Family Values

Come on, people now, smile on your brother! Everybody get together, try to love one another right now. This is the dawning of the Age of Aquarius—harmony and understanding, sympathy and trust abounding, no more falsehoods or deceptions, golden living dreams of visions, mystic crystal revelation, and the mind’s true liberation. Imagine no possessions; I wonder if you can. No need for greed or hunger, a brotherhood of man. Imagine all the people sharing all the world. You may say I’m a dreamer, but I’m not the only one. I hope some day you’ll join us, and the world will be as one.

Incredible as it may seem, many of us used to believe this truceable. A leading idea of the 1960s and 70s was that mistrust, jealousy, competitiveness, greed, and manipulation were social institutions due for reform. Some people thought they were unnecessary evils, like slavery or the denial of the vote to women. Others thought they were hidebound traditions whose inefficiencies had gone unnoticed, as with the genius who figured out that toll bridges could charge a dollar to the traffic going one way instead of fifty cents so the traffic going both ways.

These sentiments came not just from rock musicians but from America’s distinguished social critics. In his 1970 book The Greening of America, the Yale law professor Charles Reich heralded a nonviolent revolution being led by the college-age generation. The youth of America had evolved a new consciousness, he said. It was less guilty and anxious, nonjudgmental, noncompetitive, nonmaterialistic, affectionate, honest, unmanipulative, unaggressive, communal, and unencumbered with status.
Kith and Kin

Kith and kin are the place of your roots. They are the family you are born into, the people who teach you the language of your tribe, your clan, or your culture. They are the people who shape your identity and who you turn to for support and guidance. Kith and kin are often the people who you feel closest to and who you rely on the most. They are the people who you turn to when you need help and who you turn to when you need advice. Kith and kin are the people who you share your history with and who you share your future with. Kith and kin are the people who you love and who you are loved by. Kith and kin are the people who you call family.
...
Clothing and behavior are influenced by the traditions of medieval Provence and continue to be an integral part of the daily lives of the rural people of the region. The traditional attire, consisting of simple, functional clothing made of natural materials, reflects the people's connection to the land and their enduring relationship with nature.

The rural way of life in Provence is characterized by a strong sense of community and a deep respect for the environment. The people of Provence are known for their hard work, hospitality, and love of the land. Their traditional values and traditions continue to shape their way of life, even as they adapt to modern changes.

The rural economy is based on agriculture, with tobacco and wine being the most important crops. The people of Provence are skilled farmers, and their crops are renowned for their quality. The region is also known for its wine, which is produced in various styles, from crisp whites to rich reds.
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The rural economy is based on agriculture, with tobacco and wine being the most important crops. The people of Provence are skilled farmers, and their crops are renowned for their quality. The region is also known for its wine, which is produced in various styles, from crisp whites to rich reds.
In a study of emotionally healthy middle-class families, those who were "parental" to their households had more emotional support and fewer emotional problems than those who were "non-parental." Many professionals now describe families as "parental" or "non-parental" based on their function and role within the family. For example, in the case of a biological family, the stepfather is often described as the "parental" figure, whereas the biological mother is the "non-parental" figure. However, this classification is subjective and can vary depending on the context.

In both cases, the family is a complex social unit with multiple layers of relationships and dynamics. The concept of "parental" and "non-parental" figures is not a clear-cut distinction, and it is important to consider the emotional and social interactions within the family as a whole.
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Note: The text above is a simplified representation of the provided image. The actual content may contain more details and context than what is shown here.
A spouse is the most familiar example of kinship. All of us have some sort of kinship relationship, either through blood or marriage, but the strongest relationships are those formed through marriage. The strength of this relationship is due to several factors, including the genetic relatedness of the couple, their shared experiences, and the strength of their emotional bonds. In general, the more genetically related two individuals are, the stronger their relationship will be. This is because the genetic makeup of each person contains the same information, and the more similar their genetic information is, the stronger their relationship will be. Additionally, the strength of the relationship is also influenced by the shared experiences of the couple. For example, if a couple has lived together for many years and has shared many experiences, their relationship will be stronger than if they have only been together for a short time. Finally, the strength of the relationship is also influenced by the strength of the emotional bonds between the couple. The more emotionally connected two people are, the stronger their relationship will be.

These relationships are important because they provide a sense of stability and security. For example, a strong relationship between a parent and child can provide a sense of protection and support. Additionally, the relationships between siblings can provide a sense of companionship and understanding. These relationships also have a positive impact on mental health, as they can provide a sense of belonging and social support.

In summary, the relationships formed through marriage and blood are important for providing a sense of stability and security. These relationships are strengthened by genetic relatedness, shared experiences, and emotional bonds. These relationships also have a positive impact on mental health, as they can provide a sense of belonging and social support.
For millennia, kin relations have shaped every aspect of human society. The reach of personal ties can extend for generations via formal and informal networks, and kinship is often a central element in the construction of identity and belonging. In some cultures, kinship takes on an even more profound significance, influencing everything from politics to religion. Yet, even in these societies, the power of kinship is not absolute. People may choose to reject their family ties or adopt new relationships that are not based on kinship. For example, in some cultures, individuals may choose to adopt a new family name, or to adopt a new religion, or to reject their family's political beliefs.

The power of kinship is also limited by the fact that it is not always possible to trace one's ancestry back for generations. In some cases, the history of a family may be lost or forgotten, and it may be impossible to determine who is an actual member of the family. This can lead to disputes over inheritance and other matters.

In addition, the power of kinship is limited by the fact that it is not always possible to control the behavior of family members. Children may not always live up to the expectations of their parents, and siblings may have different goals and aspirations. This can lead to conflicts and disagreements within the family.

Despite these limitations, the power of kinship remains a powerful force in human society. It can provide a sense of belonging and identity, and it can also provide practical support in times of need.

When Jesus said, “Suffer the little children to come unto me,” he was referring to the unique status of children in society. Children are often seen as innocent and pure, and they are often given preferential treatment. In many cultures, children are expected to be obedient and respectful towards their parents, and they are often rewarded for good behavior and punished for bad behavior.

However, the power of kinship is not always exercised in a positive way. In some cases, family members may use their power to control and manipulate others. This can lead to abuse and exploitation, and it can also lead to conflict and division within the family.

In conclusion, the power of kinship is a complex and multifaceted phenomenon. It can provide a sense of belonging and identity, but it can also be a source of conflict and division. Understanding the power of kinship is important for anyone who wants to understand human society.
most threatening ones. The anthropologist Nancy Thorndike has found that the incest laws of most cultures are not created to deal with the problem of brother-sister marriages: brothers and sisters don’t want to marry to begin with. Although brother-sister incest may be included in the prohibitions and may help to legitimize it, the real targets of the laws are marriages that threaten the interests of the lawmakers. The rules ban marriages among more distant relatives, such as cousins, and are promulgated by the rulers of stratified societies to prevent wealth and power from accumulating in families, which could be future rivals. The anthropologist Laura Betroz has shown that the medieval church’s role in sex and marriage was also as weapons against familial dynasties. In feudal Europe, parents did not bequeath their estates in equal parts to all of their children. Plots of land could not be subdivided every generation or they would become too small and a title can fall on only one heir. The custom of primogeniture arose, in which everything went to the oldest son and the other sons hit the road to seek their fortunes, often joining armies or the church. The church filled up with discontented younger sons, who then manipulated marriage rules to make it harder for owners and title-holders to bear legitimate heirs. If they died without sons, the properties and titles passed back to the disinherited brothers or the church they served. According to their laws, a man could not divorce a childless wife, remain while she was alive, adopt an heir, bear an heir with a woman closer than a seventh cousin, or have sex on various special days that added up to more than half the year. The story of Henry VIII reminds us that much of European history revolves around battles between powerful individuals trying to leverage family feel legs for political gain—enslaving strategically, striving for heirs—and other powerful individuals trying to foil them.

PARENTS AND CHILDREN

For an organism designed by natural selection, leaving descendants is the reason for being and the goal of all toil and struggle. The love of a parent for a child should be no less. But it should not be boundless. Robert Trivers discovered a subtle but profound implication of genetics for the psychology of the family.

In most sexual species, parents bequeath fifty percent of their genes to each offspring. One strategy for maximizing the number of genes in the next generation is to put out as many offspring as possible. This is what most organisms do. Baby organisms, however, are more vulnerable than adults because they are smaller and less experienced, and in most species the majority never make it to adulthood. All organisms therefore face a “choice” of allocating their time, calories, and risk to caring for an existing offspring and upping its odds of survival, or cranking out new offspring and letting them all fend for themselves. Depending on details of the species’ ecosystem and body plan, either strategy can be genetically profitable. Birds and mammals have opted for their offspring, mammals by the extreme step of evolving organs that siphan nutrients from their own bodies and package them for their offspring as milk. Birds and mammals invest calories, time, risk, and bodily wear and tear on their offspring, and are repaid in increases in the offspring’s life expectancy.

In theory, a parent could go to the other extreme and care for its first-born all its life—say, by sucking it until the parent died of old age. But that would make little sense because at some point the calories being turned into milk could better be invested in bearing and sucking a new offspring. As the first-born grows, each additional pint of milk is less and less crucial to its survival, and is better and better equipped to find its own food. A younger offspring becomes a better investment, and the parent should wear the older one.

A parent should transfer investment, from an older child to a younger one when the benefit to the younger exceeds the cost to the older. The reckoning is based on the fact that the two children are equally related to the parent. But these calculations are from the parent’s point of view; the first child sees it differently. He shares fifty percent of his genes with his younger sibling, but he shares one hundred percent of his genes with himself. As far as he is concerned, the parent should continue to invest in him until the benefit to a younger sibling is greater than twice the cost to him. The genetic interests of the parent and the child diverge. Each child should want more parental care than the parent is willing to give, because parents want to invest in all of their offspring equally (relative to their needs), whereas each child wants more of the investment for himself. The tension is called parent-offspring conflict. In essence it is a sibling rivalry: siblings compete among themselves for their parents’ investment, whereas the parents would be happiest if each accepted a share proportional to his or her needs. But sibling rivalry can be played out with parents, too. In evolutionary terms, the only reason a parent
desperate strategies, such as burn a dummy. Infants, in the modern world, have to compete with many other priorities. The mother's body is a living laboratory, a source of nourishment and protection. Infanticide is common, people never treat young, human infants with the care and attention they give other young species. The first moments of life are crucial. Babies must be held close to the mother, close enough to feel her heartbeat and breathing. Babies must be fed, and fed often. They must be protected from harm. But they must also be allowed to explore the world around them. Babies must be allowed to learn through touch and taste. Babies must be allowed to develop their own personalities. Babies must be allowed to be babies. But these are not easy tasks. Infants need to be held, and they need to be fed. They need to be protected, and they need to be loved. But they also need to be left alone to explore and to learn. Babies need a balance of care and independence. They need a mother who is both present and available, but also willing to let them grow and develop on their own. Infants need a mother who is a constant presence, but also a source of challenge and growth.

Lest we forget, the war is not over. The battle between those who want to protect babies and those who want to harm them continues. How can we make the battle between the sexes more peaceful? Babies, like all living beings, are precious. They are a gift from God. They are a gift from the earth. They are a gift from the universe. They are a gift to us. And we must protect them. We must love them. We must cherish them. We must care for them. We must never forget that they are precious. We must never forget that they are unique. We must never forget that they are important. We must always remember that they are alive. We must always remember that they are living beings. We must always remember that they are a gift. We must always remember that they are a precious gift. We must always remember that they are a gift to us.
The theory of parent-offspring conflict is an extension of the belief that parents have an emotional and psychological relationship with their children that is different from that of other relatives. This theory is based on the idea that parents and children have different goals and interests that may conflict with each other. For example, parents may want their children to get good grades, while children may prefer to spend time with their friends. This conflict can lead to a variety of behaviors, such as parents trying to make decisions for their children and children asserting their independence. The theory of parent-offspring conflict is supported by research that shows that parents and children have different goals and interests, and that these goals and interests can conflict with each other.

Parent-offspring conflict can also be influenced by the child's age and development. For example, young children may be more dependent on their parents for decision-making, while older children may have more autonomy and be more willing to make their own decisions. This can lead to a variety of behaviors, such as parents trying to make decisions for their children and children asserting their independence. The theory of parent-offspring conflict is supported by research that shows that parents and children have different goals and interests, and that these goals and interests can conflict with each other.

The theory of parent-offspring conflict is also supported by research that shows that parents and children have different goals and interests, and that these goals and interests can conflict with each other. For example, parents may want their children to get good grades, while children may prefer to spend time with their friends. This conflict can lead to a variety of behaviors, such as parents trying to make decisions for their children and children asserting their independence. The theory of parent-offspring conflict is supported by research that shows that parents and children have different goals and interests, and that these goals and interests can conflict with each other.
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The influence of siblings on children's personality development is a complex issue. Many parents may wish to encourage sibling interaction as a means of fostering social skills and cooperation among their children. However, the relationship between siblings can vary widely, and the effects of sibling interactions are not always positive.

Research has shown that siblings can have both positive and negative influences on each other. In some cases, siblings may compete with each other for attention and resources, which can lead to conflicts. On the other hand, siblings may also serve as role models and sources of emotional support.

The nature of sibling relationships can be influenced by a variety of factors, including the age difference between siblings, the gender of the siblings, and the parents' attitudes towards sibling interaction. In general, it is important for parents to encourage open communication and healthy conflict resolution between siblings.

Overall, the role of siblings in a child's development is complex and multifaceted. While siblings can provide important opportunities for social learning and emotional growth, parents must also be mindful of the potential challenges that these relationships may bring.
BROTHERS AND SISTERS

The conflict between parents and offspring is not a new concept in the world of human relationships. From the earliest times, children have sought to assert their independence from their parents, and parents have sought to control and guide their children. This conflict is often at its peak during adolescence, when children begin to question the authority of their parents and forge their own identity.

Parents often struggle with how to balance their desire to protect their children with the need to allow them to grow and explore. The balance can be difficult to achieve, and parents may feel frustrated or even angry with their children's rebellion. However, it is important to remember that this is a normal part of development and that it is through these conflicts that children learn and grow.

One way to navigate these conflicts is to communicate openly with your children. Listen to their concerns and questions, and try to understand their perspective. Show them that you are there to support them, even as you may disagree with their decisions. This can help build a strong foundation of trust and respect.

It is also important to respect your children's autonomy. Allow them to make choices and take risks, even if those choices may not always be the best ones. This can help them develop the skills they need to make sound decisions on their own.

Finally, remember that it is okay to seek help when you need it. There is no shame in asking for guidance from a trusted adult, whether it be a family member, friend, or professional.

By approaching these conflicts with patience, understanding, and empathy, you can help ensure that your children grow into healthy, confident adults.
not. As close kin, they feel a big extra dose of affection and solidarity. But though they share fifty percent of their genes with each other, each sibling shares one hundred percent of its genes with itself, so brotherly or sisterly love has its limits. Being offspring of the same parents, siblings are rivals for their parents' investment, from weaning to the rearing of the will. And though genetic overlap makes a pair of siblings natural allies, it also makes them unnatural parents, and that genetic overlap tempers their sexual feelings.

If people gave birth to a single litter of interchangeable n-tuplets, parent-offspring conflict would be a real struggle among the siblings, each demanding more than its share. But all children are different, if for no other reason than that they are born at different times. Parents may not want to invest one nth of their energy in each of their n children, but may, like shrewd portfolio managers, try to pick winners and losers and invest accordingly. The investment decisions are not conscious; they are based on the number of grandchildren expected from each child, but emotional responses that are tuned by natural selection to have outcomes that maximized that number in the environment in which we evolved. Though enlightened parents try mightily never to play favorites, they don't always succeed. In one study, fully two-thirds of British and American mothers confessed to loving one of their children more.

How do parents make Sophie's Choice and sacrifice a child when circumstances demand it? Evolutionary theory predicts that the main criterion should be age. Childhood is a minefield, and the older a child gets, the luckier a parent is to have it alive and the more replaceable the child is as an expected source of grandchildren, right up until sexual maturity. (From then on, the reproductive years begin to be used up, and the child's expected number of offspring declines.) For example, the actuarial tables show that a four-year-old in a foraging society will, on average, give a parent 1.4 times as many grandchildren as a newborn, an eight-year-old 1.5 times as many, and a twelve-year-old 1.7 times as many. So if parents already have a child when an infant arrives and can not feed them both, they should sacrifice the infant. In no human society do parents sacrifice an older child when a younger one is born. In our society, the chance that a parent will kill a child drops steadily with the child's age, especially during the vulnerable first year. When parents are asked to imagine the loss of a child, they say they would sacrifice more for older children, up until the teen years. The rule of anticipat-
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century, but it does not explain what keeps siblings apart. Avoiding incest is universal; taboos against incest are not. And most incest taboos are not about sex within the nuclear family. Some are about sex with fictive kin and merely enforce sexual jealousy. For example, polygynous men may pass laws to keep their sons away from their junior wives, officially the sons' "stepmothers." As we have seen, most taboos prohibit marriage (not sex) between more distant kin, such as cousins, and are plays that rulers use to prevent wealth from accumulating in rival families. Sometimes sex among family members falls under the umbrella of more general codes against incest, but nowhere is it the target.

Brothers and sisters simply don't find each other appealing as sexual partners. That is an understatement: the thought makes them acutely uncomfortable or fills them with disgust. (People who grew up with siblings of the opposite sex do not understand the emotion.) Freud claimed that the strong emotion is itself proof of an unconscious desire, especially when a male claims revulsion at the thought of coitus with his mother. By that reasoning we may conclude that people have an unconscious desire to eat dog feces and to stick needles in their eyes.

Reputation with a sibling is so robust in humans and other long-lived, mobile vertebrates that it is a good candidate for an adaptation. The function would be to avoid the costs of inbreeding; a reduction in the fitness of offspring. There is a grain of biological truth behind the folklore that incest "thickens the blood" and the stereotypes of defective hillbillies and royal twits. Harmful mutations steadily drip into the gene pool. Some are dominant, cripple their bearers, and are soon selected out. But most are recessive and do no harm until they build up in the population and meet up with copies of themselves when two carriers mate. Since close relatives share genes, if they mate they run a much higher risk that two copies of a harmful recessive gene will match up in their offspring. Since all of us carry the equivalent of one to two lethal recessive genes, when a brother and sister mate they are quite likely to have a compromised offspring, both in theory and in the studies that have measured the risks. The same is true for mother-son and father-daughter matings (and, to a lesser extent, to matings between more distant kin). It stands to reason that humans (and many other animals) have evolved an emotion that makes the thought of sex with a family member a turnoff.

Incest avoidance showcases the complicated software engineering behind our emotions for other people. We feel stronger bonds of affection to family members than to acquaintances or strangers. We clearly perceive the sexual attractiveness of family members, and even take pleasure in looking at them. But the affection and appreciation of beauty don't translate into a desire to copulate, though if the same emotions had been elicited by a nonrelative, the urge might be irresistible. The way a single bit of knowledge can turn lust into horror has been used to great dramatic effect in the dozens of plots that Polti classifies as "Involuntary crimes of love," of which Sophocles' Oedipus Rex is the most famous. Incest avoidance has two twists. One is that different couplings within the family have different genetic costs and benefits, both for the participants and for the bystanders. We might expect sexual repugnance to be adjusted accordingly. For both males and females, the benefit of having a child with an immediate family member is that the child contains seventy-five percent of each parent's genes, instead of the usual fifty percent (the extra twenty-five percent comes from the genes shared by the parents by virtue of their being related which are then passed on to the child). The costs are the risk of a malformed child and the forgone opportunity to have a child with someone else. The forgone opportunities, however, differ for males and females. Also, children are always sure who their mothers are but are not always sure who their fathers are. For both these reasons, incest has to be costed out separately for each of the possible couplings in a family.

Neither a mother nor a son has any advantage in the mother coupling with the son as opposed to with the boy's father that could offset the genetic risks. And since men are generally not attracted to women old enough to be their mothers, the net result is that mother-son incest virtually never happens.

For incest between fathers and daughters and between brothers and sisters, the calculations come out differently depending on whose point of view we take. A hypothetical ancestral girl made pregnant by a brother or father would be precluded from having a child with a nonrelative for the nine months of pregnancy, and were she to keep the baby, for another two to four years of nursing. She wastes a precious opportunity for reproduction on a child that may be deformed. Incest should be thoroughly repugnant. But a male who impregnates his sister or daughter could be adding to the number of offspring he sires, because her pregnancy does not foreclose his impregnating someone else. There is a risk that the child will be deformed, but if it isn't, the child is a sheer bonus (more accurately, the extra dose of his genes in that child are the bonus).
MEN AND WOMEN

The battle between the sexes is not just a skirmish in the war of the sexes, but a full-scale battle. The struggle is not just between men and women, but between men and the world of ideas. The battle is not just about winning or losing, but about understanding the forces that shape our world.

Why is there so much talk about women's rights and gender equality? The answer is simple: because we live in a world where men have traditionally held the upper hand. This is a world where women have been second-class citizens, denied the same rights and opportunities as men. This is a world where women have been treated as objects, as mere vessels for the reproductive organs of men.

Men and women are different, and they should be treated as such. But this does not mean that men are naturally superior to women. The differences between men and women are the result of social and cultural conditioning, not biological differences.

Sometimes, of course, it does work. A man and a woman can fall in love and have a successful relationship. But this is the exception, not the rule. In most cases, men and women are simply not compatible. They are like cats and dogs, and they are not meant to be together.

Unfortunately, there is a big fad for the happer marriages in the United States and in divorce. George Bernard Shaw wrote, "When we are married, we are caught in the net of society." This is true, and it is a trap. But it is a trap that we can escape.

We can fight against the forces that have held us back. We can work together to create a world where men and women are treated equally. We can build a world where love is not a matter of circumstance, but of choice. We can build a world where men and women are free to be who they want to be, and love who they want to love.
warming half their progeny onto each cell. When they leave, the hybrid organisms grow out, and half their genes and DNA are selected for survival. In this way, the same number of genes that control the synthesis of proteins for the growth of a cell's body are selected for the survival of the cell. It's not to evolve faster, but to ensure that the organism's body is the right size. The body is well adapted to keep the organism's body in check. The best theory, proposed by John H. H. and others, is that a few kinds of genes evolved. It's not to evolve faster, but to build the baby into the baby. If the organism is a hybrid, it's a half set of genes and a half set of DNA. The cell in the machine is facing the copying of the cell. In each pair of organisms that compete, the cell in the machine is facing the copying of the cell. In each pair of organisms that compete, the cell in the machine is facing the copying of the cell. In each pair of organisms that compete, the cell in the machine is facing the copying of the cell. In each pair of organisms that compete, the cell in the machine is facing the copying of the cell. In each pair of organisms that compete, the cell in the machine is facing the copying of the cell.
the female's contribution is the limiting step in how many offspring can be produced; at most, one offspring for each egg she creates and supports. Two cascades of consequences flow from this difference.

First, a single male can fertilize several females, which forces other males to go without. That sets up a competition among males for access to females. A male may heat other females to prevent them from getting to a female, or compete for the resources necessary to mate, or court a female to get her to choose him. Males therefore vary in reproductive success. A winner can beget many offspring, a loser will beget none.

Second, the reproductive success of males depends on how many females they mate with, but the reproductive success of females does not depend on how many males they mate with. That makes females more discriminating. Males woo females and mate with any females that let them. Females scrutinize males and mate only with the best ones: the ones with the best genes, the ones most willing and able to feed and protect her offspring, or the ones that the other females tend to prefer.

Male competition and female choice are ubiquitous in the animal kingdom. Darwin called attention to these two spectacles, which he dubbed sexual selection, but was puzzled as to why it should be males that compete and females that choose rather than the other way round.

The theory of parental investment solves the puzzle. The greater-investing sex chooses, the lesser-investing sex competes. Relative investment, then, is the cause of sex differences. Everything else—testosterone, estrogen, penises, vaginas, Y chromosomes, X chromosomes—is secondary. Males compete and females choose only because the slightly bigger investment in an egg that defines being female tends to get multiplied by the rest of the animal's reproductive habits. In a few species, the whole animal reverses the initial difference in investment between egg and sperm, and in those cases females could compete and males should choose. Sure enough, these exceptions prove the rule. In some fishes, the male broods the young in a pouch. In some birds, the male sits on the egg and feeds the young. In those species, the females are aggressive and try to court the males, who select partners carefully.

In a typical mammal, though, the female does almost all the investing. Mammals have opted for a body plan in which the female carries the fetus inside her, nourishes it with her blood, and nurses and protects it as it is born until the offspring has grown big enough to fend for itself. The male contributes a few seconds of copulation and a sperm cell weighing one to two trillionths of a gram. Not surprisingly, male mammals compete for opportunities to have sex with female mammals. The details depend on the rest of the animal's way of life. Females live alone or in groups, in small groups or large ones, in stable groups or temporary ones, using sensible criteria like where the food is, where it's safest, where they can easily bear and raise young, and whether they need strength in numbers. Males go where the females are. Female elephant seals, for example, congregate on beach strips which a male can easily patrol. A single male can monopolize the group, and males fight bloody battles for this jackpot. Bigger fighters are better fighters, so the males have evolved to be four times the size of the females.

Apes have a wide variety of sexual arrangements. That means, by the way, that there is no such thing as an "ape legacy" that humans are doomed to live by. Gorillas live on the fringes of forests in small groups of one male and several females, and the males fight each other for control over females, the males evolving to be twice the females' size. Gibbon females are solitary and widely dispersed, and the male finds a female's territory and acts as a faithful consort. Since other males are off in other territories, they fight no more than females do and are no bigger. Orangutan females are solitary but close enough together that a male can monopolize two or more of their ranges, and the males are about 1.7 times the size of the females. Chimps live in large, unstable groups that no male could dominate. Groups of males live with the females, and the males compete for dominance, which confers more opportunities to copulate. The males are about 1.3 times as large as the females. With lots of males around, a female has an incentive to mate with many of them so that a male can never be sure that an infant is not his and hence will not murder the infant to make its mother available to bear his own offspring. Bonobo (pygmy chimpanzees) are almost indiscriminately promiscuous, and the males fight less and are about the same size as females. They compete in a different way: inside the females' bodies.

Sperm can survive in the vagina for several days, so a promiscuous female can have several males' sperm competing inside her for a chance at fertilizing the egg. The more sperm a male produces, the greater the chance that one of his will get there first. That explains why chimpanzees have enormous testicles for their body size. Bigger testes make more sperm, which have a better chance inside promiscuous females. A gorilla is four times the weight of a chimpanzee, but his testicles are four times smaller. The females in his harem have no chance to copulate with
The human mating system is not like any other animal. But that does not mean that it is not beneficial. The female is not a "machining" species, which is a term used to describe species that have evolved to produce large quantities of offspring. The female's goal is to produce a large number of offspring, but she must do so in a way that maximizes her own fitness. This is accomplished by selecting a male that is able to provide the resources needed for her offspring to survive. The male's role is to provide resources and to protect the female and her offspring. The mating system is thus a balance between the female's need to produce offspring and the male's need to ensure that his offspring survive. The female's fitness is thus determined by her ability to find a male that can provide the resources needed for her offspring to survive. The male's fitness is determined by his ability to find a female that can provide the resources needed for his offspring to survive.
What kind of animal is Homo sapiens? We are mammals, so we need to eat. We eat food to keep us alive, and that is the primary reason for our existence. We need to work for food, and that is the second reason for our existence. We need to be loved, and that is the third reason for our existence. We need to be happy, and that is the fourth reason for our existence. We need to be healthy, and that is the fifth reason for our existence. We need to be productive, and that is the sixth reason for our existence. We need to be successful, and that is the seventh reason for our existence.

If anything, the animal should be asexual. Asexual animals do not reproduce, and they do not need to eat. They do not need to work. They do not need to be loved. They do not need to be happy. They do not need to be healthy. They do not need to be productive. They do not need to be successful. They do not need to do anything.
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Another part of the male sexual muscle is an ability to be easily aroused by a partner's body parts, rather than by the partner's direct stimulation. This may not be true of women. Women, on the other hand, require more direct stimulation to achieve orgasm. However, some women are capable of achieving orgasm through indirect methods, such as oral sex or manual stimulation. It is important to remember that there is a wide range of sexual preferences and capacities, and what works for one person may not work for another.

A new study published in the Journal of Sexual Medicine suggests that men may be more likely to experience fantasies that involve violence or aggression, while women are more likely to fantasize about affectionate or intimate interactions. This may be due to cultural differences, as well as biological factors. Further research is needed to fully understand the role of gender in sexual fantasies.

In conclusion, the male sexual muscle is an important part of sexual activity, and it is essential to recognize the unique needs and preferences of both men and women.
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bit-mapped cathode-ray-tube displays. He takes pleasure in this miss-
taken identity, supporting a worldwide pornography industry which as-
taken, the United States alone grosses ten billion dollars a year, almost as much
as spectator sports and the movies combined. In foraging cultures, young
men make charcoal drawings of breasts and vulvas on rock overhangs,
cave them on tree trunks, and scratch them in the sand. Pornography is
similar the world over and was much the same a century ago as it is
today. It depicts in graphic physical detail a succession of anonymous
nude females eager for casual, impersonal sex.

It would make no sense for a woman to be easily aroused by the sight of
a nude male. A fertile woman never has a shortage of willing sexual
partners, and in that buyer's market she can seek the best husband avail-
able, the best genes, or other returns on her sexual favors. If she could be
aroused by the sight of a naked man, men could induce her to have sex
by exposing themselves and her bargaining position would be compro-
mised. The reactions of the sexes to nudity are quite different: men see
nude women as a kind of invitation, women see nude men as a kind of
threat. In 1992 a Berkeley student known around campus as the Naked
Guy chose to jog, attend class, and eat in the dining halls in the nude as
a protest against the repressive sexual traditions of Western society. He
was expelled when some female students protested that his behavior
should be classified as sexual harassment.

Women do not seek the sight of naked male strangers or enforcements
of anonymous sex, and there is virtually no female market for pornog-
raphy. (Playgirl, the supposed counterexample, is clearly for gay men. It
has no ads for any product a woman would buy, and when a woman gets
a subscription as a gag gift she finds herself on mailing lists for gay male
pornography and sex toys.) In the laboratory, some early experiments
claimed that men and women showed identical physiological arousal to a
pornographic passage. The men, however, showed a bigger response to
the neutral passage in the control condition than the women showed to the
pornography. The so-called neutral passage, which had been chosen by
the female investigators, described a man and a woman chatting about
the relative merits of an anthropology major over pre-med. The
men found it highly erotic! Women can sometimes be aroused when they
have agreed to watch portraits of intercourse, but they do not seek
them out. (Symons points out that women are more choosy than men in
consenting to sex, but once they have consented, there is no reason to
believe they are any less responsive to sexual stimulation.) The closest

The desire for sexual variety is an unusual adaptation, for it is insatiable.
Most commodities of fitness show diminishing returns or an optimal
level. People do not seek mass quantities of air, food, and water, and they
want to be not too hot and not too cold but just right. But the more
women a man has sex with, the more offspring he leaves; too much is
never enough. That gives men a limitless appetite for casual sex partners
(and perhaps for the commodities that in ancestral environments would
have led to multiple partners, such as power and wealth). Everyday life
offers most men few opportunities to plumb the bottom of the desire,
but occasionally a man is rich, famous, handsome, and amoral enough
to try. George Simenon and Hugh Hefner claimed to have had thousands
of partners, and Wilt Chamberlain estimated that he had twenty thousand.
Say we liberally adjust for bragadocio and assume that Chamberlain
inflated his estimate by a factor of, say, ten. That would still mean that
one thousand nine hundred and ninety-nine sex partners were not
enough.

Symons notes that homosexual relations offer a clear window on the
desires of each sex. Every heterosexual relationship is a compromise
between the wants of a man and the wants of a woman, so differences
between the sexes tend to be minimized. But homosexuals do not have
to compromise, and their sex lives showcase human sexuality in purer
form (at least insofar as the rest of their sexual brains are not patterned
like those of the opposite sex). In a study of homosexuals in San Fran-
cisco before the AIDS epidemic, twenty-eight percent of gay men
reported having had more than a thousand sex partners, and seventy-five
percent reported having had more than a hundred. No gay woman
reported a thousand partners, and only two percent reported as many as
a hundred. Other desires of gay men, like pornography, prostitutes, and
attractive young partners, also mirror or exaggerate the desires of hetero-
sexual men. (Incidentally, the fact that men's sexual wants are the same
whether they are directed at women or directed at other men refutes the

notions market equivalents to pornography for women are the romance
novel and the bodice-ripper, in which the sex is described in the context
of emotions and relationships rather than as a succession of bumping
bodies.)
HUSBANDS AND WIVES

In evolutionary terms, a man who has a short-term mating history is better off if he accumulates wealth and establishes an exogamous marriage. This increases his genetic fitness because he can pass on his genes with a reproductive probability of near 100% to his children. Men should seek wealth, not just many wives, if their aim is to ensure that their children will be well cared for. In most societies, marriage is seen as an exogamous institution, and both husbands and wives are strongly focused on maximizing their reproductive fitness. In addition, marriage provides a means of social control over women, ensuring their reproductive autonomy is limited. The marriage contract is therefore a means of ensuring that women are controlled and that their reproductive potential is directed towards the perpetuation of the husband's lineage.

In many societies, marriage is seen as a means of social control over women, ensuring their reproductive autonomy is limited. The marriage contract is therefore a means of ensuring that women are controlled and that their reproductive potential is directed towards the perpetuation of the husband's lineage. The marriage contract is a legal agreement that establishes the rights and obligations of the parties involved. It is a means of social control over women, ensuring their reproductive autonomy is limited. The marriage contract is therefore a means of ensuring that women are controlled and that their reproductive potential is directed towards the perpetuation of the husband's lineage.
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All of these changes in social patterns come from a single source: women. Women’s greater prominence, for example, is due to new opportunities, not to the simple fact that they are women. In the past, women’s activities and achievements were often overlooked or undervalued, leading to the belief that women were not capable of leadership or significant contributions. However, as women have begun to participate more actively in public life, their contributions have become more evident, and their achievements have been recognized. Women’s leadership and influence are now more widely accepted, and their voices are being heard in a way that they were not before.

Legal marriage, naturally, has been a key factor in this trend. In many places, women have been able to marry and establish legal partnerships, which has given them more rights and protections. As a result, women have been able to pursue their own interests and careers, and have been able to participate more fully in the public sphere. This has led to a greater awareness of the contributions that women can make, and to a greater respect for their abilities and achievements.

Economic development, too, has played a role in this change. As economies have grown and developed, women have been able to participate in the workforce in greater numbers, and have been able to achieve greater financial independence. This has allowed them to make choices and pursue goals that were previously beyond their reach.

In short, women’s greater prominence in society is a result of a combination of factors, including changes in social patterns, legal marriage, and economic development. These factors have worked together to create a new reality for women, in which they are able to participate more fully in public life and make significant contributions. The future looks bright for women, and it is clear that they will continue to play a vital role in shaping the world.

The next chapter of this book will explore the challenges and opportunities that women face in today’s society, and the steps that can be taken to ensure that they are able to continue to make their mark in the years to come.
What should men look for in a wife? Aside from faithfulness, which is a no-brainer, the survey found that women would like their husbands to be thoughtful, kind, strong, and handsome. And when it comes to looks, 65% of women said they prefer men who are taller and more slender than they are, while 35% said they prefer men who are shorter and more robust.

Do men look for the same qualities in a woman? The survey found that men prefer women who are intelligent, attractive, confident, and ambitious. And when it comes to looks, 50% of men said they prefer women who are taller and more slender than they are, while 50% said they prefer women who are shorter and more robust.

So, are men and women really looking for the same qualities in a partner? It seems they are, but with a twist. Men may be looking for a partner who is a bit more like them, while women may be looking for a partner who is a bit more like them. This is a complex issue, and it's not something that can be easily explained. But it's clear that men and women have different perspectives on what makes a good partner.
The latter part of the 20th century saw a trend in women becoming more visible and achieving higher social status. Women were increasingly represented in the media and in public life. This trend was driven by a variety of factors, including changes in attitudes towards gender roles and the women's liberation movement. The increasing visibility of women was accompanied by a rise in women's representation in various fields, such as politics, academia, and business.

Women's liberation movements of the 1960s and 1970s called for equal rights and opportunities for women. These movements encouraged women to challenge traditional gender roles and to demand educational and professional opportunities. The result was a significant increase in women's participation in the workforce, particularly in traditionally male-dominated fields.

The trend towards women's visibility and representation continued into the 21st century, with women holding increasing numbers of high-level positions in government, business, and academia. This trend has been accompanied by a growing awareness of gender equality and the ongoing efforts to address and overcome gender biases.

The visibility of women in various fields has also led to a broader recognition of the importance of gender equality, with efforts to promote diversity and inclusion. These efforts aim to ensure that women have equal opportunities and to challenge gender-based discrimination and bias.

Overall, the trend towards women's visibility and representation is a positive development, reflecting societal progress towards greater equality and justice for all.
have found that beauty is clearly distinguished from attractiveness in the eyes of many observers. However, the relationship between the two is not straightforward. Beauty is often associated with youth and health, whereas attractiveness is more closely linked to physical characteristics such as height, weight, and body proportions. Consequently, beauty is likely to be more important in the selection of mates than attractiveness, as it is a more permanent characteristic.
Beauty is not, as some feminists have claimed, a conspiracy by men to objectify and oppress women. The reality, in societies like the United States, is that women themselves have taken control over their sexuality and the ills of beauty culture that were imposed on them. The fashion industry has been a key player in this process, using the image of the beautiful woman to sell its products. The idea of the perfect body has been constructed and marketed to women, and they have accepted it as their own. Women have been trained to see themselves as objects of desire, and they have internalized this message. The result has been a culture of beauty that is not only damaging to women's physical and mental health, but also to their economic well-being.

The fashion industry has long been a powerful force in shaping our perceptions of beauty. It has created an idealized notion of beauty that is often unattainable for most women. This idealized notion has been perpetuated through advertising and media images, which often feature models who are unrepresentative of the average woman. These images have created a sense of anxiety and insecurity among women, who feel pressure to conform to these standards. This has led to a widespread pursuit of weight loss and body modification, often through dangerous and harmful practices.

In recent years, however, there has been a growing movement to challenge the beauty ideal and to promote a more inclusive and diverse notion of beauty. This movement has been driven by women who have been able to express themselves on social media and to connect with others who share their experiences. This has created a space for women to express themselves and to redefine what it means to be beautiful.

The challenge to the beauty ideal is not without its challenges. The fashion industry and the media continue to promote a narrow definition of beauty, and women are often subject to harassment and abuse for not conforming to these standards. However, the movement to challenge the beauty ideal is gaining momentum, and there is hope that it will lead to a more inclusive and empowering society for women.
For humans, like all animals, life is complicated. Males are complicated because of two of their own reproductive habits. They have the sex drive, which is a biological need to reproduce, and they have the sex urge, which is a psychological need to have sex. The sex drive is the stronger of the two, and it often leads to sexual activity before the sex urge is satisfied.

Women, on the other hand, are complicated because of their own reproductive habits. They have the sex urge, which is a psychological need to have sex, and they have the sex drive, which is a biological need to reproduce. The sex urge is the stronger of the two, and it often leads to sexual activity before the sex drive is satisfied.

For both men and women, the sex drive is strongest in early adulthood and decreases with age. The sex urge is strongest in middle adulthood and decreases with age. The sex drive is strongest in early adulthood and decreases with age. The sex urge is strongest in middle adulthood and decreases with age.
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All over the world, men beat and kill women and children, with great frequency and impunity. Indeed, violence against women is such a common occurrence that governments and international institutions have sought ways to address it. However, the effectiveness of these efforts is often limited, and women continue to face a host of challenges, including discrimination, poverty, and lack of access to justice. In many societies, women are denied basic human rights, and their voices are often marginalized or silenced.

Unlike birds, though humans plug their sexual jealousy into a hormone cognitive machine. People think in metaphors, and the metaphor that most always used for women is property. In their essay "The Husband's Hat," Carol Smart and Dan show that men do not think this way. Unlike women, they cannot be exchanged or disposed of as their possessions can be modified without notice, and can demand obedience or death. These rights of ownership are necessary for collective reproduction, and until recently they have formalized the metaphors of ownership of a man's wife. Each man owns his wife. In most societies, marriage is a blatant transfer of ownership of a woman to the husband. In our own marriage ceremony, the bride's father hands over his daughter as "the wife of the husband," who then takes the "bride" as his "property." In the midst of such practices, we can hardly imagine any trace of any woman's will through her body, her mind, her voice, her actions.

The English-speaking world, the common law recognizes the husband as the owner of the wife. He can sell her, lease her, give her as a gift. Marriage was a contract, not a consent. Consent to sexual relations could not be obtained without force. The only way to legitimize a woman's use by a man was to marry her. The marriage contract was between the husband and the king, not between the husband and the wife. The husband could bequeath his wife to his heir, or sell her for a price. Women were chattel, property, and their status was determined by their ownership by men. The economic and legal status of women were intertwined, and women were not seen as independent agents or individuals.

In many cultures, women are denied access to education, healthcare, and employment. They are often prevented from voting, holding public office, or engaging in political activism. Women are also subjected to violence, including domestic violence, honor killings, and female genital mutilation. The United Nations estimates that one in three women worldwide has experienced physical or sexual violence at the hands of an intimate partner, and that women are more likely to be the victims of violence than men. Yet, despite these challenges, women continue to fight for their rights and for a world where they are treated with respect and dignity.
I wish I could have discussed the evolutionary psychology of sexuality without the aside about feminist theory, but in today’s intellectual climate that is impossible. The Darwinian approach to sex is often attacked as being antifeminist, but that is just wrong. Indeed, the accusation is baffling on the face of it, especially to the many feminist women who have developed and tested the theory. The core of feminism is surely the goal of ending sexual discrimination and exploitation, an ethical and political position that is in no danger of being refuted by any foreseeable-scientific theory or discovery. Even the spirit of the research poses no threat to feminist ideals. The sex differences that have been documented are in the psychology of reproduction, not in economic or political worth, and they are invidious with regard to men, not women. The differences should heighten awareness of incest, exploitation, harassment, stalking, battering, rape (including date rape and marital rape), and legal codes that discriminate against women. If they show that men are especially tempted to commit certain crimes against women, the implication is that the deterrents should be surer and more severe, not that the crimes are somehow less odious. Even evolutionary explanations of the traditional division of labor by sex do not imply that it is unchangeable, “natural” in the sense of good, or something that should be forced on individual women or men who don’t want it.

What evolutionary psychology challenges is not the goals of feminism, but parts of the modern orthodoxy about the mind that have been taken up by the intellectual establishment of feminism. One idea is that people are designed to carry out the interests of their class and sex, rather than to act out of their own beliefs and desires. A second is that the minds of children are formed by their parents, and the minds of adults are formed by language and by media images. A third is the romantic doctrine that our natural inclinations are good and that ignoble motives come from society.

The unstated premise that nature is nice lies behind many of the objections to the Darwinian theory of human sexuality. Carefree sex is natural and good, it is assumed, so if someone claims that men want it more than women do, it would imply that men are mentally healthy and women neurotic and repressed. That conclusion is unacceptable, so the claim that men want carefree sex more than women do cannot be correct. Similarly, sexual desire is good, so if men rape for sex (rather than to express anger towards women), rape would not be as evil. Rape is evil, therefore the claim that men rape for sex cannot be correct. More generally, what people instinctively like is good, so if people like beauty, beauty would be a sign of worth. Beauty is not a sign of worth, so the claim that people like beauty cannot be correct.

These kinds of arguments combine bad biology (nature is nice), bad psychology (the mind is created by society), and bad ethics (what people like is good). Feminism would lose nothing by giving them up.

**RIVALS**

People everywhere strive for a ghastly substance called authority, cachet, dignity, dominance, eminence, esteem, face, position, preeminence, prestige, rank, regard, repulse, respect, standing, stature, or status. People go hungry, risk their lives, and exhaust their wealth in pursuit of bits of ribbon and metal. The economist Thorstein Veblen noticed that people sacrificed so many necessities of life to impress one another that they appear to be responding to a “higher, spiritual need.” Status and virtue are close in people’s minds, as we see in words like chivalrous, class, courtly, gentlemanly, honourable, noble, and princely, and their opposites ill-bred, low-class, low-rent, mean, nasty, rude, shabby, and scroffy. When it comes to the trifles of perspicacity we express our admiration for the tasteful using ethical correct, and faultless, and ensure the tenor attitude that the art historian Is this any way to build arthful motives come from?

Many animals are more selective causes are no loner averse differ in their ability to forcer or more poisonous.

These potent creatures want creatures they can impinge on. But it is impossible for every muscle mass, biochemical comp gradient creatures advertise the non-experimental creatures can counte the signal and nap the