage bond to the short-term casual encounter between fellow travelers on a train.

Relationships are important for the welfare and happiness of the individual as well as the survival of society as a whole and, consequently, building and maintaining effective and satisfactory relationships are important for hunter and farmer alike. This may appear as a restatement of the obvious but the deteriorating state of social relationships in many societies indicates that the value of this eternal message has been lost to many. Communal and neighborhood relationships are gradually vanishing and bonds within the last foundation of society, namely the family, are rapidly eroding. The large number of best-selling books and magazines claiming to teach individuals how to make friends and choose suitable

marriage partners attests to our increasing loneliness and need to relearn the value of relationships and how to preserve them.

Relationships: The essential knots

Any two individuals can be either total strangers, adversaries or involved in an amicable relationship. If we were to assign scores to these states, then the first would get zero, the second a negative value and the third a positive score. The first case does not constitute a system and thus cannot produce an output while the second is a potential or actual dysfunctional or destructive situation in which two or more persons or parties are opposed or hostile to each other. Relationships are positively valued because the performance of most tasks requires cooperative effort. Although adversity can sometimes have a stimulating effect on the creativity and productivity of either or both parties, these gains could be more than offset by the incurred losses. A war is a typical example of this state and, as judged by a neutral third party, it can only be a negative-sum game in which casualties are sustained and resources destroyed and dissipated on both sides and the spoils, if any, are the remaining assets of the vanquished party.

From early times, human beings have been taught to appreciate the necessity and utility of having numerous relatives, friends and allies. The importance of having close-knit relationships with kinsmen and other members of the community have been programmed into the thinking and behavior of individuals through religious values, proverbs, folk tales and other oral traditions. The teachings of many religions command the faithful

to honor their parents, help their relatives and love their neighbors. The folktale of the dying patriarch demonstrating to his sons the value of solidarity by testing the strength of one twig compared to that of many is claimed by many cultures. The importance of these social ties for the survival and welfare of the individual is underlined by the perceived severity of banishment from traditional community or tribe. This was incidentally the divine punishment imposed on Cain for murdering his brother. His deprivation of human contact and relationships was described by Cain as being “greater than I can bear.” It remained to be one of the harshest punishments in the written and oral legal codes of Arab tribes and communities usually reserved for serious anti-social crimes. After these communities came under British occupation in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, colonial governments adopted this tradition and occasionally banished leaders of the opposition into exile.

Before sociologists and psychologists researched and analyzed our social needs and sociability philosophers reflected on them. They recognized that mankind cannot build cultures and civilizations outside society and without organized efforts bringing people together into stable and predictable relationships. Given a hypothetical choice between the independence and freedom of the state of nature and the orderliness, security and constraints of society and state, human beings would certainly opt for the latter. Whether it is a traditional tribe, an ancient city state or a modern nation, all social structures are perceived as networks of relationships.

Social scientists have also confirmed the strength of our social need and its far-reaching impact on our attitudes and behavior. On Maslow’s

hierarchy of human needs (1965), this need is surpassed in potency and urgency only by our basic biological needs and security requirements. But where else except in society all of us can now find satisfaction of our urgent needs for food, shelter and procreation? Our social environment and relationships are also vitally important for our biological, psychological and mental development and well-being. Deprived of human interaction and nurture in his infancy and early childhood, a feral child would inevitably fail to develop human communication skills, acceptable feeding and hygiene habits and full mental faculties. Most probably, he would grow up uncertain of his human or animal identity; like Tarzan in Burroughs's *Tarzan of the Apes* he can swing on vines but can never become an ape or like Maowgli in Kipling's *The Jungle Book* he may feed and grunt like his surrogate wolf parents yet he can never be one of their cubs.

No hunter or farmer can live as an isle by himself or herself and everyone, therefore, needs to relate to others. A relationship is a bond that ties together persons with a common interest, objective or traits. Persons engaged in a relationship regard and behave toward each other in a different manner from the way they look upon and behave toward strangers. At the minimum, interactions between them are more frequent and intensive than those between strangers.

Obviously, common interests and/or positive sentiments rather than hostility or hatred are what attract people to each other and induce them to enter relationships. Thus, a friendship suggests that the two friends experience mutual understanding, shared sentiments, compassion and care for each other. Also, the true proof of a marriage relationship is not

the legal certificate or religious ceremony, but the mutual positive sentiments and supportive behavior exchanged by the marriage partners. Although familiarity may sometimes breed contempt, genuine positive sentiments expressed by one party are generally expected to sustain and strengthen the positive sentiments of the other party. In other words, a degree of reciprocity in which each party takes into consideration and actively attempts to meet the emotional and other reasonable expectations and needs of the other party is essential for the existence and continuity of a relationship.

Since hunters and farmers have, by our own definition, different values and lifestyles, their expectations from relationships may also be divergent. Accordingly, knowing the lifestyles of the persons engaged in a relationship such as a friendship or a marriage can help in predicting its nature and chances of success. Before focusing our attention on the most important of all social relationships, i.e. marriage and parental ties, it is important first to outline the attitudes and expectations of the typical hunter and farmer regarding social relationships.

The unsociable hunter

In our hunter-dominated world, establishing social relationships and maintaining strong social ties have become difficult. Most people we see or meet every day at work, in shops or on the roads are total strangers. On trains and buses men and women shield their visual separate entities behind dark glasses, books, magazines, laptops, cell phones, and

newspapers and demonstrate their lack of interest in auditory communication by listening to portable electronic music players. A famous brand of these electronic gadgets was aptly promoted in a recent advertisement as “the latest in anti-social technology.” The stress on privacy has erected additional barriers between neighbors placing them in most cases in the category of total strangers.

The emphasis on self-interest, rationality, and competitiveness has rendered the individual incapable of establishing and maintaining relationships other than those satisfying his selfish needs. Long and Brecke (2003) found that the aggressive pursuit of self-interests is not conducive to societal harmony. Sadly, outside as well as inside the family, emotional relationships and ties are being sacrificed at the altar of self-interest, individualism and rationality. These individualistic forces have made it more difficult to form friendships and weakened friendship ties. Family bonds have also suffered. The rates of divorce, separation, single parenthood, battered wives and abused children have dramatically increased. Infidelity among married men and women in Western industrialized countries has become more common. The United States, the most technologically and economically developed of these nations, was described by Reich (1970) as an “anti-community” in which family and friendship ties are artificial.

This is not a situation peculiar to the second half of the twentieth century as the following comment by Michelet (1846:99) on social relations in the mid-nineteenth century Europe proves:

Savage isolation even in co-operation; ungrateful contact, without wishes, without warmth, and which one feels only in the severity of the friction. The result is not, as might be imagined, indifference, but antipathy and hate; not the simple negation of society, but its contrary-society actually laboring to become unsociable.

It is argued here that this is the product of hunters, their values and lifestyle.

Hunters' selfish pursuit of power, possessions and status and their utilitarian morality determine their relationships with society. They recognize the importance of society and its institutions for their survival and welfare and therefore have selfish interest in safeguarding and promoting the social order. From a purely selfish perspective also, it would be ideal for them if others expended their own time, energy and other resources in serving the public interest leaving them to concentrate on pursuing their own. In some cases, hunters have shown unscrupulous readiness to sacrifice the public good for the sake of promoting their selfish interests as illustrated by the lifestyles and deeds of numerous tyrants and criminals throughout history. But in general, they are willing to work and cooperate with others inside and outside organizations if it serves their interests. The same objective would entice them to do volunteer work or contribute time and effort to non-profit causes and projects. Accordingly, their decisions to join a political party, an environment protection group, or a parent-teacher association are all primarily aimed at gaining power, influence and prestige. They are also expected to terminate this

membership and withdraw the contribution to any of these if it ceases to provide them with a net gain.

Hunters' relationships with others are also overshadowed by competitiveness and selfishness. Their conviction that everyone is like themselves, selfish, greedy and manipulative constitutes the major justification for their values and lifestyle. By subscribing to the old adage that unless you act like a wolf, other wolves will devour you, they legitimize their unscrupulous and unjust means, absolve themselves of any responsibility or guilt for such acts and their consequences, and shift the entire blame on other 'wolves' or fellow greedy humans and the social order built by them. The condition under which men behave like wolves is described by Ignatieff (1984:52) as follows: "when men confront each other as men, as abstract universals, one with power the other with none, then man is certain to behave as a wolf to his own kind". A hunter entirely socialized and conditioned by a hunter society justifies "dealing with his fellow creatures as he does with his cattle and soil, for the sake of the profits they bring." (Adam Ferguson, 1978:19) Hunters' self-knowledge and awareness of their selfish and aggressive propensities prompt them to take all necessary precautions against the potential threat posed by others to their personal safety and property such as keeping a dog, learning martial arts, installing a security system and buying a weapon, and in effect, distancing themselves from them even further.

Suspicion and mistrust of others and their motives strongly limit hunters' readiness to establish and maintain full and open relationships with them. Their suspicious nature inclines them to question the motives

of everyone, even those who generously offer them favors and free services. In their opinion, good Samaritans never or rarely exist in the real world populated only by skilled and not so skilled wolves. A Good Samaritan must, therefore, have a hidden ulterior motive. And any person who does hunters favors puts them in debt or in a state of obligation to the donor which typically annoys them because it disturbs their ideal self-sufficient image. Their typical reaction to a favor or a kindness is 'I owe you'. By stating this they make it clear that they do not consider this as a gratuitous act of kindness but as a debt to be honored and repaid and that they want to keep the relationship business-like.

No More Mr. Nice Guy is the title of a book by Robert Glover (2001). The book challenges the belief that nice guys are loved, and their needs are readily met. In fact, Glover argues, being nice does not pay and would only expose nice guys to exploitation and earn them nothing but grief. And when being nice fails to produce the desired results humans will stop becoming nice. This analysis is correct as far as it characterizes hunters who regard 'being nice' as a mere means to achieve their ends and if not will reverts to their usual selfish ways.

Hunter prefers to take, receive and hoard rather than donate or give away. According to them, generosity or kindness for its own sake does not exist or is an act of foolishness. In a traditional society, hunters may behave generously only to surpass others, to win a loyal following and qualify for a leadership position, or to ward off the envious, evil eyes of others. In a modern society, they may donate millions or even billions to earn the reputation and the prestige of a philanthropist or the social recognition

that they are unselfish, or to immortalize their names on the edifices of hospitals, college buildings or libraries. As Nelson and Greene (2003) noted, reputation rather than altruism may be the strongest motivators of acts of charity in the modern world. Unsurprisingly, charity donations are rarely made anonymously. In accordance with the hunter's principle of reciprocity, acts of giving entail a repayment. Other factors that enter into their calculations before deciding whether to give or not to another person are the risks involved, history of favor exchange with that person, and how close their paths in life are.

The feelings of jealousy and envy they harbor towards others are the natural product of their acquisitiveness or greed. Naturally, they are keenly aware of the greed of other humans and their readiness to cheat and steal to achieve their objectives. They jealously guard their possessions against others' greed and scheming and at the same time they covet their power and possessions. If they cannot have more of these, they would envy those who have them. Traditional peoples regard envy as a powerful emotion with dangerous, mysterious even supernatural powers. Inexplicable cases of ill health especially those of an emotional or mental nature are often blamed on the evil influence of envious eyes which must then be placated or exorcised through prayers and/or magic. Enormous benefits in personal power and financial rewards are obtained by shamans and priests who claim expertise in removing envy spells.

Are hunters friends in deeds?

In practice hunters do not share Aristotle's view that happiness cannot be realized without close friends. Indeed, they may not be as enthusiastic about making friends as some chimpanzees who are observed to exchange food with other members of their species in order to enter long-term bonds with them. A close friendship requires a degree of openness and sharing of feelings that establish closeness and intimacy between friends. Given their fear of disclosure and openness, hunters would make unlikely partners in such relationships. They believe that trust and openness are naive attitudes in a threatening world that would only expose them to blackmail, exploitation and abuse by treacherous, greedy others, and consequently result in loss of power. Moreover, even lonely hunters would be reluctant to admit their need for friends and thus undermine the image of a strong, independent and self-sufficient person they aspire to project. Instead, they would, as Greenwald (1973) observed, put on a show of aloofness, indifference and snobbishness. For these reasons they prefer casual or expedient friendships that involve no real emotions but can be instrumentally manipulated and exploited to serve their interests -the kind of friendship that Dale Carnegie wrote about in his bestseller book *How to Win Friends and Influence People*. When you need your hunter friends, they would not prove to be friends indeed and would probably desert you because a person in need is powerless and may not be able to repay them later.

Lonely hunters

The hunter's unsociability render him lonesome. "Self-fulfillment," wrote Leinberger and Tucker (1991:15) "has proved to be unfulfilling, since the exclusive focus on the self has left many people feeling anxious and alone". Like Faust in German folklore, he cannot find true meaning and satisfaction in all his coveted prizes of power, beauty, and pleasure. As soon as these material objectives are satisfied, he became bored and further alienated from fellow human beings. And by the time he discovered that his quest was in vain, it was too late to redeem his soul which he had exchanged for these illusive pleasures. It appears that the age of individualism, rationality, and competitiveness has been achieved at a high price to mankind's emotional and psychological well-being. More than half a century ago Fromm (1956:9) concluded that man has become incapable of satisfying his "deepest need," i.e. "the need to overcome his separateness, to leave the prison of his aloofness." Interestingly, David Riesman's title for his book on American society is *The Lonely Crowd* (1950). Edmondson (2010) estimated the number of Americans who suffer from severe or recurrent isolation at 30% of the population. Loneliness has serious health consequences; Lunstad, Smith and Wilson (2010) reported a higher probability of death from loneliness than obesity.

To relieve his feelings of loneliness, the hunter within us turns to alcohol, addictive drugs, gambling and overeating. Alcohol is said to reduce anxiety, relieve personal tensions, release aggressive impulses and lubricates socialization. Alcoholics, of whom there are an estimated 20 million in the

United States alone, drink excessively so that they can feel, as Lair (1977:183) puts it, like “giants striding the earth, and everything is possible for them.” High levels of anxiety experienced by hunters may not be significantly alleviated by drinking, and this may lead them to drug abuse. Evidence of the high social, economic and personal cost of alcoholism and drug abuse are abundant, widely publicized and known to all. It suffices here to draw attention to the contributory effect of drinking to murder and other serious crimes. In addition to the high number of fatalities and injuries resulting from drunken driving, it has been repeatedly reported that criminals and rapists, and often their victims as well, are intoxicated at the time of committing their crimes.

Kaiser (1976) called attention to the dire consequences of alcoholism in the Soviet Union where alcohol consumption was the highest in the world. Alcoholism resulted in economic losses from high rates of absenteeism, early death, half of the divorce cases and a third of crimes.

Despite this, few hunters would probably agree with Casio’s opinion, in Shakespeare’s *Othello*, on wine:

O thou invisible spirit of wine
If thou hast no name to be known by
Let us call thee devil

Alcohol was also called in the play an “enemy” that men drink “to steal away their brains”

While alcoholics try to drown their loneliness and anxiety in alcohol, habitual gambling appeals to the hunter’s passion for competition, aggression and riches. Some hunters become habitual gamblers for the

adrenalin-induced thrills, but others hope to achieve through gambling what they cannot achieve by other social channels. The results of a study on gambling in Sweden found that habitual gambling is especially common among groups deprived of access to conventional channels of social advancement (Nechama,1964). Billions of dollars are lost annually to gambling with more serious repercussions on the social and personal lives of gamblers and their families. Gambling has also been frequently associated with criminal activities such as drug abuse and money laundering.

Overindulgence in palatial pleasure, or overeating has been related to loneliness and high levels of anxiety. The cost of this short-term relief has proven to be dangerously high for many people especially in the United States and other developed countries. Almost one third of Americans are currently considered obese. Corpulence is not only a major health hazard to the inhabitants of the richest nations but also a serious social and economic problem. In their effort to shed the unseemly excess pounds, Americans spent an estimated \$55 billion on weight-loss products and services in 2007, more than enough to feed all the hungry and save all the undernourished and sick children of the world in that year.

Hunters may also attempt to alleviate their feelings of loneliness by owning a pet. In Western countries, the pet has become a permanent member of many households serviced by a multi-billion industry. It can be argued that the pet serves as a relatively abundant and cheap substitute for the social partner or friend whom lonely hunters cannot find or are afraid of seeking and cultivating. The saying that a dog is man's best friend

aptly describes the relationship between our early hunting ancestors and their domesticated canine companions, but its contemporary relevance sadly reveals how little human relations have progressed since then.

When drinking, gambling, drug abuse or owning a pet fails to alleviate the hunter's loneliness, the final solution may be suicide. A strong correlation between loneliness and suicide has been repeatedly reported. Suicide rates among the powerless elderly or youths and lonely persons such as single and divorced men and women are found to be the highest. Even in the fictitious world of heroes and legends, Narcissus was tormented by his self-adoration, and hence his loneliness, to the extent of committing suicide.

The sociable farmer

Social relationships are vital for the survival and happiness of farmers. Their traditional farming communities based on cooperation place a higher value on establishing and maintaining strong social relations. In small traditional communities, people searched wide and far for a common ancestry, and sometimes even invented it, and as a result almost everyone was either a relative or a friend. It was also the duty of everyone to demonstrate his or her concern for the welfare of other members of the community by sharing emotionally and financially in their good fortunes and happiness as well as their misfortune and sadness.

As mentioned before, love is the strongest of farmers' sentiments which bind them to others. Love may mean different things to different people,

but to farmers it is essentially an act of unconditional giving. This powerful sentiment is proactive and impels its owner to demonstrate it in a variety of ways ranging from simply greeting the loved one affectionately to risking his or her life in rescuing that person from a roaring fire. Loving persons strongly express in words and deeds genuine concern and responsibility for the well-being and welfare of loved ones. They willingly and wholeheartedly give some of their resources, time, attention and care to spouses, friends, neighbors or even total strangers. The best and undisputed proof of the existence of this noble farmer sentiment is found in the love relationship between parents and their children. Parents love their children to the extent of sacrificing their comfort and even their lives for their welfare and safety.

Unlike the hunter's manipulative sentiments, the farmer's love and compassion are genuine and sincere. Also, the act of giving involved in the farmer's love is self-rewarding and self-fulfilling and, thus, neither motivated by an extrinsic incentive nor contingent upon receiving or exchanging benefits. Moreover, while hunters reserve their positive sentiments for themselves and members of their nucleus family, farmers are eager to include in it their families, friends, neighbors and even mankind at large. Their religious and/or humanistic values encourage and support these sentiments which are also strengthened by their belief in their therapeutic value for many personal, social, and international problems.

Unsurprisingly, friendship to farmers is a fundamental and salient relationship. They are ready to befriend everyone, and especially those

who share their values and beliefs. Similarity in social background or economic status does not influence their choice of friends. Their voluntary and strong friendship ties are practically free of the potential strains of rivalry and competitiveness observed between hunter friends. However, they typically have higher expectations from friendships and friends that only a soul mate or a kindred spirit can fulfill.

Human companionship and friendship are immensely valuable to farmers and cannot be substituted or complemented by a surrogate companion pet. It is also inconceivable for dedicated farmers not to love animals. Urban people often make fun of farmers' attachment to their animals. The habit of giving human names to animals was probably began by farmers long before it became customary among urban pet-owners.

Farmers are the type of persons whom people would go to with their problems. Although they may not always be able to help them in solving these problems, they are often content with their enthusiastic readiness to listen to and sympathize with them over their predicaments.

While the farmers' deep sense of justice and fairness deters them from exploiting others, their love of life and fellow human beings and their altruism may make them vulnerable to hunters' exploitation. They may appear to be a dreamer inexperienced in the ways of the world and unable to deal realistically with others, but they are neither naive nor simpletons. Like hunters, their choice of becoming farmers and choosing to live by the farmer's social code is a conscious one based on observation, experience, and convictions. And although they may be shunned and mistreated by the world, suicide is far from their minds because they vehemently believe in

the moral righteousness of their way of life. As any thinking, rational human being, they may sometimes question their lifestyle only to reconfirm their faith in it, and this is the source of their strong self-esteem. As a result, the lonely farmer is less likely to become an alcoholic, a habitual gambler or to commit suicide than the lonely hunter.

Chapter Five: A Successful Marriage

Relationships within the family are more intense and intimate and involve a high degree of commitment and responsibility than other relationships. Compared to a friendship, for example, a marriage weaves together the different threads of the characters and lifestyles of the marriage partners into a full-time, lifelong, and closely-knit relationship. It is also relatively easier and less painful to terminate a friendship than a marriage because the marriage partners have a responsibility toward the welfare and happiness of their children as well. Thus, a friendship may not be a sufficient base for a successful marriage.

In order to be judged successful, a marriage must satisfy two major conditions: permanence and happiness. Conventionally, a marriage is expected to last until death do them part, and accordingly any marriage that ends in divorce is considered unsuccessful regardless of its duration. The satisfaction of this condition, however, is insufficient for the success of a marriage. Many marriages continue long after the mutual love and commitments are eroded and replaced by apathy, boredom and even bitterness and contempt. Like a standing petrified tree, a sour marriage may survive even in the absence of genuine affection between the partners. Whether a marriage proves to be enduring and happy or not may largely depend on the initial choice of partners and the compatibility of their lifestyles. This chapter will focus on the attitudes and behavior of the hunter and the farmer within marriage on the assumption that the lifestyle

of the persons involved in a relationship strongly influence its prospects of continuity and success.

Choosing the right marriage partner

The words “I do,” or their equivalence used in marriage ceremonies are the most critical words uttered by most of us, and the choice confirmed by them are perhaps the most important made by men and women all over the world. The significance of making the right choice of a marriage partner cannot be overemphasized. Many of the world’s social problems have been traced to failed marriages. While the consequences of a bad choice of a house, a career or a friend can be rectified at a relatively tolerable cost, an unsuccessful marriage leaves a long trail of financial, emotional, and social problems that may scar the lives of the estranged or divorced couple and haunts their children for a long time afterwards.

The choice of marriage partners in traditional societies is simplified; marriages are mostly arranged, and the betrothed couple, especially the woman, have little say in the choice of their spouse. In effect, this practice extends the commitment and responsibilities involved in a marriage to include the families of the couples. Families related by marriage have a long-term and profound interest in protecting the marriage through financial and social support, and by actively intervening to solve marital problems. Even if marriage troubles persist, the couple are encouraged to remain together for the sake of their children. All these customs and practices indicate a strong social disapproval of divorce that results in low

divorce rates in these communities. These traditions may discourage a rash dissolution of marriage but do not necessarily guarantee a happy one. Like many customs in less-developed societies, the practice of arranged marriages and related norms are weakening under the influence of modernization and westernization.

In modern societies, men and women choose their marriage partners freely and with little or no pressure or influence from their families and peers. A commitment to a marriage is never made before learning about each other personalities, lifestyles, beliefs and attitudes. Cohabitation for many months or years has become almost customary among Western men and women contemplating marriage. It should follow that the probability of marital success should increase, and consequently that of divorce decreases, but statistical and other evidence on marital discord and failure testify to the contrary. Budinski and Trovato (2005) reported a higher probability of separation and divorce during the first years of marriages following cohabitation. Divorce rates worldwide are rising and in the United States for example, the divorce rate rose from one in every fourteen marriages at the beginning of the twentieth century to one in five by the middle of the century and presently to one in every two marriages.

Commenting on this problem, Bach and Goldberg (1974:275) wrote: "Much of the contemporary scene is like a tragic comedy, with its succession of painful emotional disappointments, misunderstandings and breakups consequently, many now are speaking of the demise of family life in America."

Failed marriages: reasons and consequences

Experts on marriage discord and divorce offer several explanations. One is that many are simply not making the right choices and end up with partners that annoy and frustrate them. De Angelis (1992) believes that judging by the time and effort invested by people in decision making, most people appear to consider choosing a car or a video player more important than choosing a partner for a relationship. Given the assumption that most of us are more hunters than farmers it follows that long-term commitments in marriage and the associated personal and emotional obligations conflict with predominant social values favoring independence and autonomy. Hunters may not always need a strong reason to terminate a marriage, and in some cases a pretext may be quite enough. This will be further discussed later.

Children of divorced parents experience it as a shocking, frightening and sad event, and most of such children interviewed in one study said that living within an unhappy marriage was a better alternative than the divorce of their parents and its aftermath. Juvenile delinquency, promiscuity, crimes and other anti-social acts are frequently blamed on failed marriages and the resulting traumatized childhood and unhealthy home environment. According to one study, 70 percent of juveniles in American correctional institutes were raised by one parent. Children of divorced parents are more likely than not to follow the example of their parents. The seriousness of the problem of marital discord and its wide ramifications is

also confirmed by the fact that one in every five American police fatalities occur during attempts to break up a family altercation.

The high incidence of divorce in many countries has resulted in a continuous stream of books, articles, and television programs providing marriage couples with professional advice and traditional wisdom that unfortunately appear to have had little preventive effectiveness. Underneath the mountains of statistics, studies, and reports on marital discord and failure, the sad and alarming implication that all these people are unable or unwilling to live with each other harmoniously and responsibly is lost or ignored.

Hunters and the future of the family

In Western countries and other developed countries, hunters place less importance on marriage as a social institution for the satisfaction of social and biological needs. Hunters can now choose between marriage, cohabitation or remaining single. Single parents of children outside marriage is also common and socially tolerated if not accepted. McRae (1995) predicted the erosion of marriage institution in European societies in one generation and its replacement by cohabitation while in other countries it will continue as a temporary contract for the sake of raising children. Official statistical evidence reported by Vangelisti and Perlman (2006) revealed a steady decline in the number of traditional families made up of two spouses and children from 45 % in 1972 to 26% in 1998 while the number of cohabitation cases increased from half a million in 1960 to more

than 4 million in 1988. Half of married Americans lived together before tying the knot. If this trend continues, the conventional family may disappear in America during the next 25 years. Scandinavian countries appear to be leading in this trend with half of children born as a result of cohabitation. In comparing relationship types in practice nowadays, Wright (1994) judged serial monogamy, i.e. successive monogamous liaisons to be a worse alternative to monogamy and even polygamy. Gilder (1973:265) blames feminism for the decline of the marriage institutions describing it as “an act of genocide that dwarfs any in human history.” In another publication, Gilder (1986) explains that liberated women by shedding their sexual inhibitions and refusing to rely on men for financial support and security have removed the incentive for men to marry and make the marriage commitment and, thus, have undermined the foundation of marriage and society.

This situation has encouraged some experts and futurists to predict the displacement of marriage by new forms of associations, contractual and otherwise, but so far only in the fictitious and terrifying *Brave New World* of Aldous Huxley, human beings are cloned, marriage and family are obsolete, and “father” and “mother,” are obscene words. Despite all this, marriage remains a major thread in the fabrics of all societies, and marriage failures make large tears in this fabric.

Choosing a marriage partner

The high risk of marital failure makes it imperative on men and women to treat this with utmost seriousness and to choose wisely. Evaluating compatibility on the bases of horoscope, psychic readings or superficial and trivial similarities in taste for clothes, car brands and foods may be easy but none of these criteria can guarantee a successful marriage. Is holding someone's hand for one second enough to judge another person? Apparently, the best-selling author Paul Reiser (1994:146) believes so: "Now, I am not saying she's a bad person. But the second we held hands; I know she wasn't for me. We just didn't fit." Neither intuition nor first impressions are reliable in choosing a friendship or marriage partner.

Most experts on marital relationships also advise against choosing a partner based on sexual attraction or so-called sexual love. Lura in August Strindberg's *The Father* provides us with an insightful analysis of this kind of love: "Sexual love is conflict. And don't imagine I gave myself. I didn't give. I only took what I meant to take. Yet you did dominate me...I felt it and wanted to feel it".

In their research on marriage preferences in several countries, Buss et al (2006) found a consensus among men and among women also. Men generally seek beauty which they associate with good health and fertility. They are obviously heedless of Jean Jack Rousseau's advice that beauty ceases to be effective after the first year of marriage. Jordanian Arab males, for example, prefer young beautiful brides (Khallad 2005). Priority is given to virgin brides over divorcees and widows. Marriages to minor girls are

still practiced in rural areas and some estimates that one in seven girls are wed before reaching 18 years of age. The story of the Yemeni minor Nujud whose father gave her in marriage when she was only nine attracted wide publicity and condemnation (Ali, 2010). A high number of Saudi girls are wed at 15 years of age or younger according to Al-Saif (2005).

Women seek to marry financially-secure ambitious men. De Angelis (1992) criticizes women who base their choices of partners on wealth and prestige rather than heart and soul. Khallad (2005) found Arab women to be no exceptions to this generalization in seeking marriage partners who are wealthy, kind and of good disposition. According to Firestone (1984), women choose men not for their personal characters but for what they can offer them and would not hesitate to use sex and emotional manipulation to achieve their objectives. Beautiful women believe they deserve more than wealth and prestige in their partners; Buss and Shackelford (2008) found that these women also want husbands who are sensitive, loyal, physically fit and love children. These and other preference criteria which evolved throughout stages of human history are according to Buss and Shackelford (2008) flexible and vary in accordance with the women value as a wife. Women of lesser beauty usually have more modest preferences.

Do women prefer tall men for husbands? This preference may appear trivial and immature but nevertheless it is a fact. The only possible rationale for this choice is an assumed association between this feature and good health and strength. In fact, statistical evidence indicate that shorter men live longer (Samaras and Storms, 1992). Brewer (2007) found taller men in his research sample more satisfied with their emotional

relationships and less affected by jealousy because they are desired by women and do not worry much about their possible infidelity.

The Dark Triad (narcissist, Machiavellian, psychopath) are found by Jonason and Kavanagh (2010) to prefer short-term relationships with members of the other sex. They tend to lower eligibility qualities for mates to enhance their chances of forming such relationships according to research findings by Jonason et al (2011). They resort to this tactic if their attempts to attract 'high-quality' mates fail. Selfish interests generally govern their choices especially psychopaths and their relationships inside and outside marriage are typically exploitative. These results apply to our characterization of hunters' relationships

Most of us would never imitate Beauty in Mme. Leprine de Beaumont's *Beauty and the Beast* in choosing the Beast but how many of us can dispute the wisdom in her reasoning: "There is many a monster who wears the form of a man; it is better of the two to have the heart of a man and the form of a beast." Also, we can only agree with the fairy who complimented Beauty on her choice by saying: "You have chosen well, and you have your reward, for a true heart is better than either good looks or clever brains.

Finding the true heart requires from prospective marriage partners investing the time and effort to find out all they can about each other lifestyles and to evaluate their compatibility. Reducing this important decision-making process to a standardized process trivializes it, but two useful principles can be suggested here.

First, in order to establish meaningful and successful relationships, a person needs to be fully aware of his or her lifestyle, namely whether the

person is a hunter or a farmer, and to what degree. An actual lifestyle must not be confused with the ideal self-image because the emphasis must be on being rather than becoming. The same degree of thoroughness and objectivity is called for in identifying the lifestyle of the prospective partner in a relationship. In order to arrive at a rational choice, biases, misconceptions and deceptive blind spots must be guarded against. Correct identification of these lifestyle can help in evaluating compatibility, in clarifying the expectations of both partners from a marriage union, and in estimating its chances of success. This may constrain choices considerably but will render them more rational and effective.

Second, the lifestyles of partners must be recognized as immutable givens. As experts on social change will confirm, people tend generally to adhere to their lifestyles and resist attempts by others to change them. To pledge changing one's lifestyle to accommodate the expectations of a partner is not a guarantee of future compatibility. Numerous habitual smokers who pledged and attempted repeatedly, without success, to abandon this harmful habit attest to this. A multi-billion industry specializing in weight-reduction products and services thrives on the weak determination and willpower of overweight millions whose dearest wish is to lose weight. Also, marriage by itself or the prospect of marrying an attractive partner may not be a compelling incentive to change one's lifestyle. Once the marriage occurs, it ceases to be an operative incentive. Faking a change in lifestyle to satisfy a demanding partner is also unwise. The strain of maintaining this pretense and its high cost to one's self-esteem may eventually prove to be too high a price to pay for sustaining

the marriage. Lerner (1985) advised against attempting to control or change another person because it is difficult and ineffective.

Before opting for a hunter or a farmer, the implications of both choices must be clearly understood.

Hunters and women

Hunters have traditionally regarded women as their inferior partners in humanity, both physically and intellectually. The more a woman is dependent on men for her livelihood and protection the less would be the hunter's regard and respect for her. Hunters' condescending view of women corrupts his relationships with all women including family members. He is not expected to demonstrate filial affection toward his mother especially if she shares his hunter's lifestyle and he is the least person to qualify as a 'mama's boy'.

A hunter would probably fail to identify or even refuse to acknowledge a woman's superior intelligence, professional skills or emotional integrity. Only women possessing desirable assets or qualities would appeal to him. Such qualities are those valued by the hunter himself including physical beauty, social status and wealth. Such women are in his view assets and trophies to be won by powerful and rich men who live in mansions, drive sport cars, dine at expensive restaurants and can afford to adorn them with designers' clothes and precious jewelry.

Women have been and still are looked upon and treated as sex objects by many men and in different cultures. It was probably a hunter who

invented the chastity belt. Binding Chinese girls' feet was another hunter's practice. This cruel ancient practice was performed to meet the hunter's standards of beauty regardless of the physical pain and deformity resulting from it. According to Wright (1994), even in countries where women's right to equality has been recognized legally and socially, they are still treated disrespectfully as sexual objects, and more in the 1990s than in the 1970s. When women complain of being treated as sex objects the offensive men are typically hunters. Hunters are the main consumers of the sex trade which in the US was valued at seven billion dollars at the beginning of this century.

Discrimination and abuse of women are also encouraged by the belief that women, with few exceptions, are promiscuous and are therefore legitimate targets for men's conquests. The hunter is also generally distrustful of women and assumes that they have ulterior motives, hidden agendas and schemes. Like the character Don Juan in Shaw's play *Don Juan*, he pictures the relationship between a man and a woman as that between a spider and a fly - the women being the spider of course. The hunter convinces himself that distrust, domination and even abuse of women are necessary measures to tame their actual or potential shrewishness and to escape being caught in their webs.

In his relationships with women the hunter may be content with satisfaction of his sexual urges and bolstering his private and public images. Being the object of several women's affections satisfies his ego's needs and compliment his public powerful image. These sexual affairs are viewed as successful tests of his male magnetism, chasm, and manhood and, thus, his

personal power from which he earns 'scores' or 'hits'. He may be more interested in the cold statistics of these relationships rather than their emotional content. In his vigorous pursuit of those affairs, he aspires to emulate one of the Arabian Night's character who kept thousands of concubines or famous womanizers such as Don Juan or Casanova who exploited women's affection to obtain sexual favor without reciprocating their emotions. The French novelist George Simenon was probably seeking this dubious honor when he bragged about the thousands of women he slept with. Like a warrior boasting of his glories on the battlefield, an acquaintance proudly informed me that he had two objectives to accomplish during his university days in a European country: obtaining a degree and deflowering ten young girls. At that time, he had one more year to graduation and three more girls to reach the 'score' of ten. Few hunters can rival one of the kings of Morocco in the seventeenth and eighteenth century who, according to Tiger and Fox (1971), is reported to have fathered 1,056 children from numerous wives and concubines. Hunters who fail to realize this 'Don Juan' or 'playboy' status usually express their admiration and envy of more fortunate hunters in this regard and often resort to fabricating stories of their sexual conquests to impress others. They are not deterred by moral or religious principles from mate poaching. Sixty percent of males and 53% of females in a sample studied by Buss and Schmidt (1993) admitted attempting mate poaching.

Some frustrated highly aggressive hunters use violence to obtain sexual gratification. Rape victims are in the hundreds of thousands every year in the US where a woman is sexually assaulted almost every minute. High

numbers of males also suffer sexual violence. Strict deterrents have been introduced worldwide to discourage and punish sexual harassment inside and outside the workplace. In Egypt for example, increasing cases of public sexual harassment lately became a national issue according to Abul Kosman, Shoukry, Shoukry and Hassan (2008). De Koning (2009) found that even women wearing hijabs were subjected to sexual harassment in the streets of Cairo. Instead of at least sympathizing with these victims, some men blame them for inciting men by wearing revealing clothing.

Not only male hunters but also their female counterparts now prefer casual relationships and are unwilling or unable to invest the emotional and physical effort to build emotionally intimate, long-term relationships. Such women seek relationships with powerful men using their beauty and other qualities and skills. They may convincingly act as the loving girlfriends or wives if needed.

Hunters' love

In Shaw's play *Candida*, the character Marchbanks describes evil people as those who lack love: "Wicked people means people who have no love: therefore, they have no shame." Marchbanks being a romantic poet is expected to make this correlation which hunters would find invalid. Hunters would probably agree with Francois de La Rochefoucauld (1613-1680) that "true love is like ghosts which everybody talks about, but few have seen". In the hunters' lexicon, love is an abstract concept that means different things to different people in different situations. Of the six types

of love distinguished by Lee (1976) only one labeled (agape) is close to true selfless love. The other five types are called eros (sexual love), ludus (playful love), storge (friendship bonds), pragma (pragmatic calculating love) and mania (possessive emotion). Four of these love types belong to hunters: eros, ludus, pragma and mania while storge is shared by both hunters and farmers.

Results obtained by Hendrick and Hendrick (1986) from a study of university students show that the predominant 'love' style of male students was ludic while those of female students were storgic and pragmatic. These students are more likely than mature adults to experience true love (agape) or at least assume they did, yet none of them reported that. Among some young male hunters, admitting being 'in love' is unmanly and would probably arouse the ridicule of their hunter peers.

Hunters are least capable of true selfless love and look for other explanations for strong emotions between men and women. In some traditional communities, whenever a man openly expresses his love for a woman the woman may be suspected of using magic spells to bewitch him and the term bewitched is still used as synonymous with being in love. Until today, services offered by spiritualists and psychics in these societies include love potions and spells to free 'bewitched' persons.

Like Dorian in *The Picture of Dorian Gray*, the hunter is a narcissist who is full of pride and self-love. Fromm (1974), however, believed that selfish persons – as all hunters are - are not only incapable of loving others but cannot truly love themselves as well. Unlike Anthony in Shakespeare's *Anthony and Cleopatra*, hunters would certainly choose pride over love.

Hunters are socialized into placing a higher value on success, prestige, money and power than on love. Given their selfish nature, hunters find incomprehensible selfless love that may impel a person to sacrifice his or her interest and personal comfort for the welfare of the loved person. Therefore, in the hunter-dominated world, true love has been banished to the fantasy world of fairy tales and cheap romantic novels, and one of the last truly romantic heroes of fiction, Don Quixote, is characterized as a person of unsound mental judgment and behavior.

Even when hunters express their esteem for a role model, a hero or an idol it is only a manifestation of their narcissism. The figure of admiration here is a desired image of the hunter in perfect or near perfect form representing all or most of what they would like to become or obtain. What hunters are capable of, however, is exploiting and abusing this noble sentiment to further their interests. Their 'love' in this case is an act designed to gain the affection of specific persons in order to obtain certain benefits. Thus, they may profess their love for a more powerful person for the sole purpose of gaining patronage, enhancing their power position or simply experiencing the personal gratification of associating with a powerful person or joining their entourage or groupie. Although hunters may play the role convincingly, their sentiments are insincere, deceptive and exploitative. Their fear of emotional intimacy and other related traits make hunters unpredictable and unreliable partners in love and marriage.

Choosing a hunter

Males, Clatterbaugh (1990) generalized, are antisocial and society must therefore induce them to enter marriages. This is true of hunters who have an instrumental view of marriage. Essentially, hunters will not consider marriage unless it fits their life plans. Some of them may forego marriage following the example of the German philosopher Schopenhauer (1788-1860) who described marriage as a loss of half of one's rights and a doubling of responsibilities. If hunters opt for marriage, they would probably agree with Low (2000) that the selfish gene impels them to do so for the sake of procreation and progeny. For the same reasons, hunters seek to maximize their power and resources.

In most traditional societies, men marry and have children not only to satisfy their biological needs but also to attain the status and respect accorded to family men. In specific, marriage serves to demonstrate the hunters' achievement of full manhood, virility and eligibility to certain rights, and respect to which married men are entitled in their communities. It would grant them a degree of autonomy from the authority and domination of the patriarchs in their extended families, elevate them to the status of household masters, and may eventually qualify them to the positions of patriarchs. In societies which allow polygamy, having several wives serves as an indicator of high status since only powerful wealthy men can afford to practice it. In such communities, families often offer their daughters in marriage to powerful person to enhance their social positions and obtain economic advantages. On the other hand, an extended bachelorhood arouses suspicion and rumors about a man's sexual potency or sexual inclinations and may negatively affect his reputation and status.

Marriage in some hunter communities was a better bargain for the male hunter than buying a slave girl or employing a servant. His wife was expected to perform the roles of a slave girl, servant, sexual partner, mother to his children, and nurse in his old age and more. She must also show gratitude to him for taking her as his wife and saving her from the life of a spinster and the resulting stigmas and derision of being unwanted, barren, unlucky and a burden to her family. For many females, marriage to an unsuitable hunter may be a lesser evil than spinsterhood. The female hunter in these societies may also seek through marriage the fulfillment of her power urges and ambitions. She may nag, plead, exhort and manipulate her husband to work hard to achieve her wishes.

Children also fit the traditional hunter's scheme and serve his power urge. Socially, they cement his relationships with his in-laws, and assure him of obtaining all the potential social and economic benefits expected from these relationships. Economically, children are valued as assets that can be readily and easily exploited. They provide the hunter parent with docile and cheap labor - at least until reaching adulthood - and to whom he can transmit the knowledge and skills of his profession without worrying about them becoming competitors. And if the value of these assets diminishes for any reason, he was permitted by social norms in some societies to resort to infanticide or sell his children into slavery or lifelong servitude. Having several male children also has a security defensive value in discouraging adversaries and potential raiders from contemplating aggression against his household and possessions.

Children also provide the hunter with heirs to inherit his name and wealth. The Arabic adage that a man never dies after having children reflects the hunter's concern for immortalizing his name through his progeny. His obsession with fathering male heirs may compel him to divorce his wife and remarry or have several wives. Childless parents in some countries such as Japan resort to adopting a relative or a suitable stranger whom they train to manage and eventually inherit the family's business and carry its name.

In modern societies, hunters find fewer incentives for marriage. Consequently, marriage has lost much of its appeal to the hunter who can now choose to marry, cohabit with another person, have children outside marriage or remain single. One of the factors contributing to this situation is the hunter's attitude toward sexual pleasure as one of the major objectives of relationships with members of the opposite sex which can now be readily obtained outside marriage. Due to their antisocial inclination and preference for autonomy, hunters often associate marriage with negative images such as a trap, a chain, a gold cage, and even prison. Married hunters frequently speak with fondness of their bachelor days and enviously of bachelors who live freely 'unshackled' by a wife and children and unburdened by marriage responsibilities and worries. His opinion on marriage is aptly reflected by Reiser's (199:186) definition of marriage as "an elaborate game that allows two selfish people to periodically feel that they're not." This utilitarian view of marriage involves cost-benefit analysis. Accordingly, the partners are not expected to commit themselves

to marriage unless its benefits surpass its costs. In such relationships, emotions are of little significance.

Hunters may enter marriage if convinced that it will open for them new avenues for social, economic and career advancement. Calculating hunters may forfeit a perfect marriage match if it interferes with their career plans or an ambition of higher value to them. Consider the case of a student hunter who wants to pursue university studies but lacks the financial means to do that. Marriage may become a worthwhile option if the partner is willing to work and pay tuitions and other expenses. If this was the only or major foundation of this marriage, then as soon as the hunter graduates and finds suitable employment, marriage would lose its justification and appeal. This union may last if both are willing to adjust their expectations and roles accordingly. Zelda Fitzgerald and Gary Coleman are two real life examples of hunters' exploitation of spouse and children. Rumors allege that the famous American novelist Scott Fitzgerald put his name as author of stories penned by his wife Zelda. Gary Coleman accused his parents of misappropriating his assets from acting in a popular television show.

Hunters' power urges combined with emotional apathy may drive them to impose strict disciplines on relationships and behavior within their family at the cost sacrificing creative spontaneity in work and play. This family would very much resemble a mechanical system in which relationships become organized into repetitive and predictable behaviors and gestures devoid of genuine emotions. Hugs, kisses, greeting cards and other expressions of affection become routine symbolic duties designed to maintain a facade and semblance of a happy family life while, in fact,

genuine and sincere affection is lacking and may even be discouraged by the business like home atmosphere.

Manipulative hunters believe in the magical power of prizes, rewards and especially financial incentives for modifying behavior and cementing relationships. Gifts of money or other valuables to family members are expected to have the strongest impact on their attitudes and behavior, more powerful than any show of affection. What hunters aim to obtain in return for their rewards is not just gratitude, which they may typically mock with the words: ‘where can I deposit or spend this?’, but, and more importantly, obedience, respect and loyalty. Loyalty to hunters is a rational and concrete sentiment upon which lasting ties can be founded and maintained.

Like Sir Willoughby in George Meredith’s *The Egoist*, the hunter is a selfish person who seeks to dominate others and especially the women in his life. Unless you are a hunter yourself it may be unwise to choose a hunter as a marriage partner. Even when hunters pair together, their compatible lifestyles and values do not always guarantee a happy union. Hunters may stand shoulder to shoulder in pursuit of an opportunity to take advantage of, or a prey to hunt down, or they could be on opposite sides in a combat arena. In all cases, hunters calculate cost and benefits before taking any decision and if they hold more of the marriage assets, they exact compliance with their terms at the threat of opting out (Sayer, England, Allison and Kangas, 2011). Economics play a central role in marriages according to Becker (1991) because marriage in his view is essentially a division of labor and responsibilities between the partners. If

instead of the husband being the breadwinner and the wife minding the household affairs both perform the same duties, then the marriage effectiveness diminishes and the motivation to initiate or maintain it weakens considerably.

The likelihood of a husband using violence against his wife increases if he considers her as his 'property' and it is his privilege to stop her from leaving him by all means according to Geris and Firestone (2004). The number of wives subjected to domestic violence in the US each year exceeds a million according to official statistics. Many more cases are unreported. Shelters for these victims have been established in many countries. In Egypt, researchers (Dalal, Lawoko and Jansson, 2010) found that wives suffering domestic violence are more prone to harshly treat their children. A sample of Saudi women inmates told Al-Saif (2005) that husbands' cruelty is one of the major reasons for their crimes. Some of them committed adultery and abused drugs to retaliate against their violent husbands.

Hunters can now resort to psychiatrists, family and marriage consultant, sex therapists, and child psychologists to teach them how to enjoy sexual relationships with their spouses, to raise children, to look after the emotional wellbeing of their family members, and to essentially save their marriages from break-ups. These specialists can undoubtedly offer married couples valuable and sound advice based on research findings and field observations, encourage them to communicate with each other regularly and openly, and help them to resolve or tolerate their difference. However, transforming a marriage from a dull, unhappy cohabitation into

an organic wholesome union based on mutual understanding, respect, trust, care and love can only be achieved by the concerned couples themselves, and this may require nothing less than changing their lifestyles.

Hunters and infidelity

Due to their selfish nature, hunters are more liable to regard their marital vows as a formality devoid of any binding moral or religious significance. They may easily break these vows if the unions cease to be beneficial to them, or simply out of boredom. More married men and women are currently breaking their vows by engaging in extramarital affairs. A study published in the early 1980s found that forty four percent of a sample of American women has committed adultery. More recently, Atkins, Baucom and Jacobson (2001) found statistical evidence suggesting a 20 to 25% rate of adultery by American husbands and wives. A majority as high as 65% of clients of marriage counsellors seek their assistance in overcoming the negative consequences of adultery. Until recently such affairs were an exclusive male privilege sanctioned by the double standard. Results reported by the same research team indicate that wives with an average of 2.3 affairs are more promiscuous than husbands having 1.8 affairs. Websites have been introduced to assist marriage partners seeking extra-marital affairs and one of them claimed hundreds of thousands of registered members.

The late American President John F. Kennedy had several extramarital affairs according to Andersen (1996). He ascribed this to Kennedy's inability to relate to women except sexually, a symptom of his loveless childhood. Regardless of any analysis of justification of his flings, he would not have committed them without self-approval and if he had felt the slightest consideration to his wife's feelings, a behavior typical of the powerful hunter. Other traits common to adulterers listed by Buss and Shackelford (1997) included low moral standards, narcissism and high aggressiveness, all of which are characteristics of hunters.

Extramarital affairs result sometimes in children from men other than the husbands. Baker and Bellis (1995) put their ratio at 10% of all children in the world. However, paternity tests on 280000 cases mentioned by Platek and Shackelford (2006) revealed that 30% of them were not fathered by husbands or boyfriends. Adultery may have dire effects on children as results of research on 800 children of adulterous parents by Nogales and Bellotti (2009) show. Most of them reported negative feelings towards the errant parent, low trust in others, and cynical views on relationships and love.

Forgiveness is not one of the hunter's cardinal virtues, and a jilted or betrayed hunter may prove to be dangerous as evident in the fictitious cases of Shahriar and Othello and countless criminal cases. Until he wed Scheherazade, Shahriar of the *Arabian Nights* whom the sight of his first wife's infidelity had turned him into a psychopathic murderer, had each of his brides put to death on the morning after their weddings. Scheherazade won a stay of execution by humoring him with stories. Othello's love for

Desdemona in Shakespeare's *Othello* turned into loathing and an overwhelming urge to punish her with death by suffocation for her alleged infidelity. The same cruel fate awaited Blue Beard's wives in Charles Perrault's *Blue Beard* for a less serious transgression than infidelity, namely disobedience. Killing adulterous wives is common in some tribal communities; in Pakistan for example as many as 1000 women were killed in 2010 for having sexual liaisons outside marriage according to Al-Helal (2013). Some wives commit suicide after discovering their husbands' infidelity.

Hunters and the future of the family

In Western countries and other developed countries, hunters place less importance on marriage as a social institution for the satisfaction of social and biological needs. Hunters can now choose between marriage, cohabitation or remaining single. Single parents of children outside marriage is also common and socially tolerated if not accepted. Gilder (1973) blamed feminism for the deterioration of the marriage institution and called it the worst form of genocide. In a later article (1986), he argued that men have lost much of the motivation to enter marriages because women refuse to abide by conventional social norms and reject being financially dependent on men. McRae (1995) predicted the erosion of marriage institution in European societies in one generation and its replacement by cohabitation while in other countries it will continue as a temporary contract for the sake of raising children. Official statistical

evidence reported by Vangelisti and Perlman (2006) revealed a steady decline in the number of traditional families made up of two spouses and children from 45 % in 1972 to 26% in 1998 while the number of cohabitation cases increased from half a million in 1960 to more than 4 million in 1988. Half of married Americans lived together before tying the knot. If this trend continues, the conventional family may disappear in America during the next 25 years. Scandinavian countries appear to be leading in this trend with half of children born as a result of cohabitation. In comparing relationship types in practice nowadays, Wright (1994) judged serial monogamy, i.e. successive monogamous liaisons to be a worse alternative to monogamy and even polygamy. Gilder (1973:265) blames feminism for the decline of the marriage institutions describing it as “an act of genocide that dwarfs any in human history.” In another publication, Gilder (1986) explains that liberated women by shedding their sexual inhibitions and refusing to rely on men for financial support and security have removed the incentive for men to marry and make the marriage commitment and, thus, have undermined the foundation of marriage and society.

Choosing a farmer

Farmers make excellent marriage partners because of their strong sociability and their developed positive sentiments of care, compassion and love. They are the typical family persons who devote themselves entirely to the welfare and happiness of members of their families. Obviously, their attitudes and expectations regarding marriage are

significantly different from those of hunters. Economic or status advantages expected or obtained from a marriage are not on the list of their objectives; they are primarily interested in the social ties created by marriage and the emotional satisfaction derived from it. To dedicated farmers, marriage embodies their commitment to the community, and provides them with the opportunity to demonstrate group solidarity and care and love for others. Their experience of marriage confirms the observation made by Daly and Wilson (1990) that marriage contributes to the married person's inner peace.

Love, compassion and deep commitment to fairness would deter farmers from committing adultery or any form of intentional abuse and cruelty to family members. In devoting themselves totally to the welfare and happiness of their families they would give priority to their interests. Jean Kazez (2007) spoke for all farmers in asserting that after becoming a parent the focus of her interests changed from career to family.

Micawber's wife in Charles Dickens's *David Copperfield* behaved like a typical farmer when she decided to join her husband in the debtor's prison. Choosing a farmer demonstrates a preference for a strong, close marriage based on shared values, interests, love and a lifelong commitment.

While any person may find happiness in marriage to a farmer, a farmer is unlikely to find satisfaction with anyone except another farmer. Only another sensitive farmer can reciprocate the farmer's genuine emotions and commitment in kind and intensity. In view of this and although farmers are more enthusiastic about marriage than hunters, they may sometimes appear hesitant about making a commitment. Unlike hunters,

farmers willingly accept the mutual sharing and dependency as a necessary ingredient in a marriage, but they fear being caught in marriages to selfish, domineering hunters. While hunters may choose to remain bachelors to preserve their cherished autonomy, farmers may live miserably alone against their strongest urges because they fear exploitation and abuse. Divorce is the farmers' last resort to extricate themselves from unbearable marriages; otherwise they would probably heed John Stuart Mill's advice for unhappy married people and sit still until the feeling of unhappiness passes.

Children are valued by the farmer but not for the same reasons as those of the hunter. Having and raising children satisfies the farmer's social and emotional needs. This commitment is self-rewarding; according to Goulter and Minninger (1993), research results indicate that the mental and physical health of men who are close to their children is significantly better than those who are childless or do not enjoy close relationships with their children. If the farmer sometimes appears to be undecided, reluctant or even opposed to bringing children into this world, it is certainly not to avoid the economic costs of the extra mouths to feed or the emotional burden of raising them but out of fear for their safety and welfare. In specific, a farmer is terrified of what may be in store for them in a hunter-dominated world. This is confirmed by Lopereato's (1984) observation that some persons may become strongly apprehensive of the evil in society.

Different combinations in marriages

The hunter and farmer types occupy the two ends of a scale. In between there are many points that are closer to either the hunter or farmer lifestyle. Accordingly, there are countless possible hunter-farmer marriage matches between these types. Should hunters marry their likes and does this apply to farmers as well? And can a mixed marriage between a farmer and hunter somehow bridge the wide gulf between them in lifestyles and values. Such questions cannot be answered without research evidence. Until such evidence becomes available, a discussion of possible marriage matches between hunters and farmers can only serve to point out possible opportunities and problems.

Two hunters in marriage

Two political parties may agree to combine their forces to achieve greater powers by forming a coalition government. At the state level, the European Union brought together powerful countries with different cultures, languages and political outlooks to achieve common political, economic, and social advantages. Partners in these relationships may incur some losses but a net gain is expected by all.

At the individual level, a hunter looks upon other hunters as possible rivals or partners. For example, it is inconceivable for two contenders for the championship title in the heavy weight division to become friends. Also, a close association between two executives from rival companies may lead others to suspect them of collusion or some other unethical business activity. As a rule, and in the absence of actual or potential competition or

rivalry, a hunter is more likely to associate with other hunters. To illustrate, a member of the upper class or social elite in any society usually chose his associate, business partners, friends and spouse from among his social peers. Although clear social stratification has now eroded, this norm is still generally observed.

Partners in a hunter-hunter marriage are driven by strong urges to acquire power, possessions, and their union is expected to strengthen these tendencies. Since no hunter can climb and conquer all power hierarchies, a marriage between two accomplished hunters may offer both the opportunity to experience the thrill of a new height or triumphs. Goulter and Minninger (1993) found that successful women choose successful men as their partners in relationships and marriages. For example, a wealthy businessman or corporate leader can bask in the limelight of his film star wife while she enjoys the power and extravagance made possible by his wealth. Jackie Kennedy was the widow of an American president and a very glamorous, elegant upper-class woman who found the multimillionaire, but uncouth, Greek shipping businessman Onassis a suitable partner for marriage. Although the terms of these business-like marriage are not enumerated in the marriage contract, such union usually involves the ratification of a legal pre-nuptial agreement specifying the rights and obligation of both parties in the event of a divorce or separation.

For the sake of their public images, the powerful partners in such a marriage would work hard with the help of their public relations advisors to convince the world that their marriage is enduring and successful. This

may include frequent public appearances together, declarations of mutual commitment and love, and even having children. This facade of marital bliss is intended to hide the real relationship that is superficial and emotionally barren. In fact, their lives may only meet briefly and tangentially with each of them having little or no interest in the other's emotional needs.

A marriage relationship that does not adequately meet the hunter's expectations would be regarded by him or her a useless and cumbersome liability. Before analyzing this marriage any further, it must be pointed out that the nature of a relationship involving two dedicated hunters depends on their initial achievement of their life objectives. In other words, it is contingent upon whether they are accomplished or unaccomplished hunters. An accomplished hunter is a person whose power urges and other related propensities have been largely or progressively satisfied while in the case of an unaccomplished hunter these needs are ungratified or frustrated.

Two accomplished zealous hunters occupying the same power hierarchy, e.g. two politicians from different parties or two executives from two telecommunication corporations, would probably regard each other as competitors or rivals unless a common denominator between them can be found to justify and support a relationship. This marriage faces a tremendous challenge if one of them loses his power. Without the lubricating effect of power and success, the only thing that would remain of this relationship is the painful friction. Thus, the beauty queen married to the wealthy businessman must maintain her good looks and shapely

figure to keep her marriage viable. If their marriage eventually ends, the emotional trauma resulting from this is expected to be minimal since there was little or no emotion involved in the first place. Any children born out of it could be easily and callously disposed of by enrolling them in expensive boarding schools preferably in a far-away place or a foreign country like Switzerland allowing the divorced parents to resume their lives and selfish lifestyle's.

The marriage would be significantly different if either or both dedicated hunters are unsuccessful in achieving his or her aspirations. Most hunters probably begin with strong hunter expectations and urges for power, possessions, success, and fame but at a later point in their lives and after many painful disappointments they may either grudgingly lower their aspirations to a realistic level commensurate with their abilities and achievements or stubbornly cling to their hunter's impossible dreams and spend the rest of their lives defeated and bitter.

The probability of a marriage between an accomplished and unaccomplished hunter is low because there are few advantages for the former in it. The ineffective hunter may prove to be even less reliable a partner in marriage. If the relationship between two successful hunters could be mutually beneficial or symbiotic, the marriage between an accomplished and an unaccomplished hunter may turn out to be parasitical with the latter preying on the former's power, wealth, and prestige. All other factors being equal, emotional attachment in both marriages plays a minor role. An example of this marriage is one between a wealthy businessperson or a powerful executive and his or her young secretary or

aide. In this marriage, the older and more powerful partner accepts to exchange a share of his or her social, political and economic power in return for the company, attention and favors of his or her young, attractive spouse. The weakness of this marriage is inherent in the nature of the underlying relationship; in the absence of emotions to steer the marriage safely through stormy periods the probability of separation or divorce is relatively high.

A marriage may also bring together two less successful or failed hunters. Similarities in values and ambitions may attract them to each other but these same aspirations may prove to be the cause of their marriage's ruin. Unaccomplished zealous hunters are frustrated and tormented by their unfulfilled ambitions and either or both may view their marriage as an opportunity to satisfy their power urges by controlling the life of his or her marriage partner. Fighting over who has the final authority over important and even trivial matters may temporarily cease in a truce necessitated by mutual exhaustion but can only terminate permanently after their complete withdrawal from the battle scene.

A marriage between a zealous hunter and a moderate one is another hunter-hunter marriage type. Obviously, the power urges of these two hunters differ in their intensity and this is reflected in their attitudes and behavior toward each other and the world at large. According to the unwritten terms of this marriage, the zealous hunter offers a share in his knowledge, wealth or prestige in return for the his or her partner's acceptance of a subordinate status and role. The relationship is like the traditional hierarchical relationship between a superior and a subordinate,

a mentor and an apprentice, or a priest and his novice. A relationship like this requires little or no exchange of emotions. Loyalty, obedience and fulfillment of duties are more vital to the continuity of the relationship than genuine sentiments and emotional intimacy. Often, loyalty is confused with love in such relationships.

The degree of the dedicated hunter's domination over the casual hunter varies with the extent of the former's fulfillment of his or her power urges. In a traditional marriage for example, the successful or accomplished hunter who usually satisfies his power urges outside his home may not demand from his moderate-hunter wife more than a public recognition of his supreme authority and she may even be allowed a great degree of independence and freedom of choice in matters of secondary importance such as managing household finances and domestics. The unaccomplished zealous hunter, on the other hand, may abuse this marriage relationship to satisfy his need to control and bolster his self-esteem and public image. Unable to control the world or what he considers his 'fair' share of it, he will concentrate on controlling his family. In the family pictures on the mantelpiece and on his desk, you may see him standing shoulder-to-shoulder next to his wife – in earlier times she would appear standing behind him- but in reality she may be nothing more than his housekeeper, servant, nanny to his children and occasional sexual partner all combined together. There is little room in this marriage for her to express her independent thoughts and actions or divert some of the common resources into the achievement of her aspirations. She may end up in the same

predicament as that of Zelda Fitzgerald, the wife of the novelist F. Scott Fitzgerald who allegedly published some of her stories under his name.

“Taking care of you,” and “looking after your interests,” are the favorite phrases reiterated by the powerful hunter to explain and justify his control and domination of less powerful ones, inside and outside marriage. The dominant hunter expects his less powerful partner to be totally attentive to his needs, supporting of his endeavors in life, and, in short, to make him the focus of life and concern. You may be the only follower of his mediocre leadership, the sole subordinate of his unrecognized authority and the single apprentice to his mentoring but you must not fail to demonstrate your recognition and admiration of his talents.

In contrast, the powerful zealous hunter, usually the male, reserves for himself and exercises more rights and privileges which are granted to him by the traditional double standard. Such privileges may include the innocuous manly activities of spending time outside the home, socializing with friends, watching athletic event and so on. More seriously, the powerful male hunter may be permitted by social customs to practice polygamy, to keep concubines, and to have extramarital affairs. While he regards his sexual philandering as a prerogative, he would look upon his wife’s infidelity as unforgivable adultery.

In extreme cases, the personal rights and freedoms of the moderate hunter in such a marriage may be completely suppressed to the extent that any instance of independent thinking or action by him or her may be perceived as a gross act of disobedience or mutiny inviting punishment of a psychological or even physical nature. The subordinate position of the

moderate hunter argues against open confrontation with the powerful hunter and in favor of expressing resentment indirectly through nagging or guilt-arousal tactics. The moderate hunter must also come to terms with his or her feeling of envy and jealousy towards his or her powerful spouse.

Suppression of hostile feeling and the general oppressive atmosphere of the marriage may put the moderate hunter in a state of chronic depression that threatens to develop into a ticking bomb. The marriage may endure for relatively long periods of time until the powerful hunter becomes bored and opts out or the patience and endurance of the moderate hunter is exhausted and suddenly and unexpectedly the marriage falls apart with an explosion of the moderate hunter's complaints of mistreatment and physical and psychological cruelty.

Such problems are unlikely to be encountered in a marriage between two moderate hunters. This marriage is an alliance between two persons with the same objectives, dreams and lifestyles and who also recognize and generally accept their positions and limitations in this world. They both have low power urges, and thus neither of them is expected to seek domination over the other. Furthermore, they are unskilled and inexperienced in the ways of powerful hunters. What brings them together is the security and comfort of a mutually non-threatening relationship. At the same time, their moderate opposition to the farmer's values and lifestyle means that there would exist between them a minimum of bonding based on affection and empathy. And since this may not always be enough to sustain the relationship, they may resort to role playing to put on a show of solidarity and happiness and to disguise their

disappointments. And because there are few common domestic interests to engage their attention and fire their enthusiasm, they may seek the thrill of membership and participation in extra-marital activities such as volunteering for a good cause and active socializing. Potential threats to the continuity of their marriage may arise from infidelity, serious differences in opinion, boredom or contempt resulting from long-term affectionless familiarity. In general, however, this arrangement which probably form the bases of most marriages has a better chance of continuity and survival than other unions, involving at least one hunter. It may prove to be a lasting marriage bringing to both partners a satisfactory sense of stability, comfort and security which many often be confused with deep emotional joy.

A union of extremes

“It is said that opposite characters make a union happiest,” the novelist Charles Reade (1814-1884) wrote before telling us what the opposite characters in his novel *Christie Johnstone* thought on this. The diffident Lord Ipsden wanted someone unlike him and Lady Barbara was his choice. “But the Lady for her part, was not diffident of herself, nor was she in search of her opposite; on the contrary, she was waiting patiently to find just such a man as she was, or fancied herself, a woman.” (p.23) What did the Lady think of Lord Ipsden: “She liked Lord Ipsden, her cousin once removed, but despised him for being agreeable, handsome, clever, and nobody.” (p.24)

A zealous hunter and a passionate farmer make odd partners in a marriage because their lifestyles are worlds apart. These two have diametrically opposite values: the zealous hunter aggressively seeks power, autonomy, possessions and status while the passionate farmer greatly values cooperation, compassion and social integration. They also have low opinion of each other: the hunter regards the farmer as a naive, immature, sentimental person who is inexperienced in the ways of the world. The farmer's view of the hunter is equally uncomplimentary and accentuates his selfishness, greed and lack of positive emotions. In view of these differences, there is little room for mutual attraction, understanding, adjustment and compromise and this considerably reduces the likelihood of a marriage between them.

The farmer has been and remains the hunter's favorite prey, and the hunter may become attracted to the farmer's financial, social or personal assets rather than his or her values and genuine emotions. If marriage to a farmer serves his or her selfish interests, the scheming hunter can put on an impressive display of love, care and compassion to convince the unsuspecting farmer who would be persistently courted, dazzled and possibly swept off her or his feet by the hunter's advances. The hunter can continue this act if necessary but sooner or later the mask is dropped intentionally or accidentally to reveal his or her true character and lifestyle to the shock and dismay of his or her farmer spouse. This may be closely followed by the hunter's attempt to impose his or her values on the farmer either directly or crudely or by assuming the role of the benevolent educator or mentor. In view of the passionate farmer's strong

commitments, these hunter's attempts are unlikely to succeed and may arouse the farmer's missionary zeal to 'reform' the hunter but without achieving any impact also. The zealous hunter will be generally unresponsive to the farmer's attempts to build emotional bridges between them.

Even if life within this marriage between extremes becomes unbearable, the farmer may be reluctant to terminate it. Divorce or separation contradicts the farmer's cherished lifestyle and would be regarded as a devastating defeat of the farmer's objectives and values in life. Children would make it even more difficult and painful for the farmer to break up the marriage and, thus, expose the children to the trauma and risks resulting from it. On the other hand, remaining as a captive in a marriage to a zealous hunter could only result in further humiliation and suffering for the farmer.

Passionate farmer meets mild hunter

This is an unbalanced marriage in which the zealous farmer is expected to play a more active role in sustaining the relationship. The mild hunter does not share the farmer's values and enthusiasm for marriage and family life and may often appear undecided or indifferent about making an active commitment. Even if the marriage does not develop beyond this stage, the farmer may be willing to provide the necessary emotional support and make enough personal sacrifices to shore up the marriage. The farmer would probably do this in the hope that eventually this would make the

reluctant low hunter more appreciative of the farmer's values and participate more fully and responsibly in the relationship. On the other hand, first-hand knowledge and experience of the struggle and anguish involved in leading a farmer's lifestyle may disappoint and dismay the insecure low hunter to the extent of abandoning the marriage. The pain of separation or divorce would be experienced more intensely by the high farmer.

Is marriage between two farmers made in heaven?

Since only another farmer can appreciate the merits of a farmer lifestyle and reciprocate the farmer's sentiments, a farmer should only choose another farmer as a marriage partner. Any other alternative for the farmer is likely to result in a troublesome and possibly unsuccessful marriage in which the dedicated farmer stands to lose the most. A marriage between two committed farmers is a meeting of hearts and minds. They share the same ideals, values and world view which should provide a firm foundation for an enduring marriage. Their high sensitivity and developed empathy and their genuine love, care and compassion for each other will make their life together a happy one. Although their marriage may be forged in heaven it must, however, survive in a hunter-dominated world and thus high level of mutual support is necessary to endure their share of frustration, setbacks and disappointments.

Making the best of marriage

It is relatively easier to advise people on how to choose a marriage partner than to salvage a shipwrecked marriage. As explained earlier, for the marriage to continue and be happy the marriage partners must have compatible lifestyles. Noncompliance with the condition can have one of three consequences: separation or divorce, an enduring but unhappy marriage or endless accommodations and concessions by either or both partners. None of the above is an easy or satisfactory solution. A metaphor may help to explain this.

A marriage could be compared to a bridge extending over a chasm and connecting two persons and their lives intimately who, prior to this, led separate and independent existence. A marriage based on compatible lifestyles is like an iron-concrete bridge in its strength and durability. It is obviously stronger than a wooden bridge which is the marriage link between two persons whose lifestyles are less compatible. The bond between two married persons whose lifestyles are incompatible is, however, made up of straw and threatened with destruction and collapse by even a weak disturbance. To carry this metaphor further, when the marriage-bridge collapses, the estranged couples are in relatively safer positions than their children who are left dangling from the shattered wood or clinging to a straw, and unless they have the strength and/or receive the help to climb back to safety and a normal life they may sink down with the marriage debris. Changing straw into wood or wood into steel is a task reminiscent of the futile search of the ancient alchemists for the

'philosopher's stone' or formula that transforms base metals into gold. In the case of marriage, the transformation would require one or both partners to change their lifestyles radically to achieve a degree of compatibility. Changing one's lifestyles is difficult and protecting a marriage may not be a sufficiently strong incentive for doing that. A much easier alternative is for one of them to stage an act for the sole purpose of riding the storm in the relationship. Since we are all part hunter and part farmer, we can play both roles. Indeed, most of us are adept and experienced in playing the role of an affectionate farmer with our family friends and favored others and a ruthless hunter with the rest of the world. In order to placate his discontented wife, the manipulative hunter can temporarily switch from his primary or predominant hunter lifestyle to his secondary farmer lifestyle by pretending to be less domineering and more affectionate and understanding. In addition to untypical and unexpected expressions of love and care, the hunter's attempts to deal with what he regards as a sudden surge in his wife's sentimental mood may include an occasional dinner in an expensive restaurant or a summer vacation in a romantic resort. As soon as what the hunter usually refers to as a mood episode or a temporary phase passes, the relationship returns to its usual state of equilibrium dictated by the terms and tempo of the dominant hunter lifestyle.

Compromise and adaptation are traditionally expected from the weaker partner in a marriage, namely the wife. However, the transformation in the status of women inside and outside marriage by legislation, increasing financial independence and the feminist movement has eroded the

willingness of many wives to make the necessary concessions and sacrifices to satisfy their hunter husband's demands and expectations. Klagsbrun (1985:13) observed that "with divorce as acceptable as it, with many women be dependent economically on marriage than ever before, couples today are not willing to accommodate each other as readily if their illusions [about marriage] turn out to be false."

Although such periodical episodes involving temporary concessions and adaptation accomplished with or without the help of a third party intervention may help in bringing many marriages from the brink of a breakup, the partners' lifestyle and terms of their union remain unchanged. Consequently, the thorny root problem of incompatibility in lifestyle continues to pose a serious threat to the continuity of their marriage. Children are often the primary reason for maintaining unsuccessful marriage.

In conclusion, it has been argued in this chapter that a person's lifestyle strongly influences many important aspects of his or her life such as the choice of a marriage partner and the success of the marriage. Choosing a compatible marriage partner is a necessary condition for marital success. However, it is not enough. Having similar values and expectations may protect a hunter's marriage from breakup but only the farmer's sentiments can assure the marriage couple of living happily ever after. Therefore, farmers often make ideal marriage partners and especially to other farmers.

Chapter Six: Raising children

Hunters and farmers alike prefer to see their children grow up to be like them and copy their lifestyles. Hunter seek to provide their children not only with the necessary skills but also their attitude and values to succeed in terms of the materialistic criteria of power, possessions and status. In contrast, the farmers' wish for their children's satisfaction and happiness with themselves and their relationships with others may appear to be modest, but it is certainly more difficult to achieve. Consequently, farmers may occasionally wonder whether it is better to raise their children to adopt their values given an unappreciative and sometimes hostile hunter world or to improve their survival chances by training them to compete with others on the hunter's terms. If they choose to raise their children to become hunters rather than farmers, farmers may only succeed in confusing them with conflicting instructions. A more detailed and discussion of how hunters and farmers raise their children follows.

Hunter parenting

Children are valued by hunters for personal, social, and economic reasons. They constitute the undisputed proof of their manhood and eligibility to the status and rights associated with it. They also have an economic value in traditional societies as a source of cheap labor or additional wage earners to augment the family income. They provide their parents with heirs to inherit their fortune and as extensions of themselves

to achieve the glory they could not accomplish and ascend the lofty hierarchies which remain a cherished dream.

Under certain conditions, hunters may become obsessed with having children to achieve one or more of the benefits resulting from it while under different conditions they may be driven to infanticide. The Romans, Greek, Arabs and Chinese at different times in history practiced infanticide and especially female infanticide. Ancient Roman laws and customs recognized the right of the family head or patriarch to kill his children if he decides to do so. In Aeschylus's play *The Furies*, the Roman deity Apollo recognized the right of fathers to kill their daughters. Before Islam banned it, suffocation of newborn females was performed by fathers who feared that after reaching adulthood their daughters may be driven by poverty into prostitution or become enslaved by enemy tribes and consequently bring dishonor to their families. In China, infanticide continued until the mid-twentieth century. Eastman (1988:21) described this ancient Chinese practice as follows:

Too many daughters were regarded as a curse, especially for poor families.... Occasionally, therefore, the mother of a female newborn placed her head down in a bucket of water, suffocated her, or (perhaps more commonly) simply abandoned her to die.

In nineteenth-century England, many children lived in misery, and instead of going to schools worked for low wages in mines and factories. Destitute parents gave their hungry Godfrey's Cordial. This was a preparation prescribed by physicians then for a variety of ailments. It is made up of

opium and sweeteners according to Milner (2000). In some cases. Parents increased the dose to get rid of an unwanted child. Kilday (2013) confirms that infanticide is still practiced in many societies.

Unwanted pregnancies could be terminated legally or illegally through abortion which has been championed by the feminist movement as a basic woman right. Abortion of female fetuses was widely practiced in India and in Delhi alone 70% of abortions were for this purpose according to Imam (1994) [Imam Z. India bans female feticide. BMJ, August 13]. Alarmed by its impact on the number of females in the population, the government attempted to stop this by disallowing physicians from revealing the sex of the fetus.

In addition to infanticide and feticides, hunters have other options for disposing of unwanted infants and children. Baby slots where unwanted newborns could be deposited instead of throwing them in the sewers or garbage dumpsters were introduced in many countries. Unwanted children could also be disposed of by putting them to adoption. Anyone familiar with Rousseau's philosophy would be baffled by the fact that he put five of his children in orphanages. However, he was like all of us part hunter and part farmer. Also, hunters may simply abandon their children and become absent parents. According to Bradshaw et al (2002), the number of absent or non-resident fathers has increased rapidly in the last two decades of the twentieth century.

The selfishness of hunters is plain in smoking pregnant mothers who ignore medical warnings of the negative effects of their smoking habit on fetuses. As many as 40% of American pregnant women continue to smoke

according to Kaplan (1986) and a slightly lower but significant percentage was reported by Mohsin and Bauman (2015) in a study on Australian pregnant women. Consumption of alcohol or drugs during pregnancy is also harmful to fetuses. Babies born to mothers addicted to heroine may show signs of addiction upon birth. Drinking alcohol may negatively impact the fetus growth and alcohol addiction can lead to more serious results.

Hunters' love kicks

Hunter raise their children to value power, wealth, success and status, and to become skilled in competing with others for these cherished goals. They are impatient to see them grow up into mature, rational adults so that they can enter the competitive world. The opposite of these two valuable hunter traits, i.e. rationality and maturity, are irrationality or being emotional and immaturity or thinking or behaving childishly. Since childhood and being childish contradict the hunters' ideals of rationality and maturity, children are practically rushed through childhood by their hunter parents who are eager for them to become mature, responsible hunter adults like themselves. Ideally, they would like to see their children becoming toilet trained, weaned, and learn how to walk and communicate verbally at the earliest time possible in their infancy. Early mastery of these fundamental skills is generally regarded as indicators of mental superiority and psychological adjustment, and hence causes for parental pride and satisfaction. For the same reason, children as young as nine years old are given their own credit cards.

Hunter did not learn this lesson from experts or experience but from observing animal behavior. During their first moments after birth, most animals instinctively learn to stand on their feet and seek the company of their mothers and the rest of the herd for protection and safety. Those who fail to do so may be killed and devoured by predators or other hunters. Animals are observed to help their young in these vulnerable moments by pushing and shoving them into standing on their feet. A motivation lecturer at the graduation ceremony of my son described the push given by a mother giraffe to her newborn as the 'push of love', which is nothing more than an instinctive behavior. The lecture went on to draw what I believe to be a misleading parallel between this act and a parenting practice which may appear to be similarly harsh but is equally motivated by love. In my opinion, both acts are similar in being motivated not by love but by the hunter's sharp survival instinct.

Hunter rushes their children through childhood and youth into adulthood because like their jungle kingdom's counterparts they want them to learn without delay how to survive and fend for themselves in a jungle-like society full of hostile hunters. In order to achieve this, rationality is encouraged while the opposite of that, i.e. being emotional, is discouraged at a very early stage. Emotional involvement by the parents is kept at a minimum in the belief that this helps to develop the child's personality and individuality. The peak of the emotional bond between hunter parents and children is probably at birth or soon after and its gradual decline begins at the same time also as the parents intentionally and gradually distance themselves from their children, believing that this

best serves their interests. The Spartan rulers did not trust the parents to do it voluntarily so they decreed that children must be separated from their parents, taken out of their homes and housed in state's schools and dormitories. As mentioned earlier, Spartan children were raised to become ruthless soldiers and win battlefield glories. In pre-Islam's Arabia, children were temporarily placed with Bedouin families to live in the desert far from their homes and parents. In the harsh desert environment, they were taught by their nomadic foster parents the arts, and skills of survival such as horse-riding, swordsmanship and language proficiency.

In Communist China, it was the practice for infants and young children to spend most of their lives separated from their parents and looked after by total strangers in accordance with the party's rules. This official Chinese policy was strongly criticized in the West before day-care centers became a necessity for the same reason.

The toys and games bought by hunter parents for their children are also designed to encourage them to accept and adopt the hunter lifestyle. Many of available toys on the market are models of existing or imaginary lethal weapons, while most games involve combat or some other form of violent or nonviolent competition and mimic in their rules of play, make-believe roles and trophies the serious real life concerns of the hunter. The violent death of an opponent, the bankruptcy of a competitor or at least the designation of one or more of the participants as a loser are recognized as legitimate consequences of playing these games. Many parents, educationalists and child psychologists are alarmed by the violent nature of these toys and games and their potential harmful effect on children and

in specific conditioning the child to accept inflicting suffering, wounds and even death on opponents under certain condition as necessary and justified measures. Indeed, would it be unreasonable to expect a child who seeks and enjoys the thrill of mock-killing and defeating his closest relatives and friends to become more ruthless in his competitive interactions with strangers later in his life?

The hunter's children are also encouraged to read tales and stories that glorify real or fictitious heroic hunters and their ideals and deeds. These heroic hunters are typically endowed with superhuman traits and abilities such as legendary bravery, iron-strong determination, extraordinary physical strength and stamina, and unmatched intelligence. After risking his life allegedly for a higher cause such as saving his people, a group of strangers or a princess in distress, the hero almost never vanishes into the sunset with no reward except the simple satisfaction of having helped fellow human beings. In return for their courageous deeds, these mythical and fictitious heroes may ascend to the highest heavenly or earthly positions, win the affection of the most beautiful and desirable women, and receive the accolade and adoration of ordinary hunters. The major differences between our modern comic-strip heroes and their fairy-tales' predecessors are in their attire and arsenal. Television films and programs for children seldom deviate from these themes and messages and violence in these works of fiction and programs has been judged to be excessive even by hunter standards.

Participation in competitive sport is another major activity in the hunter's training program for his children. Whether it is cricket, polo or

golf for the wealthy hunter children or rugby, hockey and football for the less affluent ones, active interest and participation in competitive sports is believed to be necessary for the healthy physical and psychological development of the child. Sports have been accepted as important arenas for the hunter children and adults to compete in and excel, often more important than scholastic achievements and other honors. Unsurprisingly, present day athletes are moved more by greed for money and quest for fame than sportsmanship.

In many countries nowadays, the children of wealthy hunters are enrolled in private boarding schools where they are expected to obtain an education, learn to look after themselves without the advice and emotional support of their parents. The typical hunter school is probably the military academy where young men and women must endure the harsh barrack-like discipline and environment. In addition to their conventional educational objectives, these institutions are intended to develop the personality and character of the hunter's children and instill in them the traits and values of successful hunters.

Preparing hunter's children for entry into the competitive adult world vigorously continues throughout their university education. Hunters seek to enlist their children in the best and most prestigious universities. They may use their influence and other means to secure that. Scholastic achievements and merit are not the only criteria for acceptance in American universities as Dershowitz (1992) reported. Students may be admitted because of their families are famous or a parent graduated from the same university or after a significant donation. One clear example of

this mentioned by Dershowitz is the ex-President George Bush. Lately, it was revealed that bribes are sometimes given to university officials to secure admission of sons and daughters of wealthy families. In my student years, I helped the daughter of an ex- Saudi king in applying to elite British universities. Application forms included an item on her father's occupation. She was granted admission to all of them despite her mediocre grades.

What are hunters' educational objectives? Aronson (2007) observed that Americans do not instill in their children the love of education for the sake of learning only and encourage them to choose fields of studies that will earn them upon graduation better chances of employment, higher incomes and social prestige. During their student years, hunters are eager to rise to the top of one or more of the power hierarchies in their universities and colleges. It is the cherished wish of many American students to become 'stars' in their schools and universities, popular, adored and envied by other students. They learn that athletic achievement is a major criterion for entry into these elites, often more important than scholastic distinctions. In American schools and colleges, students also put a high value on gaining admission to fraternities whose initiation rites involve physical and psychological abuse similar to initiation rites in primitive hunter tribes where adolescents are subjected to thirst, hunger, corporal punishment, and exposure to the elements.

Hunter students may resort to cheating to succeed in their studies. More than half of a sample of university students surveyed by Bowers (1964) admitted committing one or more kinds of cheating. A more recent study by McCabe and Trevino (1993) found similar results and a higher incidence

of cheating in examinations. A correlation between fierce competition among students in some fields such as graduates programs in Business Administration and high number of cheating cases was reported by McCabe, Butterfield and Trevino (2006). This behavior reflecting low morality and strong negative peer influences values success and high grades more than honesty and fairness which is typical of the hunter mentality. These students may continue to behave dishonestly after graduation.

Since the hunter's daughters have lately been receiving the same education and training, reading the same books and stories and playing with the same toys and games as their male siblings, they are unsurprisingly pursuing the same objectives and lifestyle. More young women now reject the subordinate hunter lifestyle prescribed for them traditionally and seek to fully realize their hunter aspirations.

In conclusion, it can be argued that the hunter's speedy cultivation of his children's independence and achievement of adulthood may have a negative impact on the children and lead to a host of other serious problems for their families and societies. Hunter parents justify the increasing degree of freedom granted to their children by claiming that this is the best way to teach them independence of thought, choice, and action. These parents also show less concern and interest in the moral and ethical values assimilated or unassimilated by their children since they themselves may not subscribe to a fixed code of values. As a result of these hunter parenting practices, children may be encouraged to experiment with a

wide variety of attitude, and behaviors including delinquent and deviant behavior.

More children of both sexes are now demonstrating their independence, and thus fulfilling their hunter parents' wishes, by becoming sexually active at an early age. The Center for Disease Control and Prevention (2014) in the US found that about half of surveyed high school students were sexually active. The obvious outcomes of this trend are an increase in unwanted pregnancies, abortion and the deep psychological and emotional scars that may result from them. The fact that more children are becoming sexually active at an early age indicate that they are being directly or indirectly encouraged to act as adults before achieving the mental and psychological readiness to make rational and responsible choices and accept responsibility for them. Since these children are unable to shoulder the serious social and financial responsibilities of parenthood, their families and societies are burdened with this problem. Abortion and adoption can only serve to alleviate the problem, but these are far from perfect solutions and obviously do not offer a cure. Moreover, the emotional and psychological well-being of these immature youngsters who suddenly become party to these monumental decisions may be adversely and permanently affected. And if for some reason they decide against abortion or adoption, their hunter parents' plans and dreams for their lives may be seriously disrupted or even permanently derailed.

The personality strains experienced by hunter children in trying to prematurely achieve adult status in conformity with the expectations of their parents and peers may show up in various kinds of delinquency. The

young hunters are mentally and psychologically unprepared to perform the adult hunter roles and failure in fulfilling this role may lead to delinquency. At a less serious level, delinquency may be limited to drinking alcohol and smoking in imitation of their hunter parents and seniors. But it must be remembered that incipient alcoholism and smoking addiction may also be escape mechanisms from the harsh hunter world and its high expectations. Also, drug addiction, eating disorders and suicides are symptomatic of the desperation, despondency and depression experienced by young hunters unable to overcome their personal frustration and low self-esteem. Many Japanese teenage students commit suicide every year because they fail to succeed or obtain the high grades expected by their hunter parents.

The unadjusted hunter children may not only prove to be harmful to themselves in the short and long-term but also to others. Bullying is a major problem in schools and communities. Control and power urges motivate bullying behavior. Bullies derive psychological satisfaction from having and exercising power over their peers. Like adult hunters, they rarely fight fairly and pick their victims from among their juniors and weak peers. According to Smith (1993) and Baughman et al (2012), victims of bullying may experience lingering feelings of incompetence and low self-esteem. Dawkins (1995) believes that some of the children victimized by bullying may be driven to commit suicide. A study conducted in 2001 (Leary et al, 2001) listed bullying as one of the major factors in 13 of 15 school shootings in the US since mid-1990s.

Hunter institutions and parents regard bullying as a fact of life to which children must deal with on their own probably as part of their preparation for the adult world. Their only solution to this serious problem is to advise bullies to channel their power and aggressive propensities into more acceptable pursuits and activities such as athletic competitions and student organizations.

The street gang is another problem resulting from the hunters' child rearing practice. Teenagers join street gangs to demonstrate their independent thinking and judgment and attainment of manhood. They carry guns and knives, instigate and take part in violent clashes with other gangs, take drugs, steal, and even commit murder to measure up to the adult aggressive hunter image impressed upon them by their parents and peers.

Unaccomplished hunters and low hunters may find the task of raising their children to be hunters like themselves more difficult than successful hunter parents. The former teaches their children to value success, possessions, and power which they themselves lack or have failed to achieve and are, therefore, unqualified to serve as role models for their children. Their children may seek such models of success of power among their peers, political leaders, famous musicians and actors and so on. These self-steering youths are more prone to delinquency than the children of accomplished hunters.

Hunters' neglect and abuse of their children

Parents' neglect of their children is as old as history. In his description of everyday life in ancient Rome, Carcopino (2003) observed that Roman mothers shared their husbands' leisure activities. They took part in hunting and sports at the expense of their maternal duties. The employment of nannies was and remain common among aristocratic and wealthy families. The English thinker and advocate of women's rights Mary Wollstonecraft (1759-1797) was concerned that this practice may hamper the development of fondness between mothers and their children. According to Sedgwick (1985), children of rich families in the 20th century who are looked after by nannies are deprived of their mothers' love and affection.

An early independence may also be forced on hunter children as a result of parental negligence. The hunter parents' egoistic preoccupation with their careers and their overindulgence in the gratification of their pleasures and hobbies may leave little attention and time for their children. The neglected children will probably seek affection, understanding, advice and role models outside their homes. Inadequate parental attention and affection may explain teenagers' infatuation with idol figures. A teenager may proffer and express adoration for a film, sport, or pop star who is completely unaware and oblivious of this sentiment and cannot be expected to reciprocate it. To maintain this one-sided relationship, the imagination of the smitten teenager creates the reciprocal part of the relationship through fantasy and wishful thinking. Accordingly, the teenager may become convinced that the words of love repeated or sung by the idol are directed toward her or him, or that this would certainly be

the case if only the idol knew her or him. This made-up relationship will last if it satisfies the teenagers' needs and their imaginations can sustain the fantasy. This delusion would probably disappear when the need for affection is satisfied through real relationships according to Sheridan, North, Maltby and Gillet (2007).

These emotionally neglected children, Schur (1973) warned, face the risk of developing high levels of aggression and other negative behaviors. In specific, they may exhibit lower empathy (Goleman, 1994) which is a distinguishing hunter trait common with sadists, rapists and child molesters. Empathy is the bases of morality. Wright (1994) concluded that children who were emotionally neglected or grew up in foster homes may become violent adults and hardened criminals.

Conflict, strife and mutual dislike characterize the relationship between many hunter parents and the unhealthy home environment may cultivate in the hunter children negative attitudes toward others and the world at large. These children may view the external world as a source of uncertainty and regard other humans as hostile, threatening, and punitive. And if they happen to live in neighborhoods where there are many delinquents then they also may become delinquents. Accordingly, most young inhabitants of ghettos and poor slums in urban centers are generally expected to become aggressive, delinquent and join gangs. However, research results have also shown that aggressive tendencies are not exclusive to children living in violent-ridden neighborhoods and that children of high-status parents living in high-scale neighborhoods may also show relatively high degrees of aggressiveness. It appears that while peer

pressures and other factors external to the family have an impact on children's behavior, it is the home environment that makes them either susceptible or immune to delinquency. Accordingly, cases of delinquencies were fewer in emotionally warm and stable family environments. Evans and Wachs (2010) found these fortunate children to have empathy, compassion, and the skills of anger management and conflict resolution. Children of unsupportive and unstable families, in contrast, are more prone to aggression and distrust of others and habitually lie to hide their true intentions and escape retributions for their deeds as shown by Talwar and Lee (2011).

The fairy tale *Hansel and Gretel* is essentially about neglected or abused children. The abandoned siblings had nowhere to go but the forest and were easily lured by the sweet edifice of the domain of evil inhabited by the child-devouring witch.

Hunter fathers are disposed by their lifestyle to be strict disciplinarian. Some of them may resort to punishment or negative incentives in controlling their children's behavior. Only the hunters in or among us would believe that if you love your children then you should not spare the rod. A review of research by Eron et al (1970) associated cruelty experienced in childhood at home with high aggressiveness at school. Research results obtained by Benson and Buehler (2012) confirm that family environments dominated by aggression and violence in addition to negative peer pressures may contribute to children's delinquencies. In Iran, a group of researchers (Zarnsghash, Goodarzi and Mohseni, 2010)

reported a significant correlation between a violent home environment and heroin addiction.

Children of hunter parents may also suffer abuse. According to Carr (2006), the annual incidence of child abuse in the 1990s is 5-9% in the US and European countries. Carr also found that parents who abuse their children are usually under stress resulting from conflicts within or outside the family but not all parents who suffer from stress vent their anger and frustration on their children. It is also possible that these parents were victims of child abuse themselves. Child abuse leaves long-lasting negative impacts on some victims especially those who suffer sexual abuse. (Carr, 2006; 346). Some victims of physical or psychological abuse fail to overcome its negative effects which continue to impact their lives long into adulthood. They are more prone to join street gangs in their youth and develop racist and sadist tendencies.

Juvenile delinquency may also result from the hunter parent's cruelty toward their children. According to Gil (1983) abused children resort to hiding their pain behind a facade of toughness, aggressiveness, and hostility, and some of them may seek the safety of gang membership. They are also more likely to become abusive parents and prove to be chips of the old block. Furthermore, abused children may fail to overcome their childhood's frustration, resentment and insecurity and develop general antisocial sentiments such as sadism and racism. Klose (1995:60) believes that the psychic injury resulting from ridicule, humiliating, physical abuse and cruel punishment manifest itself in an "engulfing sense of impotence and vulnerability which seems to be the fore engine of sadistic character

development.” Hitler’s biographers reported that his childhood was unhappy. Some have argued that the flawed malevolent personality of the Nazi leader may have been formed during this critical stage in his life when he was often mistreated. Miller (1990) believes that not only Hitler but also his followers must have suffered strict upbringing.

The possibility of a hunter’s marriage ending in divorce is high given the hunter’s lifestyle and values. A review of 96 studies published in the 1990s by Amato (2001) showed that children of divorced marriages scored low on scholastic achievement and psychological and social adjustment compared to other children. Moreover, Yussen and Santrock (1978) observed that daughters of divorced parents tend to have more negative attitude toward men. The impact of broken marriages on children extends beyond the psychological to the intellectual; the intellectual development of children of broken homes appear to be stunted as indicated by their scores on IQ and achievement tests. Results on the effects of growing up with one parent obtained by McLanahan and Sandefur (1994) indicated that these children received lower grades in schools, were unlikely to graduate from high schools and enroll in colleges and universities and many of them lived in poor neighborhoods and the incidents of pregnancies outside marriage were high among them. Similar results were reported by Goulter and Minninger (1993).

Children of broken marriages who lived with foster parents are more likely to suffer abuse than those living with their parents. Incidents of abuse among children living with unrelated males were found by Webber

(1991) to be three times higher than those living with their biological fathers.

When these neglected children turn against their parents and abandon them in their old age to a life of loneliness or the exile of an old-people home, their parents have no right to moan like King Lear: "How sharper than a serpent's tooth it is to have a thankless child," because they brought it upon themselves.

In summary, it has been argued that child-rearing practices of hunter parents may result in troubled childhood and adulthood for their children. The major causes of their maladjustment are the parents' acceleration of their children's passage into adulthood, parental neglect and abuse. If these pitfalls of hunter parenting can be avoided, then the hunter children would probably grow up into adjusted and successful hunters.

Farmer parenting

Farmer parents would like to see their children follow in their footsteps and adopt the farmer's lifestyle. The primary tool of farmer parenting is love and a supportive home environment. Blackburn (2001) was describing this parenting style when he wrote that a child raised by loving and compassionate parents grow up into a loving and compassionate adult. Farmer children are brought up to appreciate the farmer's sentiments of love, compassion, sympathy and care. These children learn from their parents the value of these sentiments for self-realization and happiness. The relationship between their parents is presented to them as a model

and living proof of the excellence of their lifestyle and values. However, raising the farmer's children is not an easy task in a hunter-dominated world. To begin with, farmers are less prevalent around us and suitable role models other than the parents may be scarce. Other sources of influence on the farmer's children such as schools and peer groups would probably act in an opposite direction by supporting the hunter's values and lifestyle. Nevertheless, dedicated farmer parents are expected to ignore these obstacles and do their utmost to raise their children to become farmers like them.

Undedicated farmers may face a dilemma here. On the one hand, they would like their children to carry the torch after them, but not at any cost. On the other hand, they may have misgivings about raising their children in the farmer's way because their children must learn to live and succeed in a hunter world. Farmers are acutely aware that their type is psychologically and emotionally ill-equipped to successfully compete with hunters. Since all hunter institutions enshrine the hunter values and traditions, farmers' children may be at a disadvantage in these competitive establishments. Their compassion, care, honesty, fairness, good manners and respect for human rights - indeed, all the qualities that make them decent human beings - receive a credit of naught in educational institutions. And if the competition engenders hostility and resentment, the farmer children, raised not to value success above all other things, may prefer withdrawal.

The helpful and friendly farmer children may risk being boycotted by their hunter peers, excluded from games and other group membership and

activities, and subjected to teasing and bullying. As soon as they become aware of their lifestyle being different from that of their hunter colleagues, the farmer children may begin to question their values and lifestyle. At the same time, they may be targeted by strong peer and institutional pressures sufficiently strong to push them away from their parents and their lifestyle and toward the hunter lifestyle. This conversion would be experienced by their parents as a major distressing defeat.

Although farmers' children are at a disadvantage in a hunter world, they are less likely to become delinquent than hunter children. Research results confirm that children of caring and loving parents do not become delinquent even if they live in slum areas infested with delinquency and violence. In some cases, one caring and loving parent may be enough to tip the balance in favor of a healthy development of his or her children. It appears that farmer parenting endows the children with strong immunity against the lure of delinquency.

Such advantages may be lost if the parents are of mixed types, i.e. a hunter and a farmer. In such cases, the children would receive contradictory messages and training: pressured by one parent to become hunters and encouraged by the other to adopt the farmer's lifestyle. Children who are unable at this stage to understand and evaluate these conflicting directives will be puzzled and bewildered. Although it is difficult to predict which way they would eventually choose, it must be remembered that external social pressures favor the hunters. Furthermore, the healthy home environment created by farmer parents is conducive to the development of their children into responsible, caring

adults. In contrast, hunter children may be less immune to delinquency but are better equipped to live, compete and succeed in a hunter-dominated world.

Chapter 5: Hunters and Farmers at Work

If this book had been authored by a zealous hunter, he or she would have probably changed the sequence of its chapters by placing this chapter before the preceding one on relationships. Work and its financial and other advantages have priority over social relationships. Hunters typically allot more of their attention, time, and energy to their businesses, professions and jobs than the emotional needs of their families. In contrast, farmers place the welfare and happiness of their families above all other concerns. As will be shown in this chapter, hunters and farmers also differ in their occupational preferences and attitudes toward work, authority and leadership and these, in turn, influence their work behavior and performance.

Occupational choices of the hunter

If hunting and farming were the only two occupations in the world, the occupational choices of our two characters would not be difficult to predict. These choices are obviously influenced by their values, propensities and lifestyles. Hunters prefer and choose professions and occupations that provide them with the best opportunities for achieving their cherished objectives of power, wealth, and status and demonstrating their personal excellence and aptitude. At the bottom of their list of priorities are jobs and professions involving high level of cooperative and

team effort and requiring social and interpersonal skills. The ultimate objective of all hunters is to ascend to the highest position on their choice of political, administrative, military, business or professional hierarchy.

The lure of hierarchies is probably what motivated the hunter within us to leave his natural habitat in the jungle and settle down in sedentary communities. Hunters who previously survived on hunting, herding and raiding are traditionally repelled by the farmer's occupation which involves manual labor - the remaining Arab Bedouins still scorn manual work. Eventually, hunters established political, social, religious and military hierarchies and the strongest and wildest among them became rulers, generals, high priests and senior bureaucrats while lesser hunters filled lower positions on these hierarchies.

Hierarchies are essentially vertical structures, and all things of value to hunters are measurable on the vertical scale or axis. Their early creations such as the pyramid, religious-astronomical towers, temples, statues, and mausoleums, some of which made up the wonders of the ancient world, were essentially vertical achievements. The height of these structures was a significant, if not the most significant, feature. The vertical dimension was also the distance that separated them from the abode of their deities in heavens; at the top of Olympus or some other lofty place. The urge to become immortal, commit the hubris of defying the gods or even joining their ranks tormented real and fictitious hunters in ancient civilizations. It is said that this prompted Babylonian rulers to build their famous tower. Apparently, the influence of this urge on our hunter's attitudes and behaviors has not diminished; for example, we proudly call tall buildings

skyscrapers. Also, the cloning of an animal and the successful landing of an unmanned spacecraft on Mars routinely kindle comments and analysis on how close mankind, or to be exact the scientific Western man, has climbed on the vertical astrophysical dimension closer to God or God-like status. Even nations which cannot boast of such spectacular feats of scientific achievements keenly indulge in measuring themselves on one or more of the internationally-acknowledged vertical scales or hierarchies such as political power, military strength, economic development, number of patents and so on. Until recently, Japan and the Japanese people took pride in the upward-sloping graphs of their economic growth rate and income per capita which placed them at or near the top of the worlds' economic pyramid or hierarchy. Dubai now takes pride in the unique distinctions of having the tallest building in the world while Saudi Arabia has for many years listed among its achievements having the tallest fountain in the world and recently the highest mosque. Ranking nations, institutions, and individuals on hierarchical lists has been and remains a serious preoccupation for hunters.

Institutional hierarchies such as bureaucracies and corporations reflect this inner hunter propensity and provide hunters with the means and symbols of fulfilling it. A hierarchy is a system of differentiation in power, responsibilities, status and remuneration, and the strongest ambition of every hunter is to climb to the top of the hierarchy's ladder. Those who succeed in reaching the top reap all the rewards associated with it including rank, status and money. These power and position symbols intended to distinguish the powerful and privileged from the less powerful and less

privileged varied from the long nails of the Chinese Mandarin officials to the private office, parking space and washroom privileges for the modern corporation's upper management, among other things. The importance of rank, status and their symbols were demonstrated by the failure of the Communist Chinese rulers to abolish them. According to Grossman (1988:2), the corporation has become the only institution capable of bridging the psychological chasm created by the, "erosion of meaning, structure and coherence in public life." Contemporary hunters have put all their faith and trust in the corporation as the maker of our modern hunter civilization and its capacity to fulfill its promises of empowerment, security and happiness for all. Even our importance as human beings and individuals is now being measured by our productivity and how much we contribute to the marketplace. Failure to find employment in the corporation or climb its hierarchy is associated in our minds with negative feelings of alienation and low self-esteem. The importance of working for the corporation and eventually leading and managing it is evidenced by the increasing popularity of a degree in business administration and management. Leinberger and Tucker (1991) reported that while in 1971 one out of seven of all first degrees in American universities was in business administration, by 1985 it has reached one in four. Results of the 2009 American community Survey show that the proportion of holders of a bachelor's degree in business administration declined slightly to one out of five with a total number of around 11 million. Also, the number of holders of Master of Business Administration degrees rose from 5,000 in 1971 to 67,500 in 1985. By 2008 the number of MBA graduates was over

100,000. A qualification in this field assures the hunter of a good position on the corporate hierarchy, a high salary and a clear advantage in the race for senior positions. His ultimate objective is, of course, to ascend to the highest position to become an influential, renowned business leader.

In our hunter world, the list of occupations and professions found attractive by hunters is bound to be long. In addition to a career in business as managers, bankers or salesmen, hunters may aspire to political or bureaucratic leadership positions or to become military officers, lawyers, medical doctors and teachers in order to earn the power, top remuneration, and distinct prestige resulting from them. Some professions and occupations, on the other hand, may be unattractive or even unacceptable to hunters because their instrumental utility for fulfilling his aspirations is low. However, hunters' career preferences are not fixed and may change in response to market and social trends. According to Menotti (1953), the average American in the 1950s looked down on a career as a composer, a writer or a painter as unmanly or even un-American. This was true because most people in these professions do not achieve the fame or fortune of Gilbert O'Sullivan, Ernest Hemingway or Picasso. However, the increasing demand for such talents by the growing entertainment industry and their high monetary rewards have undoubtedly transformed the images of these professions in the minds of many Americans.

There are many reasons behind a hunter's career preference for law, medicine or education. Guaranteed employment or a private practice and a better than average income is some of the obvious attractions of the law profession. Those who choose to specialize in corporate law and succeed

in their practice or jobs are also assured of high income, power, and prestige. These and other incentives are strong enough to warrant the investment of much time, efforts and energy in the competitive education and training process required for law certificates and licenses. In addition to earning enormous fees, trial and prosecution lawyers may gain satisfaction from the number of cases successfully defended or prosecuted by them, their public performances, and the publicity given to them and their cases. At a later stage in their careers, they may look forward to a place on the judicial bench that would immensely enhance their social position and prestige and pave the way for a more glamorous career in politics. More than half of US presidents were lawyers and lawyers make up the largest professional group in Congress (Bogus, 1996).

Lawyers who break professional code of ethics face the possibility of losing their licenses. Geis (2011) reported that two US presidents had their law licenses revoked: in 1976 President Richard Nixon for obstruction of justice and in 2001 President Bill Clinton in the state of Arkansas for perjury. In 1995, Warren Burger (1995) the former president of the US Supreme Court wrote an article criticizing the deterioration of professional standards and conduct of lawyers in his country and as a result the reputation of the profession was at its lowest point. Bogus (1996) aptly entitled his article on the same topic "The death of an honorable profession".

The power over life and death is undoubtedly the ultimate power and judges are among few people such as rulers, military and security leaders, policemen and criminals who could exercise it in developed countries. In

performing their judicial duties and responsibilities, hunters are expected to be relatively conservative, favor a strict interpretation of the law and render maximum sentences unless it serves a higher authority and their interests to do otherwise. All hanging judges were hunters.

If the hunter opts for a career in medicine, he may prove to be an excellent physician, a skillful surgeon or a reputable medical researcher. The high incomes earned by successful physicians satisfy their pecuniary motives, and their profession also assures them of a high social status. Hunter also finds in this profession and their relationships their patients some satisfaction of their power urges. These emotionally reserved hunters are more suited to treat their patients with emotional neutrality and without allowing the traumatic events of their work to affect their personal lives.

Dr Val Jones (2012) argued that doctors act sometimes like ‘jerks’ because they are afraid of failing, exhausted and harassed. But could they be ‘jerks’ before even receiving their licenses? According to him, “getting into medical school is extremely competitive. Only the very top students make it, and they are generally ranked according to science test scores (not compassion scores or charming personality scores). Successful pre-meds are generally type A personalities with a fierce competitive nature.”

I spent three years in pre-medical studies at an American university in the Middle East. My only reason for a career in medicine was to please my father who dreamt of seeing one of his sons in white robes. Since all my elder brother and half-brothers failed to fulfill this dream, it fell upon me to do that. I finally managed to earn the label of ‘doctor’, but my doctorate

was not in medicine. One of the major reasons for abandoning medical studies was the fierce competition among pre-medicine students. The competition reached its highest point in the last year when students would regularly study till early hours of the morning; each one of them used to pride himself on staying later than the others. One of them used to keep the light on in his dormitory room and go to bed so that other students would tire themselves by staying later than him. In the laboratories the competition turned ugly, immoral and possibly criminal. Some students bribed a technician in the analytical chemistry laboratory to sell them the results of laboratory experiments. It was also reported that some students received low marks in genetics because the jars in which they kept their experimental breed of drosophila flies were switched. These unethical practices convinced me that I was perhaps in the wrong field of study.

We can blame the hunter side of medical doctors for all the things we dislike about them ranging from their bad bedside manners to unethical practices. This also explains why some of us harbor a negative image of doctors which portrays them as selfish individuals more interested in amassing fortunes from their practice and business deals and enjoying leisure activities such as playing golf rather than improving their medical knowledge and skills and caring in earnest for the health of their patients. To illustrate, it is common practice among Egyptian physicians have two queues in their clinics: a slow one for patients paying the regular fee and an expedited one in exchange for more than double the regular fee. Such unprofessional and unethical practices support imposing strong deterrents to discourage selfish medical practitioners from abusing their powers other

than the Hippocratic Oath. The risk of malpractice lawsuits and loss of medical license, however, was not strong enough to stop a Canadian doctor from molesting patients in the operating room. The malpractice may rarely turn into malice as in the cases of the German and Japanese doctors in World War II who experimented on prisoners of war and did not hesitate to inflict on them intense suffering, pain and even death. Concurrently, unethical albeit criminal experiments were conducted on black syphilis patients in the USA. According to information collected by Roy (1995), the Tuskegee study (1932-1972) funded by the Public Health Service was conducted without informing participating patients of its real objectives and without their informed consent. Patients received free medical checkup but were denied proper treatment for their illness. More significantly, researchers failed to give these patients penicillin after its effectiveness in treating syphilis became known in the 1940s. Only in 1997 President Clinton on behalf of the American government apologized to victims and their relatives of this grossly unethical medical experiment. More recently, reports of US doctors' participation in torturing Iraqi prisoners were confirmed by Geis (2011).

According to the British charity Age Concern, the words 'do not resuscitate' was inserted in some elderly patients' charts without their knowledge or consent. If any of these patients were to suffer a heart attack or other serious medical emergencies, they would be left to die according to Ebrahim (2000). Their doctors and hospital administration justified this as necessary to accommodate more patients. The welfare and health of patients were not the main concern of some physicians who reportedly

helped to market certain medications. Berenson and Pollack (2007) reported in the New York Times that two of the major pharmaceutical companies in the world were paying hundreds of millions of US dollars every year to doctors in return for prescribing a certain medication for anemia despite the fact that the recommended dosage increases the possibility of heart attacks and strokes.

Unnecessary operations and surgical procedures on patients in hospitals number in the millions and expose patients to unnecessary risks. On this topic, Stahel (2015) wrote: "In the 21st century, we still have to come to terms with the absurd reality that it is significantly safer to board a commercial airplane, a spacecraft, or a nuclear submarine, than to be admitted to a U.S. hospital." In 1994, 180000 died in the US as a result of medical errors (Leape, 1994). Null et al (2005) estimated the number to be much higher. It is currently the third main cause of death with over 400000 mortality in 2016. A concurrent steady increase in the number of malpractice suits during the last century was observed by Hogan (2003). This is true of the USA as well as Saudi Arabia (Al-Saeed, 2010). Legal action to address these complaints is a lengthy, costly process that may drag for years and consume much of the resources of the two parties according to Sloan and Chepke (2009). Friedrichs (2010) called for stiff professional and legal penalties for some medical malpractices which are or should be classified as medical crimes.

Hunters are also attracted to the teaching profession for the power and prestige associated with it rather than the satisfaction of helping the young to learn, develop and mature into responsible adults. McClelland (1975)

reported significant research findings indicating that many educationalists have high power motivation or need for power. Apparently, these individuals obtain a sense of power and control from their teaching jobs. This inclination of hunter teachers may negatively impact the performance of their educational duties. In order to maintain their superior position vis-à-vis their students, they may not share and disseminate their knowledge and expertise fully, show less tolerance for criticism and dissension and consequently inhibit freedom of opinion, expression and research among his students. Hunters in academia may be behind the growing emphasis on profit making in some sectors. Washburn (2005) warned that fierce competition among universities and colleges may promote a commercialization trend. As an example of this, she mentioned the decision by the University of Utah to patent a discovery of breast cancer genes and sell it to a private company established by one of its professors instead of making it available to researchers especially since the research was funded by the US government.

In extreme cases, unethical, hunter teachers may abuse their authority and status to extract monetary, sexual or other favors from their students. Mindful of these possible abuses, educational institutions have laid down strict, detailed ethical standards for academic staff. Breaches of academic integrity standards are found in universities and colleges at a disconcerting degree which is according to our perspective an indication of hunters' presence in universities and research establishments. About one third of a sample of scientists surveyed by Martinson, Anderson and De Vries (2005) admitted performing acts of dubious academic integrity. A review of

previous research by Fanelli (2009) found that gross breaches of integrity standards were reportedly committed by 14% and minor breaches by 70%. Another indicator of academic dishonesty is the number of scientific articles withdrawn from publication every year. Fang and Casadevall (2013) drew attention to the serious effects of uncertain results of some of these researches such as the article by Dr, Andrew Wakefield published in The Lancet alleging that measles, mumps and rubella (MMR) vaccine increases the risks of autism and other diseases. This article led many parents to stop vaccinating their children and as a result the US and other countries reported widespread cases of measles. Another example of fraudulent research was the announcement of a researcher in the University of California research center that two new chemical elements have been discovered. At first, researchers were enthusiastic but attempts to replicate the results failed. The research center withdrew the research report and dismissed the researcher (Monastersky, 2002).

Occupational preferences of the farmer

There are no significant differences between farmers and hunters in aptitudes, intelligence and work attitudes but hunters are, in general, better equipped to obtain the prerequisite qualifications and skills for many professions and occupations. All other factors being equal, farmers find fewer suitable employment opportunities because many professions and jobs are incompatible with their values and lifestyle. The strict moral code of farmers may deter them from working for many organizations

whose objectives, policies and operations contradict their values and principles. Consequently, farmers may find it morally unacceptable to work for organizations whose regular operational methods include the use or threat of force such as military and security establishments, correctional institutions and those that profit from the exploitation of human weaknesses such as gambling casinos and tobacco companies. They are also disenchanted with the general work environment in large corporations and bureaucracies where conformity to formal rules and procedures and impersonality rather than spontaneity, creativity and strong interpersonal relations are encouraged and rewarded. Working in large organizations also deprives them of the sense of fulfillment of seeing the outcome of their labor. Most of these establishments are viewed by them as creations of selfish hunters to serve their own selfish ends. While they may not be against the pursuit of efficiency and profit, they strongly oppose doing that at the expense of the public interests, environmental health, and employee rights and psychological wellbeing. They probably agree with Roberts' (1991:127) assessment of competition: "Without competition, business slow down. But with competition, far too many business leaders feel compelled to win at any cost. And when they do win, the gain is only short-lived. In the long run, they and lots of other people lose."

Farmers are at a disadvantage in competing for occupations and jobs that are highly sought by hunters. For example, careers in medicine and education are valued by hunters and farmers alike but for different reasons: the former for money, power and prestige and the latter for humanitarian care and service. Hunters are better positioned to do better

in the job market because they have better networks, contacts and influence within professional hunter- controlled hierarchies.

In the final analysis, professions and jobs acceptable to farmers must fulfill their basic need to work, cooperate with others, be productive and earn a living without compromising their cherished values and ideals. These conditions may be satisfied by employment in a small organization or a work team where readiness to cooperate and share is highly appreciated, and the strain of competition and rivalries is low. Farmers make excellent social workers, marriage counselors and nurses and their performance in these professions and jobs often go beyond the call of duty. Their clients may be encouraged by their dedication, openness and compassion to freely discuss their problems with them, to trust and believe in their sincerity and expertise, and to listen to and act upon their advice. Under the right favorable conditions, intelligent, hand-working farmers may prove to be assets for their employer by actively maintaining group cohesiveness and solidarity.

Farmers may also find satisfaction of their occupational needs and a suitable social niche in non-profit organizations. Voluntary relief and charitable work provide them with opportunities to demonstrate their compassion and care for fellow humans especially the underprivileged and the needy. If such efforts are expended within a religious establishment, humanitarian consideration rather than missionary zeal would be their main motivation and propellant.

Hunters in the workplace

Employees have personal objectives that may not be totally congruent with those of their employers. They join organizations to realize their personal goals or to obtain the means for doing that. In exchange for their labor, loyalty to the organization, commitment to its objectives and compliance with its rules and procedures, employees receive salaries, wages and other monetary and non-monetary rewards such as valuable experience, training and opportunities for socializing.

This contractual relationship based on the exchange of interests appeals to the utilitarian, calculating hunter within us. As long as hunters believe that their personal objectives are or will be met through their employment, they are likely to remain in their jobs, diligently perform the duties and responsibilities assigned to them, and contribute toward the achievement of their organization's goals - until they obtain a better job offer. Ideally for the hunters, their gains from employment and work should exceed their efforts and contributions so that they can enjoy the feeling of being the 'winners' in their exchange transactions with their employers. On the other hand, hunters are survivalists and the prospects of losing a desirable job may be more anxiety-arousing than a personal tragedy. Whether hunters submissively or grudgingly accept a minimum salary and adapt to unsatisfactory work conditions or insist on being handsomely rewarded, promoted and treated with deference depends on their positions on the hunter scale and the strength of their bargaining positions. If their bargaining position is weak, hunters may be prepared to accept lower

wages and endure unsatisfactory work environment. All low-power hunters probably appreciate the wise message in the fable of *The Lion, the Ass and the Fox Go Hunting* by Aesop: It is better to give the powerful his lion's share rather than risk his wrath. Adjustment to an unsatisfactory work situation may be easier to the moderate hunter rather than the highly ambitious zealous hunter. The threat of becoming redundant, however, may convince even high and mighty hunters to painstakingly come to terms with the imperatives of their situation but without necessarily downgrading their aspirations.

All other factors being equal, moderate hunters whose primary concern in job security exhibit high degrees of loyalty and commitment to their organizations and their objectives, and strong dedication to the performance of their duties and responsibilities. Their jobs become their primary concerns and the focus of their lives and interests. Gaining the approval of their superiors also takes precedence over all other concerns because they regard them as the significant others in their institutional lives. They are in fact the organization or 'yes' men and women who almost always agree with their superiors, defer to their judgments and opinions regardless of their merit, and work hard to live up to their expectations. According to Maccoby (1976), the typical organization or company man has the following characteristics:

1. Stick to the rules.
2. Maintain the organization's status quo and resist change.
3. Flatter corporate rulers.

- 4. Seek the approval of authority figures.**
- 5. Idolize and copy those in power.**
- 6. Avoid high-risk decisions.**

By internalizing the organization's objectives and following its rules and regulations, adjusted moderate hunters make up dedicated organization men and women. Soldiers are trained to become organization men ready to kill those designated by their superiors as the enemy without objection or hesitation. Respect for authority and authority figures is a basic trait of the personality type characterized by psychologists as authoritarian. While powerful hunters express their authoritarianism by commanding and controlling others, subordinate hunters express it through obedience to persons with authority. Results of experiments conducted by the American psychologist Stanley Milgram (1963) confirmed that the readiness to respect authority figures and carry out their orders may reside in all of us. Milgram's subjects were ordinary persons who represented the average American in terms of age, educational qualifications, and occupation. None of them showed signs of psychological disorder such as sadism or psychosis. Two in three of them, both male and female, followed instructions to administer what they believed to be electric shocks ranging in intensity from painful to lethal (450 volts) to accomplices of the researchers for simply failing to answer a question.

Whenever authoritarian hunters came together under the leadership of a selfish, unscrupulous, high hunter, a malevolent, destructive force resulted. Such forces or movements are responsible for most atrocities committed through history. Fascists were authoritarian persons who

proudly donned their black shirts and adored and obeyed the orders of their Duce. Similarly, the Nazi demonstrated their authoritarianism by becoming the instruments of Hitler's atrocious crimes. Nazi and other war criminals and accomplices justified their obedience to their superiors and implementation of their orders by claiming that disobedience would have endangered their lives. Goldberg (1995) rejected this plea by asserting that Nazi war criminals like Adolph Eichmann were mainly motivated by their desire to please their superiors and win their approval. Under ordinary circumstances, however, low hunters are not required to go to such extreme in order to prove their commitment and loyalty to their superiors. However, they may become workaholics to gain credit with their employers and to enhance their job security in times of organization reconstruction and downsizing.

In contrast, high hunters are expected to show less readiness to copy and obey their superiors, and instead may demand a greater say in the definition and performance of their duties and assignments. The demand for their talents, expertise and skills strengthen their bargaining position. In accordance with the principle of least interest, if the high hunters stand to lose the least through the termination of their employment, they can demand more from their employers. Unless their job satisfaction is high and they are content with their future career prospects, they are likely to research for greener pastures. High hunters may also become workaholics but for different reasons than those of low hunters. Ambitious hunters are prepared to work long hours every day and on weekends and holidays of this can bring them closer to the achievement of their objective. They

are always seeking to empower themselves through more delegated authorities, greater participation in decision making and social relations. Hirschborn and Gilmore (1989) observed that an empowerment program in one establishment through delegation and participation resulted to higher demands for power and aggressive behavior which are characteristic of hunter personality.

Obviously, there are not enough top positions to satisfy the aspirations of all hunters, and most hunters must be content with less. Many of these will adapt to this situation by lowering their expectations to match their achievements and by adjusting their lifestyle toward the lower end for the hunter scale. Some hunters, however, may be unable to overcome the frustration and disappointment resulting from this failure and express their resentment toward the system through unproductive behaviors ranging from the young hunter's bullying and cheating at school to free-riding, tardiness, absenteeism, disruption of work routine, vandalizing work machinery and tools, bribe-taking, embezzlement, and sale of company secrets by the disgruntled adult employees in the work place.

The attitudes and behaviors of hunters in the workplace may make them disagreeable to many of their colleagues. Hunters in general put a low value on their social need, and hence are not expected to actively socialize within their organizations - unless this somehow serve their other more important interests such as promoting their career. Instead of having close interpersonal rapport and making friends, they may be satisfied with superficial acquaintance relationships. Anyhow, their need to be ahead of others, their aggressive competitiveness, and their readiness to use

unorthodox and sometimes even unethical means to satisfy their power urges and other aspirations may not endear them to many of their work associates. Unsurprisingly, hunters make more enemies than friends in the workplace. It also appears that the higher the hunter climbs on the power hierarchy, the more isolated and lonesome they become. The attitude and status symbols of powerful hunters at the top erect high walls around them and inhibit free and open access and communication with their subordinate.

It is this harsh and unfriendly work environment which drives most Americans to regard work as “mindless, exhausting, boring, servile, and hateful, something to be endured while ‘life’ is confined to ‘time off.’” Similarly, the typical modern organization, as described by Bach and Goldberg (1974: 297) is a “hotbed of indirect and hidden forms of aggression” which generates frustration, anger and anxiety in its employees. These are undoubtedly the stamps of the hunter on organizations.

Do hunters make better managers?

Hunters are obviously favored for managerial positions and the higher is the position the stronger is the probability of finding a hunter in it. Available research results appear to support this. An in-depth study of 250 American business managers led Maccoby (1976) to identify four major types: the craftsman who is driven by the urge to excel in his work, the jungle fighter whose motto is “kill or be killed, dominate or be dominated,”

the company man whose objective is to climb the organization ladder, and finally the gamesman who seeks to win and triumph over others. Only the first type, i.e. the craftsman, has some farmer qualities and those who were classified as such made up a small minority. Also, the results of a longitudinal study of the careers of 139 MBAs by Kilduff and Day (1994) confirm that persons with certain qualities, associated here with the hunter within us, are more likely to be promoted. Studies aimed at identifying leadership traits, such as Borg (1960), have repeatedly come up with the same qualities such as high ambition and assertiveness. These are also the same personal traits singled out in evaluating management candidates. Even the Japanese corporate culture which has so far encouraged and rewarded seniority, experience and team spirit is changing to accommodate and promote individualism, ambitions and assertiveness. Hunter managers everywhere choose like-minded subordinate to succeed them and maintain the hunter traditions and values.

It is customary in several Western countries to recruit active and retired high-ranking military officers and civil servants to top executive positions in private sector companies. Underlying this practice is the belief that those who succeed in rising to the top of one hierarchy possess the personality and leadership qualities and decision-making skills necessary for filling a high position on another hierarchy. Like the comic strips' superhero Batman jumping from one rooftop to another, persons with tested and proven hunter managerial skills are thought to be able to smoothly take off from one hierarchical summit to another.

The services of successful executives and managers are in high demand everywhere, and they are tempted by competing employers with lucrative offers of senior positions, impressive titles, enormous salaries, generous benefits and, of course, immense power. Numerous top executives in North American and European countries are paid millions of dollars in annual salaries, stock options and other benefits to attract and retain their services. Talented entrepreneurs and executives are credited and praised for transforming small concerns into conglomerates, for achieving high and consistent success records for their companies, for turning around failing businesses and in the process creating much of the economic development and growth in these countries. Many best-selling books and articles are published regularly to describe and analyze their success stories including detailed analysis of their strategies, leadership styles, decision-making practices, values and even their personal lives. Their decisions, statements and movements are reported by the business media and closely monitored by investors and brokers. Shares' prices may dramatically rise or fall in response to their decisions and utterances making some rich and others bankrupt.

Hunters who sit on the boards of directors of corporations, banks and public agencies and occupy the highest managerial positions demonstrate their leadership and business skills by enhancing their companies' competitiveness, increasing their market shares and overtaking the competitions in innovative and technological fields. In order to succeed in their occupations, they must share and act upon John D. Rockefeller's belief that the prosperity and growth of a business concern are governed by the

law of the survival of the fittest, the same law copied by the hunter from nature. It is no coincidence that the every-day business vernacular includes many hunting terms and expressions. For example, fierce competition is often described as 'cut-throat'. Some businessmen are likened to 'sharks' while others are referred to as 'corporate raiders' who stage 'hostile' takeovers.

The popular image of these businessmen and executives has drastically changed from the villainous selfish barons of industry of the nineteenth century to national and international heroes of today. In the past, their motives and decisions were blamed for many economic, social and political evils and problems such as the exploitations of the workforce, child labor, the Great Depression, political corruption, overthrow of legitimate governments, colonization, and even wars. Nowadays, they are praised and applauded as leaders of the new Western capitalist's order and the creators of prosperity for all, despite recent global economic turmoil traced back to bad decisions by greedy, irresponsible businessmen and managers.

These powerful hunter managers insist that nothing and no one should be allowed to hinder or interfere with the efficient conduct of business and the achievement of results. Keeping the wheels of the business turning and meeting targets are their main concerns. Their preoccupation with success and results can sometimes impel them to concentrate on short-term returns even at the expense of their companies' long-term interest and survival.

Traditionally, hunter managers subscribe to a machine model of organizations which picture them as systems made up of mechanical and

human parts that must work together in a harmonious and efficient manner to achieve the desired results and provide the required services. The increasing rate of mechanization and the use of cybernetics and robots to replace the human force are welcome developments to these managers in bringing their machine model closer to realization.

Hunter managers have also been described as task rather than people-oriented managers because they concentrate more on the improvement of technical processes, work procedures, market shares and sales records and less on the satisfaction of employees' needs, other than the financial ones. According to this type of thinking, the human element constitutes the principal source of internal uncertainty and unpredictability which, if not controlled, may have dire consequences for the orderly conduct of business. While obsolete technology can be replaced and broken machines fixed and ineffective business strategies discarded, human-related problems can prove in their opinion to be pernicious and difficult to solve. In support of this attitude, they point out that that employees sometimes make unacceptable demands such as wage rises, disrupt work routines, slow down production lines, absent themselves, vandalize machines and other company possessions, steal work tools and instruments, commit other crimes in the workplace and consequently act in contrary to their employers' interests. Even under normal conditions, employees are thought by hunter managers to have negative attitudes toward work and would only respond to manipulative techniques such as monetary incentive and the threat and use of rewards and punishment. Therefore, hunter managers favor and practice close supervision and control of

subordinates. Douglas McGregor (1960) labeled this style as the Theory X of leadership and management. Organization researchers have found that managers who adopt and apply this style exhibit certain personal characteristics such as dominance and superego strength which are also hunter traits. Although management specialists generally find this style unsuitable for most situations, Abraham Maslow (1965: 34), a psychologist famous for his hierarchy-of-needs theory, expressed the opinion that this may be the only effective way to make some people, other than Western nations, work hard. He argued that “cracking the whip over fearful people,” is necessary because they must “be broken a little before [they] can assimilate kindness and generosity.” More recently Perelman (2003) observed that employers intentionally maintain high levels of tension in the work environment and exploit their subordinates’ fear of losing their jobs to drive them to work to their limits.

For several decades since the publication of McGregor’s book, management academics and trainers have been lecturing and advising managers to move away from the authoritarian Theory X and toward the participative Theory Y, and from a mechanistic to an organic view of their organization. They encourage them in specific to regard and treat their employees as the most valuable organizational assets, to delegate more authority to them, to allow them a greater degree of participation in decision-making processes, to pay more attention to their various needs, to listen to their grievances and suggestions and to boost their morale and job satisfaction. They are advised to view the organization as an organic system open to and interdependent with its surroundings, and whose

effective functioning requires open communication channels and high degrees of coordination and cooperation.

The major objection to this approach came from specialists who argued that managers cannot treat all subordinates and situations in the same way. This led to the contingency theory of management which asserted that there is no best way of managing organizations and motivating subordinates and before choosing a suitable style the manager must study the salient forces in the situation such as the characteristics of the subordinates, the nature of the task or work to be performed, the environment and so on. Thus, if management introduces an organization-wide empowerment program, it must be prepared to deal with a rise in the power expectations of some subordinates (hunters) manifested in aggressive behavior, as Hirschhorn and Gilmore (1989) observed in one case. According to the contingency approach of management it may be necessary to closely supervise subordinate who respect authority and power and are more adjusted to working within organizations and accept the rules of the organizational power game.

Hunter managers value loyalty in subordinates and reward it. They expect their subordinates to recognize their authority and obey and implement their orders. Loyalty has been recognized as one of the major points of strength in Japanese establishments where employees exhibit high degrees of loyalty and commitment to their employers and receive in exchange lifetime employment, subsidized housing and in some cases a lot in the company's burial ground. In contrast, disloyalty enrages hunter managers and may evoke the strongest negative emotions in them. Those

who blow the whistle on their organizations should, therefore, expect more than a reprimand, as Roger Boisjoly and Alan J. McDonald discovered for themselves. Their 'crime' was whistleblowing on the managers at their employers, Morton Thiokol Incorporated, who did not heed warnings of serious malfunctions and went ahead with the launch of the Shuttle Challenger. This was branded as a gross breach of corporate loyalty not only by their superiors but also by their colleagues. Nancy Oliveri, a specialist and researcher at the Hospital for Sick Children, an affiliate of the University of Toronto, faced the wrath of Apotex, a Canadian pharmaceutical company, for disclosing her research results on the inefficacy and harmful side effects of a drug produced by Apotex. Rhodes and Strain (2004) documented the company's attempt to silence the researcher who instead of receiving support from the University and the Hospital was dismissed from her position. Only after obtaining a ruling from the Canadian Association of University Teachers Oliveri was reinstated.

The vanity of some hunter managers may make them intolerant of criticism and susceptible to flattery and the scheming of opportunists. Unlike Edgar in Shakespeare's *King Lear*, they do not believe that it is better to be a beggar and openly despised than to be despised but flattered. These are also distinguishing traits of the dark triad as mentioned earlier. A manager who is also a narcissist, a Machiavellian or a psychopath are like poison for a living organism in their disruptive impact on performance and the work environment according to Penny and Spector (2002). Babiak and Hare (2007) described organizational psychopaths as "snakes in suits". The

following partial list of the negative results of the presence of these personalities in organizations was compiled by Jonason, Slomski and Partyka (2012) based on previous research results:

- Narcissistic executives may act unethically and aspire to amass more power.
- Psychopathic managers and employees have low sense of responsibility and hence the productivity of their organizations suffer.
- Widespread of Machiavellianism in an organization is correlated with a tangible decline in the commitment of its managers and employees to its goals.
- Machiavellianism is associated with emphasis on acquisition of power, manipulation, scheming and higher employee complaints of unfairness in the work environment.
- Psychopaths and Machiavellian managers make frequent use punitive measures in dealing with subordinates while narcissists prefer rewards and praise.

Hunter manager ethics

Hunter executives and managers have ethical and moral principles but like all hunters they do not consider them to be fixed standards that must be followed always. Guided by the overriding principle of self-interest, hunter managers may be tempted to disregard these principles, and the probability of this increases with the strength of the hunter's motives. Obviously, it is greed rather than the mythical act of opening Pandora's box

that propelled weapons and ammunitions manufactures, cigarettes makers, owners of gambling casinos and drug traffickers to make their fortunes regardless of moral and ethical principles and the cost in human destruction and suffering. Until a short time before the demise of the apartheid regime in South Africa, many Western businessmen and executives did not hesitate to ponder the ethics of engaging in business transactions with a regime that oppressed millions of indigenous Africans. Much of the Iraqi arsenal and the means for producing weapons of mass production such as giant guns, atomic reactors, biological fermentation units, and chemical plants were supplied by Western manufacturers from the US, Canada, Great Britain, Germany and France. The selfishness of hunter executives also explains the wide range of white-collar crimes including tax evasion, bribe-giving, environmental pollution and fraud. During World War II, twenty percent of American businesses were issued with warnings of black market activities. And more recently, according to Grossman (1988: 24), two thirds of the five hundred major American corporations have reportedly committed negligent or illegal act. Such gross breaches of the laws led according to Olive (1987) to the collapse of financial institutions

Hartley (2008) believed that major American companies resulted in more deaths, injuries and financial losses than all the major eight crimes as classified by the Federal Bureau of Investigation including homicide, rape, grave assault, arson, car theft, burglary and theft. In the 1960s, the drug Thalidomide was responsible for the birth of children with severe limb defects and many of them did not survive. Mokhiber (1988) found evidence

that the German pharmaceutical company which developed the drug knew of its potential harmful effects, yet it marketed it as an over-the-counter medication for the relief of morning sickness in pregnant women among other ailments. In 1965, Ralph Nader published his book *Unsafe at Any Speed* on the failure of major American automobile manufacturing companies to apply high safety standards in the design of their products giving as an example the Chevrolet Corvair. Safety failure and poor maintenance in a factory owned mainly by Union Carbide was behind the Bhopal tragedy in which thousands of Indians died and injured after exposure to a dangerous gas. In the 1990s, many of the millions of overweight Americans who were taking the diet drug Fen-Phen suffered from heart-valve and pulmonary hypertension diseases. According to Bundy (2001), the drug was eventually banned, and the pharmaceutical company Wyeth had to compensate to those adversely affected by the drug.

Businessmen and managers use their considerable economic power to influence the political decision-making processes. They finance expensive media campaigns to create public support for their causes usually by arguing that their interests and the public interest are if not identical then at least compatible. An example of this is the major campaign conducted by American cigarette companies to counter unfavorable federal and state governments' measures. Also, businessmen and executives make considerable contributions to political candidates and expect and receive favors in return such as granting them government contracts. They hire professional lobbyists to present and defend their interest with legislative

and executive bodies. State subsidies are usually rejected by businessmen as intervention in the free economy but if it serves their interests they would lobby for such subsidies, import restrictions and other interventions and justify them as necessary measures to protect the national economy and save jobs. During the decade of the sixties and seventies, many American political observers and analysts believed in the existence of a powerful military-industrial complex serving the common interests of the military establishment and major weapons manufacturers. The sphere of influence of powerful conglomerates extends to the field of foreign policy, and it is widely believed, for example, that the interests of American corporation operating in Middle Eastern and Latin American countries are served by American foreign policies toward these countries.

The use of their economic power by hunter businessmen and executives to influence political policies and decisions and obtain benefits to their companies is a cross-natural, cross-cultural phenomenon. Close cooperation and coordination between government ministries and major corporations was hailed as one of the major factors behind decades of impressive economic growth in Japan and South Korea. On the negative side, political scandals resulting from overstepping the thin line separating legitimate cooperation from unethical practices have brought down many governments in both countries. Marxists have always maintained that political leaders and officials in capitalist countries served the interests of owners and managers of the means of production. Indeed, the decline and fall of the Communist regimes in Eastern Europe have confirmed that national and personal economic interests are stronger than ideology and

political convictions. In order to avoid a similar loss of power, Chinese Communist leaders have shifted from ultra-orthodox socialism to a market economy.

Multinational corporations and their senior executives are also criticized for their selfish policies in host countries. They are blamed for the depletion of these countries' natural resources and exploitation of their workforce. Many of these countries rely on multinational corporations for the export of their raw materials, usually at low prices, and then use their foreign exchange earnings to buy expensive capital and consumer goods from other multinational corporations. Accordingly, Mexicans must grow strawberries and tomatoes for export to the United States while African nations switch from basic food crops to groundnuts to satisfy market demand in Western countries. Multinational corporations are also accused of relocating unsafe polluting industries to host Third-World countries such as the petrochemical plant at Bhopal in India and selling them inferior products.

In a clear demonstration of their selfish, power-hunger hunter side, businessman and managers have been extracting and depleting natural resources at a fast rate leaving less of them for the benefit of future generations. Relentless pursuit of rapid industrialization and material welfare with little regard for its negative side-effects has resulted in a host of problems such as wide-scale pollution, and the gradual erosion of the ozone layers. Many experts believe that if unchecked these problems could eventually pose a serious threat to the quality and possibly the continuity of life on our planet. Despite these irresponsible business practices and

inadequate social responsibility of many business and their owners and managers, the need for codes of ethics in the business world is still debated, and many agree with the renowned economist Milton Friedman that there is no real need for such codes.

Finally, are these hunter managers satisfied? Like all hunters, they should be satisfied with their power, influence, wealth and status. However, happiness may be a different issue. As many wise farmers and hunters have repeatedly advised us, power and possessions do not guarantee happiness. In support of this, Maccoby (1976) has found successful businessmen in one Mexican village to be distrustful of their subordinates and of those whom they had taken away their properties. These wealthy individuals also had no friends and were generally unhappy in their relationships with their families and other members of their communities.

Farmers in organizations

While hunters favor autonomy and working alone and accept to work and cooperate with others only if it is necessary to achieve their personal objectives, farmers have strong social needs which they seek to fulfill in cooperative effort. The farmer within us probably originated informal communal and cooperative systems but our hunter side dominated and shaped them into formal, bureaucratic power hierarchies. Despite their natural affinity to cooperative work, farmers find it difficult to obtain employment in hunter-dominated organizations because their attitudes and values are not highly appreciated or deemed unsuitable or even

unproductive. Maccoby's (1975: 178) confirmed this in observing that corporations seek and reward "qualities of the head and not the heart." Richerson, Collins and Genet (2006) found that recent research findings were unsupportive of the selfish-rationalist model of man and called for changing management and organization theories and practices. They believed that humans behave altruistically even toward strangers and "firms in which most people take pride in their craft, treat each other, their customers and other important outsiders fairly, are loyal to the firm and discourage co-workers from taking advantage of the firm are those that prosper" (p. 207).

As subordinates, farmers can prove to be dedicated and productive employees if they can identify with the mission and objectives of their employers. Employment in many non-profit organizations such as international aid and national public welfare agencies satisfy this condition. Also, farmers, unlike hunters, prefer to work in flat organizations which have fewer hierarchical levels and distinctions of rank and status. Working under such conditions can bring the best in them in terms of productivity and innovation and provide them with job satisfaction.

In addition to their contributions based on their personal skills and expertise, farmers can prove to be indispensable as social entrepreneurs. Large size, extensive differentiation in authority and status and fierce competition can make inter-personal relations and the organizational work environment harsh, impersonal and fraught with envy, jealousy, hatred and conflict. Farmers can mitigate the severity of this situation by acting as social integrators by coordinating the efforts of team members and solving

interpersonal problems. Without the integrating efforts, open-mindedness and tolerance of the farmers, the clash of selfish interests, and the differences of opinion and conflicts would make cooperation in such an organization difficult. This may be best illustrated by military establishments. Armed units everywhere are based on strict hunter rules and discipline but as several Iraqi soldiers explained to me this is not enough to keep a unit from fleeing the battle scene at the first sign of the enemy. This fact was especially understood by Iraqi officers who usually treated them with typical hunter's rudeness and abuse at all times but before and during every engagement they drastically shifted to camaraderie, refraining from insulting them, calling them 'brothers' and 'sons' and praising them for their intelligence, courage, nobility, and patriotism.

Organizations staffed by farmers only are unthinkable to hunter who would see in them an end to competition, as they know it, and the loss of its motivating impact on innovation and creativity. This stance fails to take into consideration the creative strength of human curiosity, dedication to truth, search for knowledge and beauty, and the urge to contribute to human welfare. Many of the early breakthroughs in science, technology and other fields of inquiry were achieved by persons who had few or no competitors or were apparently unaware of them. Many scientists, philosophers, novelists, poets and artists persisted in pursuing their vocations despite their poverty and other obstacles and left the world a rich heritage of ideas, literature and art without enjoying fame or fortune.

Furthermore, farmers are not opposed to competition as a means in the pursuit of the public interest and welfare.

The advantages of cooperative farmers' organizations were demonstrated by the results of a study conducted by the social psychologist Muzafer Sharif and his associates published in 1961. This experiment on inter-group conflict and cooperation was conducted on boys in a summer camp. The experiment involved dividing the boys into two separate groups that were then pitted against each other in competitive exercises. The rivalries and hostilities observed between these two groups were strong enough sometimes to lead to violence. Experimenters tried to stop these hostilities but to no avail. They decided then to try a different approach, and it worked effectively. They introduced exercises which made it necessary for everyone to cooperate rather than compete. When cooperation replaced competition, everyone benefited, and hostilities ceased. Other studies have also supported that groups engaged in cooperative efforts performed better and experienced lower levels of interpersonal tensions and hostilities.

This lesson is thoroughly understood by farmers who as managers would apply it by attempting to meet the work-related needs of their subordinates without neglecting their responsibilities toward getting the work done and achieving results which they would regard as a moral obligation. They can prove to be effective leaders in building teams, raising morale and coordinating efforts. Since they do not value their formal authority as a source of personal power, they are generally more prepared to responsibly share it with their subordinates through decentralization

and empowerment. They are better suited than hunters to manage and supervise professional organizations and units such as research and development units, university departments, staff groups and any organizational unit staffed by highly qualified, mature, rational employees requiring and expecting minimal supervision.

Why there are more hunters than farmers in positions of authority in organizations? Hunters are favored for supervisory and managerial positions because of their dedication to hierarchy and power, competitiveness and flexible moral codes. By employing hunters, organizations indicate their preference for the detached head that is devoid of emotions while the heart, i.e. the farmer, is not permitted to develop its full potential. As will be argued in the following chapter, supporting the farmer lifestyle can have numerous benefits inside and outside organizations.

Chapter Six: Do You Dare to Change?

Then after this long separation, may man have a happy reconciliation, with both his fellow man and nature. May every kind of pride cease and may the city of protection extend from heaven to the abyss, vast as the bosom of God.

Jules Michelet, French thinker

For neither good nor evil can last forever; and so, it follows that as evil has lasted a long time, good must now be close at hand.

Cervantes. Don Quixote de la Mancha

By now you should know how much of a hunter and a farmer you are. This knowledge leads to the critical question: is this the best lifestyle for me? Should I aspire to join the powerful hunters in their jaded towers and jet-set lifestyle and enjoy all the security, comforts, pleasure and thrills of power, wealth, status, and fame? Or should I nurture the farmer within me and seek to contribute to the welfare of others and myself by working and cooperating with fellow human beings? If you are prepared to consider the challenge of transforming your lifestyle then you must be aware of the required efforts and sacrifices and the obstacles that must be overcome in this change process.

A hunter or a farmer lifestyle

Many would look at this question as superfluous; for them there is only one reasonable choice and that is the hunter lifestyle. Indeed, most of us are born, raised by our parents, educated by our schools, socialized by our societies and trained and motivated by our employers to become hunters. It is more likely than not that our parents, relatives, friends,

spouses and children are hunters and expect us to be like them and pressure us to do so. As a result, our choice of a lifestyle is severely constrained by our social and cultural values and norms. And unless we conform to the hunter lifestyle, we may be judged to be maladjusted, drop-outs or misfits and ostracized by our family, friends and community.

Unsurprisingly, most people are eager to become accomplished, successful hunters. They aspire to possess wealth, status, beauty, fame and all the things that increase their personal power. Whether they occupy the lowest rung on the power ladder, the comfortable position of a middle class status or the top of the social, political or economic pyramids, hunters crave more power, and the limit is not even the proverbial sky anymore.

Proofs of the potency of our power urges are abundant. It suffices here to point at the numerous books, videotape and cassettes produced and the training programs and lectures conducted annually with the aim of teaching existing and potential hunters how to become more successful and satisfy their power urges. Authors of these self-help sources promise their readership, audiences and viewers the achievement of these desirable objectives provided they are willing to invest the time, money and effort necessary. The assumption underlying this promise is that all of us are actually or potentially hunters with strong hunter urges, but some of us lack the required level of ambition, determination, assertiveness and/or the skills to channel their energies and resources in the proper direction.

Advocates of the hunter lifestyle have argued that despite its shortcomings it is essential to sharpen our survival instincts,

competitiveness and motivation to develop, improve and be creative. Some regard it as being intrinsic to human nature as the pecking order, alpha male, or some other hierarchical order is to chickens, chimpanzees, wild dogs and many other social animal species. As for the problems prevalent in hunter-dominated societies such as crimes, high divorce rate and environmental pollution, supporters of the hunter lifestyle argue that effective solutions for these and other problems will eventually be found through the rigorous application of reason and the scientific methods. The modern hunter believes in science, technology and market forces as the supreme sources of power which will bring about true salvation, and a real earthly Garden of Eden for all mankind, and if not immortality then a long, healthy, and happy life.

This optimism, however, is not shared by Eysenck (1973: 183) who believes that humankind “have muddled along for thousands of years without appreciably improving our ability to deal with human problems or social ones.” Kane (2010) blamed the current state of uncertainty and confusion in our societies on the different lifestyles and value systems. Dews (2008) believed that humans face a dilemma; they are conditioned by their good nature to adopt high moral values and act accordingly but at the same time fail to do so or break these values.

Are humans ready to take the bold step toward real freedom of choice? Irvine (2009) is pessimistic because most of humans in his view seek fortune and fame and if given the choice between these and peace of mind, they would choose the former. Could this vast majority of people be wrong? Majorities usually win elections and their decisions are legitimized

but they are not necessarily right always, Irvine argued. He cited thinkers and religious leaders who believed that those seeking fortune and fame have lost their sense of direction.

The evidence presented in this book so far indicate that our hunter-dominated and populated world is far from perfect. Our hunter aggressiveness, greed, and low empathy are directly or indirectly linked to various forms of human sufferings. It is responsible for the wars in the last century that killed and injured tens of millions of mainly European 'civilized' citizens. Overfed selfish hunters gave little or no help to the millions of starving people. Despite their power and material wealth, many of the well-known hunters of the past and present times reportedly led lives fraught with danger and fear and frequently ended tragically. How many of us would willingly exchange places with infamous hunters like Caligula, Henry VIII, Napoleon, Mussolini or Hitler or even with popular and much admired film actors or pop stars who died from a drug overdose. It appears to Bach and Torbet (1983: 42) that even those whom we envy for "having everything are tormented by the anguish and unhappiness suffered by the 'have-nots'. There are many people who seem to have it all -career, family, friends, recognition. They come to therapy seeking help: They cannot understand why they are depressed, why they feel like imposters, why they feel unfulfilled."

Despite its social and moral worthiness, our farmer side has been neglected or suppressed, and consequently full-fledged farmers are rare. Unlike the hunter, farmers prefer to regard others as associates and partners rather than competitors and rivals, and thus they are not

suspicious of them and of their motives and are unlikely to exploit or treat them unfairly. Farmers are, hence, expected to lead a highly peaceful and harmonious life with others, especially farmers like them.

Some maintain that human beings are born good and guiltless but social pressures corrupt our nature and as the following statement by Michelet (1864:121) morbidly suggests, our redemption can only occur in death:

When we regret our childhood, we do not so much regret the life and years that were there before us, as our nobleness. We had then that simple dignity of the being that has not yet bowed down- equality with all, all handsome; all were then young, all beautiful, all free. Let us be patient, it will return. Inequality is only for life; equality, liberty, nobleness, we recover all by death.

Farmers believe that human nature is essentially good, and that delinquency and perversion are the products of socialization and conditioning, but they disagree with Michelet in that this good nature can be preserved and acted upon in our lifetimes. Their survival despite adverse conditions throughout the ages is the living proof of this fundamental conviction.

While a change from a farmer to a hunter lifestyle is encouraged and rewarded by dominant hunters and their institutions, a shift in the opposite direction would be frowned upon. Why should anyone then choose the apparently undesirable farmer lifestyle?

The real question is actually: who is the real star, the farmer or the hunter? Some ancient nations believed that after death some persons were transformed by virtue of their glorious deeds into shining planets or stars. If this was true, a dead farmer should qualify for such an immortal honor while a hunter deserves to be turned into a black hole. These transformations are appropriate in view of their lifestyles on earth.

Like black holes, hunters attract all forms of energy, i.e. power, wealth and status, and everything that comes close to them and fall under their gravitational pull is sucked in. Hunter horde this energy and emit little or nothing of it to the outside world. In comparison, farmers can be likened to a star or a sun which radiates energy, light, and warmth to others. The superiority and advantages of a sun to a black hole are clear to all; if our sun becomes a black hole not only life on earth would end but also the earth itself would cease to exist.

The energy emanating from the farmer-sun takes the physical form of time, effort and energy expended as well as the emotional forms of care, love, compassion and sympathy for others. As in the case of a chemical reaction between molecules and atoms of different substances, this energy is necessary to create social bonds between human beings. However, if the person at the receiving end is a hunter, then all this energy beamed by the farmer will be absorbed without resulting in a bond, or it would be a one-sided bond or a short parasitic relationship. Of course, the result would be entirely different if this energy is reciprocated with a similar field of energy in nature and intensity from another farmer. In this case, little physical or emotional energy would be lost or absorbed and not reciprocated. It is

reasonable to hypothesize that many of the world's serious and chronic problems such as wars, poverty, malnutrition and crimes can be solved with this surplus energy floating among farmers. Before this can be achieved, more people must choose to become farmers.

Do we lose our individuality if we switch to the farmer lifestyle? The answer to this question becomes obvious once we deal with the more pertinent issue of whether our so-called individualism is real or is it just make-belief like many other things in the hunter world? Perelman (2005) offers us an answer; he calls equating individualism with greater freedom of choice a delusion. This delusion is propagated by the modern corporation. The corporation makes the major choices and leaves the individual with only the minor ones. Consequently, we imagine that we choose our political representatives, our clothes and food. The corporation can only achieve this by keeping us apart because if we forsake this illusory individualism and join forces together the corporation will lose much of its power over us. Clearly only the farmer in us can bring us together to achieve genuine freedom of choice.

On becoming a farmer

It is widely thought that only an extraordinary event or even a miracle can convince people to reconsider their lifestyles. This opinion is frequently repeated by persons tormented by their addiction to cigarettes, alcohol, drugs or food. According to Morse (1992: xi-xiii), only a close brush with death, a serious illness or accident would force us to 'see the light' and

rethink our ways of life. It certainly took a near death experience for one of his cases, a 62 year old businessman who survived a cardiac arrest, to arrive at the following farmer's beliefs: "One thing I learned when I died was that we are all part of one big, living universe. If we think we can hurt another person or another living thing without hurting ourselves, we are sadly mistaken" Similarly, after suffering loss of power and humiliation, King Lear developed genuine compassion for the plight of the poor and powerless and advised the wealthy and powerful to cure themselves by giving to the less fortunate.

For most of us, a personal crisis such as a serious illness may not occur before the twilight of our lives, and the change encouraged by it, if it happens, may be too little and too late. Every one of us who would like to become a farmer must first surmount the psychological walls or barriers that imprison us into our present lifestyles. The commitment and determination to go through with this change is a basic prerequisite for its success, and these must be strong enough to withstand the opposition and counter pressure from hunters all around us.

While this change is admittedly difficult, the process of change itself is not complicated. It does not require special training, attending seminars, watching video films, listening to tapes or reading manuals. Other farmers can be a source of valuable information and encouragement but in the final analysis anyone who has the strength of conviction and determination to go through this change can succeed without any external help.

Where do I begin? There is probably more than one way of doing this. Moses, Jesus and Muhammad retired to a secluded place at the top of a

mountain or inside a cave to meditate and come back with revelations, scriptures and commandment for their followers. Introspection is certainly useful because we are all part-farmers, and this could help us in discovering or rediscovering this neglected or suppressed side of us. We must of course learn to differentiate between the two voices inside us, i.e. the hunter and the farmer in order to encourage and express your farmer side.

The basic beliefs and attitude that distinguish the farmer and hunter lifestyle are summarized in Table (1).

Table 1

A Comparison between the basic beliefs of the hunter and the farmer

Hunter	Farmer
<p>1. Human nature is fixed</p> <p>2. Human beings are copies of a social master copy.</p> <p>3. Human beings have limited concerns and involvement.</p> <p>4. Others are competitors, rivals or accomplices.</p> <p>5. Human beings have gang memberships and loyalties.</p> <p>6. Morality is relative and dictated by powerful persons.</p>	<p>1. Human nature is developmental.</p> <p>2. Human beings must have original and authentic identities based on personal choices.</p> <p>3. Human beings should have wide concerns and total involvement.</p> <p>4. Others are associates or partners.</p> <p>5. Human beings must have a universal loyalty.</p> <p>6. Our moral and ethical principles such as the principle of justice must be immutable.</p>

--	--

A person who wishes to endorse the farmer lifestyle must consciously and intentionally abandon the hunter's beliefs and attitudes and adopt the farmer's corresponding beliefs and attitudes. To begin with, hunters believe that human nature is fixed, and that by natural or social design all persons are essentially selfish and seek to optimize their selfish interests. To become farmers, we must abandon this attitude in favor of the belief in the diversity of human nature including both selfishness and altruism and our capacity to change, improve and develop in accordance with our inner convictions. Farmers are realistically aware that all persons are the products of inner personal choice and external influences. Farmers follow their inner convictions even if they must pay a heavy price for doing so. They also believe in the essential goodness of human nature, although it can be corrupted by external influences. Since our hunter side is not something innate, those who follow the hunter lifestyle can change to bring out the farmer within themselves.

Second, we must develop our own original and authentic identities. As hunters, we believed that we are all copies of a master blueprint or image designed by our societies and cultures, and conformity to this image and following the paths laid down by powerful hunters is the best way for achieving success and happiness. Farmers oppose the view and warn, along with Bach and Torbet (1983;41) that "the price of conformity is high, because if we drift far from our true selves, if we give up too much, if we

grow to disdain those qualities that are unique to us, we lose ourselves completely". This warning becomes more persistent and terrifying when we read the following analysis by Lair (1977:77-78): "Sure Hitler led the killing of the Jews. But he and his regime needed the support of the good churchgoing Germans to do what he did." Farmers independence is also different from the kind which, according to Maccoby (1976), encourages Americans to be stubborn, suspicious and uncooperative. It is, however, a humanistic independence led by the counsel of conscience, as Ralph Waldo Emerson described it. This independence should also be free from the tyranny of the anonymous power of the market, success and public opinion. By rejecting being a copy and not caring for the approval of powers outside us, we seek our authentic identities as farmers and insist on being true to ourselves both privately and publicly.

Third, hunters are shortsighted persons who see more of the trees and less of the forest. When they look around them, they see other individuals who like themselves are preoccupied with their selfish pursuits. They have little regard for or interest in their community and its welfare, or only by as much as it influences their personal welfare. They justify this attitude by arguing that there are elected or appointed officials who are paid to look after communal affairs and welfare. This is unacceptable to farmers who insist on total involvement in public affairs. Without doubting the honesty and sincerity of public officials, farmers strongly maintain that whatever influences his community, society, and country will directly or indirectly, and sooner or later, impact the interests of each individual member, and it is, therefore, the duty of everyone to show active concern and

responsibility for the public good. In their view, an act of injustice does not only disrupt the life of the victim but also the totality of society and its institutions. It is interpreted by farmers as evidence of lack or ineffective preventive institutional and social measures. Also, farmers demonstrate this responsibility in taking an active concern in stopping pollution and their universal perspective on space and time sensitize them to its negative impacts on the environment and living things not only in the affected areas but the whole world, and not only in the present but also in the future.

Fourth, in order to become farmers, we must also change from viewing others as mainly competitors, rivals or accomplices to accepting them as associates and partners. Hunters trust in the market forces and thought it is natural and acceptable for some people to lose their jobs and suffer economic hardship while a successful corporate executive is paid millions of dollars in wages and benefits. And they showed little interest or sympathy to the plight of millions of poor people around the world who starve or die of lack of proper medical care because their earnings from the sale of their labor and raw materials are insufficient to pay for the food and medicine whose production and prices are dictated by developed nation. Hunters in rich developed countries would not be particularly annoyed by the fact that these countries which make up one fifth of the world population control or consume eighty percent of the world's resources - the US alone with only 4 percent of the world population possess 22 percent of the world wealth, a decline from a previous peak of over 40 percent. Farmer, on the other hand, would be painfully aware that while people in some counties died of obesity every day, elsewhere many may

be starving to death, regardless of whether those two occurrences are somehow related or not. The preventable death of a fellow human being is personally experienced and grieved by farmers as a sad, personal loss. It does not only lead them to reflect on the unsatisfactory human condition but also to become actively involved in preventing its reoccurrence by working for a charity or joining an anti-war group.

Such attitude and personal involvement in national and international problems may deprive farmers from enjoyment of the common selfish hunter joys. However, farmers derive their simple but profound satisfaction from this involvement and its positive results. The claim of some humanitarian aid workers that their greatest reward is the smile on the face of a hungry child after a full meal is not an exaggeration by overly sentimental individuals.

Fifth, those who wish to become farmers must replace their gang loyalty with universal loyalty. A gang loyalty is any kind of affiliation, identity or loyalty that falls short of a universal loyalty encompassing the whole human race. A gang loyalty is characteristic of hunters. In their childhood, hunters' loyalties are limited to their families and during their youth and adolescence, may extend to include friends, gangs and clubs. their loyalties and feeling of solidarity with their groups may be strong enough to impel him to harm or even kill rival group members and risk their lives and freedom in the process. As adults, hunters' loyalties may be based on ethnic origin, color of skin, race, sectarian affiliation, and religion. Although some of these affiliations may include hundreds of millions, they, nevertheless, exclude significant segments of humanity. Closed group

loyalties have been and remain a major cause of conflict, war, oppression and discrimination in many parts of the world. According to Hinde (2007), we are driven by our group loyalties that distinguish between the in-group and out-group to bend the rules sometimes. Also, hunters' readiness to cooperate is usually limited to their in-group and more specifically to those whom they are familiar with and can be sure of their adherence to the reciprocity norm. In contrast, farmers oppose such closed loyalties and insists on nothing less than universal human loyalty. The philosopher and Roman emperor Marcus Aurelius aptly expressed this view by stating: As Antonius my city and country is Rome but as a human my country is the whole world. This does not imply abandoning our cultural roots and farmers are keen to cherish them without being blindly biased or at the expense of high moral values.

Finally, hunters' relative moral code which can be selectively adjusted to suit their purposes is unacceptable to farmers who, instead, subscribe to a fixed, universal moral code. Like Gert (2005), farmers dispute the belief that there is no one universal moral code. This code lays down the rights and duties of all human beings regardless of color, creed or race such as the sanctity of human life, and the right of everyone to liberty and freedom of choice. This freedom of choice even recognizes the individual's right to choose his lifestyle, i.e. whether to become a hunter or a farmer. Farmers endorse and apply these principles willingly and without the fear or threat of institutions coercion.

Commitment to justice and fairness is the first principle in the farmer's moral and ethical code. Aristotle wrote in the *Nichomachean Ethics* that all

virtue is summed up in behaving justly. More recently, Rawls (1971) regarded justice as the primary virtue of social institutions and a prerequisite condition for human cooperation and welfare. Everyone has a sense of justice and therefore does not require training on how to behave justly toward others. This sense is developed from a person's first-hand experience of injustice or from empathy with victims of injustice. Injustice can be defined here as any act that deprives a person from basic rights or infringes upon them and usually evokes in them the feelings of being wronged. Such an act may vary from an offensive profanity to torture or killing of loved ones.

Farmers devote much time and attention to developing and sharpening their sense of justice. Before expressing a viewpoint or committing an act, farmers would carefully consider whether it involves an injustice to others or themselves. They are expected to refrain from any unjust act even if this involves a personal sacrifice.

Bach and Torbet (1983) considered alcoholism, drug addiction, sadomasochism, criminal behavior, psychosomatic illnesses, and suicide as acts of aggression against the self. Similarly, Fromm (1947) described all vices as 'self mutilation'. Hunters would probably agree with these views and thus regard smoking or substance abuse as harmful and even 'unjust' to the person committing these acts. In contrast, farmers would not only regard these acts as self-inflicted injustice but would be equally concerned with their impact on others. For example, farmers do not commit suicide not only because it contravenes their moral code but also because of its

tragic consequences for their families and communities. In contrast, hunters and their governments advocate legalizing assisted suicides.

This developed sense of justice in combination with total involvement and universal loyalty would impel farmers to insist on universal justice. They are not expected to automatically endorse their governments' foreign policies and actions and would not only disassociate themselves from an unjust act against a foreign government or nation but also exert whatever pressure at their disposal to dissuade policy makers.

Farmers must also take responsibility for previous acts of injustice and attempt to make amends by redressing these injustices. They also use the power of forgiveness to absolve those who wrong them. Through justice, atonement, forgiveness and other farmer virtues, the happy reconciliation which Michelet dreamt of can be achieved in this life.

Bibliography

- Abul Komsan, N., Shoukry, A., and Hassan, R.M. 2008. **Clouds in Egypt's Sky: Sexual Harassment From verbal Harassment to Rape, a Sociological Study**, Egyptian Center for Women's Rights (ECW).
- Abul Komsan, Nehad, ed. **Sexual Harassment in the Arab Region: Cultural Challenges and Legal Gaps, Findings from the Conference on Sexual Harassment as Social Violence, and its Effect on Women**. The Egyptian Center for Women's Rights.
- Adler, Alfred. 1979. *Superiority and Social Interest*. Toronto, Canada: W.W. Norton & Company.
- Adler, Alfred. 1937. **What Life Should Mean to You**. New York: Little, Brown and Company.
- Aladjem, Terry K. 2008. **The Culture of Vengeance and the Fate of American Justice**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Al-Atrushi, H. H., Al-Tawil, N. G., Shabila, N. P., and Al-Hadithi, T. S. 2013. Intimate partner violence against women in the Erbil city of the Kurdistan region, Iraq. **BMC Women's Health**, 13(37).
- Al-Helal, MD. Abdullah. 2013. Extra marital affair and family discord: Way-out in Islam. **International Journal of Islamic Thoughts**, 2: 35-44.
- Ali, Nujood and Minoui, Delphine. 2010. **I am Nujood Aged 10 and Divorced**. New York: Broadway Books.
- Almosaed, Nora. 2004. Violence against women: A cross-cultural perspective, **Journal of Muslim Affairs**, 24 (1).
- Al-Muharib, N. I. (2005). **Strict paternal upbringing and school environment and delinquency among intermediate and high school Saudi Arabian students**. Riyadh: King Saud University. (in Arabic).
- Al-Saif, M.I. (2005). **Working Paper Presented to the Seminar on Society and Security**. King Fahad Security College, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia (in Arabic).
- Alvard, Michael S. and Gillespie, Allen. 2004. Good Lamalera

- whale hunters accrue reproductive benefits, in Michael Alvard, ed. *Socioeconomic Aspects of Human Behavioral Ecology (Research in Economic Anthropology, Volume 23)* London: Emerald Group Publishing Limited, pp.225-247.
- Amato, P. R. 2001. Children of divorce in the 1990s: an update of the Amato and Keith (1991) meta-analysis. **Journal of Family Psychology**, 15(3):355-70.
- Andersen, Christopher. 1996. **Jack and Jackie: Portrait of an American Marriage**. New York: William Morrow and Company.
- Aronson, Elliot. 2007. **The Social Animal**. New York: Worth Publishers.
- Atkins, David C., Baucom, Donald H. and Jacobson, Neil S. 2001. Understanding infidelity: Correlates in a national random sample. **Journal of Family Psychology**, 15(4): 735-749.
- Axelrod, Robert. 1981 The emergence of cooperation among egoists. **The American Political Science Review**, 75(2): 306-318.
- Babiak, Paul and Hare, Robert D. 2007. **Snakes in Suits: When Psychopaths Go to Work**. New York: Harper Collins.
- Bach, George R. and Goldberg, Herb. 1974. **Creative Aggression**. New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc.
- Bach George R. and Torbet, Laura. 1983. **The Inner Enemy: How to Fight Fair with Yourself**. New York: Berkley Books.
- Bacon, Francis. 1908. **The Essays**. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.
- Barasch, D.P. 1980. Human reproductive strategies: A sociological overview, In J.S. Lockard, ed. **The Evolution of Human Social Behavior**. New York: Elsevier.
- Baughman, Holy M., Dearing, Sylvia, Giammarco, Erica, and Vernon, Philip A. 2012. Relationships between bullying behaviors and the Dark Triad: A study with adults. **Personality and Individual Differences**, 52: 571–575.
- Bateson, Patrick. 2000. The biological evolution of cooperation and Trust, In Gambetta, Diego, ed. **Trust: Making and Breaking Cooperative Relations**, electronic edition, Department of Sociology, University of Oxford, chapter 2, pp. 14-30.

- Batson, Daniel. 2011. **Altruism in Humans**. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Beck, Allen J., Kline, Susan A. and Greenfeld, Lawrence A. 1978. **Survey of Youth in Custody**. U.S. Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Becker, Gary S. 1991. **A Treatise on the Family**. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Benson, Mark J. and Buehler Cheryl. 2012. Family process and peer deviance influences on adolescent aggression: Longitudinal effects across early and middle adolescence. **Child Development**, 83(4): 1213–1228.
- Bentham, Jeremy. 1823. **Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation**. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Berenson, Alex and Pollack, Andrew. 2007. Doctors reap millions for anemia drugs. **New York Times**, May 2nd.
- Blackburn, Simon. 2001. **Ethics: A Very Short Introduction**. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Boak, Arthur E. R., and Sinnigen, William G. 1969. **A History of Rome to AD 565**. London: The MacMillan Company.
- Bobbi S. Low. 2000. **Why Sex Matters: A Darwinian Look at Human Behavior**. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Bogus, Carl T. 1996. The death of an honorable profession. **Indiana Law Journal**. 71(4): 910-947.
- Botting, Ellen H. 2006. **Family Feuds: Wollstonecraft, Burke, and Rousseau on the Transformation of the Family**. New York: State University of New York Press.
- Bowers, William J. 1964. **Student Dishonesty and its Control in College**. New York: Bureau of Applied Social Research, Columbia University.
- Boyce, W. Thomas and Ellis, Bruce E. 2005. Biological sensitivity to context: I. An evolutionary–developmental theory of the origins and functions of stress reactivity. **Development and Psychopathology**, 17: 271–30.
- Budinsk, Ronald A., and Trovato, Frank. 2005. The effect of premarital cohabitation on marital stability over the duration of marriage. **Canadian Studies in Population**, 32(1): 69-95.
- Burger, Warren. 1995. The decline of professionalism. **Fordham**

- Law Review**, 63(4): 949-958.
- Burke, Edmund. 1990. **Miscellaneous Writings**. Indianapolis: Liberty Fund, Inc.
- Bushman, Bard J. and Baumeister, Roy F. 1998. Threatened egotism, narcissism, self-esteem, and direct and displaced aggression: Does self-love or self-hate lead to violence? **Journal of Personality and Social Psychology**, 17(1): 219-229.
- Buss, David M., and Schmitt, D.P. 1993. Sexual strategies theory: An evolutionary perspective on human mating. **Psychological Review**, 100: 204-232.
- Buss, David M. and Shackelford, Todd K. 1997. Susceptibility to infidelity in the first year of marriage. **Journal of Research in Personality**, 31: 193–221.
- Buss, David M. 2006. Strategies of human mating. **Psychological Topics**, 15 (2): 239-260
- Buss, David M. and Shackelford, Todd K. 2008. Attractive women want it all: Good genes, economic investment, parenting proclivities, and emotional commitment. **Evolutionary Psychology**, 6(1):134-146.
- Campbell, W. Keith. 1999. Narcissism and romantic attraction. **Journal of Personality and Social Psychology**, 77(6): 1254-1270.
- Carcopino, Jerome. 2003. **Daily Life in Ancient Rome: The People and the City at the Height of the Empire**. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Carr, Alan. 2006. **Family Therapy: Concepts, Process and Practice**. 2nd ed. NY: John Wiley.
- Cartledge, Paul (2002), **Sparta and Lakonia: A Regional History 1300 to 362 BC**. 2nd. Ed., Oxford: Routledge.
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. 2014. **Youth Risk Behavior Survey Data – United States, 2013**. Surveillance Summaries, vol. 63, no.4.
- Childe, Gordon. 1942. **What Happened in History**. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Books.
- Clagnon, Napoleon A. 1983. **Yanomamo: The Fierce People**. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.
- Clatterbaug, Kenneth.1990. **Contemporary Perspectives on**

- Masculinity.** Boulder, Col.: Westview Press.
- Collins, Randall and Makowsky, Michael.1984. **The Discovery of Society.** 3rd Ed. New York: Random House.
- Collins, Randall. 1975. **Conflict Sociology: Toward an Exploratory Science.** New York: Academic Press.
- Comte, August. 2009. **The Positive Philosophy of August Comte.** London: Cambridge University Press.
- Conn, J.M, Annest, J.L., Gilchrist, J. and Ryan, G.W. 2004. Injuries from paintball game related activities in the United States, 1997-2001. **Injury Prevention: Journal of the International Society for Child and Adolescent Injury Prevention**, 10: 139-143.
- Corvisier, Andre.1979. **Armies and Societies in Europe: 1494-1789.** Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Coward, Howard. 2008. **The Perfectibility of Human Nature in Eastern and Western Thought.** New York: State University of New York Press.
- Dalal, K., Lawoko, S. and Jansson, B. 2010. The relationship between intimate partner violence and maternal practices to correct child behavior: a study on women in Egypt. **Journal of Injury and Violence Research**, 2(1):25–33.
- Daly, Martin and Wilson, Margo.1990. Killing the competition. **Human Nature**, 1(1): 81-107.
- Dawkins, Judith. 1995. Bullying in schools: Doctors' responsibilities. **British Medical Journal**, 30 (6975): 275-276.
- Dawkins, Richard.1989. **The Selfish Gene.** Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- De Angelis, Barbara. 1992. **Are You the One for Me? Knowing Who's Right and Avoiding Who's Wrong.** New York: Island Books.
- De Koning, Anouk. (2009). **Global Dreams: Class, Gender and Public Space in Cosmopolitan Cairo.** Cairo: The American University of Cairo Press.
- Dershowitz, Alan M. 1992. **Contrary to Popular Opinion.** New York: Pharos Book.
- Desmond, Morris. 1962. **The Naked Ape.** New York: McGraw Hill.

- Dews, Peter. 2008. **The Idea of Evil**. MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Dion, K. K., Berscheid, E., and Walster, E. 1972. What is beautiful is good. **Journal of Personality and Social Psychology**, 24:285-290.
- Docker, John. 2008. **The Origins of Violence: Religion, History and Genocide**. London: Pluto.
- Durkheim, Emile. 2009. **Socialism and Saint-Simon**. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd.
- Dutton, Donald G. 2007. **The Psychology of Genocide, Massacres, and Extreme Violence: Why “Normal” People Come to Commit Atrocities**. London: Praeger Security International.
- Dwairy, Marwan and Achoui, Mustafa. 2006. Introduction to three cross-regional research studies on parenting styles: Individuation, and mental health in Arab societies. **Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology**, 37(3):1-9.
- Eastman, Lloyd E. 1988. **Family, Fields and Ancestors**. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Ebrahim, S. 2000. Do not resuscitate decisions: flogging dead horses or a dignified death? Resuscitation should not be withheld from elderly people without discussion. **British Medical Journal**, 320(7243), 1155–1156.
- Eron, Leonard D., Walder, Leopold O., Togo, R. and Lafowitz, Monroe M. 1970. “Social class, parental punishment for aggression and child aggression,” In Thomas D. Spencer and Norman Kass, eds. **Perspectives in Child Psychology: Research and Review**. New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, pp. 250-259.
- Evans, G. W. and Wachs, T. D. 2010. **Chaos and its influence on children’s development**. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Eysenck, Hans J. 1973. **The Inequality of Man**. Glasgow: William Collins.
- Fanelli, Daniele. 2009. How many scientists fabricate and falsify research? A systematic review and meta-analysis of survey data. **PLOS ONE**, 4(5).
- Fang, Ferric C. and Casadeval, Arturo. 2013. Why we cheat?

- Scientific American Mind**. May-June, 31-37.
- Ferrill, Arther. 1997. **The Origins of War: From the Stone Age to Alexander the Great**. Colorado: Westview Press.
- Firestone, Shulamith. 1984. "Love: A Feminist Critique," In Robert Baker and Frederick Elliston ed. **Philosophy and Sex**. New York: Prometheus Books.
- Fourier, Charles. 1971. **Design for Utopia: Selected Writings of Charles Fourier**. New York: Schocken Books.
- Fishbein, Diana H.1992. The psychology of female aggression. **Criminal Justice and Behavior**, 19 (2):99-126.
- Freud, Sigmund. 1959. **Collected Papers of Sigmund Freud**. New York: Basic Books.
- Friedrichs, David O. 2010. **Trusted Criminals: White Collar Crime in Contemporary Society**, 4th ed. Belmont, California: Wadsworth
- Fromm, Eric.1947. **Man for Himself: An Inquiry into the Psychology of Ethics**. New York: Holt Rinehart and Winston.
- Fromm, Eric.1956. **The Art of Loving**. New York: Harper & Row.
- Fukuyama, Francis. 1999. **The Great Disruption: Human Nature and the Reconstitution of Social Order**. New York: The Free Press.
- Gaertner, L., Iuzzini, J., and O'Mara, E. M. 2008. When rejection by one fosters aggression against many: Multiple-victim aggression as a consequence of social rejection and perceived groupness. **Journal of Experimental Social Psychology**, 44(4): 958–970.
- Gat, Azar.2006. **War in Human Civilization**. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Geis, Gilbert. 2011. **White Collar and Corporate Crime: A Documentary and Reference Guide**. Santa Barbara, California: Greenwood.
- Gert, Bernard. 2005. **Morality: Its Nature and Justification**. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gil, Eliana. 1983. **Outgrowing the Pain: A Book for and about Adults Abused as Children**. New York: Dell Publishing.
- Gilder, George.1973. **Sexual Suicide**. New York: Bantam Books.
- Gilder, George.1986. The princess problem. **National Review**,

- February 27:28-32.
- Glover, Robert A. 2001. **No More Mr. Nice Guy! A Proven Plan for Getting What You Want in Love, Sex and Life.** Barnes and Noble Digital.
- Godwin, William. 1793. **Enquiry Concerning Political Justice and Its Influence on Morals and Happiness.** London: G. G. J. and J. Robinson. Goldberg, Carl.1996. The demonic development of the malevolent personality. **Journal of Humanistic Psychology**, 35(3); 7-36.
- Goldhagen, Daniel J.1997. **Hitler's Willing Executioners: Ordinary Germans and the Holocaust.** New York: Random House
- Goleman, Daniel.1994. **Emotional Intelligence.** New York: Bantam Books.
- Goulter, Barbara and Minninger, Joan.1993. **The Father-Daughter Dance.** New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons.
- Greene, Robert. 2000. **The 48 Laws of Power.** London: Profile Books.
- Greenwald, Jerry.1973. **Be the Person You Were Meant to be.** New York: A Dell Book.
- Grossman, Brian A.1988. **Corporate Loyalty: A Trust Betrayed.** Markham, Ontario, Canada: Viking.
- Hammond, Ross A. and Axelrod, Robert. 2006. The evolution of ethnocentrism. **The Journal of Conflict Resolution**, 50(6): 926-936.
- Hansson, R.O, O'Conner, Jones, W.H. and Blocker, T.J. 1981. Maternal employment and adolescent sexual behavior. **Journal of Youth and Adolescence**, 10:55-60.
- Hardin, Garrett.1968. The tragedy of the commons. **Science**, 162:1243-1248.
- Harris, Marvin. 1977. **Cannibals and Kings: The Origins of Culture.** New York: Vintage Books.
- Hartley, Richard D. 2008. **Corporate Crime: A Reference Handbook.** Santa Barbara, California: ABC-CLIO Inc.
- Hegel, Georg. 2001. **Philosophy of Right.** Kitchener, Ontario: Batoche Books.
- Hendrick, Clyde and Hendrick, Susan. 1986. A theory and

- method of love. **Journal of Personality and Social Psychology**, 50(2): 392-402.
- Herbert, Frank. 1964. **Dune**. New York: Berkley Books.
- Herlihy, David. 1970. **The History of Feudalism**. London: Humanities Press.
- Hinde, Robert A. 2007. **Morality in the Modern World: From Relationships to Politics and War**. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hirschborn, L. and Gilmore T.N. 1989. The psychodynamics of a cultural change: Learning from a factory. **Human Resources Management**, 28:211-233.
- Hirst, Margaret E. 1923. **The Quakers in Peace and War**. London: The Swarthmore Press.
- Hobbes, Thomas. 2012. **Leviathan**. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hogan, Neal C. 2003. **Unhealed Wounds: Medical Malpractice in the Twentieth Century**. New York: LFB Scholarly Publishing LLC.
- Holt-Lunstad J, Smith T. B., and Layton B. 2010. Social relationships and mortality risk: A meta-analytic review. **Public Library of Science Medicine**, 7(7).
- Hospers, John. 1982. **Human Conduct: Problems of Ethics**. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovonovich, Inc.
- Hume, David. 1960. **Treatise of Human Nature**. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ibn Khaldun, (2000). **al-Mukadima** (The Introduction). Beirut: Dar al-Kutub al-Ilmiyah. (in Arabic).
- Ibn Muskawiah, A.M. (2011). **Tahtheeb al-Akhlaq wa Tatheer al-A'raq** (Refinement of Ethics and Purifications of Roots). Baghdad: Dar al-Jamal. (in Arabic).
- Ignatieff, Michael. 1984. **The Needs of Strangers**. New York: Viking.
- Irvine, William B. 2009. **A Guide to the Good Life: The Ancient Art of Stoic Joy**. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Irwin, Robert. 2004. "Futuwwa": Chivalry and gangsterism in Medieval Cairo. **Muqarnas**, 21:161-170
- Johnson, Dominic and Bering, Jesse. 2006. Hand of God, mind

- of man: Punishment and cognition in the evolution of cooperation. **Evolutionary Psychology**, 4: 219-233.
- Jonason, Peter K. and Kavanagh, Philip. 2010. The dark side of love: Love styles and the Dark Triad. **Personality and Individual Differences**, 49: 606–610.
- Jonason, Peter K., Valentine, Katherine A., Li, Norman P. and Harbeson, Carmelita L. 2011. Mate-selection and the Dark Triad: Facilitating a short-term mating strategy and creating a volatile environment. **Personality and Individual Differences** 51: 759–763.
- Jonason, Peter K. Slomski, Sarah, and Partyka, Jamie. 2012. The Dark Triad at work: How toxic employees get their way. **Personality and Individual Differences**, 52: 449–453.
- Jonason, Peter K. Webster, Gregory D., Crysel, Laura, Schmitt, David P., and Li, Norman P. 2012. The antihero in popular culture: Life history theory and the Dark Triad personality traits. **Review of General Psychology**, 16(2): 192–199.
- Jung, Carl G. 1977. **Two Essays on Analytical Psychology**. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Kahn, Herman and Wiener, Anthony J. 1967. **The Year 2000: A Framework for Speculation on the Next Thirty-Three Years**. New York: MacMillan.
- Kaiser, Robert G. 1976. **Russia: The People and the Power**. New York: Atheneum.
- Kant, Immanuel. **Principles of Politics**. Edinburgh: Clark.
- Kane, Robert. 2010. **Ethics and the Quest of Wisdom**. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Kaplan, Paul S. 1986. **A Child's Odyssey: Child and Adolescent Development**. New York: West Publishing Company.
- Kazez, Jean. 2007. **The Weight of Things: Philosophy and the Good Life**. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Keal, Paul. 2003 **European Conquest and the Rights of Indigenous Peoples: The Moral Backwardness of International Society**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Keeley, L. H. 1996. **War before Civilization**. New York: Oxford University Press.

- Keynes, John Maynard. 1963. **Essays in Persuasion**. New York: W.W. Norton and Company.
- Khallad, Yacoub. 2005. Mate selection in Jordan: Effects of sex, socioeconomic status, and culture. **Journal of Social and Personal Relationships**, 22(2): 155–168.
- Kilday, Anne-Marie. 2013. **A History of Infanticide in Britain c. 1600 to the Present**. Hampshire, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kilduff, Martin and Day, David. 1994. Do chameleons get ahead? The effects of self-monitoring on managerial careers. **Academy of Management Journal**, 37: 1047-1060.
- Klasgbrun, Francine. 1985. **Married People: Staying Together in the Age of Divorce**. New York: Bantam Books.
- Klose Donald A. (1995). M. Scott Peck's Analysis of human evil: A Critical Review. **Journal of Humanistic Psychology**, 35 (3): 37-66.
- Kluckhohn, Clyde. 1949. **Mirror for Man**. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co.
- Kohn, George C. 1986. **Dictionary of Wars**. New York: Facts on File Publications.
- Korda, Michael. 1975. **Power, How to Get it, How to Use it**. New York: Random House.
- Kropotkin, Peter. 1972. **Mutual Aid: A Factor of Evolution**. New York: University Press.
- Lakoff, Robin T. 1990. **Talking Power: The Politics of Language in Our Lives**. New York: Basic Books.
- Lair, Jess. 1977. **Ain't I a Wonder and Ain't You a Wonder Too: Winning Freedom through Acceptance**. New York: Fawcett Crest.
- Langlois, J. H. Kalakanis, L., Rubenstein, A. J., Larson, A., Monica H., and Smoot, M. 2000. Maxims or myths of beauty? A meta-analytic and theoretical review. **Psychological Bulletin**, 126(3):390-423.
- Leape, Lucian L. 1994. Error in medicine. **The Journal of the American Medical Association**, 272(23): 1851-7.
- Leary, M. R., Kowalski, R. M., Smith L., and Phillips, S. 2003. Teasing, rejection, and violence: Case studies of the school shootings. **Aggressive Behavior**, 29:202–214.

- LeBlanc, S. A., & Register, K. E. (2003). **Constant Battles: The Myth of the Peaceful, Noble Savage**. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Lee, John. A. (1976). **Lovestyles**. Abacus.
- Leinberger, Paul and Tucker, Bruce. 1991. **The New Individuals: The Generation after the Organization Man**. New York: Harper Collins.
- Lenski, G. E. and Lenski, J.1978. **Human Societies: An Introduction to Macrosociology**, 3rd ed., New York: McGraw Hill.
- Lerner, Harriet. 1985. **The Dance of Anger**. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers.
- Lerner, Harriet.1989. **The Dance of Intimacy: A Woman's Guide to Courageous Acts of Change in Key Relationships**. New York: Harper Collins.
- Locke, John. 1988. **Essays on the Law of Nature**. London: Clarendon Press.
- Long, William J. and Brecke, Peter. 2003. **War and Reconciliation Reason and Emotion in Conflict Resolution**. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.
- Lopreato, Joseph.1984. **Human Nature and Biocultural Evolution**. Boston: Allen and Unwin.
- Lorenz, Konrad.1966. **On Aggression**. London: Methuen.
- Maccoby, Michael.1976. **The Gamesman: The New Corporate Leader**. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Machiavelli, Niccolò. 1992. **The Prince**. New York: Dover Publications.
- MacNeesh, Richard S. 1992. **The Origins of Agriculture and Settled Life**. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Makary MA, Daniel M. 2016. Medical error-the third leading cause of death in the US after heart disease and cancer. **British Medical Journal**: 353: i2139.)
- Malthus, Thomas. 1798. **An Essay on the Principle of Population**. London: J. Johnson.
- Mannheim, Karl. 1954. **Ideology and Utopia: An Introduction to the Sociology of Knowledge**. London: Harcourt, Brace and Company Inc.

- Marcus, Rebecca B. 1980. **Survivors of the Stone Age: Nine Primitive Tribes Today**. New York: Hastings House.
- Marcuse, Herbert. 1964. **One-Dimensional Man**. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Martinson, Brian C., Melissa S. Anderson, and De Vries, Raymond. 2005. Scientists behaving badly. **Nature**, 435:737–738.
- Marx, Karl. 1904. **A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy**. Chicago: Charles H. Kerr and Company.
- Maslow, Abraham. 1943. A Theory of human motivation. **Psychological Review**, 50 (4) 370–96.
- Maslow, Abraham. 1965. **Eupsychian Management: A Journal**. Homewood, Ill.: Richard D. Irwin, Inc.
- Mayo, Elton. 1960. **The Human Problems of an Industrial Civilization**. New York: Viking Press.
- Maziak W. and Asfar, T. 2003. Physical abuse in low-income women in Aleppo, Syria. **Health Care Women International**. 24(4):313-26
- McCabe, D. L., and Trevino, L. K. 1993. Academic dishonesty: Honor codes and other contextual influences. **Journal of Higher Education**, 64(5): 522–538.
- McCabe, Donald L., Butterfield, Kenneth D. and Trevino, Linda K. 2006. Academic dishonesty in graduate business programs: Prevalence, causes, and proposed action. **Academy of Management Learning and Education**, 5(3): 294–305.
- McGregor, Douglas. 1960. **The Human Side of Enterprise**. New York: McGraw Hill.
- McRae, Hamish. 1995. **The World in 2020: Power, Culture and Prosperity**. Cambridge, Mass.: the Harvard Business School.
- Menotti, Gian Carlo. 1953. A plea for the creative artist. In Fernando Puma, ed. **The 7 Arts**. New York: Doubleday, pp. 39-40.
- McClelland, David C. 1975. **Power: The Inner Experience**. New York: Irvington Publishers.
- McLanahan, Sara, and Sandefur, Gary. 1994. **Growing Up with a Single Parent: What Hurts, What Helps**. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

- Mead, Margaret. 1970. **Culture and Commitment**. New York: The American Museum of Natural History.
- Mesquida, Christian G. and Wiener, Neil I. 1999. Male age composition and severity of conflict. **Politics and the Life Sciences**, 18(2), 181-189.
- Michelet, Jules. 1846. **The People**. New York: D. Appleton and Company.
- Milgram, S. 1963. Behavioral study of obedience. **Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology**, 67(4): 371-378.
- Miller A. 1990. **For Your Own Good: Hidden Cruelty in Child-Rearing and the Roots of Violence**. New York: The Noonday Press.
- Mills, John Stuart. 1929. **Principles of Political Economy**. London: Longman.
- Milner, Larry S. 2000. **Hardness of Heart/Hardness of Life: The Stain of Human Infanticide**. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
- Milton-Edwards, Beverly. 2006 . **Islam and Violence in the Modern Era**. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Mohsin, Mohammed and Bauman, Adrian E. 2015. Socio-demographic factors associated with smoking and smoking cessation among 426,344 pregnant women in New South Wales, Australia. **BMC Public Health**, 5(2005): 138. PMC. Web.
- Mokhiber, Russell. 1988. **Corporate Crime and Violence: Big Business Power and the Abuse of the Public Trust**. San Francisco: Sierra Club Books.
- Monastersky, Richard. 2002. Atomic lies: How one physicist may have cheated in the race to find new elements. **The Chronicle of Higher Education**, August 16.
- Montaigne, Michael de. 1877. **Essays of Michael de Montaigne**. London: Reeves and Turner.
- Morgenthau, Hans. 1946. **Scientific Man versus Power Politics**. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Morris, Desmond. 2010. **The Naked Ape: A Zoologist's Study of the Human Animal**. New York: Random House.
- Morse, Melvin. 1992. **Transformed by the Light: The Powerful**

- Effect of Near-Death Experiences on People's Lives.** New York: Villard Books.
- Mumford, Lewis.1961. **The City in History: Its Origins, its Transformation and its Prospects.** New York: Harcourt, Bruce and Word Inc.
- Mundy, Alicia. 2001. **Dispensing with the Truth: The Victims, the Drug Companies, and the Dramatic Story Behind the Battle over Fen-Phen.** New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Nader, Ralph. 1965. **Unsafe at any Speed: The Designed-In Dangers of the American Automobile.** New York: Grossman Publishers.
- Nelson, Phillip J. and Greene, Kenneth V. 2003. **Signaling Goodness: Social Rules and Public Choice.** Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich W. 1967.**Thus Spoke Zarathustra.** New York: The Heritage Press.
- Nogales, Anna and Bellotti, Laura G. 2009. Parents Who Cheat: How Children and Adults Are Affected When Their Parents Are Unfaithful.** Deerfield Beach, Florida: Health Communications, Incorporated.
- Null, Gary, Dean, Carolyn, Feldman, Martin and Rasio, Debra. 2005. Death by Medicine. **Journal of Orthomolecular Medicine**, 20(1): 21-34.
- Nye, Ivan and Hoffman, Lois. 1963. **The Employed Mother in America.** Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Oakley, Barbara. 2008. **Evil Genes: Why Rome Fell, Hitler Rose, Enron Failed, and My Sister Stole My Mother's Boyfriend.** New York: Prometheus Books.
- Oliner, S.P. and Oliner, P.M.1988. **The Altruistic Personality.** New York: The Free Press.
- Olive, David. 1987. **Just Rewards: The Case for Ethical Business.** Toronto, Ontario: Key Porter Books.
- Ornstein, Robert and Ehrlich, Paul.1989. **New World, New Mind: Changing the Way We Think to Save Our Future.** London: Methuen.
- Paine, Thomas. 2011. **The Age of Reason.** Peterborough: Broadview Press.

- Pareto, Vilfredo. 1935. **The Mind and Society**. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company.
- Peck, Morgan S. 1983. **People of the Lie**. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Perelman, Michael. 2005. **Manufacturing Discontent: The Trap of Individualism in Corporate Society**. London: Pluto Press.
- Pfeiffer, John E. 1972. **The Emergence of Man**. New York: Harper and Row.
- Plamentaz, John. 1992. **Man and Society**. London: Longman.
- Platek, Steven M. and Shackelford, Todd K. 2006. **Female Infidelity and Paternal Uncertainty: Evolutionary Perspectives on Male Anti-Cuckoldry Tactics**. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Pope, Alexander. 1881. **An Essay on Man**. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Prinstein, M. J., and Cillessen, A. H. N. (2003). Forms and functions of adolescent peer aggression associated with high levels of peer status. **Merrill-Palmer Quarterly**, 49: 310–342.
- Prinz, Jesse J. 2007. **The Emotional Construction of Morals**. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Proudhon, Pierre J. 1840. **What is Property? An Inquiry into the Principle of Right and of Government**. New York: Humboldt Publishing Co.
- Rawls, John. 1971. **A Theory of Justice**. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Reade, Winwood. 1945. **The Martyrdom of Man**. London: Watt & Co.
- Reich, Charles A. 1970. **The Greening of America**. New York: Bantam Books.
- Reiser, Paul 1994. **Couplehood**. New York: Bantam Dell Publication Group.
- Renton, David, Seddon, David and Zeilig, Leo. 2007. **The Congo: Plunder and Resistance**. London and New York: Zed Books.
- Rhodes, R. and Strain, J. J. 2004. Whistleblowing in academic medicine. **Journal of Medical Ethics**, 30:35–39.
- Ricardo, David. 2005. **The Works and Correspondence of David Ricardo**. Indianapolis: Liberty Fund.
- Richerson, Peter J., Collins, Dwight and Genet, Russell M. 2006.

- Why managers need an evolutionary theory of organizations. **Strategic Organization**, Vol. 4(2): 201–211.
- Riesman, David. 1950. **The Lonely Crowd: A Study of the Changing American Character**. New haven and London: Yale University Press.
- Ringer, Robert J. 1977. **Looking Out for Number One**. New York: Funk and Wagnalis.
- Robarchek, Clayton A. and Robarchek, Carole J. 1998. Reciprocities and realities: World views, peacefulness, and violence among Semai and Waorani. **Aggressive Behavior**, 24:123-133.
- Roberts, Wess.1991. **Straight A's Never Made Anybody Rich**. New York: Harper Collins Publishers.
- Robin, Baker R. and Bellis, Mark A. 1995. **Human sperm competition: Copulation, masturbation, and infidelity**. London: Chapman and Hall.
- Rodkin, Philip C., Farmer, Thomas W., Pearl, R. and Acker R.V. (2000) Heterogeneity of popular boys: Antisocial and prosocial configurations, **Developmental Psychology**, 36(1): 14-24.
- Rousseau, Jean Jacques. 1762. **Emile**. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Books.
- Rousseau, Jean Jacques. 1762. **The Social Contract**. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Books.
- Roux, George.1964. **Ancient Iraq**. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Books.
- Roy, Benjamin. 1995. The Tuskegee syphilis experiment: biotechnology and the administrative state. **Journal of the National Medical Association**, 87(1): 56-67.
- Saint Augustine, 1909. **The City of God**. Edinburgh: John Grant.
- Saint Simon, Henri de. 1975. **Selected Writings on Science, Industry and Social Organization**. London: Croom Helm.
- T.T, Storms L. H.1992. Impact of height and weight on life span. **Bulletin of the World Health Organization**,70(2):259-267.
- Sartre, Jean-Paul. 2004. **Critique of Dialectical Reason**. New York: Verso.
- Sayer, Liana C., England, Paula, Allison, Paul and Kangas, Nicole.

2011. She left, he left: How employment and satisfaction affect men's and women's decisions to leave marriages. **American Journal of Sociology**, 116(6): 1982–2018.
- Schur, Edwin M. 1973. **Radical Non-Intervention: Rethinking the Delinquency Problem**. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, Inc.
- Sedgwick, John. 1985. **Rich Kids**. New York: Morrow.
- Serran, Geris and Firestone, Philip. 2004. Intimate partner homicide: A review of the male proprietariness and the self-defense theories. **Aggression and Violent Behavior**, 9(1): 1-15.
- Sheridan, Lorraine, North, Adrian, Maltby, John and Gillett, Raphael. 2007. Celebrity worship, addiction and criminality. **Psychology, Crime and Law**, 13(6): 559-571.
- Sherif, M., Harvey, O.J, White B. J., Hood W. R., and Sherif, C.W. 1961. **Intergroup Conflict and Cooperation: The Robbers Cave Experiment**. Oklahoma: University Book Exchange.
- Sloan, Frank A. and Chepke, Lindsey M. 2008. **Medical Malpractice**. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press.
- Somach, Susan D. and Abou Zeid, Gihan. 2009. **Egypt Violence against Women Study: Literature Review of Violence against Women**. USAID.
- Sonn, Richard D. 2010. **Sex, Violence, and the Avant-Garde Anarchism in Interwar France**. Pennsylvania: The Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Spencer, Herbert. 2003. **Social Statics**. Hawaii: University Press of the Pacific.
- Spencer, Herbert. 1864. **The Principles of Biology**. London: Williams and Norgate.
- Spinoza, Benedict. 2002. **Complete Works**. Cambridge, Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company, Inc.
- Smith, Adam. 1776. **The Wealth of Nations**. London: W. Strahan and T. Cadell.
- Smith, Denise. 1981. **Mussolini**. London: Weidenfeld.
- Smith, Whitney I. 1993. A survey of the nature and extent of bullying in junior/middle and secondary schools. **Educational Research**, 35; 3-5.

- Stahel P.F. 2015. NASA's proven safety culture paradigm. **Safe Care**: 4:54–57.
- Stewart, Frank H. 1994. **Honor**. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Suetonius. 1931. **The Lives of the Twelve Caesars**. New York: Modern Library.
- Sumner, William G. 1876. **The Forgotten Man and Other Essays**. Online Library of Liberty Fund.
- Sumner, William G. 1992. **On Liberty, Society and Politics: The Essential Essays of William Graham Sumner**. Indianapolis: Liberty Fund.
- Sussman, Robert W. and Cloninger, Robert C. Eds. 2011. **Origins of Altruism and Cooperation**. New York: Springer.
- Taylor, A.J. P.1945. **The Course of German History: A Survey of the Development of German History since 1815**. London: Hamish Hamilton.
- Thomas, Hugh. 1979. **An Unfinished History of the World**. London: Hamish Hamilton.
- Thompson, Allan. 2000. Haunted by Rwanda. **The Toronto Star**.
- Tiger, Lionel and Fox, Robin.1971. **The Imperial Animal**. New York: Henry Holt and Company.
- Tobias, Carmelita R., Pary, Raymond and Lippmann, Steven. 1992. Preventing suicide in older people. **American Family Physician**, 45(4):1707-1713.
- Tolstoy, Leo. 1894. **The Kingdom of God is Within You**. New York: Cassell Publishing.
- Toynbee, Arnold.1947. **A Study of History**. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Trueman, John H. and Trueman, Dawn C. 1982. **The Enduring Past: Earliest Times to the Twentieth Century**. Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson Limited.
- Twenge, Jean M., Konrath, Sara, Foster, Joshua D., Campbell, W. Keith and Bushman, Brad J. 2008. Egos inflating over time: A cross-temporal meta-analysis of the narcissistic personality inventory. **Journal of Personality**. 76(4): 875-901.
- Vangelisti, Anita L. and Perlman, Daniel. 2006. Personal relationships: An introduction, In Vangelisti, Anita L. and

- Perlman, Daniel. Eds. **The Cambridge Handbook of Personal Relationships**. New York: Cambridge University Press, pp.1-7.
- Viano, Emilio C. and Cohn, Alvin W.1975. **Social Problems and Criminal Justice**. Chicago: Nelson-Hall.
- Von Furer-Heimendorf, Christoph. 1967. **Morals and Merit: A Study of Values and Social Controls in South Asian Societies**. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson.
- Washburn, Jennifer. 2005. **University Inc.: The Corporate Corruption of Higher Education**. New York: Basic Books.
- Weber, Max. 1964. **The Theory of Social and Economic Organization**. New York: The Free Press.
- Weber, Max. 1978. **Economy and Society**. Berkeley: University of California Press, Ltd.
- Webber, Marlene. 1991. **Street Kids: The Tragedy of Canada's Runaways**. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- White, Ronald C. Jr. and Hopkins, C. Howard. 1976. **The Social Gospel: Religion and Reform in Changing America**. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Wiener, Martin J. 2004. **Men of Blood Violence, Manliness and Criminal Justice in Victorian England**. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Wilson, James Q.1993. **The Moral Sense**. New York: The Free Press.
- Wrangham, Richard; Dale Peterson (1996). **Demonic Males: Apes and the Origins of Human Violence**. Houghton Mifflin.
- Wright, Robert.1994. **The Moral Animal**. New York: Vintage Books.
- Yussen, Steven R. and Santrock, John W.1978. **Child Development: An Introduction**. Dubuque, Iowa: W.C. Brown Co.
- Yutang, Lin. 1937. **The Importance of Living**. New York: The John Day Company.
- Zarnaghash, Maryam, Goodarzi, Mohammad Ali and Mohseni, Meisam.2010. Comparing the perceptions of Heroin-abusers and non- abusers from their parental discipline. **Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences**, 5: 74–77
- Zizek, Slavoj. 2008. **Violence: Six Sideways Reflections**. New

York: Picador.