

**Introduction for
Are We Hardwired for War Program**

<http://www.atriumsoc.org/causes-of-war.php>

**What Created this Battle in my Brain?
A Genetically Maladapted Instinctive Reaction for Survival?**

“Most honest combat vets will tell you, perhaps not eloquently but in their own way, the same thing: essentially that combat is in our human DNA and demands to be exercised...The question is, can we humans evolve peacefully, or will we succumb to instincts we can't transcend?”

– Quote from former Marine Corp helicopter pilot in Vietnam

Do we need to have an enemy to feel safe, to feel secure – to survive?

Instinct Theory states that motivation is the result of biological, genetic programming. Thus, all beings within a species are programmed for the same motivations. At the heart of this perspective is the motivation to survive — we are biologically programmed to survive. And, all of our behaviors and motivations stem from biological programming. Thus, our actions are instincts. Through the process of natural selection, individuals who were even slightly predisposed to engage in adaptive social behaviors were the "fittest" and tended to survive longer and to be more successful in passing their genes along to future generations. Even though these tendencies may not enhance our fitness in today's world, eons spent in harsher environments have left us genetically predisposed to perform certain social behaviors when situational cues call forth ancient instincts.

Biological Conditioning Is the Source of Conflict

The main objective in teaching this curriculum is to bring awareness to the role that biological hence psychological conditioning, stemming from its biological source*, play in creating conflict. The process in teaching this is to understand the key characteristics that make it possible for young people to grasp what this means — in their own lives and in the world. The first one is to help your students ask questions and think for themselves. This is true of many programs for young people, but most

questioning for them is random and not cohesive or consistent and does not address conditioning as the source of conflict.

**What this curriculum is asking,
that goes beyond this generalization of random self-inquiry,
is that the right questions be asked, at the right depth,
and in the right developmental sequence leading the student
to be able to understand the role of conditioning
in creating conflict and hence preventing peace.**

At that critical point, the curriculum then assists them in making the connection with how conditioning occurring in their lives is, in fact, the incipient stage of conditioning that creates conflict in the world in what we call war — that we are the world and the world is us, that what we do at any stage of human development is responsible for what happens in the world.

**In other words, students need to associate
the bullying on the playground with the bullying on the battlefield – that
they are founded
on the same survival reactions, that their basic primitive drives are
essentially the same, so when you are talking to your students about the
conflict that occurs in their lives, the curriculum will make the necessary
correlation to the larger picture in the conflict in the world.**

And most importantly the curriculum will move them out of the abstraction of knowledge, of thought, to the actual observation of what thinking is pointing at, for this is the immediate insight that is necessary to nullify conditioned thinking as it's happening and prevent it from reoccurring habitually as it has in the past. In other words, the intent is to end conflict from conditioned thinking at the primary prevention level as it happens in each and every moment.

Too often understanding human conflict has been conventionally addressed in a remedial, reactive way at the secondary level of "resolution" through therapeutic or moralistic means, as in the case of individual conflict, or through diplomatic or political intervention, as in the case of social conflict — or it has been addressed at the tertiary level of managing conflict through judicial or military intervention. These remedial, reactive approaches do not address conflict at the primary prevention level in

understanding and avoiding the fundamental factors that create conflict in the way we have been conditioned to act and are therefore essentially ineffective because they do not prevent conflict from happening in the first place.

Realizing what was necessary was the prevention of conflict at this level, this curriculum was developed to go beyond the surface of conditioned thinking to explore the foundation of conflict it creates in the way the brain is essentially hardwired for war, that it is rooted in the genetically programmed physical make up of the brain – in the fight or flight survival mechanism.

**What triggers this biological hardwired automatic survival reaction is the instinctive fear of who and what we think is a threat to “our” survival.
In this case of war it is the image of “the enemy,” that ethnocentric ideological nemesis – “them” – that is in competition with “us” for our survival.**

The conditioned image of “the enemy” is solidly in place due to the constant reinforcement it has received over time. This image created what you could call a biological self-defense blueprint, like a computer database, that over time has created an inborn or inherited pattern in the brain’s physical structure in order to feel protected and to therefore ensure its survival. It is acting automatically, on its own without our consciously doing it. It is a machine built like a robot to ensure its existence instinctively. It is like having something that makes you feel secure deep inside. It is what can be called a “genetically programmed instinctive reaction,” which simply means, that our brains are hardwired for war because we have inherited the tendency at birth for what we mistakenly believe will help us to survive. In other words, like being a puppet and someone else pulling the strings, it has us believing that what it’s doing will guarantee our continued existence when in actuality, it is threatening it because it doesn’t work any longer as it perhaps did in ancient times.

The information that has been put into our brain is like a software disk — it is information the culture you live in tells you what to do, how to act and — in certain cases — who is a threat to you, who your enemies might be. It is like a corrupt computer disk creating a virus that is killing us. It is like a driver of a car telling it where to go and it doesn’t see that it is going off a cliff. When confronted by a potential conflict due to what it supposes as a threat, it awakens our biological brain that is equipped for combat — which is like a car — it is like a hard drive — and off they go together along the same road to war they’ve been on since before we were born — inherited from generations of people before us.

That disk keeps getting put into our brain because we are used to it being there even though it doesn't work for our survival any longer — it is maladapted — it's not able to adapt to what is necessary. It's corrupt. It doesn't work. And being maladaptive it continues to activate inappropriately the old primitive brain to protect us when it is not necessary. This happens because it cannot tell the difference between a real threat and a supposed one. It reacts to the image of threat that the disk has been programmed to say is real.

Knowing this then, we can see that conflict created by this biological genetic program is no one's fault — it is not a "personal moral shortcoming" — it's not my fault or your fault — it's the fault in the brain's system, its malfunctioning primitive biological make up, that is not working correctly. It can be called a systemic defect in that the human brain is defective, operating on an archaic program driven to survive that is unwarily its causing conflict. It's also like a collective virus for it affects the whole human race because we are born with this "fault" in our brains, a primitive defect that is corrupt, contaminated. Being so, it is our responsibility to look at it, to pay attention to it as it arises in the moment and to not react out of it. Then it has no place to go. This survival mechanism thinks it's doing the right thing. It just doesn't understand that it is misguided, that it's not working to guarantee our survival any longer.

What is of upmost importance is to see that conflict created by conditioned thinking emanating from the biological brain is the same in all human beings. In other words — conflict is conflict. It is essentially the same in everyone since the human brain is basically identical structurally. It works alike for everyone. The content is different in each one but the brain is anatomically equal in all human beings, thus what happens to me happens to us all. Self-understanding is understanding the whole human race, for we are the world and the world is us. And this fundamental maladaptive drive to survive has been going on since humans started their journey on this earth, trying to stay alive in world that was harsh and threatening. Humans have been at war with themselves in this way since the start, having biologically inherited a brain with an inborn harddrive that is driving the human race to its destruction. As an old saying goes, "We have met the enemy, and he is us."

Technologically and scientifically we have advanced at great lengths, but psychologically we are still in the cave of ignorance. The essential question is: can we bring insight to this maladaptive means of survival and therefore be free of this self-destructive genetic inheritance or "*will we succumb to instincts we can't transcend?*"

What it takes to rectify this maladaptive process is the innately competent mind of a young person with the right education to look anew at the old program that creates conflict by mistakenly trying to protect us from what seems to be a real threat

to our survival when it is only a imagined one. In this fresh awareness, free of intellectual suppositions, one can see what is, without prejudice or without trying to correct or solve it, for conflict is not a problem to be solved but a reality to be observed. In this awareness, it can end. This is called “proprioceptive learning (also Empirical observation*).” It is “nonaccumulated learning” as opposed to knowledge, which is accumulative learning, the gathering and analysis of information to arrive at a certain intellectual conclusion. Knowledge at this level has no place. But we have to very careful not to make Empirical observation or proprioceptive learning an ideal, a solution, an answer in the conventional sense, to the “problem” of conflict. Thought can take up these words and make them seem like, just by their definition, to be the remedy, the antidote it themselves. The words here are pointing to what is, the fact of what is perceived without any reference to the meaning of the words used to describe the need to look. In other words, the word in not the thing.

Proprioceptive learning is the state of noncumulative observation that sees the conditioned thinking as it is without judgment or trying to change it and in that moment of observation realizes the danger of it and does not act on it thus freeing the mind from it’s habitual conditioned divisive state of reaction.

Proprioceptive learning is an innate capacity for psychological self-correction. This faculty is self-operating in that it sees that which is unhealthy in the thinking process and in the moment of intelligent awareness in nullifies the effect of the conditioned thinking thus making it ineffective. One doesn’t need to do anything, for proprioceptive learning is self-corrective in and of itself. But in order for proprioceptive learning to come into effect, the education of the young person has to address the nature and structure of conditioned thinking that is preventing this capacity from performing its innate capacity.

As Quantum Physicist Dr. David Bohm** states, *“We could say that practically all the problems of the human race are due to the fact that thought is not proprioceptive. Thought is constantly creating problems and then trying to solve them. But as it tries to solve them, it gets worse because it doesn’t notice that it’s creating them, and the more it thinks, the more problems it creates – because it’s not proprioceptive of what it’s doing.”*

“One gives close attention to all that is happening in conjunction with the actual activity of thought, which is the underlying source of the general disorder. One does this without choice, without criticism, without acceptance or rejection of what is going on. And all of this takes place along with reflections on the meaning of what one is learning about the activity of thought.”

(In 1927 quantum physicist Werner Heisenberg states he had a shocking but clear realization about the limits of physical knowledge: the act of observing alters the reality being observed.)

**The Three Brains – With Dr. David Bohm*

“Let's see if I can propose something. First of all there has been the theory of the three brains: the reptilian, the mammalian and the new brain –the neocortex. Now the cortex appeared rather suddenly. The reptilian and mammalian brains came into equilibrium with their surroundings and were more or less suited to them. Then suddenly the cortex appeared. The mammalian brain with its emotional response responded to the environment and it worked, statistically. But now the new brain surrounds it. It's a different environment and it doesn't work because of simple reasons. The new brain can produce images, which are very convincing to the old brain. The old brain does not actually see these objects but the whole body still responds in a way, which corresponds to the object. The old brain knows how to get correspondingly stirred up in response to a lion and it says, "run". Or something nice appears and it says, "Go there". The new brain, however, can produce images, which means not just pictures but stirring up the whole system as if there were that thing present. The old brain doesn't look out to see whether it's there or not. It can't. It just gets stirred up. So therefore it can say those images are irresistible. Either it says I want them or they frighten me or they make me enraged or whatever. However, the new brain is functioning in the environment of the old brain. Namely, all the neurochemicals and so on come from there. All the desire and all the energy to do something come from there.

“The new brain has no reason to do anything by itself. Therefore, when it gets all stirred up, it's confused and it doesn't work right. It's not integrated. When these neurochemicals are too strong, they confuse the new brain. Let's take an elementary case. Suppose a certain thing disturbs or frightens you. Your mother comes along and says don't worry about it; she lulls you into a sense of security. What happens is that that thought liberates just as simply as a nice situation would; it liberates what are called endorphins which coat the nerves that produce pain or fear, which then produce an effect rather like morphine --- they're named after morphine. Then when the situation suddenly changes or you think differently, the endorphins are removed. Eventually you're hooked on them. Why? Because the old brain demands that you think again in such a way as to reproduce those endorphins; it demands this of the new brain. Therefore it demands false thoughts that will lull you into a nice sense of security (like being identified with a group).

“Now who is providing you with the false thoughts? The new brain. It is simply a machine that provides whatever thoughts will satisfy what's going on in the old brain. The old brain makes a demand. Let's say it needs food; food comes in, it stops.

It needs a nice thought that says everything will be all right. When it comes in it says, "O.K. It doesn't bother me anymore." The new brain gets hooked; it gets habituated into providing the old brain with the thoughts that will lull it into a good feeling.

"The new brain has to do what the old brain wants, and then that's the way the system presently works. The desire, the energy, the intention fundamentally come from the spinal column. The new brain cannot see any reason to do anything. It's sort of an analytical function.

"The new brain cannot control the old brain. Functionally that's an illusion or delusion. But society and culture said, "Let the new brain control the old brain. Being virtuous consists of doing that."

The old brain is dealing with survival, but then it also sent signals that the new brain picked up as suggesting that it could help with survival. Therefore, the new brain found out that it could help the old brain in the struggle for survival by all sorts of methods improving tools and whatnot.

"The challenge to humanity is this: How is humanity going to get these two brains to work together? Some new movement is needed which cannot start in either brain. It must start in another way. More creatively (proprioceptive learning – Empirical observation)

*** Empirical observation– being derived from or relating to direct observation rather than theory, speculation, dogma or ideals, i.e. looking at what is factually, actually without any interpretation or reference to any authority.*

****David Bohm was a Quantum Physicist who made significant contributions in the fields of Theoretical Physics, Philosophy and Neuropsychology. He was once a professor at Princeton University where he worked closely with Albert Einstein. His books that reflect proprioceptive learning are Thought as a System, On Dialogue and Changing Consciousness.*

A Special Note on Teaching this Curriculum

The 3Es:

Experiencing Conditioning Is the Best Teacher

We use the acronym the "3Es" to demonstrate how we need to approach changing human behavior. The 3Es represent this learning process. This is what it means:

1. The first E is **Explanation**: It is what I am doing right now. I am using thought to describe the learning process. If we both speak the same language and have had a similar background, then what is being explained will probably make sense. The intent of this is to create a common definition of what is meant by the “learning process.” One can call this stage “foresight.”
2. The Second E is **Example**: It is the next step in learning. This is when one remembers something from his or her past that corresponds to the Explanation. In this way one “personalizes” the explanation in that one now thinks, “Oh, I know what he is describing, because I remember when this happened to me.” For example, if I was explaining that the cause of bullying is conditioned thinking, one might see the truth of this in a past occurrence. “I remember that my teacher explained that Joe the bully picked on me because he was always picked on by his brother.” This stage can be called “hindsight.”
3. The third E is **Experiencing or Empirical Observation**: This is the stage that is not of thought. Thought is used to explain it, as I am doing here, but it is not thought that is experiencing. The actual awareness of the fact of conditioning as it is happening in the moment is experiencing. This stage can be called “insight.” And it is this stage that I call “proprioceptive or empirical learning” as I just explained in the last part of the Introduction.

The intent of the 3 Es, especially the last E – Experiencing – is to create what can be called an “epigenetic environment”, an environment that can bring about empirical or first hand insight into the hardwired genetic structure as its happening in the moment that is generating conflict in the human brain. This conflict is the same in all human beings being a structural defect in the human brain trying to survive in this maladaptive way. In other words, conflict is conflict for it is a mechanically identical fault in all brains.

When we are experiencing how we have been conditioned — in the moment — insight is being enhanced. This insight helps us see our conditioned reaction as it happens. In this moment of insight, our conditioned brain does not operate as it has in the past. In this moment, when we see how our brain has conditioned us — reaction can cease, because we are, in the moment seeing. This is an “aha” moment — when you suddenly realize how what you have said or done may have triggered a reaction.

This stage is the most important for it is the stage of awareness that can free the conditioned thinking by the observation of it alone. As Dr. Bohm said in the quote at the end of the end of the Introduction, " ... all of this takes place along with reflections on the meaning of what one is learning about the activity of thought." But the important difference about thinking abstractly about conditioning and understanding it, as Dr. Bohm has pointed out, is that the Explanations and the Examples come directly from the observation of conditioned thinking, therefore they are not an abstract theory or an intangible conclusion but rather enhanced awareness or insight.

This is what this curriculum is primarily trying to do – to create an “aha” moment that comes directly from the observation of conditioned thinking. This is the proprioceptive learning that will bring forth real understanding and in that understanding there is the possibility of being free of the conditioned thinking that has caused so much misery for so long.

I must mention again, just to be as clear as possible, this has nothing to do with thinking at this level for it is thinking that is being observed that is creating conflict. Thinking has its place in describing what is being seen but it is not the answer or the solution to the problem of human conflict. That is the conventional method we think that will answer all our problems. In technology and science, this type of thinking is appropriate but in understanding human behavior and freeing us from psychological suffering, it has no place.

– Dr. Terrence Webster-Doyle