

Chapter Five — We Also Have Instincts to Construct And Use

Paradigms

We will not be able to use our instincts most effectively to support us in achieving intergroup Peace until we resolve a few key paradigms that are creating barriers to Peace today.

Paradigms have a huge impact on our lives and are also a key topic for a book on instinctive behavior. We clearly have very strong instincts to build paradigms about every major aspect of our lives.

Our universal instincts to create paradigms — like our instincts to build and use cultures — give us a set of thought processes that we need to understand and a set of tools that we need to use to help create and sustain intergroup Peace.

Our minds instinctively build paradigms about all of the key components of our world and our lives. We all use paradigms to understand our world and to interact with our world because paradigm building is a basic instinct sculpted behavior and it is a foundational structural thought process that we all share and use.

We all very instinctively create, find, learn, and acquire paradigms to guide our thinking about each of the key areas of our lives.

We all have paradigms in our heads about all basic aspects of our lives. We have paradigms about our political processes and we have paradigms about our governance processes.

We have paradigms about healthy and unhealthy behaviors.

Science, of course, depends very explicitly on paradigms. In the world of science, paradigms function as the basic, fundamental, and core belief systems — the thought structures — that help explain major categories of science and major aspects of reality in functional and effective ways to scientists.

Scientific thinking is almost entirely done in the macro context of paradigms. Scientists in each field do their work in the context created by the key paradigms for their field.

When the paradigms change for any key area of science, the thought processes and the data interpretation approaches that are linked to that specific area of science all tend to shift and change to align closely and completely with the new paradigm that is being used for that area of science.

As a familiar example — for our basic planet surface scientific belief system — the old paradigm that was believed by scientists for many years said that each and every continent on the planet Earth had emerged intact and in place in its current position directly from the ocean floor.

That paradigm about the static origin of continents was replaced a couple of decades ago by a new paradigm that said there are actually massive tectonic plates that float on the molten core of the earth and that those huge plates are actually both slowly splitting off from one another and moving on a collision course toward one another.

Having the continents of our earth each emerge intact from the ocean floor is one very clear paradigm and having floating continental plates that are either drifting apart or crunching together is another very different paradigm. Those points of view represent two very different belief systems about continents.

Each of those paradigms drives its own set of conclusions from the available information about continents.

Which one is right? That is the key question that people tend to ask when there are dueling paradigms on any topic.

Dueling paradigms frequently exist, and choices sometimes need to be made between them. New science and clearer thinking about any given topic can cause new belief systems to emerge and contend with old belief systems for that topic.

Which Paradigm Works Best?

We sometimes need to choose between contending paradigms.

The best and most relevant test of any paradigm to use to compare it to another paradigm is pure effectiveness.

The best test for choosing between dueling paradigms with the goal of possibly making a paradigm change is to learn and discern whether the new paradigm interprets basic information about a given topic in ways that are more accurate and more functionally useful than the interpretation of information that had been done in the past by the old paradigm it aspires to replace.

That test of relative accuracy and comparative functionality enables us to replace old paradigms with new paradigms when the new one turns out to be a more effective tool to use to understand relevant data.

The goal of the people who are thinking about any given topic is usually to use the most accurate, most useful, and the most functional paradigm when there are dueling paradigms in existence on any important topic.

Paradigms — like cultures — are a tool that helps us interact with the world we live in. They help structure our thinking and they give us a context for interpreting events, data, and information about each relevant topic.

Cultures, in fact, function much like a paradigm in a number of settings to guide our thinking and influence key behaviors.

Paradigms Anchor Our Thought Processes

We use paradigms extensively. We teach them with great energy. And we generally incorporate them at a foundational level into our thought processes and our mental models about the world for each area of our life.

We use paradigms constantly — and we tend to bond with the paradigms that we use. That issue is directly relevant to intergroup Peace strategies. We instinctively tend to have a strong loyalty that binds us to our existing paradigm in any area. As a result of that bonding — paradigm change on various topics and issues often isn't easy... even when a new paradigm turns out to be a better interpreter of data than the old one.

Paradigm change can, in fact, be very difficult. Sometimes painful. Even in pure science. The people who originally proposed the tectonic plate paradigm as a new theory about the nature of continents were ridiculed and sometimes attacked.

They were initially prevented from presenting their beliefs and their theories in some scientific settings.

Scientists who are heavily invested in a particular paradigm often resist paradigm change and sometimes resist the change with high levels of energy and even anger.

Over time — once the data points that resulted from the new continental drift theory became too convincing and too overwhelming for the believers in the old paradigm to rebut successfully — that basic core belief about the origin of continents changed for relevant scientists and the resistance among scientists to that new belief model ultimately melted away.

Science relating to the nature of continents today tends to be based on the new tectonic plate belief system.

Old Paradigms Are Often Forgotten

A useful and important point to recognize about the basic paradigm change process is that most scientists today who deal with those specific issues currently can't remember or even imagine that they ever believed or used the old theory.

That level of memory modification impact often happens when paradigms change. That particular memory change is a normal change in perception and in our mental functioning for a wide range of paradigm changes.

When new paradigms replace old paradigms on any topic, the new ones that we use tend to have the functional impact of making the old beliefs on that topic disappear to the point of literally being forgotten.

That is a good and useful point to understand and remember relative to some of the negative paradigms that people believe in today about intergroup relationships, and intergroup realities, as well as some of the more negative paradigms that are believed today by some people about the basic nature and characteristics of other groups of people.

Once we move to better and more enlightened paradigms on key topics, the new paradigms we adopt tend to make the old ones disappear. The old ones that we replaced because they are less accurate tend to become entirely irrelevant and they generally are functionally forgotten by people who now believe in the new paradigm.

We very much want some of our more damaging old intergroup paradigms to become irrelevant and forgotten — because some of our most negative existing intergroup belief systems and negative intergroup perceptions have not served us well to achieve the positive intergroup interactions we will need going into the future in order to succeed in having intergroup Peace for our country.

We Need To Take Deliberate Steps To Achieve Paradigm

Change

To achieve that change to new and more positive intergroup interaction paradigms, we need to take some deliberate steps that replace several of our negative and dysfunctional old paradigms with more accurate and more positive new ones.

That can be done when we understand the paradigm change processes that need to be involved. *The Art of Intergroup Peace* book explains some of those paradigm change processes in more detail.

To use the basic paradigm change tool well, we need to understand what it is and how we use our basic paradigms now.

We continuously build paradigms for just about every major area of life and our lives. We do use our paradigms to guide our behaviors in very much the same way that we use our cultures in various settings to help us decide what to do and when to do it.

We have paradigms that explain our governmental system. We have paradigms about the transportation realities in our lives. We have paradigms that allow us to deal with electricity.

We have paradigms that explain the cause and spread of disease — and we have modified those disease-focused paradigms multiple times over the centuries.

We continue to evolve those particular disease-linked paradigms even today as our science and our wisdom continuously improves relative to diseases and issues of physical health.

We Have Paradigms About Our Groups And Other Groups

The instinct to develop paradigms is a very powerful one. It is included in this chapter of this book because building and using paradigms is an instinct-linked tool that we need to use to help us effectively create intergroup Peace.

Our paradigms give us our core beliefs. We have paradigms about our own groups and we have paradigms about the other groups we deal with and we use those core beliefs both to guide what we do and to explain to ourselves why we do it.

We interpret events, understand information, and make decisions about how we will interact with other groups based on our belief systems about those groups.

We believe we can both predict and interpret the behavior of other groups based on our paradigms about them. We justify our individual and collective behavior relative to other groups of people based on our belief systems about those groups.

We are often accurate in those beliefs about other groups, because those beliefs tend to be based at least partly on our actual history and our direct experience of functional interaction with each relevant group.

We have belief systems about other groups that are based, at least in part, on our observations about the beliefs and the behaviors of those groups. Our instincts influence those thought processes and observations.

When we perceive the other group in any setting to be a “Them,” we tend to interpret their behavior in very negative ways.

In many instances, the more negative paradigms we have about other groups become self-fulfilling prophecies, because our negative expectations about the other groups behavior in key areas can actually influence and shape the actual behavior of the other group in those areas.

When we expect an enemy and when we behave toward people like the people actually are an enemy, then the response from the people who are treated by us as an enemy and regarded by us to be an enemy very likely will be the response of an enemy.

We create what we perceive in a number of situations.

Stereotypes Are A Kind Of Paradigm

We also can completely misread information about any topic when paradigms skew our thought processes about that topic.

When we believe in our basic paradigm that another group of people is inherently evil, then even acts of obvious generosity and pure kindness by that group can be interpreted as deceitful manipulation of some kind rather than as being acts of either goodness or mercy.

When we believe at a basic level that a group of people can't be trusted as a core part of our paradigm about that group of people, then even years of trustworthy behavior can have minimal impact on that belief, because we believe that they are just very deceitfully and cleverly hiding their untrustworthy nature.

Stereotyping people is actually a type of paradigm. We often create stereotypes about other groups of people that both interpret and explain behavior for the other groups.

Negative stereotypes about other groups of people can functionally impede both intergroup interactions and intergroup trust.

The Art of Intergroup Peace book deals directly with that issue.

We need to achieve paradigm changes for some of those situations and for those dysfunctional stereotyped beliefs. We need to build good and accurate intergroup paradigms for all relevant groups in order to achieve good and productive intergroup interactions with those groups of people.

We also need to identify, understand, and then defuse or eliminate damaging or dysfunctional intergroup paradigms. Those negative beliefs impede positive interactions.

We Interpret Information About Other Groups In The Context Of Their Paradigm

When we have belief systems in place about other groups of people that include core beliefs in our paradigm that say the other group is greedy or dishonest or lazy or evil — then we tend to interpret all data about those other groups in the context of those unfortunate paradigms.

Those interpretations influence and affect our future intergroup interactions. Our future intergroup trust levels with those groups can obviously be damaged, impaired, or undermined by those negative beliefs.

In some areas of the world, there are sets of people who clearly hold deep-seated and very negative paradigm stereotypes about other groups of people. Northern Ireland has two very distinct groups of people who each tend to raise their children from birth on to believe very negative stereotypes about the other group. Palestine and Israel clearly have similar paradigm issues for the children born in those settings.

The Kurds in Turkey, Iraq, Syria, and Iran all have very similar sets of intergroup paradigms relative to The Kurds that are the core belief systems taught to the children in each of those settings at birth.

The Tamilese have similar paradigm issues, as do the two very separate groups in Fiji and the two conflicted groups in The Dominican Republic.

Basic negative intergroup paradigms in each of those settings are creating conflicts, triggering distrust, and getting people in those settings damaged and killed today.

In our own country, we have some relatively negative intergroup paradigms in place in multiple settings. We need to recognize that reality.

We need to very intentionally change our most damaging paradigms about other groups of people in our own country in ways that will allow us to achieve the Intergroup Peace goals we want to achieve with all of those groups of people who make up the richly diverse fabric of America.

Changing A Paradigm Involves Addressing Core Beliefs

Changing a paradigm in any setting on any topic actually can be a very difficult thing to do. Paradigms do not change easily. We need to understand how paradigm change works in order to actually have our paradigms change.

We need to start the change process by figuring out the anchor beliefs for a given paradigm.

Paradigms usually only change when we deal directly with the core belief or the core and key sets of beliefs that anchor each paradigm. That is a basic and foundational process point that needs to be understood relative to changing a paradigm because we need to change that core belief in order to actually change any paradigm.

Each paradigm tends to have at least one key core belief — and that core belief is the central lens that interprets information for us about the subject of the paradigm.

Those foundational belief-defining lenses for our paradigms tend to be very hard to replace or even modify once we have them fixed in our minds.

Simply introducing new facts into a situation generally is not enough to create paradigm change.

Facts alone often have no impact on those lenses. Facts that point in other directions than the direction created by the core belief are often either ignored or simply rejected by the paradigm. Using contradictory facts and contradictory data points about a paradigm generally is not enough to change a paradigm.

Having a contradictory data point that is used as your only piece of evidence and as your only tool for either debating or rebutting an existing paradigm seldom achieves actual paradigm change.

Contradictory Facts Can Be Dismissed As Anomalies

Belief persistency for current paradigms can be extremely strong. People who believe strongly in a particular paradigm tend to disregard and even completely ignore contradictory data about that paradigm.

When faced with contradictory facts and when faced with contradictory data points, strong believers in a paradigm often simply declare the opposing evidence to be either inaccurate, or insignificant, or untrue.

When any key, but contradictory, data points turn out to be obviously true — then the usual approach that is used by the defenders of the paradigm to avoid changing the paradigm is to perceive, define, and declare those contrary facts and those contradictory data points to be either an inexplicable and ignorable anomaly or to be functionally irrelevant to the core belief.

It's hard to overcome having a piece of evidence simply declared to be an irrelevant anomaly.

People who are true believers who are defending a current paradigm against contradictory pieces of evidence often feel great comfort in labeling

those contradictory data points to be simple situational aberrations and entirely circumstantial anomalies of some unknown kind that can functionally be safely ignored as data points because they obviously can't be relevant.

The true believers in a paradigm actually say — often with complete comfort — that the seemingly contradictory data points can't be relevant and can't be true because the paradigm itself tells us they are not true.

The thought process used to reject those specific data points can be very circular and, in fact, entirely cyclical at that point.

Paradigm Loyalty Has Functional Value

We tend to be very loyal to our beliefs. That loyalty to our beliefs has significant functional value in the real world. Our primal ancestors would have been less likely to survive in any setting if our ancestors had veered away from functionally useful belief systems and moved away from life supporting paradigms about key operational issues for their culture and setting based on single, solo, or circumstantial pieces of contradictory information.

Changing useful current paradigms that help us function in key areas now is clearly an area where there are high levels of risk. Once a belief in a

particular area of function proves to have significant value, that value tends to be protected against circumstantial and situational changes.

The basic approach that we use to deal with contradictory data is to believe at a functional level that we can't ever possibly truly know everything about any given topic, so our in-place paradigms are given the power to dismiss those contradictory data points as anomalies of some kind that can safely be ignored.

It would not have been good for group or personal survival in our more primal days to have zigzagging and insecure belief systems on key processes and functions that could be influenced unduly and put at risk by single data points.

As a result of that thought process and the value of protecting paradigms that work, we tend to have high levels of rigidity relative to many of our in place paradigms.

We Can Be Very Flexible Relative To New Topics For **Paradigms**

That rigidity and that inflexibility relative to existing paradigms tends not to exist in the early stages of each belief system when each of our paradigms are being initially built.

We can be and we often are very flexible when we are first creating a paradigm on any given topic or area of our lives.

We can be very innovative in building paradigms about things where we don't have belief systems in place about those specific things.

We are very flexible as children in learning new paradigms about each topic. So we do tend to have significant levels of mental flexibility before any given paradigm is in place.

But we generally tend to be inflexible and even rigid about not changing a paradigm once we believe the paradigm to be functional and true and once we embed it in our beliefs.

We tend to be extremely rigid in keeping each key paradigm in place once we have it in place — and simple contradictory data often is shrugged off with comfort once we fully believe in a paradigm and have used it as a working tool.

That is why many people who want to change a current belief in a setting fail to change other people's paradigms on that issue by simply citing or showing a contradictory piece of data. We tend to be comfortable assigning any contrary facts for the paradigms we believe in deeply to the category of irrelevant anomalies that we can safely ignore.

“Paradigm belief persistency” in the face of contradictory evidence and contradictory data is so common that it has a name.

Paradigm Change Requires Several Key Steps

Paradigms are, therefore, very hard to change once they are believed. We actually can change paradigms — but we need to do that paradigm change work in a conscious, deliberate, and systematic way.

To begin the change process, we need to look very carefully and intentionally at the specific paradigms we want to change. That needs to be an explicit process — and it isn't a process that we usually engage in. We usually do not look deeply or often at the various core pieces of our paradigms once we believe them to be true and have them in place.

We tend to simply take our existing paradigms for granted — believing that the paradigms we believe in are, in fact, sufficiently examined, fully verified, and represent the unquestioned truth for those topics.

To change a paradigm, we need to look at each piece of the current belief and we need to identify exactly which part of a particular paradigm needs to be changed.

Core beliefs are usually the key. Core beliefs anchor paradigms. Paradigm change means that those core beliefs need to change.

To do that successfully, we need to understand those core beliefs for the paradigm we want to change explicitly, clearly, and well. We also need to understand why each core belief for that particular paradigm is in place.

It is extremely useful to know the history of the core belief. Core beliefs generally have their history. They each tend to have their reasons for existing. We each need to understand those historic and functional reasons why each belief exists in every setting if we want to modify those core beliefs in any setting in any substantive way.

Core Beliefs Anchor Paradigms

There is always a reason why each core belief exists. We don't always know the history or the rationale for any core beliefs — but it can be very useful to know what that reason is when that particular piece of paradigm history is possible to know.

We need to respect the old belief and we need to clearly define the old belief, and we need to be able to clearly explain the origin of the old belief.

When we are very clear about the old core belief, then we need to very explicitly replace the old core belief with a new core belief that better fills the key functions of the paradigm than the old belief filled those same key functions.

We need both wisdom and explicit change strategy to change a core belief. Wisdom requires us to understand the origin and purpose of the old belief. Change strategy generally requires us to explicitly respect that old belief.

We generally need to openly respect the old core belief in any setting on many issues because the people who believe in the paradigm in each setting will resist change more fiercely if you simply attack their old belief.

**People Need To Perceive That Their Paradigm Is Being
Enhanced — Not Rejected Or Disrespected**

Better results are the key point that can justify paradigm change. To get people to support a new paradigm, we need to show that the new paradigm does the functional work of a paradigm on that issue better than the old one.

We need to start that process by clearly understanding and explaining the old paradigm. We need to both respect and explain the old paradigm as part of the change process.

Respecting the origin of the old belief can often be an extremely useful step in paradigm change. It isn't always relevant — but when that

step is relevant, do not underestimate the value or usefulness of that respect.

People tend to be bonded to their old beliefs.

Fierce resistance from old believers generally isn't conducive to change. Gentle respect for the old belief followed by offering an alternative way of understanding the issue is often significantly more likely to be successful in many settings as a process for getting a paradigm to change.

The truth is that many people will tend to resist non-respectful change efforts with both emotion and vigor. To change paradigms, it is generally not good or helpful if people feel that their old paradigm is being attacked.

It is often useful to have people with a sense that their old paradigm is being enhanced, not attacked.

Paradigms Explain Why And Predict Consequences

The key functions of a paradigm are to explain why something is happening, to interpret relevant data in a useful way, and then to accurately predict consequences and outcomes for the relevant issues that are addressed by the paradigm.

That means that any new paradigm that is proposed for a given topic has to perform each of those functions and has to do each of them better than the old paradigm did them in order to become the new belief system on that issue or topic.

If the new paradigm doesn't predict consequences better — if it does not explain causality in a more useful way — and if it does not give us better guidance about what relevant decisions we should make, then the old core belief actually works better for that issue and it should and probably will stay in place.

Evil Spirits Were Replaced By Dangerous Micro Organisms

For diseases, the old paradigm for a very long time was that evil spirits caused diseases.

That evil spirit paradigm told us that any cures or any health improvement that might be accomplished for a sick person by mixing potions or by using the bark of a tree or the parts of a plant to remedy and reduce symptoms for a patient were explained by the paradigm anchored belief that the tree bark or the plant that has worked as medicine for a patient was somehow spiritually blessed and that it clearly contained positive spirits that had help to drive out the evil spirits of the disease for that patient.

When the paradigm believed and taught that diseases were based on evil spirits, then the cures for the disease also needed to have a spirit base and a spiritual functionality as part of the curative process belief.

When that evil spirit paradigm was replaced for our health care delivery practitioners by a new belief system that said most diseases and

most infections are generally actually caused by germs and by various kinds of dangerous biological microorganisms, then the interpretation of all relevant historical and current data about those diseases and their cures changed significantly.

The curative power that resulted from tree bark being applied to a wound — when a cure sometimes did happen for a patient because of the administration of that tree bark — was then seen through the new lens of the new paradigm to be due to some kinds of beneficial chemicals that must be embedded in the tree bark — not due to beneficial spirits who lived in that tree bark.

The new paradigm about germs lets us look at all relevant data about sickness and about curing diseases in a new context.

That new context actually reinterprets all prior data about disease. Disease paradigms have changed multiple times over the centuries — and they are changing again today.

Each new disease paradigm gives us a set of tools to help people survive and thrive — and to react effectively to ill health.

We need to continue to have our collective thought processes evolve about disease — and we need to judge each new disease-related paradigm against the standard of relative functional benefit.

To achieve a paradigm change, any new paradigm needs to explain all of the key points that were explained by the old paradigm — and the new paradigm needs to do that in a way that is more useful and that lends itself to better actions and more useful decisions than the decisions that were going to happen if we used the old paradigm.

We Need to Replace Negative Paradigms About Other Groups

For the purposes of this book, we need to understand that some intergroup paradigms do exist today where people strongly do believe that evil values — even evil spirits — are actually embedded in the people from other groups.

Some groups hate other groups. Some groups fear other groups. Intergroup distrust is widespread in a number of settings.

Intergroup paradigms exist today for some groups of people that believe and say that the other group's people are inherently greedy, inherently duplicitous and both fundamentally and functionally inherently evil.

Those kinds of negative beliefs about the other groups clearly need to be replaced where they exist. We need to understand that there are paradigms that do exist today that say that people from other groups are basically lazy or inherently untruthful or even fundamentally evil.

To change those paradigms, we need to go to the core beliefs of that belief system and we need to show that those negative core beliefs about that group are inaccurate and wrong.

Some Paradigms Say Other Groups Can Never Be Trusted

Some paradigms say very clearly that people from particular groups can never be trusted.

In those situations, we need to build trust. We need to explicitly call for trust. We need to explicitly do things that demonstrate, deserve, and earn trust.

We need to address that particular trust issue explicitly and intentionally with behavioral proof points that create trust.

We also need to be aware constantly that when trust is being built, it can be very fragile and the new levels of trust we build are constantly at risk if we experience any non-trust worthy behaviors.

We need people who are building trust levels to be above reproach... and perceived to be above reproach. We need to build trust and deserve trust.

Some paradigms define the other groups to be a clear, instinct-triggering category of “them.”

We Need To Change “Them” To “Us” In A Key Way

That is a damaging belief — and it needs to be replaced by including the other group in a working definition of “us.”

Using the six alignment triggers that are outlined in this book can help generate a sense of “us” that can functionally offset the prior sense of “them” in any setting.

We need the new paradigm that we use about intergroup trust to be that it is possible and it is good to create a legitimate sense of us based on our shared commitment to a shared set of enlightened and inclusive beliefs and that we can functionally trust other people who make and share that commitment with us.

Multiple negative stereotypes exist about various groups today — and each stereotype is a belief system in its own right.

We need to replace those negative stereotypes about other people with replacement paradigms that are far more accurate about the positive attributes that actually exist everywhere and that function in very positive and very ethical ways in every group of people.

We very much need to include other people legitimately in our sense of “us” — and we need to create the values and the beliefs about the other people that stem from perceiving those people as a type of “us.”

Trust Can Be A Self-Fulfilling Prophecy

In some ways, that belief in us all being an American “us” can become a self-fulfilling prophecy. We tend to behave differently to and with other people when we have our instinctive “us” perceptions activated relative to those people.

We tend to feel conscience and we tend to feel a sense of ethics relative to “us.”

We need to recognize that various groups of people actually do have very different behaviors in place when the people in each group function as an “us” and not as a “them.” The same people who did, in fact, lie to us as a “them” are much more likely to tell the truth to us when we are all an “us.”

We need those “us” based ethics to be activated in all of us and we need them to reinforce themselves in our intergroup interactions. We need to create that broad sense of values-based “us” so that we can trigger and deliver those “us” related intergroup behaviors to each other as a people.

We need to replace our most negative intergroup stereotypes and our negative intergroup paradigms in order to achieve various levels of intergroup Peace. We need to change the negative paradigms we have about other people as well by having all relevant people join with us in an important values based sense of “us” and in a shared commitment to have us all do well together.

We need to begin that process with a clear understanding of our collective history in the context of our more negative instinctive behaviors and values and with full recognition of the negative behaviors that our us/them instincts have generated for so many years.

We need a new set of belief systems in place about those prior behavior patterns that will allow us to understand intellectually why people have behaved the way they did in the past.

That awareness of prior behaviors can help us understand what we need to do now in order to create better intergroup behaviors and better intergroup interactions in the future. We need to look at our history clearly through the paradigm lens of us/them instincts and behaviors and we need to use that paradigm to set up a context that creates trust today.

Conspiracy Theories Create Their Own Paradigms

One of the key paradigm issues we need to address in our country at this point is the widely held belief that functional overarching conspiracies exist in our nation and that those macro conspiracies cause almost all of the bad things that happen to happen between groups of people.

A widely held paradigm for many people in our country is the core belief that all of the bad behaviors that have happened over the course of time to minority people in America have basically been the result and the

direct consequence of a very well-designed, very powerful, clearly architected, strategically intentional, very effective, overarching race-based fundamentally evil intergroup conspiracy.

Conspiracy theories have many believers. Many people believe that an overarching evil conspiracy exists for this country and those people believe the conspiracy is based on White racial interactions and White racial interests.

Many people believe strongly that there is an actual underlying White-anchored conspiracy drives all of the negative behavior we see in so many settings toward minority Americans.

Many people believe today in that particular overarching conspiracy theory as the cause of a wide range of intergroup interactions in this country.

Books have been written about that conspiracy. Articles and speeches have focused on the impact of that conspiracy.

One survey several years ago showed that a majority of Black Americans who were surveyed believed that HIV was a genetically engineered disease that had been created by White people intentionally to kill Black people.

That particular belief assumes the existence of a White-anchored conspiratorial strategy that has enough internal consistency and enough

functional power to make very specific, explicitly real, and very negative things happen in favor of White people at very explicit levels in our society.

That belief in an overarching macro conspiracy strategy creates functional challenges for improving the situation we face today.

It is hard to make real and significant progress in some areas of intergroup relations if people believe that the core cause of the actual negative behaviors that exist all of those settings and situations is conspiratorial rather than instinctive.

Each relative paradigm about those basic intergroup issues creates its own set of possible response strategies.

We Can Offset And Guide Instincts

If we want to build a future with fewer negative intergroup behaviors, we need to replace conspiracies with instincts as a key paradigm that explains all of those consistent and negative comments and historic intergroup behaviors.

As this book has pointed out, the most functional and productive way of looking at all of those horrific sets of consistent negative behaviors both today and in our history is to believe in and work with a basic paradigm that says we actually have overarching instincts — and to believe that those overarching us/them instincts consistently create all of the very specific anti-

group behaviors we see in so many places that look very much like the result of conspiracies when they functionally happen.

Situational Conspiracies Do Exist

That is not to say that conspiracies do not exist. They do exist. There are very real conspiracies. Conspiracies happen in multiple situations and settings. Those conspiracies do damage people.

We need to recognize that reality of situational intergroup conspiracies and we need to deal directly with it. Conspiracies of various kinds do exist in a number of places and settings — and those conspiracies are all anchored on our instinctive us/them behaviors, values, and thought processes.

We need to recognize and be very open and honest as we look at that particular possible paradigm change to believing that instincts create most negative behavior and we need to all understand and deal with the fact that situational racist and discriminatory conspiracies clearly do exist.

They exist as a result of our instincts. Negative conspiratorial behaviors do happen in multiple ways and those negative behaviors do damage people.

The Overarching Conspiracy Does Not Exist

The old, widely held belief that there is a macro overarching conspiracy that structures, channels, and functionally choreographs all of the evil and racist behaviors in all of those settings at a macro intentionally engineered level needs to be replaced as a paradigm by a working understanding of the real world existence of a wide range of less macro, much more situational, clearly race-related and ethnicity-linked conspiracies that do exist and that do create both discriminatory and prejudicial behaviors in multiple settings.

People do conspire along racial and ethnic lines in various ways that we have all seen evidence of. There is not an actual overarching macro conspiracy to get all police forces to be racist — but some police forces clearly do have their own specific, instinct-triggered, setting specific, clearly racist behaviors.

There can be situational police force conspiracies in some settings and those are clearly negative intergroup behavior patterns happening in those instinct-guided settings. We need to address each of those situations in the setting where it is happening — and we need to build solutions that build intergroup trust in each of those settings.

Likewise, there are some work settings where discriminatory behavior happens in negative and very intentional ways that are directed, guided, or even blessed by the people who manage those particular settings.

As a kind of conspiracy, Jim Crow laws obviously did exist. There are people today who would like to restore some of those levels of highly prejudicial behaviors for our society and for our current intergroup actions.

The people who have those feelings about restoring Jim Crow Laws have them for instinctive reasons and not because they have been guided to those thoughts and those beliefs by a conspiracy.

There are people today who would still favor laws that would reduce positive impacts of the new laws for people in ways that would clearly reflect our more negative us/them instinctive behaviors — and those people are inspired by their own us/them instincts and not by a macro conspiracy.

Situational, Instinct-Incented Conspiracies Do Exist

The paradigm proposed by this *Primal Pathways* book is that situational and setting specific conspiracies can exist — and all of those very situational conspiracies are — at their core — triggered and guided very directly by our instincts and not created by a secret racist master plan.

To end all of those negative intergroup behaviors, we need a new basic shared belief that addresses each new conspiracy and each negative

behavior pattern as it emerges and then we need to deal with each negative intergroup situation in its own setting as being unacceptable behavior for us as a community and as a culture.

We need an overall, overarching strategy and culture of “us” that creates a new American “Us,” and then has us interacting with one another as “Us.”

We need the equivalent of a macro conspiracy — and we need it to be transparent, inclusive, enlightened, and based on us all wanting us all to benefit and thrive.

We Need A Conspiracy To Be “Us”

We need a true macro, intentional, and very public conspiracy to be “us.” We need to resist and defeat each of the situational and setting specific negative intergroup conspiracies that do exist that do actually spill out of our us/them instincts.

We can deal with those negative behaviors and with those micro and situational conspiracies more effectively when they are not part of an overarching master secret racist conspiracy that we can’t clearly quite either delineate or fully expose to the light of functional transparency.

We need to deal directly with the relevant instincts in each situation and — if we do the entire process really well — we need to make our most

important and problematic intergroup instincts work for us instead of against us.

We Need A Paradigm Change To Channel Instinctive

Behaviors

That particular set of beliefs is a good paradigm change topic for us to work with as we go forward to create intergroup Peace. We need to understand which paradigm is most useful to us in both predicting future behavior and which paradigm gives us the best tools to change the future trajectory of our collective and individual behavior into better directions.

There will be very little we would be able to do to make real progress toward intergroup Peace if that overarching evil intergroup conspiracy really did exist and if that highly powerful and invisible conspiracy actually was in place.

But there is a very large number of very good things that we can collectively do if the negative intergroup challenges we need to deal with in our world today have instincts at their core, instead of conspiracies.

ISIS Has A Real, But Limited Conspiracy To Deal With The

World

There are some settings in the world where functional and negative intergroup paradigms do result in the equivalent of conspiratorial intergroup behavior.

The ISIS situation in the Middle East, for example, has a group of people who have a paradigm that says that the only way to run the world is through their belief system and through the people who are committed to their belief system. They have a strategy that has the functionality of a highly visible intergroup conspiracy and they clearly identify the conspiring group.

They believe that everyone who is not in their belief system is a “Them” — and they act accordingly.

In those settings, intergroup slavery and genocide both exist — and those evil behaviors feel right to the people who have that particular paradigm structuring their thoughts, values, and behaviors.

Dealing with ISIS will require having clear and intentional alliances of people who are against them in ways that can control key pieces of relevant turf. Dealing with ISIS will also involve recognizing that their key inherent flaw and their most problematic and insurmountable function of short coming as a world power is that their entire universe of eligible members and supporters is a very finite set of people who subscribe to the

specific subset of their faith that they champion. They are land locked at several levels in their strategic potential

They obviously have no potential ability to extend their sense of “us” beyond an inherently limited audience. So once they have achieved a peak level of recruitment into that set of people — and once they have occupied lands that are the tribal turf of those sets of people — there are no further opportunities for them to expand that have any prospect of long-term success.

They have clearly limited their definition of “us” to a subset of people that can be clearly confined in both size and geography.

But in that space and in those settings, their particular internally focused conspiracy has given them great local leverage and significant power.

Those belief systems that they espouse do create a very real and consistent set of conspiratorial behaviors for a particular subset of people. They have a paradigm that is self-limiting because they are only attractive to true believers who are already part of their core consistency.

There is some overlap from that particular set of intense religious alignments to American soil — but that overlap depends on people who

have converted to those beliefs acting as small groups and individuals to do damage at some level.

Issues like to Boston Marathon bombers can happen — but they cannot happen very many times because their supporters are limited by those beliefs.

Infrastructure damage is the next likely set of challenges that we will face from that set of people. We will need to be very good at keeping that damage from happening.

Those are not the kinds of problematic intergroup behaviors and challenges that are being created in our own country by our own intergroup instincts rather than by conspiratorial design. We have created our own intergroup paradigms that we need to discuss and address in informed and insightful ways.

Paradigms Guide Us — We Should Guide Our Paradigms

For our own future success in creating intergroup Peace, we need to recognize that building paradigms is an instinctive behavior. Paradigms are everywhere. Our paradigms guide our behaviors.

The answer, for us and for our basic sets of enlightened values, is for us to carefully structure and guide our key intergroup paradigms. We need to use our paradigms — and our cultures — as tools. We can put in place the

paradigms and cultures that we need to steer us in the directions we need to be steered.

We “feel right” acting in accord with our instincts. We also “feel right” acting in accord with our culture. We “feel very right” thinking and acting in accord with our paradigms.

To achieve intergroup Peace, we clearly have some negative paradigms that we need to change and we need to build some very useful and functional paradigms on some key topics if we really intend to achieve InterGroup Peace.

We Can't Erase Instincts Or Avoid Paradigms

We can't erase our instincts and we can't not think in the constraints of paradigms — so we need to use our instincts in the cause of enlightened intergroup behavior and we need to use both our paradigms and our cultures in ways that give us the best chances of success of intergroup Peace.

We have not been able to do that work in the past as well as we can do it now. We have not collectively understood those processes well in the past and we have not been clear on how those processes actually interact with one another.

We can have that knowledge now. We can also use it now.
Knowledge is power.

We Need Paradigms That Guide Us To Peace

We need to understand each of the key and relevant instinct packages that are part of our overall functionality. We need to understand how both our paradigms and our cultures are formed and we need to understand how they guide what we think and what we do.

The next chapter of this book describes a number of the key packages of instincts we need to understand and use in the cause of Peace. We have turf instincts, hierarchical instincts, Alpha and Beta instincts, and instincts to feel anxiety and stress when we are surrounded by people who are not “us.”

We need working paradigms about each of those packages of instincts that will allow us to use them to create intergroup Peace and to a win/win set of intergroup outcomes for America.

Those instincts hugely impact our thinking, our behaviors, and our lives. We need to know what they are and we need to know exactly how they do their work.

Those are the paradigms we need to use now to steer us all to a future of enlightened behaviors and beliefs.