

## **Chapter Six — Alpha, Beta, And Theta Instincts All Influence**

### **Our Intergroup Behaviors**

Our basic sets of instincts that cause us to be hierarchical create behaviors and thought processes that can both support and enable intergroup Peace and create major barriers to the creation of intergroup Peace.

We have very clear instincts to be hierarchical, territorial, and to gain, hold, protect, and use power as leaders in the hierarchies we create.

We have Alpha instincts, Beta instincts, and Theta instincts that all are relevant to our thinking and our behaviors as individuals and as groups.

We create hierarchies of some kind in every setting where we form a group. We create cultures in every group setting and a key component of every significant culture tends to be a hierarchy.

We clearly know in every setting what the hierarchy for the setting is and we each tend to know our own relative position in the hierarchy that exists for each setting.

We tend to have several layers of relative status in our hierarchies that each tends to generate their own fairly predictable and consistent sets of instinctive behaviors.

It is useful to understand and work with each of those sets of instincts to create and sustain support for intergroup Peace in all of our hierarchical settings.

### **Hierarchical Instincts Create Hierarchies Everywhere**

Our hierarchal instincts and behaviors tend to be directly relevant to the issues of intergroup Peace because of the role that key people in the hierarchies of each group play in determining how groups interact with one another.

Making Peace between groups — and creating Peace inside of groups — both usually require interactions at key levels with the relevant hierarchy of each group. Each city, business, military unit, tribe, clan, or religious organization — sets up some level of hierarchy — and creating a strategy that builds Peace in those settings requires getting the relevant levels in each hierarchy to support those efforts and those objectives.

Most hierarchies are multi-level. Most hierarchies determine and identify not only who is the Alpha person for each hierarchy but also who are the various levels of people who function and hold status and exercise relative power at each step in the chain of command below the Alpha level.

The military has very clear chain of command levels that range from the individual private soldier at the bottom to major generals at the top. Our military people have perfected the multi-step structured hierarchal process.

We use that model so well in the military that we can actually have multiple levels of private soldiers at the base of the military power pyramid and we also tend to have multiple levels of generals at the very top. There are clear levels of gradation in authority from top to bottom for each step in the hierarchy.

Ships have captains. Every sea faring group of people that sends ships to sea has historically had a captain at the helm of each ship. Ships also tend to have very clear chains of command for leader levels below the rank of captain.

Groups of ships also generally have their own ship group leader. Commodores and admirals are the Alpha leaders for groups of ships. The chain of command from top to bottom tends to be very clear on all naval settings across all cultures.

That particular set of instinctive behaviors tends to feels right to he people in each setting.

The sailors on a ship feel comfort in having both a chain of command and a leader on their ship. People on a ship clearly tend to feel instinct triggered stress when there is no captain in place for their vessel.

People also feel comfort in having a hierarchy that falls below the Alpha leader. Ships often have first mates, second mates, etc., who represent the chain of command below the captain level.

One of the roles of that explicit hierarchy chain of command that is used for ships and navies is to determine without question or hesitation who is in control and who is in command of the boat if the captain is killed by an enemy or simply falls overboard and if the first mate has a heart attack or is also killed.

For any kind of collective operational enterprise, like steering a boat or running a ship — the role of the Alpha leader and role of the hierarchy in making various categories of decisions is extremely important for the operation of the vessel.

That chain-of-command approach is obviously not a process or a functionality that is limited to ships. We tend to use the similar processes whenever we set up a hierarchy — beginning with an Alpha in every setting.

## **We Have Chiefs Everywhere**

In each group setting, someone ends up as chief. The pattern is functionally universal. We have chiefs everywhere. Clans have chiefs. Tribes have chiefs. Corporations have chiefs. The C in CEO stands for “Chief” Executive Officer.

We have a whole array of “chief” titles in our various organizational settings and those titles tend to indicate the Alpha leaders in every setting.

Every hierarchy has an Alpha in the process.

Towns have mayors. States have governors. Countries have Emperors or Kings or Sheikhs or Dictators or Presidents or Prime Ministers.

For each country, international law and universal practice earnestly and faithfully echoes those basic instinctive patterns and recognizes someone in the country to be the Chief of State for that country. All countries have someone who is at least their symbolic Alpha leader. Likewise, each organization we form tends to have a hierarchy and each hierarchy tends to have, at its peak, an Alpha person who fulfills the role of chief for that group and that setting.

### **Organizations Have Multiple Levels In Their Hierarchies**

Our hierarchies do not stop at the Alpha level. We also tend to identify other people in each setting to represent the functional chain of command for the setting.

Corporations generally have both people in Alpha positions and people in multiple other levels in their hierarchies as well — ranging from front line workers to work leaders, work supervisors, unit managers, various levels of directors, multiple levels of vice presidents, and multiple categories and layers of junior and senior leaders.

Inside each hierarchy level in our larger organizations, we often see additional layers — with assistant directors, directors, and other senior directors for the director level in a company. We can see vice presidents, senior vice presidents, group vice presidents, and executive vice presidents — and each level in each setting knows exactly where they are in their own chain of command.

## **Each Person Knows Both Who To Salute And Who Should**

### **Salute Them**

Each person in those hierarchies knows who they are supposed to salute and each person knows who is supposed to salute them. People very instinctively — and culturally — expect to salute and people expect to be saluted...and people can be very unhappy at an instinct and culture-supported level when their personal expectations are not met in either direction.

We tend to take pride and find comfort both in the existence of a hierarchy and in our own relative position on it.

Dukes, Earls, Counts, Marquis, Kings, Sheiks, and Emperors all know and are defined by their relative position in their relevant hierarchy. People with each of those titles of nobility tend to have great pride of position that is derived from their place and position. Likewise generals, colonels, majors, captains, lieutenants, sergeants, and corporals all know their places in their relevant military hierarchies.

That relative position tends to be a source of pride and a defining characteristic for each person who is in a hierarchal position.

Each layer has its own set of instinctive behaviors. We create very predictable sets of behaviors for each relative status level. We have Alpha instincts, Beta instincts, and a broad range of Theta instincts that guide how people feel, behave, and even think in each setting.

Interestingly, observers have written about a somewhat similar existence of multi-level hierarchies for baboon troops, chimpanzee clans, hyena packs, and even lion prides. There tend to be very recognizable multi-level hierarchical behaviors in those settings that closely parallel some of the human hierarchal levels and roles.

Lion prides, for example, invariably have an Alpha male for each pride and many prides also have one or more beta males who help the Alpha male with his Alpha duties. The Beta males do that work in a way that is subordinate to the Alpha male, but dominant relative to other members of the Pride.

### **Each Hierarchical Level Has Its Function And Purpose**

Instincts clearly structure those lion hierarchies and their related roles in very consistent and predictable ways. Each hierarchy level that exists for each of the other hierarchical species seems to have an inherent functionality and purpose.

Alpha male lions, for example, tend to have a clear role, function, and hierarchical position in each pride. Female lions in each pride actually do most of the hunting for the lion families. The females are faster and quicker than the males and female lions are extremely strong and fierce in their own right.

The female lions kill prey well and that is a major role for them. The larger and slower Alpha male lions in each pride then play a very important role for the food supply of lion families by protecting the kills that are done by the female lions from other predators and from various scavengers who would otherwise steal their food.

The male lions protect the prey killed by the female lions from jackals, hyenas, wild dogs, and even vultures. The usual pattern for consuming food supplies for lions is that the male lions in each setting primarily function to protect the kill from all of those categories of hungry and fierce scavengers in their setting while the female lions and cubs eat.

That entire process — and the assigned tasks and roles that exist for both lion genders — are consistent and logical. The fast and lethal females kill the prey. The bigger and slower male lions then go to the kill and generally eat first before the various sets of scavengers arrive.

The female lions and the lion cubs in each pride eat safely while the male lion protects their food.

The female lions do not simply fight the jackals and attack the hyenas themselves because the female lions might be damaged in that fighting process and the female lions can't afford to be crippled, slowed down, or functionally impaired by the kind of damage that could result from a jackal or hyena fight. The female lions need their speed.

Alpha male lions, by contrast, do not need to be fast. They only need to be strong and fierce.

The prominent male lion manes seem to have the functional value of giving the male lions a degree of protection against neck bites by the key sets of scavengers who want to eat the lion family's food.

The Alpha roles and the relative hierarchical status for lions tend to be clearly defined and they are clearly very functional.

Alpha status for lions comes with a set of Alpha roles and Alpha rules.

In many lion prides, there is at least one beta male who is subordinate in multiple behaviors, who also protects the food supply and who is also allowed sexual access to the female lions. The beta lions are often brothers to the Alpha lion.

### **Chimpanzee Clans Have Similar Hierarchies**

Chimpanzee clans have similar hierarchies — with the Alpha males for each chimp group generally supported by some discernable layers of subordinate males.

The males, as a group, are frequently accountable for protecting the females from other chimp groups and from various relevant predators.

The males tend to have a clear hierarchy for each chimpanzee group. The female chimpanzees in each group also tend to have their own hierarchy — with an Alpha female in each group.

The Alpha female in each chimpanzee clan tends to oversee the various interactions within the group. Some observers have reported that the Alpha female in a chimpanzee group sometimes has the power to organize a functional revolution and to depose the alpha male in a group if the Alpha male either is inadequate in defending the group against enemies or if the Alpha male is abusive or threatening in some way to the baby chimpanzees.

The Alpha males have their status, their privileges, and their functions. The Alpha females sometimes decide whether or not a functionally deficient and behaviorally flawed Alpha male can be allowed to continue in their Alpha role.

Hierarchies and related tasks for each group member exist for those species because the hierarchies for each setting create functional roles for each layer in each group that helps to ensure the success and the survival of each group that is using that specific hierarchy.

So, we are not alone in having our hierarchies and we are not alone in using them in very functional ways.

### **Each Hierarchy Functions in a Culture**

In important respects for people, each hierarchy is defined by its own setting-specific functional paradigm.

Each hierarchy clearly has and uses its own culture. The culture paradigm that exists for each group functions as a set of rules and guidances that help people in each hierarchy know what to do, when to do it, and who to do it with.

The leaders of each hierarchy tend to set, influence, define, and enforce the cultural realities and cultural functionality for each hierarchal setting.

Sun Tzu, in the 2,000-year-old book, *The Art of War*, outlined the need for military leaders to clearly establish both the hierarchal chain of command and the basic culture of each army. Sun Tzu was very clear about the needed structure for an army and he was even more clear about the culture components that he believed were needed for an army to both succeed and survive.

His insights on those issues are useful reading even today. Some of those organizational approaches and cultural insights from Sun Tzu are described in *The Art of Intergroup Peace* — a sister book to this book.

In any case, our instincts to create hierarchies are clearly universal. We see them everywhere. We feel instinctive comfort both when a hierarchy is in place and when we know our own relative position on our relevant hierarchy.

People can feel high levels of instinct triggered stress in any setting when people don't know their own relative position on the relevant hierarchy or when there is a time of change and that change creates hierarchal uncertainty.

Mergers in the corporate world — and merging or combining government units, religious groups or even labor unions — can all trigger significant hierarchal stress levels. Those stress levels usually continue until the people in the merged setting have a clear sense of the leader level for the group and of their own personal relative status in their newly relevant hierarchy.

People who want to end the sometimes dysfunctional morale issues and the various misalignment consequences and behaviors that can result from a merger in any setting can usually reduce or even avoid many of those negative consequences by moving quickly to identify both the new culture that will be used and the new hierarchy that will be in place for that organization.

People often feel deep instinctive stress when the culture for their organization is unclear and when the hierarchy they relate to is either ambiguous or confusing.

### **We Have Instincts For Other Hierarchal Levels as Well**

People instinctively want a clear sense of what the relevant hierarchy is for a given setting and also what their personal role and status is in that hierarchy.

Like the Beta lions, people tend to be in various levels in our hierarchies. The sets of instincts that are triggered by Beta status and by each of the other relative power levels also tend to look very similar across multiple cultures, organizations, communities, and relevant settings.

Our Theta instincts cause people to know exactly what their own relative position is in any hierarchy and to be both ambitious relative to the possibility of being promoted and to be significantly concerned, worried, and alarmed about the possibility or threat of being demoted.

Whether someone is a department manager — or a unit supervisor — or a platoon Lieutenant — there is often a level of instinct-based security and comfort for the person who is in that status and who is currently functioning with the specific relative power that is conveyed and granted by holding that particular position or that relative status in the hierarchy of each setting.

People can feel comfort in holding the position and — as noted earlier — people can feel real stress and even anger at a very instinctive level if

their relative position and relative status is threatened or actually undermined.

People in each setting in a hierarchy tend to be comfortable exercising the relative power that comes from their position in that hierarchy. Our Alpha status instincts create one very consistent set of behaviors and values and our Beta and Theta instinct packages create additional very predictable sets and packages of responses and hierarchical behaviors.

### **Not Knowing Relative Status Creates Real Stress**

Mergers can screw up hierarchies.

The deepest stress for people after a merger of some kind often comes from not knowing their own relative position in the new hierarchy. People tend to defend and protect their hierarchical positioning.

People can become angry and can exhibit conflict-provoking behaviors if their relative status is threatened in any setting. People feel a need to understand who to salute and people need to know who should salute them in any setting — and learning that quickly after a merger or reorganization can reduce stress levels.

### **Equality Creates Its Own Flat Hierarchy**

Some cultures have created a sense of relative and broad equality for various sets of group members — extending egalitarian citizenship status of some kind to a broad set of group members, for example.

Creating any kind of broad “citizenship” equality for a set of people seems to eliminate a hierarchy — but it actually is not the elimination of hierarchy. It functionally creates a flat hierarchy. “Flat” actually defines a type of hierarchy.

Equality functionally creates a flat hierarchy.

People who have that relative egalitarian position in any setting will also generally fight to protect it. Equality is actually its own hierarchy.

People who feel that equality is their rightful position in a group setting can feel anger and stress if their equality is threatened.

Even in the settings where there is a legal equality for all group members, those settings still select people to act in Alpha roles. The equal status in those settings gives people equal say — a vote — in selecting the Alpha leaders. Pure anarchy does not exist in nature.

So even in those settings where equality is a key cultural component, the equality does not eliminate Alpha or Beta positions. It functionally lets all of the equal people share in the selection process for the people in those positions.

## **People Know Their Relative Position**

Once people are in a chain of command, their relative position becomes very imperative to them. People who believe they are somewhere up a chain of command generally know exactly how far up that chain they are and people will often feel pressure at an instinctive and visceral level to defend that exact hierarchical level against slippage of any kind.

So in any time of change, clarifying relative status for everyone very soon can be a good thing for senior leaders to do for both Peace of mind and for functional stability and operational effectiveness in that setting.

Skillful merger leaders who deal with those kinds of issues directly and quickly after any merger and consolidation happens as a strategy to tend to be able to forestall the paralysis and the stress levels that can be caused by uncertainty in those areas.

Machiavelli— in *The Prince* — outlined the need for dealing with the array of cultural and hierarchal issues that are generated anytime a prince gains power in a new setting.

*The Prince* is actually a useful book to read for any people who are leading or planning mergers or group consolidations in any setting.

In any case, hierarchies are everywhere. We clearly have an instinct to make them happen. Each hierarchy tends to be led by someone who

personally has achieved Alpha status for that hierarchy and who has their own Alpha instincts activated.

### **Alpha Status Instincts Drive Predictable Behaviors**

That is an extremely important set of relevant instincts that we need to understand in order to improve intergroup interactions. Alphas are also everywhere. Having alpha status actually generates its own set of instinctive behaviors at several very predictable levels and those behaviors can be extremely relevant when our goal is to create a culture of intergroup Peace for America.

Each of our relevant hierarchies tends to have a person who is in the lead position — the very top Alpha level — for the hierarchy.

We need to understand clearly that being Alpha in any setting can actually trigger its own set of instinctive behaviors for the person who becomes Alpha for that setting.

A number of very consistent instinctive behaviors and emotions can be activated and empowered in individuals when a person achieves alpha status for any group.

Those patterns of alpha behavior are so consistent and so universal that we can only understand them fully when we recognize that they are clearly and directly based on a common package of Alpha instincts and they

are not invented as unique sets of situation specific behaviors by each Alpha leader.

Patterns exist. We need to know exactly what those patterns are.

The Alpha in any group tends to look out for and focus on the governance processes, the power structure, and the functional status of the entire group. Alpha leaders everywhere find themselves focused on that set of issues.

Turf instincts are often significantly stronger in the people who have personally activated Alpha instincts. Like the Alpha lions, Alpha wolves, Alpha chimpanzees, and Alpha horses, Alpha humans tend to have a strong commitment to their group turf.

Our turf protection and turf ownership instincts are discussed and described in the next chapter of this book. Those turf-linked instincts tend to be very easily and fully activated at both the group and individual level in whomever is Alpha for any given setting.

The Alpha person in any group generally expects to be obeyed. That isn't always true, but it is consistent enough to be a predictable behavior. Being obeyed and followed by the group is an expectation that often isn't held by the non-Alpha people in any group.

It generally feels right to people whose Alpha instincts have been activated by achieving alpha status in their setting to be obeyed in areas where that setting creates and grants both alpha authority levels and functional Alpha roles and behaviors to that leader.

### **People Can Become Addicted to Alpha Status**

People often like being Alpha.

People often aspire to Alpha status. Many people find being Alpha to be a psychologically and emotionally rewarding experience.

Some people can even become addicted to Alpha status. Being Alpha can be ego enhancing. The other people in any given group tend to defer to whoever is Alpha. Other people in each group often agree or seem to agree with the Alpha status holder on the statements that are made — and agree or seem to agree on the decisions that are made — by whoever is Alpha in that setting.

So whoever is Alpha in any given setting tends to have other group members in that setting defer to the Alpha person's status and other group members tend to openly and consistently agree with the Alpha person's thinking and directives.

That whole process of having people defer to the Alpha in multiple ways can be emotionally reinforcing and rewarding for the people who achieve Alpha positions in any setting.

## **The Loss Of Alpha Status Can Generate Unhappiness And**

### **Pain**

That entire situation can create its own kind of psychological addiction for many Alpha-activated people. Even relatively low levels of power can be both seductive and addictive for some people.

The daily neurochemical rewards that came from Alpha status in any setting can become an expected part of the Alpha's life experience.

In some settings, the people who have held Alpha status for significant periods of time build their own internal expectations about being treated in alpha ways and many people can have strong and constantly reinforcing experiences relative to the benefits and the emotional rewards of being Alpha.

When those reinforcing experiences disappear because Alpha status is lost by someone for any reason, the loss of that status can create both pain and unhappiness for the former Alpha.

The loss of a person's Alpha status in any setting can actually be extremely unpleasant for some people. The Alpha status loss impact can sometimes function like a form of addiction withdrawal for the former Alpha who has lost the various direct and indirect reward processes that were part of the Alpha role.

### **Alpha Instincts Can Trigger A Level Of Accountability**

There is a functional and process-linked set of reasons why we have neurochemical reward systems for being maternal and for being sexual and for being Alpha.

Basic survival at a functional level depends on our children being born and protected and on our groups being safely led and protected.

Successful Alpha leaders improve the survival probabilities for the groups they lead. So we need Alpha leaders to do that work and do it well.

Being Alpha, however, can actually be hard work. Being Alpha can be very stressful in its own right.

Like the Alpha lions and the Alpha chimpanzees, being Alpha as a person can create a set of obligations and layers of specific functional and emotional concerns for whoever holds that status in any setting.

Being Alpha can create a sense of needing to be both the protector of the group and a personal need to be the protector of the group's turf at multiple levels.

The person who is Alpha for any family, clan, tribe, or nation — or for any company or union or association — can feel the instinctive need to protect their own group. The Alpha person will often feel deep levels of instinctive stress and anger when their group or their turf is threatened, invaded, or jeopardized in any way.

Alpha status generally creates its own array of concerns and obligations that bear close resemblance to the Alpha obligations, expectations, behaviors, and functions of Alpha leaders in many of the other species who also have instinctive Alpha roles and expectations in place.

Because the Alpha role has its obligations and sometimes stressful accountabilities, Alpha status also brings with it a significant array of behavioral and emotional benefits. In some settings, the person who is Alpha can end up with the best living quarters, the best food, and — in a number of alpha settings where males are the usual Alpha placeholders — multiple wives or a plural number of concubines or concubine equivalents.

### **Alpha Males In Some Cultures Have Multiple Wives**

The people who are in Alpha positions in some cultural settings are not unlike the Alpha lions, the Alpha baboons, and the Alpha stallions in having some functional level of priority sexual access to multiple females in their group. Cult leaders, tribal kings, and Emperors in various settings have often had multiple wives.

Those levels of multiple sexual relationships are a familiar and not uncommon behavior and cultural pattern for Alpha males in many historical settings.

The number of wives that have existed for various kings, emperors, or chiefs, and even dictators in a number of cultures have sometimes far exceeded the number of female lions in a pride or the number of female wolves in a pack — but the basic patterns are not dissimilar.

In most modern settings — and in our own country — that particular linkage between Alpha status and multiple sexual linkages doesn't formally exist. We tend to be a monogamous culture and actual bigamy at any level is illegal for everyone — including our Alpha leaders.

But there are some times and some settings even in our culture where echoes of that influence and those particular instinctive behavior patterns can still be seen.

Chapter Ten of this book deals with the various ways we have created patterns of behavior that discriminate very directly and clearly against women. Women have been oppressed and mistreated in multiple cultures and that continues to be the reality today in far too many parts of the world.

Our own society has been improving, but we have only made significant progress in some of those areas of discrimination against women relatively recently.

The very consistent patterns that exist to have men as the heads of families and to have men with some level of ownership and control status over their wives and the women in their families are described in Chapter Ten of this book.

In most settings, survival of the family depends on the children surviving. In order for the children to survive, each culture needs to make it possible for women to care for the children of the groups.

In order for the women in a culture to be available to care for the children, many cultures have mandated roles and functions for women that keep women in their homes and prevent women from going to war or even going into the forest to hunt.

Women in those settings who were functionally designated and mandated to remain in their homes needed someone to seek food — to be the hunter. So that hunter role has been given by almost all cultures to men.

Men have been both the hunters and the warriors in almost all cultures.

To keep men from deserting families, most cultures made families the only legal place for men to have sex. Most cultures also let men have their own personal Alpha instincts be activated in the context of their family by having men in all cultures being heads of families.

The specific sets of Alpha instincts and related behaviors that have historically been triggered in men by having men be the heads of families is also explained in Chapter Ten in more detail.

### **Our Alpha Instincts Interact With Other Instincts**

In any case, we clearly have sets of Alpha instincts that can be activated when someone achieves Alpha status. Those instincts guide Alpha behaviors — and they do not operate in a vacuum.

An earlier chapter in this book pointed out that our instincts can act alone or they can act as part of a package — with each instinct's impact embedded, modified, and functionally intertwined in the context of other

instincts. That is very true of our Alpha instincts. Several other relevant instincts can be triggered in a shared context with our Alpha instincts.

One level of interaction between our various key packages of instincts links our Alpha instincts to our culture building instincts.

Our laws and our cultures both regulate what our Alphas can do in their alpha settings relative to a whole array of behaviors.

Mayors in our culture can, for example, lead cities. Mayors can be the Alpha leader of our city. Mayors do not have unlimited Alpha power. Mayors must lead those cities in the context of the laws, the regulations, the cultural guidances, and the various functional infrastructure capabilities that we have deliberately and explicitly put in place for each city.

Being mayor, or governor, or CEO, can give a person great functional authority and significant power — but that power is never absolute in this country and it always functions in a context.

In our country today, that context we create for those positions limits and constrains a number of Alpha behaviors — and those behaviors tend to be more extreme in those settings where those restraints and constraints do not exist.

We humans often enjoy the opportunity to be alpha. Many people do aspire to achieve at least relative and situational alpha status. People who

have the ambition to climb any relevant chain of command often have the goal of ultimately becoming alpha in the process.

### **Alpha Instincts and Turf Instincts Tend to be Linked**

As noted earlier, one of the problems that can exist relative to creating intergroup Peace is that the Alpha person in each group and setting tends to be very conscious of turf infringement and of turf encroachment issues.

That is a clear area where our Alpha instincts interact very directly with another highly relevant instinct. Alpha activated people tend to define turf, protect turf, and can even aspire to expand turf.

The more ambitious alpha leaders in some settings may also be emotionally linked — at the negative and more destructive end of the intergroup instinct-guided value and ethics continuum — to taking turf away from other groups.

Some Alpha leaders aspire to achieving functional turf expansion and some may even create turf theft goals for the group they lead at the expense of other groups.

Congruent and contiguous turf expansion can easily be an Alpha behavior in some settings. Many kinds of turf expansion or turf encroachment behaviors can create serious intergroup tension and conflict, and they can create very real and very powerful intergroup anger.

We need Alphas in our lead positions who don't aspire to — or try to — expand turf.

We will all need our Alphas to be aligned with the concept of Peace in order to make Peace possible for this country and that alignment needs to include respect for the various relevant categories of turf that exist for the other groups in any setting.

We need our Alpha leaders to each help their own group achieve the safety of its relevant turf, without aspiring to take turf from other groups. We need Alphas who support an agenda of intergroup Peace where everyone has protection for their own turf.

### **Alphas Can Be Key To Peace**

Alphas are often key to Peace. Peace without Alpha support is close to impossible to achieve in far too many settings.

*The Art of Intergroup Peace* book that is a sister book to this book explains those points about the need for Peace — focused Alpha leaders in more detail.

Groups who want Peace in any setting need to understand that reality about the potentially negative and dangerous values and divisive goals of their Alpha leaders to be true.

Groups who want Peace in a setting may want to look for and support leaders who are, themselves, servant leaders — as opposed to leaders who individually need power or who are addicted to enhanced personal status.

We need leaders who aspire to Peace rather than leaders who aspire to conflict and we need to avoid leaders who create conflict because those leaders know that intergroup conflict in any setting can invoke and increase their own personal power over their own groups.

### **Intergroup Conflict Can Increase Alpha Power Levels**

Intergroup conflict has the clear ability to increase the power of alpha leaders in many settings. We all need to understand that to be both true and very relevant.

Using intergroup conflict to increase personal status and power is a relatively common instinct-based set of Alpha leader behaviors.

We all need to understand how that process works so we can keep it from happening. The patterns are all too familiar. We all tend to rally behind our leaders in times of war.

Leaders of groups often have more personal power when their group is in conflict, threatened, or actually at war.

That set of linkages between intergroup conflict and power for leaders can create significant intergroup challenges in some settings because some

of the leaders who are personally addicted to power and love their Alpha status will sometimes increase external stress levels for their groups and deliberately increase intergroup anger levels to increase their own power — rather than taking the steps that are needed and possible in any given setting to achieve Peace.

People in Alpha roles will sometimes do negative and dysfunctional things that create conflict between groups of people because when that conflict exists, people tend to grant more power to Alpha leaders and because the people in a group are less likely to replace Alpha leaders with another Alpha leader in times of conflict.

Job security for Alpha leaders can be created by the existence of InterGroup conflict. Too many Alpha leaders who don't want to lose their Alpha status know that to be true and act accordingly.

Once people recognize that those behavior patterns and those thought processes exist for Alpha status leaders, it can be easier to help the leaders in any group aspire to Peace.

It can also be easier for groups of people to very intentionally and deliberately select leaders who will work to achieve the personal status and role of a Peace leader instead of selecting and supporting leaders who prefer and chose to function as a war chief.

## **Losing Alpha Status Is Often Feared**

Losing Alpha status is often feared at a very basic level by people who are currently Alpha, and who have become emotionally committed to and addicted to their Alpha status.

Once a person has been in a position of significant authority, status or power and once a person has experienced the consequence and the impact of having their own personal Alpha instinct package activated, it can be very difficult and threatening for those people to return to non-Alpha status.

People who lose Alpha status can become depressed, angry, and sometimes dysfunctional. That can be particularly problematic when the status loss is involuntary, but even voluntary loss of that Alpha status can have a negative emotional impact on people.

Rational thinking can be challenged for those Alpha-jeopardized people in those situations. Anger and depression can both be triggered in those addicted and deposed leaders.

## **Mergers And Consolidations Can Create Duel And Dueling**

### **Alphas**

In looking at the impact of Alpha status changes for our society overall, it can be useful to understand how those instinctive behaviors have

an impact on various organizational settings including mergers of businesses, associations, or schools.

Corporate and organizational mergers often create a situational circumstance where there are situationally two alphas in an equivalent Alpha position within the merged companies or organization.

That can happen at the peak job of the company or organization and it can very easily happen at multiple division or departmental alpha, beta, and even theta levels.

When two hospitals merge, for example, it's highly likely that there will be two chiefs of surgery and that there will be two chief financial officers in the new merged organization.

Usually, a re-organization of some kind takes place after any merger. The usual pattern is that one of the two alphas in each position is selected to continue as Alpha and the other is, in practical terms, demoted — functionally rejected, displaced, and directly deselected as the key leader for that specific merged area or for the entire company.

### **Demoted, Reassigned, Or Ejected**

The rejected person in those situations can be demoted, reassigned, or completely fired and functionally ejected and served from the merged

organization. All of those consequences can be unpleasant for former Alphas.

When demotions take place, and the prior Alpha continues to be part of the work force, then that prior Alpha no longer has the mental mindset of being the lead person for that specific function.

Those demoted people often suffer pain, experience bouts of anger, and can even feel depression as the result of their very basically instinctive reaction to their demotion.

### **We Are Not Well Wired For Demotion**

We are not instinctively wired well for demotion. That particular wiring makes some biological sense.

In other species who have their own version of local Alpha leaders, the demoted Alpha in each setting is generally either killed or permanently expelled and exiled after they lose Alpha status — forced forever to live away from their former group.

Each of those outcomes is negative enough to make the fear of losing Alpha status in those settings very real and to make the Alphas in those settings do fierce and sometimes bloody things to retain and maintain their Alpha status.

For people in community leadership roles and for our work settings and our other organizational hierarchies, the deposed Alphas are not killed. Demotions and pure position losses do often happen, however, and people in Alpha positions tend to fear, resist, and resent that loss.

### **Captive Alphas Can Fester**

Fairly often, the former Alpha in any work setting who has been demoted — if they are still with the organization — can begin to feel like a “Captive Alpha.” Those former Alphas who are still embedded in an organization tend to be deeply unhappy.

An unhappy “Captive Alpha” can sometimes express their unhappiness, and their displeasure, and even their anger by engaging in negative behaviors and by setting up various kinds of negative and divisive communications that can undermine basic functions, damage morale and even sabotage operations and processes for the new merged organization.

Captive Alphas can be a problem in any setting.

The reality is that captive Alphas who are not addressed in an effective way can fester inside an organization and they can do damage as they fester. That set of negative consequence should be avoided in merger and consolidation settings for any kinds of organizations whenever possible.

### **People Need to Believe the Alpha Position is Filled**

Another Alpha related set of circumstances that presents itself with some frequency in various settings happens when an alpha position is filled in an organization and when the people in the hierarchy don't have a clear sense at a basic instinct-triggering level that the lead position has actually been filled.

When that happens, morale can suffer. When someone is named to a lead job and when other people in that chain of command don't believe or perceive that the Alpha position has actually been filled by the new leader, then people in those settings can sometimes behave in ways that are not positive and supportive for the overall success of the organization.

Basically, if that situation exists in a setting, the new Alpha leader in that setting can take several very specific and clear actions that will cause the people in her chain of command to have their Beta and Theta instincts fully activated.

A first clear step is to have other people in the chain of command have a clear focus and a sense of concern about their own relative current status. Announcing the fact that the new leader in that setting is going to review all key jobs and might do some level of reorganization and hierarchical changes for the organization, for example, can often very quickly trigger both people's Beta and Theta instincts.

People fear losing relative status at an instinctive level. People can be brought to a focus and a realization of the actual powers of the new leader when that relative status is clearly at risk.

It can also be very useful to give clear work direction in a definitive way for a number of important areas to the various other hierarchy leaders.

## **We Need Alpha Instincts To Be Aligned With Intergroup**

### **Peace**

In any case, for all of us, we need to understand that Alpha instincts clearly exist. We need to recognize that those instincts generally create very predictable patterns of behavior whenever they are activated.

We need to understand and deal with those instincts to achieve intergroup Peace — because if our Alpha leaders in any setting want to sabotage, undermine, and destroy Peace in that setting, they are often in a good position to do exactly that.

Likewise, if our various Alpha leaders in any setting want to achieve Peace, the likelihood of success for Peace for that setting increases substantially.

Leaders who want to fight rather than collaborate generally can create situations and circumstances where people will fight. Leaders who want to

collaborate with other leaders to achieve Peace can and do significantly increase the likelihood that Peace and collaboration will occur.

We need to expect that the prospect of intergroup alignment and Peace in a setting might feel like a threat to an Alpha leader's Alpha status, and we need to respect that fear and reflect those concerns in the strategies we implement for Peace in each setting.

We need to be particularly aware of the concerns that Alpha leaders might have that the steps they take to get to know leaders from other groups might be perceived by their own group to be the actions of a traitor at some level and not the acts of a person who have full loyalty to their own group.

Those issues are discussed in the section of this book that deals with our traitor instincts as a barrier to Peace.

Our instincts relating to turf can be a major trigger topic that focuses the attention of Alpha leaders and causes them to decide to fight or to decide to somehow make Peace happen for that setting.

Often, the single most difficult and challenging set of issues that Alphas need to face relative to making Peace are the issues relating to turf.

Likewise, the easiest set of trigger issues that can be used by leaders in many settings to create conflict and to end Peace or sabotage and prevent Peace can be turf-related.

That is an area where the personal credibility and standing of leaders with their own group is extremely important. Turf issues reach into group belief systems at an essential level — and the only way that those issues can be resolved in many settings is to have leaders in those settings who understand the instinctive issues involved as well as the historic ones — and who have both the wisdom to build a successful solution to those issues for their groups, and the credibility and standing with their own group to actually negotiate and execute the deal that solves the issues.

Leaders who solve those issues who are not perceived by their own group to have the authority to do those deals cannot create successful solutions to those issues.

We need to very clearly understand our entire packages of instincts that relate to turf, and we need to understand how our Alpha leaders can and should deal with those packages of instincts and the realities they create.

That is the next chapter of this book.