

Chapter Ten — Discrimination Against Women Has Been Painfully Universal For A Very Long Time

Building small, locally run health plans in rural villages in Uganda was a fascinating learning experience for me at multiple levels. I learned a lot about both care delivery and community activism in those settings.

That level of learning did not surprise me. What did surprise me — and gave me cause for serious thought — was to learn how badly women were too often treated in that country.

Women in Uganda often had very difficult lives. They had amazingly few rights as human beings. Their husbands had total control over their finances, and their husbands even had complete and unchallenged legal control over their children.

Women in Uganda had no legal rights relative to their own children. I could not believe that to be true when I first heard it. I saw that to be true in the lives of women who were my friends and my colleagues in that country.

Men had all the power and all the control at multiple levels over a wide range of activities and behaviors for women.

The situation was so grim that there was a local court case that happened while I was helping to start those health plans where a man beat

his wife to death and he was acquitted of murder on the basis of “logic” because the judge ruled that he owned his wife and no sane man would intentionally and basically destroy his own property.

I was shocked at what I saw. What I saw caused me to spend time looking at the status and treatment of women in other countries, including our own.

I began that process as a strong supporter of equal rights for women.

I was a charter local member of NOW. I had been a long-time advocate for full women’s right in our own country. I knew that we had discriminated against women in multiple ways for a very long time — and I was opposed to that discrimination.

But I did not understand how difficult and miserable life can be for women in other countries until I saw those negative realities first hand in a number of other settings.

I did not have a clear sense of how bad the problem was until I started looking at those issues and I began seeing some extremely negative behaviors relate to women at very direct and damaging levels. The sad and painful truth is that women are oppressed in multiple settings today.

When I looked at those situations to see what the overarching behavior patterns were, I could easily see that the oppression of women existed across a wide range of settings that reached as far back in our history as we have access to our history.

It was clear that the discrimination against women in all of those settings had clear cultural underpinnings.

Cultures have discriminated against women in very specific and very intentional ways for a very long time. Women are, in many settings, the property of men. Men tend to be the heads of families and the heads of government across all cultures. Women have been excluded in most settings from almost all positions of hierarchical power.

We have been better in our own country on women's issues in many aspects and respects compared to the worst countries, but we are far from being above reproach on those issues. In our own country — a very visible model of democratic processes for the world — for a very long time, women could not even vote.

Our level of enlightenment as a country on that particular issue was not high. The men who held power in this country fought giving women the

right to vote for literally centuries. “Women’s suffrage” was a hotly contested social and political issue in this country for a long time.

I could see as I looked at those patterns of oppression, repression, and discrimination against women across all of those settings, that progress has been made in some areas in some settings, but there are still far too many areas of the world where it can be very difficult to be a woman.

Women in many settings are not being educated and women in some settings are actually being enslaved.

People Are Not Trying To Take Away The Right To Vote

Today

Our own country has clearly made some progress in those areas. Women can, in fact, now vote in our country. Because that is true we now have a different belief system in our country about women voting.

Our new sets of beliefs on that particular issue are now so well embedded in our current sense of who we are and in our current sense of what we do that no one in this country today wants to take the vote away from women.

The people who ran this country initially fought making that change to give women the right to vote. Then, once that change was made, we embedded the new beliefs into our belief system and into our laws.

We Americans now collectively believe that women should vote. Our laws explicitly reinforce that belief. Behaviors and beliefs on that issue have both changed. In fact, the majority of voters in a number of elections are now women.

We also now have laws making it illegal to deny a job to a woman simply for being a woman. Women in our country can own property and women do not lose that ownership of their property to their husband when they marry.

Progress is being made in our country relative to many areas of discrimination against women. But there are still aspects of our society where there is very real discrimination and even some harassment against women and there are major parts of the planet where functional progress on those sets of issues for women is minimal or non-existent.

Discrimination Against Women In Many Parts Of The World
Is Massive

That was a reality that I did not expect to encounter when I started looking at intergroup interactions in countries across the planet. There are far too many other parts of the world where women are discriminated against massively today. Uganda was far from unique. I have personally seen discrimination against women in a number of countries that was so direct and so intense that it gave me pain to see it happen.

I have had a chance to look very directly at basic discrimination issues relating to women in dozens of countries. I have seen massive and very explicit discrimination against women in India, Bangladesh, Saudi Arabia, and in the old Soviet Union.

I saw stores in Saudi Arabia where women were not allowed to shop and I saw public dining rooms in that country where women were not allowed to eat. Women physicians who attended my presentations to an audience of Saudi medical people in Riyadh on system change and on process improvement successes in the delivery of health care had to sit fully covered in the back of the room.

Those women in that audience were not allowed to eat lunch with the rest of us after I spoke — because you can't get food through the full veils they were required to wear.

I heard — but did not see — equally well covered women in rural Bangladesh and I had to speak to some women through interpreters through the closed doors of their huts because they were not allowed to leave their homes or show their faces to a male outside their immediate family.

Those issues were particularly visible to me in Uganda when I had women co-workers in that country whose husbands could simply take their children away from them at any time for any reason with no possible legal response or recourse from their mother. In Uganda, I learned, only the father has legal custody and control rights for all children. Women friends of mine in Uganda suffered personally and directly because of those laws.

We actually hired a local woman — a superstar performer — to be the local CEO of our overall program in that country. Her father was an Anglican Bishop who had made sure that she was well educated.

She was the first woman leader in quite a few of the meetings we had to set up to create our health plan agenda for that country.

She was a pioneer... and anomaly... and she did incredible good work.

But she was an exception. Other people in similar problems were all men.

I have now read about the Ugandan kinds of purely discriminatory issues relative to women in multiple countries and I have also seen them first hand in too many settings. I personally do not take the progress we have made on women's issues in this country lightly, because I have seen first hand how badly some other countries deal with those issues even today — and I have seen how little progress is going on in too many places where the discrimination against women is most extreme.

One of our caregiving employees in Uganda had to work for us under a false name. Her husband had abused her and her children. She had fled to another city and she used a fake identity there because her husband had the right to take her children at any time with no possible legal response from her. We verified her educational training and then allowed her to use a different name for her daily work with our group.

In another Ugandan situation, I bought three cows through a friend and traded the cows to a family to free a woman from being forced by the death of her husband to become the fourth wife of his brother.

The particular rule in that particular culture of having widows automatically become the wife of their late husband's brother when their husband dies actually can be very good for children in Uganda. That practice logistically reduces the number of orphans in that country because many

children who would otherwise be fatherless automatically get a new father when their actual father dies.

But that approach wasn't good for the woman I used the cows to free because her new family could not afford her and because that family also could not afford the other new dependents she brought with her. Being purchased was her only path to freedom.

There are many countries where the status of women is truly negative to an amazing level.

We are seeing situations today in a number of settings in Syria, Iraq, and The Sudan where women are actually being captured and sold into slavery and can be sexually abused by their purchasers with full protection of the law for their abusers.

Thousands of women are being killed by their families every year in Pakistan, Bangladesh, and a number of other Middle Eastern country in what the families call "Honor Killings."

Those women who die in those honor killings may have merely had a conversation with a man outside their family in a face-to-face setting.

Those issues and those levels of discrimination and abuse are very real and very current. There is a chapter about women in the *Primal*

Pathways book that deals with the discriminatory and even evil ways that women are treated in far too many settings.

The truth is that we did have very clear levels of explicit and intense discrimination in our own history, but we have grown to be far more enlightened now in many of those areas. We have a long way to go in some areas relative to that discrimination, but overall — compared to our own past and compared to the most repressive other areas of the world — my sense is that we are now doing much better today on most of those issues.

Every Culture Claims To Honor And Respect Women

When I looked at the issue of how women have been treated — and are being treated — in various countries, I was puzzled by the fact that we do such evil things in so many settings to women and, at the same time, every culture I looked at claimed to value, respect, and even honor women.

Claiming to honor women and then having brothers killing sisters to protect the honor a family adds a level of irony to the use of that word.

It was clear as I looked at those issues that many cultures have built very strong and rigid rules and laws restricting and limiting the acceptable behaviors and allowable activities for women. Those cultural restrictions were easy to see. What I could not, however, easily see was which specific

instincts we might have that would cause our cultures to create those specific sets of restrictions. Our cultures tend to be created to meet the needs of our instincts, but there is no instinct that I could see, discern, detect, discover, or uncover to dislike or damage women.

It was clear that many of our cultures do create very explicit and intentional rules that significantly restrict the roles and choices for women in ways that do damage many women.

Multiple cultures create very clear rules that keep women from owning property. Most cultures have had rules that keep women from taking on particular functions, roles, activities, or jobs. Those cultures have often reinforced those job and role restriction laws with some vigor.

Because I had developed the belief early in my thought process about instincts that our cultures are very consistently the tools of our instincts, I believed that there had to be some levels of explicit instinctive behavior or some basically instinctive goal behind each of those explicit rules and expectations relative to women.

That's how the culture building process usually works. We have instincts to be hierarchical — so every culture creates its rules for hierarchy.

We have instincts to be territorial — so I could see that every culture creates its laws, rules, and expectations about property and ownership of turf.

We Tend To Feel Right Acting In Accord With Our Cultures

This book has explained earlier that we tend to “feel right” when we act in accord with our instincts. It is also true that we tend to feel right when we act in accord with our culture. We tend to feel right when we are in alignment with whatever rule set or expectation factors exist that have been created by our culture.

It was clear as I looked at many cultures that people in many settings clearly “feel right” oppressing women. I could not find an actual instinct to oppress women, but I did find a rich array of cultural expectations and rule sets in many settings that functionally oppressed women.

The question that I wrestled with was this: how do all of those oppressive and restrictive cultural expectations that limit the roles of women somehow help groups of people in any setting satisfy an instinctive goal or achieve an instinctive guidance of some kind?

I believed that I needed to figure out what the basic instinct-linked underpinning was for each of those cultural expectations if my goal was to figure out how to change the cultures in all relevant settings to be less

discriminatory toward women in the future. To fix the flawed process, I needed to understand the actual process.

Survival Was A Core Instinct Factor That Created Those Cultural Expectations

What I concluded — after literally years of thinking about those issues and after writing multiple draft explanations of those behaviors — is that the core and basic instinct that fundamentally triggers and underlies all of those negative, oppressive, and restrictive behaviors in all of those cultures toward women is survival.

We have very strong survival instincts.

As I looked closely at those behaviors, I began to understand that the instinct-anchored goal that underlies all of those restrictions on women in all of those settings is the instinct to help our cultures and our families survive.

That sounds wrong — but I believe it to be true. Those behaviors — those restrictions on women's activities and on women's freedoms — when you drill down far enough into each one, tend to relate in a functional way to our survival as a species and to our survival in each setting as groups, as families, and as cultures.

I now believe that we have created all of those rules and all of those restrictive and negative cultural expectations with our survival instincts as a core factor. Those rules built into each of those cultures created roles for women and the same cultures created roles and rules for men. Early cultures and early families survived because the rules and the roles they created for both men and women made the cultures and the family more likely to survive.

Biology Was A Key Component

Biology created the key components that sit at the root of those survival issues. Biology gives us the absolute functional and logistical reality that our species depends on reproducing physically to survive.

We can't survive over time without reproducing. The basic functional reality is that we need to make babies and then we need to have our babies survive in order for us to have a collective future in any setting.

The unchallenged biological reality we face is that only women can give birth. Only women have the ability to produce a baby and only women can go through the physical realities that are involved in utero-level baby existence and in both early child existence and early infant survival.

Men, even with the best intentions, cannot give birth to a child and men, in those basic and primal logistical settings where there is no non-maternal milk or food supply, cannot nurse or feed a newborn infant to keep that infant alive.

So at a very core level, our functional survival as people and our survival as tribes, clans, families, and cultures depends on women being able to safely give birth and then on women being able to safely nurture, nurse, and protect each child after the child is born.

The logistical, functional, and physical realities for each baby are stark and clear. Children are basically helpless in their early years. Unprotected and unfed children in any setting would simply die.

Cultures would die as well if the children who are born to a culture all died. Our survival instincts call for us both to survive as individuals and to survive as cultures. The *Primal Pathways* book in this trilogy deals with those issues in more detail.

So the functional reality was that each basic culture has created a set of rules, expectations, and designated functions that are intended to help mothers in that culture safely give birth and then have the mothers be in position to help the children who are born into the culture each survive.

Cultures are the products of inventive, creative, and practical thinkers in each setting. In order to have mothers give birth and then feed, support, and protect their children, our cultures set up rules, behavioral expectations, designated functions, assigned roles, and specific tools that were all aimed at making that survival process for each child a reality.

Cultures do that very basic work of creating life-essential support systems for children in multiple innovative ways. But the basic overall rules and the functional expectation patterns that are created tend to be fairly similar from setting to setting and from culture to culture because our baseline logistical, biological, and functional realities relative to children and to mothers tend to be very similar from setting to setting.

Situations, circumstances, and settings vary somewhat for each group of people, but the underlying processes and key functional elements that enhance survival likelihood for babies tend to be very similar from site to site.

We Tend To Be Flexible In Building Cultures And Inflexible

In Enforcing Them

We can be very creative and very flexible when we are first building initial cultures in any setting.

We then have a very strong survival-linked tendency to both support, and intentionally and eternally perpetuate at a very explicit level the cultures that we create for each setting.

When cultures in any setting work and meet our needs, we tend to keep those cultures in place.

It was clear to me in looking at a wide range of cultures that we tend to leave the basic components of our cultures in place on any key issue or any key set of behaviors once we have put those components in place. We tend to use the same cultural expectations on key behaviors from generation to generation in any setting if those particular behavioral expectations have passed the situational test of helping us survive as a group in that setting.

People in each of our primal cultures tend to teach each other the culture of their group and people in each setting tend to put pressure on anyone in the group who tries to change the culture or whose behavior seems to be outside the rule set or the expectations of the culture.

The Family Is The Key Survival Tool

As I looked for the origin of our cultural rule sets that were relevant to women, it became clear that the primary tool and mechanism that cultures

everywhere use to support and protect the survival of the children in each setting is the family.

That major role for families to help children survive was obvious fairly quickly. Families are clearly key tools for children's survival. Every setting and every culture I could find has family groupings and all settings provide various levels of recognition and support for the family as a mechanism for helping children survive.

Families everywhere tend to be built around the same three component parts — mothers, children, and a male who provides some level of sustenance, support, and protection for the family.

The basic model we use for survival of our infants looks a lot like the template used by wolves and lions for the survival of their cubs. There are a few variations to that model, but the basic model that I could see for families in cultures everywhere includes a man, one or more wives and mothers, and the sets of children who have been sired by that male and who were directly produced by those mothers as the core family unit for each child.

Community Cultures Tend To Support Family Cultures

Many cultures also have a range of other group level support systems that result in having the village, clan, or extended family also provide some

pieces, components, and layers of support that help with the survival of the children.

Some villages have worked out truly lovely functional, inclusive, and collaborative support systems for their children.

But when I looked at those issues from the perspective of process engineering and analytical thinking, it was clear that the functional heart of all of those supports at the core functional level for each child in each setting is that child's family.

Families in all of the cultures I could see or learn about have identities, functions, and a clear set of behavioral expectations for each family member.

Cultures Defined Different Roles For Men And Women

Those assigned roles for each family member are where, I learned, several of the key issues of discrimination that exist against women have their functional roots.

The roles that have been defined by cultures for each family member are not identical for men and women.

The role patterns that divide functions by gender are remarkably consistent from culture to culture. Women in our traditional family settings

tend to have roles that are focused on the children, on various aspects of gathering and preparing food, and creating apparel, and on the maintenance of whatever dwelling is used by each family.

In primal and traditional settings, men are very consistently the hunters and men are the warriors.

It was obvious to me when I looked at those role patterns that the standard approach makes some purely logistical and purely functional sense as a division of labor by gender.

Women with children in arms are logistically less likely to successfully stalk a deer or net a goose. Men do the basic hunting roles in every hunting culture I could find.

Men in each of those hunting cultures tend to bring home food to feed each family as a result of their hunting activities and — where fish are situationally relevant — their fishing activities.

Hunting and fishing were not the only sources of food for early sets of families. In most pre-modern settings, much of the food supply for each family also came from an array of gathering processes — digging roots, picking berries, gathering nuts, collecting wild grains, and somehow

harvesting and processing wild rice and other equivalent naturally available organic foods.

Cultures tended to each develop very explicit and functional gathering processes, approaches, and tools.

Gathering was very important for people's survival. For some sets of people, the gathering process collected more caloric intake than the hunting processes. Gathering often created food supplies that were processed, stored, and then used by the families to keep the families alive in the times each year when various other food sources were slim and meager.

Early families in many settings clearly needed both hunters and gatherers to survive.

Women, in those cultures that gather food as a key functional family survival factor, tend to have a much heavier role relative to the gathering processes.

That also makes sense. You actually can gather blueberries carrying a child in a backpack without alarming the berries.

In many settings, particularly for the prime and high opportunity harvest days that existed for some food supplies each year, I could see that both genders tended to do at least some of the gathering work — but it was

clear as I read about those issues that women tend to be the primary gatherers in those settings where gathering is relevant and where gathering is a consistent source of food.

I saw a couple of studies that indicated the number of calories that were produced by gathering and the number of calories that were produced by hunting in many societies very close to equal — with some cultures getting most of their calories from gathering and a few — like the Inuit — gathering almost all of their calories from hunting.

But for most cultures, both sources of sustenance were important and the key roles for each function each tended to have very clear gender alignments that made logistical sense in the environment that was relevant to each group.

Men Hunt — Women Gather

Men tend to kill the seal or kill the deer and then the men bring the food back to the family. Women cook and store the food and women turn the hide of the deer or the skin of the seal into clothing and shelter.

Those patterns were pretty clear. In those primal hunter/gather cultures, the number of women who hunt seals is very low and the number of men who make seal skin pliable enough to wear might be even lower.

Young boys and young girls in each culture know from a very early age which set of behaviors was going to be relevant to their gender and to their personal life trajectory.

Those roles that were assigned to people by gender were, in many cultures, mandatory. Some of the functional roles for both genders have had the force of law in many cultures. Those laws and those assigned gender-linked roles have been carried over from the historical past of every culture.

Those gender-linked roles become deeply engrained in each of our legacy cultures. We still have examples of those gender linked roles in our various cultures today.

When I was working in Uganda, a friend gave me a tour of a house he was building for himself and his family. The walls were being built. As I started to go through one half-built doorframe, he took my arm and stopped me. “We can’t go in there,” he said.

I was surprised and said, “Why not?”

He told me — “That is the kitchen. No man is allowed to ever enter the kitchen. Now that the room is outlined, we must stay out of that room.”

He was both adamant and rigid in making it very clear that entering that room would be a sin for a man and that he did not want me to go through even that partially built door.

That clear conviction on his part clearly stemmed from a deep belief about right and wrong behavior by gender that is explicitly embedded in his specific local culture.

Those kinds of deep beliefs exist in many settings. People in all cultures know exactly what the expectations are in their culture for every key area of behavior. Our cultures tend to create different expectations in some areas by gender.

We all instinctively learn our cultures and we all build those expectations from our cultures into our thought processes and our personal behaviors.

Current Job Restrictions Have Cultural Roots

It was clear as I looked at our patterns of discrimination against women relative to careers and jobs that we have a very long tradition of having gender-based roles embedded in our tribe, clan, and ethnic cultures.

I could see that those long-standing patterns of expected behavior by gender clearly have their antecedents in some of the more restrictive

traditional behavioral expectations by gender that have been extended into current times and redefined to fit today's sets of functions.

Our cultures even today have obvious echoes of those earlier cultures for many of our gender-related behavioral expectations.

We have continued that pattern and practice of dividing tasks to be done by gender long past the point where that division by gender makes any functional sense and long past the point where that division of labor is relevant to our individual or group survival.

Some sets of jobs in our more modern societies have been considered male jobs and others have been considered female jobs, even though many of the pure logistical realities for our earlier cultures that pointed genders in their own separate directions on jobs to be done are either irrelevant or much less relevant to people today.

In our own country, we have relatively recently managed to move past most of those legacy role expectations. We now have women firemen. We have women soldiers. Women lawyers and women doctors abound. The majority of students in a number of our law schools today are women.

Having the majority of law students in some settings to be women is a very recent development. When I was first employed as a department

supervisor more than three decades ago, one of the senior secretaries I met was a trained lawyer who could not find a job as a lawyer.

Our traditional culture at that point in our history only had men in that attorney role. She had spent an entire career as an executive secretary. She was a very intelligent and highly competent woman who thoroughly intimidated me in several ways — and she also was a mentor for me on a couple of key issues about positioning some of my own work product in the most professional way.

I can say from personal experience and observation that major progress has been made on the issue of allowing women into those professions. I saw how bad those restrictions were in our own country just a few years ago. They were bad.

That set of issues about designated work roles and assigned functions by gender helped me understand one set of areas where discrimination against women has been a reality.

Those Functional Divisions Only Created Part Of The Problem

But those kinds of legacy job restrictions for women by category of job have only been a subset of the total spectrum of repressive and restrictive behaviors that exist in far too many settings relative to women.

When I looked at the total spectrum of restrictions, discrimination, and even abusive behavior against women, it was clear that those functional job related gender-linked issues only created part of those problems.

It was clear to me that we had other major areas where significant and even crippling behavior restrictions for women existed that extended well beyond those simple job linkages and functional gender role issues.

When I looked at the broader set of restrictive issues for women. In our country and in other countries around the world, I could see that there are a number of very oppressive and repressive cultural rule sets that have created extremely dysfunctional barriers and restrictions for women.

The honor killings that I mentioned at the beginning of this chapter stem from that set of restrictions.

As a process analyst, I drilled down a bit to better understand what those specific gender-related behavioral restrictions were and to see why they existed. I was not entirely surprised at what I found when I did that search.

Family Survival Created Its Own Set of Cultural Expectations

There is another level of restrictions for women that not only keep women out of certain professions — those additional restrictions in some

settings limit and restrict women's ability to interact with other people at fairly rigid and confining levels.

Those additional interaction restrictions that keep women from interacting with men outside their immediate families, I discovered when I drilled down into that issue using a systematic behavior pattern analysis approach, were also created by cultures to protect and support both family functions and family survival.

Those sets of control-related cultural restrictions focus on interaction control, control of sexual activity, and determining relative power and control for men and women in family settings. Controls have existed for women based on each of those factors in a wide range of cultures. Those sets of cultural value sets that restrict activities for women and control behaviors for women have been extreme in some settings.

Some of those additional restrictions that exist relative to restricting and limiting behaviors for women continue to reach very extreme levels in some settings.

It was clear that some cultures today have created behavior restrictions for women that can literally result — even today — in women being killed just for talking to people outside their family.

I could also see from looking at many cultures that women in a very large number of settings had little or no hierarchical power.

Everywhere I looked, men ran societies and men ran families. That has been true with great consistency across multiple cultural settings for a very long period of time. A number of cultures severely limit both activity levels for women and power levels for women.

A number of cultures also dictate and restrict sexual activity levels — and many cultures tend to be much more restrictive relative to sexual activity levels for women.

The patterns that I could see on several sets of issues across cultures were clear — particularly on the issues of relative power and sexual activity.

Sex, Power, And Restricted Interactions Were Tools To Keep Men From Deserting Families

Most cultures, I could see across multiple settings, have sets of laws that designate men to be heads of families.

Most cultures also have sets of laws that restrict legal sexual activity to marriage and that are intended to significantly limit the likelihood of women or men having sex outside of marriage.

After looking at each of those issues from a pure process engineering perspective, it became clear to me that those particular sets of cultural expectations and those packages of rules relative to women and men are actually used by cultures at the most basic level to keep men from deserting and abandoning families.

The basic family design in many settings tended to be to have a man for each family who functioned as the hunter or wage earner and one or more women who gave birth and who then raised the children and maintained the dwelling space.

To make that functional model work, it is essential to have men not desert their families after their children are born.

The functional reality for families in many primal settings was that if the men in those settings deserted their families, then the seals, elk, and zebra that had been killed in the past by that absent hunter would no longer be part of the family food supply. Families without food in any setting are less likely to survive.

Children need families to survive. Men tend to be a key part of family survival. Families, themselves, in primal settings generally need men who

functioned in specific supportive and protective roles in order for the families to survive.

The Goal Is To Keep Men From Abandoning Families

Because that is true, cultures have tended to create very consistent, functional realities for men in almost all settings that both encourage and reward men for maintaining their family status and that also reward and encourage men in several ways for protecting the families they are part of.

It was a bit painful for me as a man to recognize and accept the functional reality that men are higher flight risks than women from family settings. That reality, however, is what it is. We do know from sad reality at multiple levels and from a wide range of settings that men are far more likely than women to abandon a family.

Women, for a variety of logistical and personal attachment reasons, tend to have a built in higher level of family loyalty and women tend to have higher levels of family bonding. The number of mothers who desert their families tends to be very low in all settings.

There are a number of reasons why that is true. At one purely logistical level, every mother knows exactly who her own children are. Each woman knows very clearly who she gave birth to.

Each woman also tends to be intensely focused on keeping the baby she gave birth to alive. Maternal instincts are both powerful and real. Those maternal instincts tend to be very directly activated in each mother.

Mothers in every setting who have activated maternal instincts tend to bond closely with her children.

Men Do Not Have That Same Biological Certainty

Men do not have that same biological certainty about who their children are.

That particular biological uncertainty issue is real. Men, for purely logistical reasons, have historically often not been able to absolutely know with clear and complete certainty whether or not a child who was born to their wife is, in fact, actually their child.

That uncertainty about parentage by men can create its own bonding problem with children for any men who are uncertain about that issue. That particular parental uncertainty and paternal insecurity level can clearly make the linkage of men to families weaker.

Cultures know in practical ways that the men who do not have a high level of confidence that they are, in fact, the father of their children are less likely to spend years of their life — time, resources, and their own personal

life's supply of focus and energy — feeding and protecting children who might be of uncertain parentage.

Societies and cultures tend to deal with that particular parental uncertainty issue for men very explicitly and very intentionally in a number of fairly consistent ways.

Marital Fidelity Decreases Parental Uncertainty

One commonly used approach that can give the men in families more security about the parentage of their children is for cultures to set up very clear and often very strict rules requiring absolute and unquestioned marital fidelity for women.

Most cultures do have very rigid rules requiring women to be sexually exclusive and to be completely and absolutely “faithful” to their husband.

I could see as I looked at cultures in many settings that a violation of that particular marital fidelity rule by women is punished in significant ways in almost all cultures — sometimes with death.

Various cultures have shamed, imprisoned, physically punished and even killed women — sometimes in public settings — who were sexually unfaithful to their husbands.

A number of cultures have not considered the killing of an unfaithful wife by her husband or by other family members to be murder in the eyes of the law.

I can personally remember when some of our own states still had local laws that allowed a cuckolded man to kill both his wife and her lover without being punished by the law if the husband caught them in the act of being physically unfaithful.

We no longer have those particular laws and priorities, but we do continue to have very clear cultural expectations of marital fidelity for both men and women in our culture today. We do generally continue to expect people who marry each other in our country to be sexually faithful to each other in the context of their marriage.

A combination of birth control and DNA testing now makes the original biological and cultural underpinnings and the problematic causality links for those expectations of marital fidelity less relevant.

The fidelity agreements we reach now when we marry each other represent, as they should, a direct relationship commitment that people make in good faith as responsible adults to one another.

The law does not currently enforce those commitments in this country. We don't even use adultery as a factor for most divorce court situations in our country today.

So we have changed our enforcement approach and our rule set in those areas significantly as a country and as a culture relative to those sets of behaviors.

Honor Killings Exist In Multiple Settings

It was clear to me, however, as I looked around the world that a number of cultures today still take those kinds of rule sets about marital fidelity very seriously. Some cultures take those expectations to extremes that can include women being forbidden to interact in any way with men outside direct family settings.

Some cultures today actually punish women with death for simply talking to a man who isn't her husband or family member.

That isn't ancient history. I could see as I travelled to various cultures that there are "honor killings" happening in the world today where fathers or brothers sometimes kill a woman for simply having direct contact or private conversations with a man who isn't their husband or a family member.

Thousands of those honor killings happen every year in several cultures. The people who do those killings feel that those sets of rules for their culture are right and correct to the point where they believe that a woman in the family who violates even those most amazingly onerous and restrictive contact rules with men should die as a result of that behavior.

I talked to a father in Bangladesh who told me that if one of his daughters had a direct and private contact with a man outside her village, she would not only be punished and never allowed to marry — her act would dishonor her sisters and they would also not be allowed to marry.

He told me with quiet confidence that his daughters would never break those rules because they would not want to ruin their sisters' lives.

It was clear to me as I looked at those issues that some societies take that whole category of rule sets that were created initially to give men of the family a sense of security that the children they are supporting are, in fact, biologically their children to unconscionable extremes.

It was also clear to me that women in many settings have suffered, been oppressed, and have even died in the context of those oppressively restrictive extremes... and that those oppressive behaviors are a fact of daily life for far too many women today.

Cultures Make Expected Behaviors “Feel Right”

One of the fascinating powers that our cultures have is the ability to make a culturally defined and culturally believed behavior feel right. This book and the *Primal Pathways* sister book both discuss that power of cultures to make behaviors “feel right” in several places.

That clearly has been true for the various rule sets that discriminate against women. People who believe in those rules in many settings feel very right in enforcing those rules and in perpetuating those sets of rules and those behavioral expectations to future generations.

Confining and oppressing women in rigid and repressive ways in the goal of imposing and enforcing fidelity is clearly a set of values that we need the world to move beyond. We need more enlightened beliefs and we need more enlightened behaviors that protect women against being damaged by those old cultural rule sets and behaviors.

We need fidelity to be a chosen behavior — not an imposed functional reality that subordinates women to sets of rules and subordinates the value of a woman’s life relative to externally imposed restrictions that are imposed culturally on any woman’s personal interactions with other people.

Being Head Of Family Can Trigger Alpha Instincts

The other key set of highly discriminatory behaviors that I saw in every culture relative to the role and status of women has been the sets of rules that I saw everywhere that make men heads of families and that tended to keep married women from actually being either the heads of families or the heads of communities, tribes, or religions.

Every culture I could see had a family head role and every single traditional culture that I could find anywhere clearly defined and designated men to be the heads of families.

That was true in our own culture until very recently. When I was first married roughly four decades ago, I sometimes filled in official forms for various purposes that had one line for “head of family” and another line that was labeled “wife.”

It was explained to me at that time that an unmarried adult women, a divorced woman, or a widowed woman could sign her own name on the “head of family” line. A married woman, however, was required to put her name on the line marked “wife.”

My first wife used to suggest that I cross off the words “head of family” and write in the word “husband.” It seemed like a good idea at the time. It did make a few bureaucrats unhappy to have clutter up their forms.

Some of our forms and documents in this country didn't stop using those terms to label family members until fairly recently. It is rare now. It would be interesting to hear the reaction today to any government agency or business of my kind in this country who decided now to use those labels and that head of family definition on an official document or form.

In the rest of the world, however, many cultures still use that approach and I saw clearly in my travels and learning processes that some cultures do it with great rigor and vigor.

As I looked across cultures and as I looked back into history, I could see that in almost all cultures, the husband in each family has been considered in the context of each culture to be the head of each family.

Sex And Power Can Both Be Effective Bribes

Having that pattern of men being named by each culture to be the head of each family tended to be extended very consistently in each culture to having men be the heads of clan, the heads of tribes, the heads of communities and the heads of nations. That pattern of having men in that "head" role for all hierarchical settings was pretty clear and it was pretty universal across cultures.

Why did that pattern exist? That also was fairly easy to figure out once I saw what the patterns were and how they affected people.

That particular pattern is part of the same overall strategic package that is intended by cultures to keep families alive. The cultures that used that rule set and imposed those hierarchy rules on families that made men heads of families did it to keep families together and functioning.

The key goal for those relative status rules and roles for men and women in families was the same as goals for the core set of the marital fidelity rules — to keep men from deserting their families.

Some cultures attempted to deal with that same objective of keeping families together by creating explicit legal mandates that very directly and explicitly required men to stay with their families. Mandates can have their value and can influence behavior — but mandates also tend to have their own clear sets of problems. Enforcement of mandates can often be problematic.

Men Have Been Bribed To Stay With Families

Because mandates are imperfect and because mandates can create enforcement problems at several levels, almost all cultures went beyond

those basic mandates and used a set of very basic bribes to keep men in families.

Men have been directly bribed by most cultures to be in families and men have been equally well bribed by most cultures to stay with their families.

The patterns were clear to me as I looked at those cultural patterns from a process engineering perspective. All of our various primal cultures have basically very directly bribed men to stay with their families.

The two very clear bribes that were used by almost all cultures with great consistency to keep men in all settings with their families were two very effective motivators — power and sex.

It can be functionally much easier to deliver a bribe than it is to impose and enforce a mandate. Bribes, well designed and well defined, reinforce themselves and sell themselves. People tend to want bribes. People tend to resist mandates.

Power And Sex Work Effectively As Bribes

Cultures used both mandates and bribes as a package, but functionally relied very heavily on those particular bribes for men as a key factor that kept men with their families.

Both power and sex work well as bribes for men. Power came from being the head of the family. Power — in a very basic form — was the motivational strategy and key point for that set of family head rules. Men got to be head of their families in every culture.

Men had power in those family settings.

Having men assuming the head of family role and the head of family function meant that each man had a definite and real setting where his Alpha instincts both could be and would be activated.

Alpha Instincts Can Trigger Almost Addictive Behaviors

Alpha instincts can trigger almost addictive behaviors. As I explain in other chapters of this book and as I discuss more extensively in the *Primal Pathways* book and *Cusp of Chaos* book, Alpha instincts can be seductive and their activation and their realization can be very rewarding to the Alpha person in any setting.

My observation has been that men, in particular, tend to get a level of positive psychological reinforcement by being “king.” Being Alpha in any setting has its own emotional reward package. It can feel good to be king.

That Alpha-linked reward system works as a trigger and incentive for individual men even when the actual place where a man can be king is only in the context of his own family.

Any man who was head of a family could have his Alpha instincts activated in that setting by being in that role. Very few men in traditional cultures turn down or reject the Alpha role, Alpha privileges, Alpha status, or Alpha rewards when that Alpha role is given to them.

People aspire to that role rather than decline it.

A significant percentage of men tend to have other hierarchical ambitions as well. It has been clear to me that both men and women also often aspire to Alpha status in various settings.

The processes and patterns are pretty clear. Whoever climbs to the head of a hierarchy in any setting has a good chance to having his or her Alpha instincts activated in that setting. It can feel good and it can be very reinforcing to have those instincts realized when Alpha status in any setting is achieved.

The Alpha role can be self-reinforcing once people take on that status and once that status begins to structure people's feelings and the way people think about themselves are their relative status.

That inherent self-reinforcing aspect of that status for family setting Alphas helps keep families together.

Heads Of Families Have Alpha Instincts Activated

When cultures make each family a hierarchy, that creates a place for an Alpha role and it sets up a very clear Alpha reward system for the family head. Men who move into those Alpha positions at the family level tend to get the functional and psychological rewards that come from having that role.

Men who are Alpha in family settings tend to be surrounded by other family members who all tend to honor the Alpha status of their family head.

The scope of actual power for a family Alpha can be tiny, but even tiny scopes of power can feel very right and directly reinforcing to the people who hold that power. Cultures everywhere create that context for family heads to feel that power and family heads tend to stay with their families because that is the only sure way for many men to have that Alpha level of power.

Women Also Have Alpha Instincts

Alpha instincts are not, of course, limited to men. Many women also clearly appreciate, enjoy, and utilize Alpha status. I know from both

experience and observation that women obviously can just as easily become addicted to Alpha roles and Alpha power and that women can and do aspire to achieve and maintain alpha power with significant energy and commitment.

The cultural rule set issue that exists relative to who gets to be the head of the family in traditional cultures is not that women don't also enjoy Alpha status or that women don't do well in Alpha roles. Neither of those things is true.

The key logistical issue that creates that particular set of rules that set up male heads for families for cultures is that women who don't have Alpha status in a family setting usually do not desert their family — but many men who don't have that Alpha status in that setting as a personal incentive and reward system are clear flight risks for their families.

As the *Primal Pathways* book and *The Art of Intergroup Peace* book both describe, we all have strong instincts that can be activated when we become Alpha in any setting. That set of instincts can be activated in whoever becomes the family Alpha — and in most cases, our traditional cultures have all awarded that status to the man who is labeled head of each family.

We Also Have Self-Reinforcing Beta Instincts

It was useful to me to understand and remember as I looked at those sets of issues in families to remember that we all also have a set of Beta instincts that also create very predictable behavior patterns and that can create their own emotional rewards for whoever achieves Beta — or number two — status in any setting.

Most hierarchies in communities, tribes, and even businesses tend to have other clearly defined levels of relative power that extend beyond the relevant Alpha. It is clear that people do also tend to also have a set of Beta instincts that can also be triggered in the people who hold number two rank in any setting.

My experience has been that Betas in any setting also expect to be obeyed and that Betas in a high percentage of settings where Betas exist generally work both to lead their own set of activities and to support their Alpha.

What I have seen in multiple cultures and settings where men are heads of families is that the women who are in each family are generally not powerless. Women in many traditional cultures tend to have a very clear and

explicit Beta-like role — with their own defined areas of authority and with at least partial control over a specified set of family decisions.

In many settings, that wife/Beta role is a role that generates significant respect and defined power within the family.

Many — but not all — cultures very clearly expect the mother/wife in each setting to be well regarded and to be treated with respect by various relevant parties for whatever specific status and role is created for those women by their culture and by their setting.

So I could see that our traditional cultures have generally created a kind of power sharing status within families. But everywhere that I could see, in our traditional cultures, men were designated as the cultural head of each family.

Sex Was Only Legal In Marriage

Sex has been the other bribe for men that cultures have used in most settings to keep men from deserting families.

The attraction of the husband role for men has been strengthened significantly in many cultures by the fact that the only place where men could legally have sex was in the context of marriage.

Sex can also be an important and useful motivator. Cultures very clearly and carefully linked sex to marriage and that was done to make marriage more attractive to both men and women.

Almost all traditional cultures made extramarital sex — except in times of war when rape was involved — illegal. Extramarital sex could be severely punished for both genders in some settings.

Extramarital sex was extremely difficult for most people to achieve in many settings. But marital sex existed everywhere. Marital sex was, in fact, expected in every setting and it was even mandated in some.

So another very basic and effective bribe that was used by most cultures to keep a man with his family was to create rules and laws that say a man could only have sex in the context of his family. Marriage explicitly and uniquely created functional access to sex. A man with no wife was expected in most cultures to lead a celibate, sex-free life.

That particular expectation of celibacy for unmarried men was violated in many creative ways in many settings. Prostitution was created in many settings to give men another avenue of access to sex. Extramarital sex and premarital sex both happened in a variety of ways.

But the basic pattern that existed for most cultures was that sex was only legally allowed in the marriage setting.

That set of rules about the focused availability of sex created another obvious and effective incentive for both men and women to marry. And to stay married.

That set of rules also added a level of energy and focus to courtship. Many kinds of courtship processes and behaviors have been created by various cultures. People of both genders everywhere seem to feel right in each of our settings using the courtship approaches that are created for them by their own cultures.

Males of many species seem to find sex to be an incentive for certain visible and aspirational courtship behaviors when the right set of sexual instincts has been situationally activated. We actually are not an exception to that particular pattern.

Our courtship patterns create behavioral expectations for both genders that tend to feel right to people when they are done in right ways for each culture.

Women Had Protection For Children And Parenting Support

The trade off for women that was generally created in all of those cultures for having men be the heads of families and for women being expected to be sexually available to the husband in whatever context each culture created for marital sexual availability was that women could also have sex in that context and that women who were in those very clear marital relationships could expect to have their children provided for and protected by their father.

Under that traditional marriage model, women could expect to have a man in their marriage and women could expect to have a family to share their life.

Women in most observed cultures tended to have a clear directional role in each family with its own specified authority and its own behavioral levels and authority levels for specific areas of family function as the wife.

Women in each setting could also expect their husbands to fulfill the family support roles that are defined by each culture for their men and women could expect their entire culture to support the process of having men do the tasks, functions, and roles expected for men.

Those patterns also tend to be consistent and clear. Men were expected to be key providers in almost all cultures. In the kinds of settings

where a job like mining provided the family sustenance, the people who actually went into the mines to earn a miner's pay were all men — not their daughters or their wives.

When the job that triggered family income was to be a sailor, the family member who went to sea tended to be the husband or son — not the wife or daughter.

Those kinds of division of labor had some advantages in some settings for some women. But even those patterns of keeping women out of some kinds of dangerous jobs could create real hardship if a women wanted or needed to earn a living in the mines or on a ship and was banned from those pay checks and that cash flow by her gender.

Families Tend to Honor Their Mothers

There was a lot of variation that I could see on that point, but most cultures that I could see made it very clear that family members are supposed to honor the mother, respect the mother, and protect their mother when protection for the mother is needed.

There was a very wide range of cultural expectations on those respect issues. Women in some settings were reduced to being almost commodities — but women in other settings were idealized and regarded with almost

sacred protectionism that sometimes constituted and created its own kind of functional isolationism.

I did observe, however, that even in the cultures that idealized and romanticized the role of women, men held the Alpha status and women tended to be at best, in honored Beta roles.

Having my friend in Uganda unable and unwilling to step into the future kitchen space of his partially built house fits the pattern of having a clearly defined beta role with its own set of rights and entitlements. Women friends in Uganda quietly told me later that the women in those settings tended to strongly support that barrier to entering into that particular defined space for men because that barrier functionally gives women in Uganda in that particular cultural context a space in the house to be Alpha.

My friend told me that men who entered that space in a home in that particular culture were sometimes quietly called names by the women in the family using language and terms that indicated that the trespassing man's personal masculinity levels might be weak or impaired.

That particular demarcation of power and space turned out to have its supporters on both sides of the gender line in that country.

We Feel Right Being In A Family

The traditional gender role demarcations that make families a functional reality in all cultures had benefits at some levels for both men and women.

Being in a couple with a shared family commitment as a couple can be, obviously, a good thing for both men and women. We clearly have instincts that can cause us to feel good and to feel right when we are functioning in family ways. It can feel very right to be in a couple in many ways.

Men and women both seem to share those feelings.

Both men and women want to be parents, and the various roles that are associated with parenting in various cultures can be a blessing and a joy for both men and women.

Shared parenting can clearly feel both right and good for both men and women.

Sex can also be a positive and even wonderful thing for both genders. Consensual sex that creates good sexual feelings and mutually pleasing sexual behaviors can be one of life's major joys.

Having a companion and a fellow journeyman for life's experiences challenges, and opportunities can also be a very positive experience, even

when there are no children involved for the people who are in those relationships.

A key component of the focus on protecting the existence of each family that adds real value for women is that, having a family infrastructure creates a badly needed support system for women when pregnancies occurred. Having their families function as a safety net for pregnancies obviously has had value at multiple levels in a wide range of settings for women.

Birth control options today create a wider range of choices in our own society relative to family planning — but in much of the world we live in today, births just happen and women who are pregnant and who have children are generally better off if the birth process is done in the context of a family.

So there are many reasons why the involvement of both men and women in families can add very real value for both men and women. Keeping families intact in our cultures is clearly a good thing to do at multiple levels.

Our Cultures Create Gender Restrictions — Not Our Instincts

— And We Can Change Our Cultures

As I looked at all of the behavioral expectations and all of the discriminatory rules and restrictions that have existed in all of those settings for women, I have come to believe that most of the cultural expectations we have in various settings about the roles of men and the roles of women actually do stem in a very linear way from that set of historical and primal realities about the need to keep families intact and alive in order to keep babies alive in each setting.

It is also clear to me that many key realities about the world we live in have changed — and that we need to now have clearly enlightened cultural expectations about the role of women that eliminate all of the legacy restrictions on women's roles, behaviors, and levels of personal freedom that have been embedded in all of those cultures.

The fact that those rules that have discriminated against women in so many ways are all created by our cultures and not created by our instincts is a good thing at this point in our history because it gives us a very high level of flexibility and very real functional power relative to improving future behaviors and improving future behavioral expectations for our cultures relative to both men and women.

Change is possible. Change is needed. We can't change instincts, but we can change cultures. We can decide to adopt more enlightened values for

our cultures wherever and whenever we decide that more enlightened values are needed for each culture.

As our values change, we can directly and explicitly change our cultural expectations in each setting so that the cultures we use to guide us today reflect our more enlightened values about the roles of men and women.

Sexual Harassment Laws Need To Be Enforced

One set of culture-based values and beliefs where we need to be clear and very intentional in creating better and more enlightened behavioral expectations in our country today relates to the issues of sexual harassment.

Even though we have made progress in a number of key areas relative to the status of women in this country, the sad truth is that sexual harassment clearly still creates significant problems for far too many women in far too many settings.

I have to admit to being personally deeply ashamed of my gender relative to that issue. Harassment is not limited to men, but the reality is that too many men in far too many settings, when sexual harassment and sexual abuse is allowed in those settings, actually do abusive and sexually harassing things at least some of the time to the women who are in those settings.

I saw a survey from one setting in another country where the rape laws were generally not enforced by the local police. That survey said nearly 20 percent of the men who were surveyed in that country admitted to having personally raped at least one woman.

That particular percentage numerically and mathematically could be higher and it could be even worse — but that percentage is absolutely horrible. Horrible. Disgusting, bad, and truly horrible.

The vast majority of the men are not raping women in that setting, but far too many are and many who do it seem to be doing it routinely.

Unenforced rape laws are ignored in that setting by far too many men — and very real damage is being done to a significant number of women today because those laws are not enforced.

Some Men — With No Constraints — Sexually Harass Women

The sad truth is that some men — if we do not constrain those sets of behaviors in their settings — will sexually harass women and those men in those unconstrained settings seem to feel entirely entitled to exhibit those behaviors.

The issue of sexual harassment and sexual abuse keeps springing up in multiple settings — and our country is not at all exempt from those behaviors.

The sad truth that we should openly face and acknowledge is that we even have sexual harassment as a significant problem today in our military.

We have made great progress relative to the status of women and the status of minorities in many aspects of our military. We fully integrated our military before almost any other countries — and we also have added women to our military in ways that are not the usual approach elsewhere in the world. We have women generals and we have armed women going into actual combat.

That is almost unique to us. I personally have talked to women generals and to senior women officers about their military experiences. The truth is that we have made great progress in our military in a wide range of areas of inclusion and opportunity.

That's the good news. The really bad news is that our military has not done a good enough job of enforcing their rules on sexual assault and rape with the needed levels of consistency and with the necessary rigor.

Our Military Has Not Enforced Harassment Rules Well

Media reports tell us that we have had a horrific and really sad number of women soldiers who have been assaulted and raped over the past several years by their fellow soldiers.

That behavior has been very clearly against the stated rules of the military. But — the rules that exist on harassment issues in those military settings have clearly not been consistently and effectively enforced in all settings.

The functional reality clearly is that in those settings where those kinds of rules exist, but are not enforced, some number of men do harassing things to women.

Sexual harassment can also include harassment by men against men, women against women, and women against men. All forms of sexual harassment are equally wrong and all forms of harassment should be prevented and punished in every setting.

Sexual harassment is sadly relevant in too many settings today in our country — usually in a pattern of men harassing women.

Some Wall Street Women Have Also Reported Harassment

The military obviously isn't alone relative to having problems with those particular issues. Some of our Wall Street investment settings recently have also reported an increase in sexual harassment situations there.

The women brokers and women analysts in those financial settings are not being raped, but there clearly have been serious, demoralizing and debilitating levels of sexual harassment that have been happening in some Wall Street settings that have made life very unpleasant for some of the women working there.

The overwhelming majority of men who work in those Wall Street settings do not descend to crude and invasive levels of sexual harassment. But some people in those settings do descend to that level and those people who do make that descent to that level clearly feel right and entitled doing very ugly things to other people.

Those issues need to be addressed and those behaviors need to be prevented in each of those settings.

We Need Enforced Laws And We Need A Culture Of

Intergender Respect

We clearly do need laws and we do need rules that forbid harassment. We also need to enforce those laws and those rules to make them real.

When we create rules that very clearly ban sexual harassment and when we actually enforce those rules, harassment shrinks as an issue and more enlightened behaviors are the norm and the expectation for people in that setting.

But — and I have seen this in multiple settings — when we don't enforce the rules against those behaviors — harassment too often happens and the consequences can be sad and dysfunctional.

It only takes one bad person to ruin a work environment for many other people. It is even worse when there is a work site setting that encompasses and allows those behaviors by multiple people.

We need to build the right levels of behaviors into our laws and we very much need to build both the right behaviors and the right expectations about behaviors into our cultures and our value systems.

We need a culture of inter-gender respect. We need a culture where we all act and react in unified and collective horror in any setting when someone violates our cultural expectations about coercing and harassing levels of sexual behavior.

We need to teach that enlightened and respectful culture to each other and we need to teach it to our children and to their children.

We Need Rigorous Enforcement Of Rules Against Negative Primal Behaviors

Absolute rigor is needed to enforce the rules that protect us from our more negative primal behaviors. That is true for the rules about acceptable behavior that protect us from theft and violence and it is particularly true for issues of sexual harassment.

In settings with no rules against physical harassment and in settings with no rules against bullying behaviors, a subset of people tends to become bullies and those people do damage to other people.

Pure physical domination and abuse can happen far too easily in settings where the rules against those behaviors don't exist or are not enforced.

We very consistently need to use our cultures in all settings to prevent those kinds of assaults from happening — but that approach to prevent those ugly behaviors is only successful when we actually enforce our cultures in those areas. That pattern of needing to enforce our rules to make them effective is true for general physical violence, it is true for theft, and it is particularly true for issues of sexual harassment.

Those people who do those ugly things to other people will not improve their behaviors if they are left to their own devices. They will improve those behaviors, however, if improvement is both mandated and enforced.

Our patterns tends to be that whenever new behaviors in any area become the behavioral norm, that new behavior also become an expectation and expected behaviors in any setting invariable become a function and a clear component of the culture for that setting.

We learn by doing — and we have a strong tendency to believe in what we consistently do in those areas. Those more enlightened and expected behaviors tend to “feel right” — even to people who have violated those same behaviors before the new and more enlightened behaviors became an expectation.

We all can change our cultural expectations with the right set of change factors in place. We need to put the right set of expectations clearly in place on those issues.

We Had Zero Tolerance On Harassment

In each of the settings where I have been the CEO, we have had a zero tolerance standard relative to all of those several harassment abuses and we

have enforced those rules with clarity and impact. I can tell you from direct experience — that approach works.

As we go forward as a country and create the enlightened behavioral expectations we need in a wide range of areas, we need to be very clear on our values, our rules, and our expectations, and then we need enforcement of those key behaviors to be a basic and core competency of us in each setting.

We cannot afford to have our functional enforcement levels to drop to the level of enforcement being an operational and situational anomaly relative to those sets of issues and behaviors. “Anomaly” enforcement of behavior rules in the face of negative primal behaviors always fails.

We need to figure out the key rule set for each set of key issues in each setting — and then we need to enforce those rules. The time to do that is now, because we are seeing increasing numbers of both women and minority Americans at every level of the work force and government.

We need to turn that new reality into a new strength — with people interacting as people in a context of mutual respect and mutual support in ways that make us collectively stronger.

We need to recognize and remember that those are very recent freedoms and relatively new opportunities. We are just learning now how to take best advantage of the new roles and opportunities that exist.

We Still Want Our Children To Survive

So what should we do now?

We still want our children to survive. That priority has not changed.

In our own American society today, we have created child support laws and cash flow approaches to replace the old functional support model where only an intact family created direct support and generated resources for each child. That is a very different functional and cultural reality.

Birth control now gives us significantly more choices when it comes to both planned and unplanned pregnancies. Men no longer need to be married to have access to sex. Women, also do not need to be married to have access to sex. Women who are married who want to have sex with someone other than her husband can now have it in our society without being stoned or imprisoned.

It is clearly a time for us to be figuring out what our gender related expectations and gender-linked cultural values should be for the years ahead. We still want to create a world where our children survive and thrive, but I

believe that we are now freed entirely from needing to discriminate through our legal system against women in basic life choices in order to protect and support our children.

Children need parents. We need parents to give children a sense of emotional security and we need parents to exercise each child's brain in the first three years of life when brain exercise builds strong brains.

We need both parents to be part of that process whenever possible. Both mothers and fathers add great value to each child in those key years.

We need to have our parenting skills continuously improving. We can do all of that without discrimination against women.

Because we are no longer a hunting and gathering society, we don't need any of the cultural expectations that define different jobs and different work roles as an absolute guidance or a fixed and rigid rule set for either men and women. Education and employment are now open to everyone, regardless of gender.

We need both parents to be supported in the key processes of parenting.

We have made massive progress in a number of areas just since I personally entered the work force a few decades ago. In our society, we now

have women mayors, women generals, women secretaries of state, women physicians, and women in every category of job that I can see except for sperm donor.

Women Are Now In Key Leadership Roles

The next chapter of this book shares some of my experiences with women in the work force who have been in key leadership roles in a number of settings.

It is obviously time for us to move past the horrible discriminatory situations and restrictions that guided our earlier cultures into a world of inclusion — based on the realities we face today. It is also time for us to take advantage of the full skill sets available to us from people of every gender and gender alignment as we build our society for the future.

When we move past our old oppressive behaviors and limited mindsets into inclusion, we literally double our asset base. Doubling assets is almost always a very good thing to do.

I was delighted when I studied all of those discriminatory behaviors to see that those sets of behaviors were linked to cultures and not to instincts — because we can, in fact, change cultures and because our instincts tend to be permanently embedded in us and really can't be changed.

So now we need to make the right set of culture changes to create full opportunity and inclusion.

We need to condemn those evil behaviors in all the places where they create problems and harm for women in the world. We also need to put constraints on sexual abuse and harassment in those settings where it exists today and make sure that all settings are free from those behaviors.

We need enlightened behavior to be our guide. It is long over due on gender issues, but it can be done and we need to do it.