



PEACE IN OUR TIME

by George Halvorson

Introduction — Peace In Our Time

Peace In Our Time has had important historic significance as a term and as a public policy goal because it was the anchor for a very public statement made by a British Prime Minister, Neville Chamberlain, who did a deal with Germany just prior to World War II that he claimed would create exactly that outcome for the world he lived in for the foreseeable future.

He was wrong.

He not only did not achieve Peace for his time — he made the situation he was in significantly worse. He failed.

So why use that historically damaged title for this book?

I am using the title for this book because we also are in a setting and in a situation where we once again do need Peace In Our Time.

Chamberlain was right about the goal. He was only wrong about the strategy that could work to achieve that goal.

We do need to create Peace In Our Time.

We are in a world that has a wide range of ethnically divided countries that are currently at war with themselves. At this point in

history, we don't face wars between countries. We face an explosion of wars within countries.

Tribes are fighting tribes in settings across the planet.

Tribal warfare defines Iraq, Chechnya, Nigeria, The Sudan, and major areas of Sri Lanka, India, and the Russian Confederation.

Every multi-tribal African country has tribal groups in a state of conflict with other tribes. Every multi-tribal country in the Middle East has tribal groups in a state of conflict with other tribes.

Every country in Europe has significant numbers of new immigrants who are all from tribal groups that are different from the local European tribes who have lived in those areas for centuries. The old French tribe, the old German tribe, the old Dutch tribes, and the other old European tribes all now have large numbers of new local residents from other ethnic groups who speak a different language, have a different culture, have a different group history and identity, and who are very consistently generating a level of intergroup tension and intergroup conflict relative to the original tribes in each setting.

Religion is also a factor that divides the tribes in many of those settings.

Many of the clearly tribal conflicts that are happening today in those multi-tribal countries are exacerbated by the fact that there are different religions for the people from each tribe. The new immigrants to historically Christian Europe tend to be Muslim — and many of those immigrants who feel a sense of division and discrimination in those countries clearly feel and believe that their religion has been a key reason why they have had problems fitting into their new settings.

The actual functional dividing lines between the warring groups in each setting tend to be very clearly ethnic and tribal, but the labels for the conflicts that have resulted from those tribal divisions tend to have religious overtones that make the actual issues of functional division by tribe less clear.

That alignment of religion with tribe for the tribes in conflict is true in other parts of the world as well.

In the Middle East, the local tribes are all Muslim, but those tribes are divided into three groups with clear and distinct religious alignments for each group. The Middle East has Shiite tribes, Sunni tribes, and Kurdish tribes. Tribes are fighting tribes in every Middle Eastern setting. The bloodshed in all of those settings is entirely and

clearly intertribal — but religion provides each of the conflicted tribes with another reason for the tribes to hate the other tribes.

India and Pakistan have similar histories of tribes fighting tribes with the religion of each tribe determining which tribes fight which tribes. Even Ireland has two tribes in a state of conflict who clearly fight each other as tribes, but use a religious label to describe the reasons for their conflict.

The book, *Cusp of Chaos*, explains those intertribal conflicts that have clear religious overtones in more detail. The book *Primal Pathways* explains the underlying instinctive behaviors that are shaping those intergroup interactions and intergroup behavior patterns in entirely predictable and highly consistent ways in all of those settings.

Primal Pathways explains the instinctive underpinnings of all of those conflicts. We tend to be heavily influenced in our thoughts, emotions, and behaviors by our instincts — and that is extremely true at a very powerful level for our intergroup interactions.

We have very strong instincts to divide the world into us and them and then to act accordingly based on which designation we give to

other people in our setting. Those instincts have a major impact on the world we live in.

There are actually more than 200 ethnic conflicts going on in various settings today. People are activating their basic us/them instinct packages in each of those settings. The results of that activation for those instincts is that people feel right at a very primal level protecting their own tribe and turf and people feel right at a very primal level in doing damage to other sets of people who are perceived, in each setting, to be “Them.”

We are all heavily influenced by our instinctive behaviors. The books *Primal Pathways*, *Art of InterGroup Peace*, and *Cusp of Chaos* all describe those instincts in more detail. Our instincts affect the way we think and they tend to guide us in what we do at levels that we often do not appreciate, see, or understand.

Our Cultures Support Our Instincts

Our cultures are a key part of that package.

Our cultures support our instincts in every setting. We have instincts to be hierarchical, so every setting creates its own rules and

processes for hierarchies. We have instincts to be territorial, so every setting creates its own rules and processes for territory and turf.

Each culture creates behavioral expectations that help our instincts achieve their goals in every setting.

If we want to steer the impact of our instincts in positive and enlightened ways, we will only be able to do that if we understand the role that our cultures play in guiding our instinctive behaviors and then use our cultures in very intentional ways as tools for that process.

That can be done — but it will only happen if we understand the processes that are involved in creating and changing cultures and then use those processes in our self-interest.

The book *Art of InterGroup Peace* deals with those issues and those strategies very directly.

“Us/Them” Instincts Have A Major Impact On Our Behaviors

The instincts that are creating the most significant impact on our world today are the instincts we have to divide the world into Us and

Them and to treat people very differently depending on whether we perceive people to be an Us or a Them.

We are supportive of Us. We tend to trust Us and we tend to find comfort in being surrounded by Us. We distrust Them — and we feel stress and even anxiety whenever we are surrounded by Them.

In each Us/Them setting, we apply very different standards to our treatments of Us and Them. We are protective and forgiving for our Us — and we tend to be antagonistic, territorial, and aggressive toward anyone we perceive to be “Them.”

Those same patterns trigger how we think and how we feel in all of the various intergroup settings where there is a sense of Us and Them.

In Our Country, We Have Damaged “Them”

In our own country, those sets of instinctive thoughts and behaviors have shaped our history. We have displaced the original inhabitants of the country — moving “Them” into reservations that are a pale shadow of the former turf that was originally occupied by each of those original Native American tribes.

The White majority group in this country has acted in a number of obviously and clearly instinct-aligned ways relative to themselves and to other groups of Americans. The White majority group has been an “us” to itself and has treated people from all other groups as “Them.”

It is not a good thing to be perceived as “Them” by anyone who has functional power as an “Us.”

This country has enslaved people that the White majority group in this country perceived to be “Them.” That White majority group proceeded to discriminate very intentionally for a very long period of time against those same people once slavery was ended.

The White American majority group that has run our country for hundreds of years has actually discriminated directly at multiple levels against every set of people perceived to be a “Them.”

African Americans, Hispanic Americans, Asian Americans, and Native Americans all have faced legal, economic and functional discrimination and negative consequences at multiple levels that all stem from being perceived by the White American majority group to be Them.

Our History Has Gone Down Two Very Different Tracks

We have a history that has gone down two very different tracks.

We have had one track of history that has been a combination of enlightened behaviors and positive ideological beliefs that have been a model of freedom and opportunity for the world. We made democracy, freedom of religion, and basic principles of equality for some of our people a high point of enlightened behaviors as a nation.

At the same time, we have acted in extremely unenlightened ways. The people who ran this country as a majority group “us” for centuries made it very difficult for some subsets of the people of this country to succeed and made it hard for some groups even to survive.

We clearly have a history where the White majority group has run the country in ways that have exhibited both “Us” behaviors and “Them” behaviors in the clear and obvious manifestations that can be created by each set of instincts.

Even though the White American majority group clearly anchored at a very important level by one of the most enlightened belief systems in the world relative to the issues of democratic self-governance, individual freedom, and full interpersonal legal equality, the group that created all of those positive and enlightened benefits only extended

those very enlightened and positive benefits fully to other White Americans.

Full Benefits Were Extended Only To White Males

To be most accurate, those full benefits of equality, opportunity, and full inclusion were actually only extended to White males. Women were also discriminated against at multiple levels in this country for a very long time. In a pioneering democratic context that prided itself on extending equal voting rights to every citizen, women were not given full citizenship and women were not allowed to even vote at all for most of our history as a nation.

This book — and its three sister books — all explain why that discrimination against both minority Americans and women has happened in this country. It also explains what the status for that discrimination against both minority groups and women is today.

We have made progress in a number of key areas — and there are a number of key areas where major progress remains to be made. Those books explain both what we have done well and what we need to do well now to succeed and prosper as a people and a country in all of our settings.

There Are Four Books In The Trilogy

This book is the fourth book in my Intergroup Trilogy. I actually also had four books in my health care reform trilogy, so this is not the first time that I have added a fourth book to what I thought was a complete set.

The anchor book for the Intergroup trilogy is *Primal Pathways* — a book on our basic instinctive behavior. That book explains some of the key instinctive underpinnings that shape our thoughts, beliefs, emotions, and behaviors. It discusses how our instincts affect us now and explains how we should use our instincts to shape and guide our future thoughts, behaviors, and beliefs.

The trilogy also includes *Cusp of Chaos* — a book about how messed up and troubled major parts of the world are today. *Cusp of Chaos* explains why there are so many intergroup problems in the world today and explains and describes many of the areas where problems exist.

That book argues that we could find ourselves in an ugly and damaging future — ugly and dysfunctional intergroup chaos — if we don't do enlightened things in very intentional ways now to steer us

down another, better path toward intergroup synergy, harmony, and Peace.

The other key book in the set is *The Art of InterGroup Peace*. The *Art of Intergroup Peace* outlines specific steps we can and should take now to create and protect intergroup Peace in America. It is intended to be a useful guidebook for building Peace in various settings and in creating a culture of Peace for us as a nation.

That book also offers some thoughts about what some of the other nations in the world who are currently at war with themselves might do to create a future of prosperity and Peace.

This particular book describes my own journey of learning relative to this set of issues. *Peace in Our Time* explains when and how I have reached the intergroup beliefs that I now hold and describes my own learning process and personal experiences relative to those basic intergroup issues.

It describes a number of things that I have done in my various work settings and in various public and community settings to test and validate the key points about intergroup interactions that I have

included as observations and recommendations in all of the books in this set.

I have been studying those sets of intergroup issues very explicitly and directly for nearly three decades. I have done that study from the perspective of a very useful set of jobs that have allowed me to learn about those issues very directly in a real and functional operational context.

I have been the CEO for several fairly large health care organizations over the past three-dozen years — serving for the last 29 years in the CEO role for multi-billion dollar organizations that have employed tens of thousands of people and provided care to millions of people.

Diversity Led To Top Performance

My most recent health care job — serving as Chair and CEO for Kaiser Permanente — involved an organization with more than \$50 billion in annual revenue, nearly 600 care sites, roughly 10 million patients, and nearly 200,000 staff members and employees.

Diversity was a major asset and attribute for that effort and team. On the day I retired, Kaiser Permanente was 59 percent minority in its

overall employee count. In a world where multi-billion dollar organizations tend to have overwhelmingly male and extremely White Boards of Directors, the Kaiser Permanente Board of Directors was only 40 percent White male.

I had three group presidents who ran the regions for that organization. One was African American, one was Chinese American, and one was a White woman.

For our eight direct regional presidents, only two were White males and four were women.

My CFO, controller, and senior head of communications were all women. We were a highly diverse organization — and that diversity had no glass ceiling of any kind.

That organization was very diverse and it was very high performance.

The Most Diverse Organization Had The Highest Performance

That highly diverse organization was given the highest service and quality ratings in America by Medicare. It was also rated number

one by both JD Powers and Consumer Reports. Consumer Reports called us a “Most Trusted Brand.” You can pull up those references and those ratings by going to their websites.

You can look at the book, *KP Inside*, to see dozens of other first place recognitions and performance awards that were earned by that highly diverse organization.

I mention all of that here to make the point that my own learning process relative to those issues of functional intergroup interactions in diverse situations and settings has not been an isolated, purely observational, primarily theoretical, or functionally academic journey. I did do extensive reading and secondary research into each of those areas, but I also did very real work at a very operational level in very diverse settings — and I helped make diversity into a major asset and strength for those settings.

My experience base and set of learning opportunities has extended beyond just the organizations that directly employed me.

As part of my learning process and work reality, I have served on trade associations, task forces, commissions, panels, and various reform

coalitions that have all helped teach me a variety of ways that we can help people work together in a common cause to achieve common goals.

I have chaired half a dozen of those organizations. Some of those organizations were overseas. My experience base has not been limited to our country. I have also helped start health plans in half a dozen other countries and I have worked with plans and care systems in nearly thirty countries. My work in Uganda can be read about in the book, *Health Care Co-Ops in Uganda*.

I chaired the International Federation of Health Plans for nearly a decade. I also chaired the Health Governors for the World Economic Forum in Switzerland, and I chaired or co-chaired several of their committees.

Overall, I have been blessed with some extremely useful learning opportunities. I have tried to take full advantage of those opportunities as part of the journey of understanding that I have been on for the past couple of decades about this entire array of intergroup interactions and related instinctive intergroup behaviors.

I have learned, in all of those settings, a number of ways, techniques, and approaches that we can use in various settings to get

people to be aligned, to work together, and to mutually benefit from the process of being together. I have worked on tools, strategies, and approaches aimed at bringing people in each setting into effective and functional intergroup Peace, and I have found that entire learning process that I derived from those work settings to be a gold mine for the writing of these books.

I Believe We Can Achieve Peace In Our Time

I now believe, as a consequence of that entire learning process, that we can, in fact, achieve Peace in our time, in all of the settings that make up America. I also believe that we can achieve Peace in our time as a nation and as a people who are aligned and united by our core beliefs.

I believe we can embark on a journey of healing and trust in our own country at this point in our history. I believe we can support our children in their hours of need — and that we can create a country where the learning gaps that damage so many of our people today can disappear and even be forgotten.

The book *Three Key Years* explains exactly how we can make that particular goal of making learning gaps for our children disappear

happen. Please read that book if you care about the future of children in America.

We do need to achieve Peace In Our Time. My belief — after all of the learning and experimentation that I have done — is that we can actually achieve that goal.

I also believe that if we do not very intentionally do what we need to do to achieve that goal, we truly are on the cusp of chaos and I believe that things will get much worse for us all instead of better.

We need to make some right choices and we need to make them now. I have been on a journey to figure out what those choices are and to figure out how to make them successfully for almost two decades.

This book explains what I now believe about how that can and should be done. It also outlines the personal learning journey and set of experiences that have brought me to this set of values and to these beliefs.

It is time, I believe, for us all to help make Peace happen.

It's up to us.

If we don't make Peace happen, no one will.

Chapter One — My Personal Learning Process And Journey Have Helped Me Understand Both Instincts And Myself

My learning process about how groups of people interact with one another has been a fascinating journey — and it gets more interesting for me every single day and year.

I started my personal learning process about all things relevant to all of the key sets of intergroup interaction issues as a white guy from a very small town in Northern Minnesota.

Our small town was surrounded by second growth forests — primarily jack pines, popple trees, and scrub oak. Those trees offered their own semi-lush Eden as protection, shelter, and habitat to a wide variety of wildlife. They also offered fairly meager economic sustenance to a relatively small number of people who had decided to make their living running tiny mixed crop farms and from doing low income, physically draining, and sometimes physically damaging and dangerous logging of the local trees.

Our trees become paper rather than furniture or roofs.

I learned initially about several relevant differences between groups of people fairly early in my life in that small town.

The differences that existed between those particular groups of people who lived — at that point in time in those jack pine forests — seem minor and inconsequential when viewed from a distance, but those differences among those people were a looming fact of life for me in my most formative years.

That very small town actually had very real internal ethnic divisions between the people whose families had immigrated from Finland and the people whose families had immigrated to that piece of Minnesota turf from other Scandinavian or European countries.

“Finn town” was a fairly clearly defined part of town when I was a child. The people with Finnish ancestors were concentrated in several neighborhoods. Their houses often had saunas attached. I used to play poker in those saunas and I would periodically also get very clean in those same saunas.

Some very clear us/them thinking and some very distinct us/them behaviors were triggered by the specific categories of ethnic groupings that existed in that small town. There were several Lutheran churches, for example. They were divided by tribe. The Finnish people in town tended to go to different Lutheran churches from the non-Finns.

The differences in denomination between those churches seemed to matter quite a bit to a number of the folks who lived in that town. Church sect differences, I could see in those early years, tended to trigger a clear sense of “Us” or “Them” for the folks who chose to be part of each sect.

The truth was — as usually happens for religious alignments — people actually did not choose their sect. People were born into their sect. My own grandparents were founding members of the Norwegian Lutheran church in that town — and I would have been considered a traitor to my family “us” if I had somehow chosen to spend my Sunday mornings at the Finnish Lutheran church.

That choice was inconceivable to me. It never occurred to me to even consider it. We all know exactly where we belonged when it came time to pray and that was exactly where we all stayed.

Martin Luther King once said that the most segregated hour in America occurs just before noon every Sunday morning.

That segregation clearly happened on Sunday morning in Menahga.

We had more than religion to shape our intergroup division. Many of my fellow students spoke Finnish as their primary language when they reached first grade. Some of my fellow students had a clear Finnish accent for their English that lasted for many years.

Some of the Finnish families would not allow their daughters to date non-Finns. Or at least, that's what a couple of the daughters from those families told me at that time.

There was no open hostility between the groups — but there were clear intergroup divisions in several aspects of local life. Our local political candidates generally had very clear ethnic patterns in their voting support.

My maternal grandfather was mayor of that town twice and my own father was mayor three times. I don't believe my father had more than 10 percent of the Finnish votes on his first election. It was a very close election. They actually had a court-supervised recount for that particular election.

My father had high levels of support from all groups in town by his final term in office — but that very first vote was very clearly divided along ethnic lines. The other candidate in that first election was

a full-blooded Finn and he campaigned very explicitly and openly for the Finn vote.

We also had a very small number of Native Americans in town. We lived relatively close to a couple of large tribal reservations — so driving to and through those reservations and having some interactions with some of the people who lived there was also a part of my growing up set of life experiences.

We were also slightly more than an hour away from some significant migrant farm worker encampments in the Red River Valley. The workers in those camps came almost entirely from Mexico.

I did drive by those sites and I saw the people who lived in them, but I had no actual encounters of any kind at any time with any of the people who lived and worked in any of those sites. Not one interaction. Zero. They were like people from a different planet to me in my growing up years.

I saw the tiny cabins in rows on the narrow dirt roads by the sugar beet fields and I had no sense at any level about who lived there or what their lives were all about.

One of my cousins worked one summer in the beet fields alongside and with the migrant workers who lived in those tiny cabins. He told us that it was the hardest work he ever did in his life.

That job made him easily the person in the family with the most “diversity” experience. His friends at school made disparaging comments to him about his experiences. They made negative comments to him about his new friends in the beet fields — so he stopped sharing those stories with them or with anyone else after he returned to school that fall.

He later became a full sergeant major in the U.S. Marines and he did a number of things to help improve some aspects of Marine Corp. ethnicity and Marine Corp. racial interactions before his untimely death from a fairly rare cancer. It occurred to me at the time of his death that his exposure to the chemicals in those sugar beet fields might have planted a seed for that cancer. Those were not safe working conditions and he died relatively young.

As a Northern Minnesota White guy, my own exposure to African Americans, prior to my college years, came entirely from television. There were no Black people in our town or in our county.

I was very pro-civil rights, however. I did see extensive television footage of the very ugly things that were happening to the civil rights efforts and to the civil rights workers in some of our Southern states, and I had great sympathy for the protestors.

But I had no direct contact with anyone Black until I got to college. I then did have some Black friends in the small Christian college I attended — so my exposure to racial diversity increased a little.

I had a day job as a newspaper reporter for the local daily newspaper during my college years. I was a full-time student and I was simultaneously a full-time newspaper reporter. I loved both roles.

I have never entirely given up my sense of being, at heart, a journalist who is functionally embedded in my own daily career and life.

I once wrote an article for that local newspaper about the very dysfunctional prejudice that some of my Black friends from school had experienced when they tried to rent apartments in that town.

I actually did an experiment and I had a White student go to some houses where my Black college friends had been told that the apartments had all been rented. The White students were told a

completely different story from the same renter and the White students were actually offered the rooms.

Several people were angry that I wrote the article. A couple of people told me that I had invented the story and I was told with great energy by a couple of people at the newspaper that no one was actually racially prejudiced in those ways in that particular town.

The experiences I had with that small set of discrimination issues reinforced and reaffirmed what I had seen on the national television news shows. I was sad for my friends who were denied rooms and I was more than a little angry about their treatment. My friends were unable to rent a place to live off campus and had to sleep in the freshman dorms at the college for four years.

It made me sad and angry to see how badly my friends were treated relative to a very basic and simple fact of life like finding a place to sleep, and it made me even sadder and angrier to hear from my Black friends that they were entirely used to being treated in that way.

They, of course, were not surprised at that experience. They told me they had expected the rejection. That kind of experience was, they said, a routine fact of life in their world.

Hearing that from my friends made me a little crazy in an angry way. That made the discrimination experience very real. It's always easier to understand those kinds of issues at a human level. It is significantly easier to put them into human context as a real and important behavior when they happen directly to a personal friend.

The Twin Cities Were More Diverse

When I moved from that small college town in Northern Minnesota down south to the metropolitan Twin Cities area to work, I found myself in a much more diverse setting. Minneapolis/St. Paul had significantly more diversity than Fargo/Moorhead. As a new Twin City resident, I ended up with some Black friends, some Asian co-workers and friends, and a growing exposure to various minority groups.

I did some work with the community clinics of St. Paul, but I did that work at a support and governance level and not in a direct caregiving job. The African American woman who ran the St. Paul Model Cities community clinics later became one of my best friends, and I still mourn her loss to cancer before her time.

One of the greatest honors of my life — one that I still treasure deeply — was to be asked by her to do her eulogy at her funeral.

Timothy Vann was my mentor, my counselor, my coach, my inspiration, my hero, and my friend — and I still have a religious gift — a fairly large and lovely statue of St. Joseph — that Mrs. Vann gave me in passing, sitting in a prominent place in my living room.

I did not do justice to her in her eulogy. I did not come close. She deserved better. But I still feel grateful and deeply honored that she asked me to do that eulogy for her.

So I did have some experience relative to some issues of diversity and to both positive and negative intergroup and interracial interactions in the first decades of my life. I was pro-civil rights and I was an activist for integration issues at several levels, but I held those beliefs from the perspective of a White guy who had basically only directly experienced Minnesota in the days before Minnesota had any significant diversity.

I Had The Chance To Build A Health Plan In Jamaica

Then, in mid-career, I had an amazing opportunity to see a much wider range of intergroup issues from a much richer and more direct perspective. I was blessed with a marvelous opportunity to experience and learn. My first major and very direct personal exposure to many

people from a wider set of ethnic and racial compositions came when I had a chance to start a health plan in Jamaica.

The Minnesota health care company that I was the CEO of at the time was given a chance to build a health plan in Jamaica — and I was a lead person from our team who was able to go there to do that work.

I gave myself that assignment. I went to Jamaica — met with the local people relevant to my work — and I designed and helped build a health plan that provided care and coverage to local Jamaicans.

That plan had major support from the labor unions of Jamaica — so I had a chance to meet the labor leadership in Jamaica as well as the local insurance business people, the local caregivers, and some members of the government.

That was a remarkable learning experience. I went from being in Minnesota rooms with few or no black faces most of the time into being the only white face in the room most of the time. I was clearly the minority person in almost all of my Jamaican settings.

I helped start a health plan in Jamaica that had almost all black doctors and nurses and that also had a board of directors that did not have a white face on it. There were a couple of Hispanic and Asian

doctors and business leaders in that setting, but white, as a descriptor for any person in the room, was very often limited to just me.

I Learned The Stress Of Being The Only “Us”

I learned a lot. I was deeply blessed to have had that experience at many levels. I learned in those settings in Jamaica how stressful it can be at both a subconscious and a conscious level when we are the only anything in a room full of people from another group.

That was an important learning experience all by itself. As a White majority group member functioning entirely in groups of Minnesota White people, I had no idea before going to Jamaica that being alone as a different type of person in any setting could generate subconscious tension and could trigger constant mild stress and I did not learn that particular very important reality about intergroup interactions until I was in a setting where the only person of my own type in a group in a room was me.

That was truly a golden learning experience. In reality, I could not have been in a safer environment. I was not at risk. I had a great job and I had a solid interaction level with my co-workers. I had great support.

My co-workers in Jamaica all seemed to like me, and I believe we did really good work together.

But I often had a strong sense of being surrounded by “them” because I was, in fact, the outlier person most of the time in most of the work settings and in almost all of the after work settings.

That was a great opportunity for very personal learning for me at multiple levels. One of the levels took me entirely by surprise.

One night, at a very local reggae event down by the waterfront in the city of Kingston, I looked around me at a sea of entirely black faces and I had a panic attack at a very primal and personal level that literally and physically dropped me to my knees.

There was no overt threat and there was no functional reason for me to panic. I was not threatened in any way. But I suddenly had a sense of being completely and entirely surrounded by “Them” and I melted.

Back in my own bed later that night, I had a very clear and explicit flashback on what it felt like to be entirely surrounded by “Them” and I realized how primal, basic, pure, and entirely instinctive my panic had been.

I then started noticing which daytime settings increased my levels of stress and anxiety. I began to understand that being a minority in any setting had levels of instinct triggered stress that I had never suspected.

I was suddenly both very sympathetic and highly empathetic for all of the African Americans who had been the only black faces in all of those overwhelmingly White meetings that I had been part of back in Minnesota.

I had never personally felt interethnic stress or even interethnic tension or discomfort in any of those slightly multi-ethnic Minnesota meetings, but that was obviously because I was part of the absolute and clear majority in each setting. I now had the insight at a very personal level that the African American people in those Minnesota meetings might well have felt very differently about each of those meetings and settings.

That suspicion was correct. When I talked very explicitly and extensively to multiple people who have been situational minority people in various settings about that specific situational minority stress issue since that time, I have confirmed in many conversations that those

feelings are in fact often felt by people who are the situational minorities in any multi-group settings.

My supposition on that night in Jamaica about the universality of that deeply embedded and very primal reaction that we each can have at an instinctive level whenever we are a situational minority was true. I learned that it is common to feel some level of stress anytime any of us are surrounded by “Them.” I also learned that under some circumstances, the basic discomfort can accelerate into actual panic as a pure situation reaction.

I now know that it is true that people in any setting who are the clear minority of any kind in a given setting often have a very similar sense of group-linked discomfort and stress.

I did have a somewhat similar and equally primal feeling when I was wind boarding a couple of miles out to sea in the blue water area of the ocean off Jamaica and what appeared to be a giant squid — many times larger than my wind-board — partially surfaced and rolled a vast expanse of smooth dark skin on the surface of the water a few feet away from my board.

I melted again — dropping to my knees first and then only able to lie down on the board until the beast left and I regained slow control over my limbs. That panic was equivalently instinctive. It took away my ability to function and I had to slowly and carefully recover at an emotional and mental level before I could move either my arms or my legs.

Both of those experiences triggered feelings that were equally primal and equally pure.

I did not have anything resembling that level of panic attack in any of my various business meetings in Jamaica — but I did have a strong sense of stress and basic discomfort in some non-business settings where I was clearly the situational minority.

When I asked people about that set of reactions, many other people from several groups have told me about having similar intergroup stress feelings in similar intergroup situations.

I learned from all of those conversations with other people about those issues and feelings and from my own personal experiences that the normal consequence of being a minority in any setting is often a level of instinctive stress.

People In the Majority Often Have No Realization Of The

Situational Stress

I have learned through my conversations with many people and from direct observation in a number of settings that it is also true that whoever is in the majority status in those exact same settings often has no clue at any level that anyone who is in that room with them is currently feeling that level of situational stress. Those feelings can be very powerful to the person who is feeling them and they tend to be entirely invisible to everyone else in the setting.

I personally had no idea those sets of reactions existed — and I might personally never have learned that fact and experienced that reality about situational minority stress — had I not gone to Jamaica to start that health plan.

It was much easier to explain and discuss that situational stress later in talking to other people about it because I had actually experienced it myself.

Reading about a sense or reading about a feeling or reading about an instinctive reaction can be informative. Actually having and personally experiencing an instinctive emotion or instinctive feeling can

be insight provoking and educational at higher and more meaningful levels.

My initial response when I recognized those patterns about feeling stress at being in a minority situation in a setting to be true was to be sad about the existence of that set of feelings and those levels of intergroup stress. Our primary civil rights goal and strategy as a country at that point in our history was integration. We wanted to eliminate segregation. We wanted to replace segregation with integration.

Our primary and explicit civil rights objective at that point in time was to integrate in every place and every setting where integration was possible.

That is a good goal, but it became clear to me in Jamaica that our efforts to integrate various work places and schools and multiple other settings would always carry the burden of having whoever the minority person is in each setting feeling that level of discomfort and feeling a level of stress at an instinctive level for simply being in that situational minority status whenever that particular situation exists.

Through experimentation and through a couple of pilot efforts done with myself and other people, I have learned that people who are

going into that kind of intergroup setting as a minority participant can very often significantly reduce that level of subconscious stress when we understand that instinct-triggered stress to be what it is and when we cognitively, intellectually, and practically recognize that the intergroup situation we are in is actually safe.

We Can Mitigate That Reaction When We Know Its Origin

We can mitigate that particular discomfort when we know its origin. But my experience has been that we can never eliminate entirely our instinctive reaction to being in a situational minority status.

Interestingly, I felt that same set of primal reactions again one time at an extreme level several years later when I was working to put health plans into Uganda. I had a moment of pure situational panic one night in a street market near Kampala with only open fires for lighting and with many people milling around on the streets who were all very obviously Ugandan.

Panic waves rolled momentarily in my brain. My knees were again unstable.

The good news was that I recovered much more quickly in Uganda because I knew what the trigger was for my panic and I was

able to get through it with less negative impact. I do not think the people around me in Uganda knew or even suspected that I had panicked.

I had a strong sense again, however, that it is a very useful thing to understand those instinctive reactions. It also made me sad that the perception and the sense of being a situational minority can create so much situational stress for people everywhere in settings that really are safe and non-threatening.

Instinctive Stress About Being Surrounded Can Help Survival

I now have mixed emotions about those feelings. I have since figured out that the instinctive stress that is triggered in all of us by being surrounded by “Them” can actually be a very good survival instinct for people to have. As I have looked at a wide set of behaviors in multiple settings, I have since come to realize and to appreciate the sad but realistic fact that those instinctive reactions actually continue to have real survival value for many people in the real world today.

That panic instinct and that sense of stress that is triggered when we are surrounded by “Them” are both intended to cause us to want to

be in different group settings than the one we are in when we are surrounded by “Them.”

That stress is clearly intended to cause us to reduce stress by doing what we need to do to not be surrounded by “them.” It is an ancient instinct, but it does have very real and immediate impact for people in many very modern settings today.

Last year, in the Congo, a number of people were killed brutally by machetes because their accent was from a different tribe than the men who had the big knives and who used them to do damage in that setting. That difference in how those people sounded with just the differences in their clan dialect was enough to get those particular people injured, mutilated, and then killed.

Those people in that very current inter-ethnic setting in the world today would have been much better off somehow following that particular stress instinct to its extreme level and entirely avoiding “Them.”

Because so many people have their own negative instincts in gear to treat people differently when we perceive people to be a them instead of us — and because some people feel no guilt in damaging

people and doing evil things to whoever they perceive to be “Them” — it can be a good thing for each of us to avoid people who see us as “Them.”

That stress creating instinct to not ever be a situational minority actually often points people in many settings in the world even today in a safer direction. That is sad but true.

Jamaica And Uganda Gave Me Great Learning Experiences

My international learning experiences have been fascinating learning opportunities for multiple levels of us/them issues. Jamaica and Uganda both gave me great personal and direct learning opportunities relative to those packages of behaviors.

I have worked in several other countries as well. Working with people in Wales and Spain also gave me additional sets of intergroup experiences and intergroup insights.

In addition to being the CEO of several health plans and health systems in the U.S. over the past three decades, I have had the opportunity to consult with and coach health plan people in more than a dozen other countries and I have helped get actual health plans functionally started in several countries.

I did on-the-ground work to help care systems in Uganda, Jamaica, Great Britain, and Spain. I helped design and create plans for both Chile and Nigeria. I served as the chair of the International Federation of Health Funds for nearly a decade — and I worked with health systems and health plans from literally dozens of countries in that role.

I had the good fortune to be a small town boy from Northern Minnesota who was blessed with the opportunity to do front level work with local people in local health care and community settings around the world. I used that opportunity to study the intergroup interactions of people in each and every setting where I did my health care work.

My job has allowed me to travel to multiple countries and to interact as co-workers with people in those settings. As I have been looking at all of the intergroup issues I could find in all of those settings over the past couple of decades, I have found those same patterns of instinctive behaviors actually do exist everywhere.

My basic beliefs about those instinctive intergroup behaviors and their impacts on our lives have been reinforced with great consistency by each and every international project and situation that I have had a chance to be involved in.

The Russians Would Not Take Direction From A “Black”

One of those experiences happened in Moscow more than 25 years ago when I was giving some advice about health care structure and laws to a working committee of the Russian Dumas. The government of that country was dropping the communist economic model and was putting together laws to help create private health care delivery approaches in that country.

Because I had run both health plans and care systems in the U.S. and because I had also chaired what was then the national trade association for all American health plans, the Russian Government had asked me to go Moscow and help them design their future health care system. I was asked to help them write laws that would guide and govern their new economic system for health care. I loved the project.

Private health care had been illegal in Russia before that time. The president of the country wanted the country to have laws that would legalize private health care delivery and that would allow Russians to also set up private systems that could insure and pay for that care.

So the parliament was writing those laws for him and the drafters of the legislation wanted outside help from someone who had been involved in writing and using those kinds of laws in another country.

My co-consultants for the official Dumas Health Care Committee that was focused as a legislative committee on that project included the then current head of the British Health Service — the NHS — and an old friend of mine from Santiago, Chile who then ran the largest health plan in Chile. I had actually helped co-design elements of his plan in Chile in earlier times.

“We Don’t Take Work Directions From A Black”

In any case, I had the chance to work in Moscow on that project and our support team for that effort included some local Russians who spoke English well.

What happened with my co-workers should not have surprised me. I knew even then that Russia had a number of dozen current ethnic hot spots and I knew that Russia had many more historic ethnic hot spots. So I know that ethnic and intergroup interaction issues were extremely relevant in that country.

I told the Russians in my work group as we left a meeting that I had been particularly impressed by a briefing I had received from a woman doctor earlier in the day, and I suggested to the Russians that she was probably a good leader for their efforts. One of the Russians grunted and said — “We could never follow her. She is a black. None of us in our office would ever follow her anywhere.”

I was shocked. The term Black, in particular, took me entirely by surprise. She was one of the whitest people I had ever seen. Literally starkly white. I had actually wondered earlier in the day when she gave us the briefing if her extremely white skin could handle either sunburn or a tan. Black was not a descriptive term I would have used for her.

So I asked one of the Americans later what that exchange had been all about. The American told me she was from a local ethnic minority that they generically labeled as black and that the ethnic Russians in that setting would not accept her in any supervisory role. Her career in Moscow was stalled — basically frozen — but her English was remarkably good. So they had her brief our group on some health care related legislative issues.

The ethnic Russians at that point in time would not, however, be willing to have her as a leader or even as a full colleague because they perceived her to be from an “inferior” ethnic group. Their open contempt for her group surprised me... in part because I still had a vague sense in my own head that we needed a difference in both race and ethnicity to fully trigger that full set of intensely prejudicial intergroup instincts — and that was clearly a wrong assumption.

What also struck me at the time about the refusal of the people in that group to work with her because she was Black was that I had heard almost the same exact language in Minnesota 20 years earlier when I had hired a first ever African American woman into a professional analyst job at my place of employment — and one of the clerical people I worked with on my team said to me with great concern in the privacy of my office — “I can’t take work instructions from a black.”

In that Minnesota setting, I said — “Hey, give it a shot. Get to know her. It will be fine.”

My advice to our clerk in Minnesota was both accurate and right. When our current employee got to know our new hire, through working directly with her — it was in fact — just fine. I think they actually

became friends. That friendship between the two of them would have been logical because the truth was that they were both good people.

But the initial response by that White clerk in Minnesota to having an African American woman in a professional job and giving work direction to people in our particular work setting was resistance and some anger.

The White clerk told me at the time that her mother would not respect her if her mother ever learned that she was being given work direction from a “Negro.” I told her that her mother didn’t need to hear about it until she was ready to share that information with her.

I was surprised two decades later to hear the same language and same concern expressed in Moscow about a White woman who was officially, to the ethnic Russians, Black.

I now know that Russia has more than 100 minority ethnic groups who all have their own language and cultures and who all tend to have their own arrays of negative intergroup interactions with the majority Russian Ethnic group. But at that point in my learning process, I thought that all Russians were essentially one group and believed that Russia was a much more ethnically monolithic country than it actually is.

We Needed To Work With Each Tribe

In each of the settings around the world where I have had a chance to work with local health care teams to help set up and build local care systems, I have seen the impact of intergroup instincts influencing what we did and how we did it.

In Uganda, after we put the first micro health plans into villages that were part of one local tribe, we were told that we needed to set up the next plans in villages that were the home sites for at least one other tribe or we would be perceived to be tied to the first tribe in a way that would cause us not to be trusted or supported in the future by the people from other Ugandan tribes.

That also took me totally by surprise. I had also been thinking in a basically uninformed way that all Ugandans were Ugandans and that anything we did anywhere in the country would count as something we had done everywhere in the country. I was totally wrong.

There are actually 40 key tribes in Uganda. There are a couple of primary language groups. We needed to reflect that reality by providing support in impartial ways to people from multiple tribes and each of the key language groups in order to be trusted across tribal lines.

I then had a couple of settings where I gave speeches to community gatherings to explain what we were trying to accomplish and I had translators from two other languages standing next to me — each repeating what I had said in their own language.

That double translation process generally made for very long and slow presentations. I sometimes forget the first part of my own point by the time the two translators had each stopped talking and had both turned back to me for my next point.

I learned to speak in very brief sentences to keep the flow going in all three languages.

Standing under a canvass shade a few miles from the actual equator and speaking slowly to a crowd of local residents using double translators for my speech was a good reinforcement about the issues of intergroup relevancy in that setting. It also brought back some memories of my multi-lingual youth.

In the small town in Northern Minnesota where I grew up, there had been a number of immigrants from Finland who had never learned to be fluent in English. Talking to those people sometimes also required an interpreter and that process also required speaking very slowly to

make sure that whatever I needed interpreted was clearly communicated in the translation process.

I worked as a clerk in the local bank, and that experience gave me my first small, but useful, opportunity to work with people who did not speak my language, but who I needed to serve as customers and clients.

I did have a flash back to that experience in that bank when I was at the microphone in Uganda trying to persuade a room full of people to agree with our approach and to become members of our local health plan.

My Jobs Have Been Times Of Learning

I have been blessed with the opportunity to do interesting work in a wide range of settings that all have been useful in giving me a context for understanding intergroup interactions.

As a life long believer in both continuous learning and continuous improvement, I have been able to turn those job opportunities into times of exploration and learning.

Initially, my goal in those work settings tended not to learn as much as it was to simply survive and succeed.

I believe that my success in some of the foreign settings that I worked with later was made possible by the fact that I had learned, in Minnesota, in fairly complex organizational settings to very intentionally create levels of intergroup trust, intergroup interaction, and intergroup communications for our initial work settings.

Those complex work settings in our country shaped my own learning in some clear and useful ways and I found the ability to create trust and a sense of alignment was useful in every setting.

When I talked to the people who were setting up those tiny co-ops in those small villages, I often opened by saying that my own organization back in the U.S. was fairly large — but when it was formed, there were just a couple of people who had the cooperative spirit and they started with no resources, no funding, and a belief in the need for that care for their children that caused them to persevere in tough times.

I told the story that our very first employees in my own plan not only did not get paid, they actually brought light bulbs from home when the light bulbs in the office burned out. One took out a second mortgage on his house to pay the office rent!

My goal in telling those stories was to create a sense of “us” with the people in those villages — to say that we were very much alike in where we were and to say that they, too, could turn that tiny co-op into a success because true believers in Minnesota had also started with nothing but a similar dream and had succeeded in building the plan that I worked for.

That approach worked. I could see people nodding when I made those points and I could tell from their questions that they believed I was an “Us” who was there to help, and not a “Them” there to lecture or to endow.

People who perceived me, and our team to be an “us” helped solve the problems of each village in collaborative and creative ways. I don’t think they would have done the same work with a “Them.”

I learned a lot in each of those settings.

Chapter Two — Becoming Successfully Diverse Tends To Follow Fairly Predictable Patterns

One of my major goals in my work settings going back nearly 40 years has been to do what I could do to make those work settings more diverse.

I love and value diversity. I believe — from years of practical experience — that we are all smarter collectively than we are smart individually — and I believe that our collective smartness improves when we are more diverse.

When all people in a room are the same age, same ethnicity, same culture, and same gender, there is an unfortunate tendency to have the same thoughts.

When people in a setting have different ethnicity, different cultural backgrounds, different training, different ages, and different life experiences, then when we are solving problems and when we are figuring out how to do important things, we are more likely to bring broader, more creative, more flexible, and more intellectually and experientially powerful sets of resources and insights to that task.

That is not a hypothetical or theoretical set of beliefs.

I have had some significant real world successes over the last two decades in helping diverse organizations achieve some of the highest performance levels in the country on issues like care quality and service levels. I believe that we achieved those high levels of service and those high levels of quality because we were highly diverse — with a majority of women employees and with a 59 percent minority employee percentage in my last work setting with over 200,000 total employees.

I believe we achieved top performance levels in the country because we were a true meritocracy in each setting — where people who did well from every group were included and did well themselves at every level in that context and that setting.

Meritocracies, I believe, outperform organization who use standards other than merit as their strategy for selecting leaders and for getting work done.

Diverse Organizations Can Outperform Less Diverse Organizations

Diverse organizations can, I believe, outperform less diverse organizations when the setting is an inclusive and functional

meritocracy at its core. I have helped my work settings be more diverse with that belief system as my guide and it has proved to be true.

That approach of increasing diversity on my work teams has not always been welcomed by my employers or my supervisors. In my earliest work settings, when I first became a department head and when I initially served as a hiring manager and decided to do some diverse hiring, the truth was that I actually very consistently faced some internal opposition to making those hires.

My own direct bosses in those early settings allowed me to go down those paths to diverse hiring because the work product of my departments was fairly good. My bosses trusted my commitment to turning out a solid work product and so they tolerated what some other people at that time saw as radical hiring practices.

Many of my team members and colleagues were initially less than enthusiastic about some of my diverse hiring decisions. Some thought it was a good idea and some were very opposed to those hires. Some were very angry.

I learned back in my first Minnesota work setting, as I intentionally did a number of things to integrate that specific workforce,

that there was a response and a reaction pattern I could count on relative to bringing both women and minorities into new jobs where women and minorities had not been before.

I have had a chance to do the kinds of hiring efforts that create diversity in a work place setting a number of times, both early and late in my career... and I have generally had very similar consequences and closely echoing responses from the work settings for each diverse hire.

Initial “Diverse” Hires Often Face Opposition

I have personally been in the work force since 1968 — so I have had the experience of seeing a wide range of changes through very personal and direct experiences over a number of years relative to intergroup integration approaches and to intergroup discrimination issues.

When I hired the first woman professional writer at a professional/non-clerical level into that same setting, the initial reaction to her being hired was actually quite negative from quite a few people in my work site.

The full degree of that discrimination level that existed then against making those particular hires seems hard to believe today, but

at that point in our history as a country, quite a few jobs were officially held only by men. I am certainly not an ancient man, and even I can clearly remember working in a time when the want ads in the newspapers were divided into jobs for men and jobs for women.

When my first wife wanted a job right after grad school, she had to look for her jobs on the want ad pages that accepted women applicants.

Women in those days were paid a lot less money than men — a practice that hasn't been eliminated — but quite a few jobs were also entirely and officially off limits to women candidates. In that societal context, I did hire some women into those “men only” jobs for my place of employment.

That hiring was actually extremely easy to do. There were some amazing women candidates available. One of the very first secretaries I had worked with in that organization was a lawyer who had finished law school, passed the bar, and couldn't find a single law firm to hire her.

I met her just before she retired. She made a career as a spectacular secretary. She taught me a lot about being professional and about not ever turning in a substandard work.

She could not get work as a lawyer, however, and so she had to type and file to make a living and she did that up to her retirement. She would have been a great lawyer and she was prevented by her gender from going down that path as a career.

She was not my first exposure to gender-based job discrimination.

I Learned A Lot About People And Perceptions In My Small

Town Bank Job

While I was in high school, I had worked part-time as a teller in a local bank in that same small Northern Minnesota town. The bank had a practice of hiring high school students with good grades to work for the bank for their junior and senior years.

They only hired one student at a time, and I had the good fortune to be the student they hired that year because my father was a friend of the man who ran the bank.

It was an amazing job.

I learned a huge amount about people at multiple levels in that job. I learned a huge amount because in my work assignment at the bank, I personally manually “processed” and administered each of the personal checks that were written by each of the bank customer, into their accounts.

I learned very quickly that some people that I believed to be rich were poor. I also learned that some people I had believed to be poor were actually rich. I learned that some people spent money on vices that were not evident from their public demeanor and their community persona.

As employees of the bank, we were each sworn to secrecy. To this day, I have never violated that pledge — even though I have been tempted on more than one occasion. So that job was a stunning and wonderful learning experience for me.

For a naïve young person, the job was a very effective reality-expanding and reality-grounding process, and it was a highly instructive tutorial at a very persuasive and effective level in the difference between appearances and reality for many people.

I have never had the same sense that people are what they initially appear to be. I now tend to wait for some levels of behavioral proof points from people in addition to personal image and reputation as I try to figure out who people really are.

That was not, however, the main learning point that is relevant to this book that I picked up in that bank job — although it is probably relevant that I do tend not to be taken in by appearances as much as I might otherwise, be because I had that almost unique learning experience of seeing all of those amazing functional and secret financial realities for all of those very real people.

We lived in a very small town. Everyone knew everyone. I learned in that job in that small bank that we did not all know everything about everyone.

That was golden learning.

The Women Did The Heavy Lifting At The Bank

Relative to this book and to my own commitment to diversity as a winning strategy, however, the more directly relevant and important topic that I learned about the world in that bank-clerk-job relates to gender discrimination. Both men and women worked in that bank. My

own personal job at the bank functioned in a support role relative to the women. I learned what the jobs of the women were and I saw how each of the women did those jobs.

I saw the women bank clerks do all of the heavy lifting in that bank. They performed the basic banking functions, set up the schedules, and those women ran a perfect and efficient set of processes.

The women who worked in that bank in those clerk jobs were amazing workers. They kept the bank functioning. They had both judgment and wisdom about how to keep the bank functional and how to keep the bank in service to its customers.

I was in awe of their competency. and I was heavily reliant on their goodwill and their functional generosity, because my own level of competency as a bank clerk was clearly and undeniably imperfect. I made errors and they helped me fix the mistakes I made in ways that were a mercy to me and a benefit to the bank.

This Is A Great Job For A Woman

I very much appreciated who the bank women were and I appreciated what the bank women did for the bank and its customers.

Then — I was shocked. I learned one day, in the context of me directly administering bank paychecks into everyone's bank account on pay- day — that the women who were doing all of that work were making a fraction of the money that was being paid to men — in the bank who did less work — and who did their work, in my site-based and slightly biased opinion, less well than the women in the bank did their work.

I wanted to protest. I, in fact, planned to protest. I began to set up the protest. A couple of the women told me to 'cool my jets' and to be quiet. "This is a great job for a woman," one of them told me, "Don't make any waves or we will get fired. There are a lot of women in this town who would kill for this job. I don't want to lose it."

I was outraged. I also was quiet. I then looked at a couple of other local work settings and I discovered the same patterns there. I already had a sense that my own mother was being underpaid for her job in another setting. I could see that women in several settings were often the best workers and were paid less than the men for doing their work.

Later, when I personally was able to do some hiring myself in my own work settings, I made a point of hiring both women and people

from minority groups into good jobs when the people I hired were good fits for the job.

The truth is, in my initial hiring at that point in my career, I actually had a slight prejudice in favor of women being better workers that was directly based on my early experience of watching the women do such good work in that bank.

That turned out to be a good prejudice to have. I actually ended up getting some super- star performance from my very first work teams because when I opened those previously men-only jobs up to women, some of the candidates available to be hired by me were spectacular.

The talent pool of women to be hired at that point in our history was both deep and untapped. Those high performance hires of very capable women generally made me look good in my job. I owe some early promotions and some significant project successes to the superb work done by those teams.

I Owe My Success To Those High Performance Hires

To be accurate and complete relative to that issue, I also actually owe some of my later promotions and I owe much of the success of the organizations I later led as CEO to that same practice of hiring

spectacular workers from a talent pool of minority and women candidates that some other hiring processes overlook.

In the CEO job for the \$50 billion company that I just left last year, we had stars in all lead jobs. Of our eight regional presidents, only two were White males. Of our three group presidents, none were White males.

That particular organization has won multiple quality and service awards and has won them in significant part because of that very impressive and highly diverse leadership team.

I learned to hire stars early. I continue to hire stars. The White males who were members of that top lead senior leadership team for my last health system job, were also very clearly stars. Every single member of that very diverse team is a star player. They did great work together. Stars work well with stars if you select the right stars.

The Resistance And Acceptance Stages Could Be Predicted

Back in my early hiring days, it was clear that not everyone in those worksites was happy that I was hiring those more diverse sets of people. A fairly clear pattern of internal resistance, as I noted above, tended to be almost identical for each new type of hire.

That initial resistance to those diverse hires tended to be followed, in a year or more, with acceptance. Acceptance then tended to evolve into enthusiasm in the following year when the teams performed at star levels and interacted well with each other as teams.

I did those diverse hires a number of times. The pattern was absolutely consistent and easy to predict once I recognized the pattern to be a pattern.

For each hire, there was initial resistance. Sometimes, there was initial anger. People in a work setting often tend to be unhappy about any new hires when their expectations for who will be hired into a job are not met.

Most Unhappiness Results From Unmet Expectations

Most unhappiness is, I believe, the result of unmet expectations. My father used to say that, and I think he was accurate. That is clearly true for many areas of behavior. Prior and long-standing expectations were not being met for people who were already working in those settings by my diverse hires. Some people were clearly angry and unhappy at each diverse hire in those settings.

That was the initial response.

Then the people in each setting where the diverse hire was made tended to see the new reality. They also saw the performance results. They saw good people with good ethics and good interpersonal skills doing good work.

Anger faded at that point. Expectation changes happened.

The response process to that level of change tended to be both gradual and incremental. My experience has been each of the future diverse hires for those same jobs in those same settings tended to generate less stress than the prior hires.

People Tend To Forget Old Beliefs When Paradigms

Change

My experience with making any work setting more diverse has been , in fact, that each subsequent diverse hire generally reduces the stress level.

And, to my initial surprise, I discovered that ultimately, the people in the work settings where the new hiring patterns exist, often have a hard time even remembering their old expectations and their initial negative reactions once the new expectations are clearly in place and after some time has passed.

That specific piece of learning about people in a setting forgetting old expectations when new expectations are in place was an extremely important thing for me to learn. It could only have been learned through direct experience and observation.

When people's expectations and people's paradigms change on any topic, the old paradigm that people used to believe in for that topic actually is very often forgotten.

What I have seen more than once, is that after a couple of years, many of the same people who had initially been upset with me about the hires would deny that they had ever been angry when the first hires had happened. They sometimes expressed surprise in later years if I mentioned their earlier more negative reactions.

That bothered and even slightly irritated me when it first happened. Then I changed my opinion about that memory modification process entirely — and I now count on it as a useful and positive part of the change process that is an asset for making some things in a given setting better.

Some of those people would actually pass a lie detector test on that point of fact at that point in time because they had forgotten their

initial resistance and because their personal expectations and their personal paradigms about those practices had changed.

Anger And Resistance Became Acceptance And Expectations

That pattern of initial resistance and anger in a setting evolving into acceptance in that same exact setting happen in work places very often. It happens in communities as well. The first round of unexpected hiring or unexpected inclusion creates anger and even resistance. Then expectations change, and the new reality becomes the new normal.

I saw that in my own hiring practices and I could see that basically, that very same pattern and acceptance cycle happened for both women and minorities in multiple other settings. A good example was the U.S. Military.

We had that same pattern occur very clearly in our armed services. It happened relative to integrating each armed service and it was particularly true for integrating the officer corps in each setting.

There was initial resistance to both minority and female senior officers. Over time, the anger turned into acceptance and then into new expectations. Minority and female generals are now expected.

The first generals who did not meet the hiring expectations for the current people for those positions created real situational anger. Those diverse generals are now the new normal and they don't trigger anger at any level.

It's always a different situation relative to expectations and behaviors in a setting once you establish the "new normal" for any behavior in that setting.

Integrated Professional Sports Became The New Normal

That same basic pattern of reactions and behaviors also happened for minority athletes when this country first integrated baseball and then integrated other professional sports.

The first minority players in those key sports had to go through hell — with anger, resistance, and even hatred in some settings. The second round of minority players in each sport faced less resistance.

The third round of diverse participants for most settings and most sports barely merit comment for their diversity related factors.

Over time — the expectations of both the public and the other players in each sport changed to the point where, if you suggested today that someone not be drafted onto a team because of their race, most people would find your suggestion a bit strange, inexpert, uninformed, inappropriate, incorrect, poorly reasoned, and even more than a little dysfunctional.

Expectations do change. New normals create the new set of expectations. That can be a very good thing. As noted earlier, most unhappiness is the result of unmet expectations.

My experience has been that one way of handling organizational unhappiness in any setting is to manage the organizational expectations for that setting. When you make the overall organizational expectations in any setting on any issue very clear — and when you then enforce the new expectation with either actual rules or some kind of explicit action — then the culture of the setting generally changes and the new behavior becomes the new expectation.

When that is done well, people internalize the new expectation. People who have internalized the new expectations on any issue or

behavior actually tend to resist the old, less enlightened, behaviors in future situations and circumstances.

When We Have A New Normal — Expectations Change

That was another key set of discoveries that I made in my various jobs along the path to learning how to deal, in a process-linked way with those sets of behaviors and those packages of instincts. Sometimes the initial set of hires or promotions or assignments that I made in a setting were a bit difficult, but then the barriers to those activities tended to soften, and they usually disappeared entirely as time went on and as new expectations replaced the old expectations.

I also learned that even when real and relevant progress is made on those issues, however, we are never entirely out of the grasp of the potential to revert in a negative way to our more primal definitions of ourselves.

Sadly, there is always a risk in any setting where we have made progress, that we will regress to less enlightened and directly instinct-triggered more negative behaviors for various intergroup interactions and thought processes.

We can lose ground on key issues in any setting if we don't continue very intentionally to act in enlightened ways and continue to enforce and reinforce the new expectations that we create. We need to reinforce our new behaviors with conscious efforts and we need to reinforce them by creating relevant rules and laws and by embedding them in our cultures.

That intentional process and those explicit steps can defuse most of the resistant energies in any setting in a positive way that can cause the new expectations to last for very long periods of time.

Cultures Can Be Used To Create Expected Behaviors

Cultures are a very useful tool for selling, steering, guiding, enforcing, and reinforcing the right set of expected behaviors. I have included a chapter in each of the four books dealing very directly with that use of cultures. Cultures can be great tools when we understand what they are and how to use them.

When we put a culture in place that calls for non-discriminatory hiring, then the people in that culture internalize those expected behaviors and people in that setting then tend to feel right in making those non-discriminatory hiring expectations their functional reality.

That linkage of cultures to behavioral and value based expectations is a very useful thing to understand as the leader for any setting. It is functionally useful for a CEO and for any other type of organizational leader in almost all work or community settings to understand that group behaviors can be influenced very effectively by managing the cultural expectations of the group in that setting.

Managing the culture can be done both systematically and strategically when you decide what you want the new culture to be in any setting.

I was delighted to learn that cultures did not need to be something that just happened. I learned in my three decades as a CEO, in half a dozen work settings, that cultures could be constructed, designed, and then modified, and enhanced as needed to meet the needs of an organization or group.

Our Cultures Create The Rules To Actualize Our Goals

Our cultures, I learned, are created by us in an instinct-triggered process. Creating cultures is a useful instinct, for people to have and it is an extremely useful process for people and group leaders to understand.

We actually build cultures for every setting. They spontaneously create themselves if we don't create them intentionally for any setting. Because I have been the chair or CEO for various organizations for more than three decades, I have been able to create and use the cultures in my various settings to do major parts of the work that I needed to do in each setting.

It has been fascinating to me as I have studied group behaviors, to see the role culture plays in group behaviors. We all have instincts both to own things and to acquire things — so our cultures create both property rules and rules to prevent theft. We have instincts to have hierarchies, so each culture creates and defines hierarchies. We have instincts to form families, so each culture creates its own set of rules about creating and protecting families.

We all have sexual instincts — so our cultures create rules that allow sexual behaviors to happen in each setting, and our cultures create rules about how those sexual behaviors can be actualized.

Some Cultural Expectations Become Self-Reinforcing

Some of our cultural expectations become self-reinforcing. Behavioral issues like our wedding cultures take on a life of their own

and they create self-reinforcing behavior patterns for people getting married.

As I have traveled around the world, I have partially enjoyed looking at wedding cultures in multiple countries. That has been a fascinating set of side cultural issues to observe. India, Vietnam, and China have built some amazing wedding cultures that are worth seeing, if you can manage to get yourself into a wedding setting in those countries.

Those particular areas of our cultures reinforce themselves without the need for laws. That collective, voluntary, and self-enforcing behavior guidance approach for the cultures of weddings is workable because our wedding cultures are not in place to overcome or prevent the activation of any of our more negative behaviors — like theft or sexual harassment.

Some aspects of our cultural rules — like making theft illegal — are much less self-reinforcing. The cultural rules we create that relate to steering our most negative instincts to minimize the damage they cause generally do need some levels of supportive enforcement processes.

We all have instincts to acquire things and the sad reality is that we generally need to control and channel those particular instincts through sets of rules and laws to keep those instincts from triggering theft and robbery and enabling or allowing simple and direct forced usurpation of property.

In those instances, we need both cultural rules and supportive law enforcement processes to keep theft from being normal behavior in various settings.

Similarly, our rules against sexual harassment need to be both clearly defined and strictly enforced in order to end harassment in all relevant setting. Without those rules in place, harassment too often happens. That is sad, but true. The chapter of this book that deals with discrimination against women is clear on that issue and explains why we cannot afford to stop enforcing those rules if we truly want to prevent those negative behaviors.

Cultures give us tools that we really need to give us the settings we want to live and function in for our workplaces, schools, and communities.

We need cultural rules that protect us against the most negative sets of interpersonal and intergroup behaviors, and we need cultural guidances and steerage points that help us achieve the full benefits of our most positive and beneficial instinct packages.

Our cultures reflect our values on those issues in each setting — and we need to make the intellectual decision to have our cultures reflect and support our most enlightened sets of values and behaviors.

That set of decisions, I have learned from experience, too often happens without guidance and that can lead us to unfortunate cultural outcomes.

Each Job Was A Chance To Learn

My path that began in a small, multi-ethnic town in Northern Minnesota has taken me down a learning trail and a learning process that has given me a chance to look at group behaviors, group values, and group instincts in a number of settings.

My jobs have allowed me to work in a number of countries and in a variety of organizational settings — with health care delivery and health care financing as the main business models and operational function for the places that have employed me.

I have been in management jobs since my early 20s and I have served as the CEO of one organization or another for more than three decades. The CEO roles in each of those settings have also allowed me to function in a number of public policy and public service settings that have also been fascinating learning opportunities.

A Work Site Practitioner Who Loves Theory

Instead of becoming an academic — as I had considered early in my career — I became a work site practitioner who loves theory and who loves the intersection between theory and real world practice.

I have particularly enjoyed learning how our instinctive behaviors influence us as individuals and as groups. There has been significant overlap in those areas. I found that my study of instincts helped me immensely in my day job of being a CEO and in my roles helping to lead and guide various commissions, task forces, and trade associations on a variety of public policy related issues.

Over the years, I have served on more than three-dozen boards or task forces. I have chaired a significant number of those settings — including chairing the health governors for the World Economic Forum in Davos, chairing a task force on international health systems

development in London, and chairing the International Federation of Health Plans for nearly a decade.

The Federation had more than 100 health systems from 40 countries. I loved chairing that group. In each of those settings, I had a chance to either build or influence relevant cultures. I actually used the six-trigger, group alignment tool kit that is outlined in this book to make my job easier in every setting.

A key part of my learning process has focused on the intersection between instinctive behaviors and creating systematic processes, important approaches, and strategies to first improve care delivery and then to improve intergroup interactions.

Over the past couple of decades, as I have been both managing and leading organizations and doing the research and experimentation that has led to the writing of these books, I have found the entire process to be extremely synergistic.

It turns out that understanding intergroup interactions more clearly actually can make managing people in group settings an easier task to do.

Chapter Three — Some Work Sites, Schools, And Community Settings Tribalize, Hurt Themselves, And Feel Right Doing It

My work sites have all been working laboratories for the study of instinctive behaviors. I have worked in a number of settings — and each setting has given me a rich array of instinctive interactions to experiment with and study.

For most of the past three decades it has been particularly useful for me as a learning person to serve in the CEO jobs for the half dozen companies that have employed me. Being a CEO is a great job at multiple levels if you are the kind of person who enjoys being a CEO and it is a particularly useful job if you want to use your work site as learning grounds and test sites for behavioral theories and approaches.

The CEO position in a number of settings creates both leverage and flexibility. It offers the vantage point that comes from being able to make changes of various kinds in both operations and processes to see what their impact might be on the setting.

One of the most useful aspects of being the CEO for me in each setting has been that I did not need to somehow convince a boss in each

setting to allow me to do my various process-related or instinct-related experiments.

Being the CEO also meant that I could modify my approaches and that I could change my behaviors fairly quickly when my attempts to do experiments or my efforts to change approaches failed or hit rocks. I have had failures and I have hit rocks. But I have been able to learn from my failures and I have learned from direct experience how to detect and either avoid or prevail over many types of rocks.

Continuous Improvement Is The Goal And Strategy

My direct personal and professional goal in each work setting is to continuously improve. I believe in continuous improvement as a philosophy, a commitment, and a strategy.

Over the past couple of decades, I have become a formal continuous improvement process believer, disciple, practitioner, proselytizer, and zealot. I want to personally continuously improve and I want the organization that I currently serve as CEO to continuously improve in doing whatever it exists to do.

I love the whole concept and skill set that is functionally involved in formal continuous improvement processes. Continuous improvement

is a commitment to get continuously better. Getting continuously better generally requires the ability to make decisions and to react to new learning and to respond to new facts in meaningful and systematic ways when both new learning and new facts are relevant and available.

Being the CEO in the places I have worked has made that whole direct reaction process and continuous learning approaches that support continuous improvement much easier.

Because one of my goals since 1987 has been to build a functional tool kit that we could collectively use to improve intergroup interactions in our country in ways that will ultimately steer us toward intergroup Peace, I have done much of my thinking and I have done most of those work site experiments in a fairly systematic, focused, and process oriented way with that specific overarching learning goal in that mind.

The Art of War And The Art of Peace Use Lists

Those efforts to create continuous improvement approaches were foundational for creating the various lists of options, strategies, approaches, and relevant factors for systematically achieving and

protecting Peace that are now included as tools for *The Art of Intergroup Peace* book.

The Art of Intergroup Peace is a sister book to this book. My Peace book was inspired and shaped in significant ways by a 2,000-year-old training manual on how to conduct and win wars.

Sun Tzu, the author of *The Art of War*, was actually my direct inspiration for the list building process and the strategy option choices that are used as teaching tools in the intergroup Peace book.

Sun Tzu wrote his own book of multiple lists to give guidance about both tactical and strategic choices to warriors roughly 2,000 years ago. He used an extensive array of lists in his book — with lists of terrain possibilities, organization approaches, and multiple strategic options and responses — all clearly based on his own actual personal practical and operational experience with war.

I read *The Art of War* several times early in my career. I actually used advice from that book to anchor some strategic thinking about competitive issues in a couple of my work situations.

Sun Tzu was a key inspiration for the strategy I used in one setting to turn several major — but entirely invisible — quality of care victories

for my care system into an explicit ad campaign. That approach surprised people in our market.

It ended up changing the nature of the competition.

As one of my mentors said — “It doesn’t do you any good to be the very best baseball team if everyone else is playing cricket. You need to get everyone else to also play baseball — and then you can win.”

By changing the nature of what we advertised as our value and our key benefit to the customer, we converted major portions of that particular market from cricket to baseball — then we triumphed as baseball all stars.

Sun Tzu preached the advantage of surprise. He said the enemy was less likely to defeat you if you surprised them in some important way.

We completely surprised our competitors in that work setting by using that positioning strategy. People did not expect us as an organization to take the public high ground on quality and people absolutely did not expect us then to hold and reinforce that high ground with data and with extensive and focused public communications about quality topics and agendas.

We surprised, outflanked, and outperformed our competitors. Sun Tzu very directly inspired that thought process at all three levels.

I actually read the relevant passages from *The Art of War* out loud to key members of our leadership team at the beginning of that process as I explained to that team what we were doing and why we were doing it. Some people on our team were surprised to get copies of that book as gifts that year.

I still appreciate the help that I received for those settings and situations from that book on war.

Sun Tzu gave me a good context to do some key thinking on a number of competition-related topics and I continue to be grateful to him for that guidance.

His approach to his topic of winning wars also gave me the foundation and the context of building functional and practical lists that I used to write my own version of intergroup interaction strategies and then — echoing Sun Tzu — to call my own book initially, simply *The Art of Peace*. After a couple of drafts, it seemed more accurate to call my own book *The Art of Intergroup Peace*.

In either case, the title is a deliberate homage to Sun Tzu and his very useful book on war.

Both Books Love Lists

The two books, *The Art of Intergroup Peace* and *The Art of War*, each have some sections that are counter balancing and offsetting versions of the other book. The two approaches are, in some areas, exactly opposite one another as you might expect given the very different goals of the two books.

In other areas — because both sets of strategies involve aligning relevant people and getting them to function well together — the sets of lists and the strategies they contain overlap significantly.

At the extreme contrast end of the comparisons, my Art of Intergroup Peace approach advocates ethical behavior — and Sun Tzu's Art of War approach says that ethics are irrelevant and that deliberately unethical behaviors in many areas can be among the most effective tools you can use to win a war.

The Art of War teaches, preaches, and strongly endorses the use of deception, for example. Sun Tzu clearly advocates and very clearly recommends deliberate and intentional deceit.

The Art of Intergroup Peace — in complete and very intentional full contrast — preaches, teaches, and advocates transparency, honesty, and deliberate, open, and clear intergroup communications and believes that deceit can undermine and destroy trust and alignment between people.

The Art of War focuses on achieving win/lose outcomes. Defeat of the other side is the key goal for *The Art of War*. *The Art of Intergroup Peace* focuses on win/win outcomes — with each group in a win/win setting deliberately and intentionally helping the other group in the setting to also win.

Both Books Advocate Understanding The Other Party

Both books advocate fully and completely understanding the other group in a setting — but for very different reasons.

The Art of War preaches understanding all aspects and components of the other group deeply in order to most effectively damage, undermine, defeat, and destroy the other group. *The Art of Intergroup Peace* goes in the opposite direction and preaches understanding the other group in a setting deeply in order to help the other group thrive, prosper, and mutually succeed.

The Art of War believes in setting up skillful and deliberate communication approaches that are intended to strategically confuse and mislead the other party. *The Art of Intergroup Peace* calls for setting up skillful and intentional communication strategies to be sure that the other group in your setting is never misled.

Lists Are Useful Strategy Building Tools

The book outlining pathways to war and the book outlining pathways to Peace clearly have some very different strategic and very different tactical components. What the two books share is a love of lists and a focus on making the exact right strategic choices for each specific setting and situation. Lists are key to both processes and approaches for both Peace and war.

Both books are anchored in real life experience. Neither book is written as academic theory or hypothetical speculation. Both books use lists because people who are practitioners rather than theorists know that lists can be a good functional tool for creating practical arrays of choices, options, situation definitions, and situation relevant strategies that can create a context for optimal strategic and tactical thought processes.

Sun Tzu wrote his guide book to help leaders in winning a war. He knew how useful, functional, practical, and helpful it can be to describe both potential situations, potential issues, potential solutions, and potential strategies using lists that are based on real life situations and real life settings. His lists are based on his own direct and functional experience in the actual fields of war.

He recommends, for example, that if the enemy army is crossing a river, the best time to attack is probably when the army is halfway across the river.

That is clearly a piece of advice grounded in logistical realities and functional experience.

In a similar vein, *The Art of Intergroup Peace* book is also based on experience in real world intergroup settings where conflict was reduced or avoided and where Peace and alignment were achieved and supported.

The Art of Intergroup Peace book contains a number of Peace-related lists that describe actual functional sets of Peace-related opportunities, as well as strategies, tactics, situations, practices,

realities, and approaches that also are experience-based and field-tested for creating and protecting intergroup Peace in various settings.

Those lists are a key component and tool for my book about Peace because lists can be a very useful way of both explaining and assembling the right set of strategies for Peaceful intergroup interactions in any setting.

We Have Nine Ways To Align And We Have Six Useful Tools To Trigger Alignment

The fifth chapter of *The Art of Peace* book, for example, outlines the nine levels, types, and categories of functional intergroup alignments that we can put in place between groups of people. That is actually a practical, functional, field-tested list of intergroup alignment options. I have used or observed each of those types of interactions in real world settings for a significant number of years.

That list of intergroup interaction options begins with total and intentional separation between the groups on one end of the continuum and it extends to full blending and complete assimilation of the relevant groups at the other end.

The Art of Intergroup Peace book explains when and how each of the alignment options included on that continuum might have functional value and practical use for a specific intergroup situation or setting.

I have actually had a chance to work with all nine of those interaction models and approaches in various work settings. I have had a chance to use each of them in various settings to create levels of both intergroup alignment and functional interaction.

I have also been able to observe others who have used each of those approaches in various settings and I have learned from both their successes and their failures. I have seen both successes and failures — often at very close range — and that experience strengthens the book.

As you can read in *The Art of Intergroup Peace* book, each intergroup interaction strategy and each approach has its relevance and its value in the right setting. Each approach can be a major mistake and can have unintended negative consequences if the situation where it is applied doesn't actually lend itself to that particular approach.

The Art of Intergroup Peace book, the *Primal Pathways* book, and this book all explain the six instinct-linked triggers that can be used to

bring people in any given setting into levels of internal alignment. The alignment triggers range from danger at one end of the continuum to a sense of shared missions and purpose at the other end of the continuum.

I have found both of those lists to be highly useful to me at a very functional level in my own CEO functions. I have also found them both very useful in my various public settings and industry roles.

The Alignment Triggers And Tools Work In Multiple Settings

In addition to serving as the CEO of my own organizations, I have had the opportunity to participate in a number of commissions, trade associations, alliances, and coalitions that were each created to help achieve various objectives using multiple organizations functioning in various and sundry aligned ways.

Over the years, I have served on nearly 50 task forces, commissions, alliances, or formal associations of one kind or another. I have personally chaired more than a dozen commissions, committees, conferences, associations, task forces, or boards.

I have found the tool kits that are outlined in those books to be very useful in those kinds of roles at multiple levels. I have also found those industry and public involvement roles to be great testing grounds and solid research fodder for the theories, strategies, concepts, and approaches that are outlined in the set of books that make up the initial intergroup book package.

Being Chair In Intergroup Settings Is A Great Learning Opportunity

In my overall industry roles, I have very directly helped a couple of trade associations create their own categories of alignment and their own direct strategies for intergroup interactions. It has been particularly informative to chair several of those groups. My chair roles have included both national and international trade associations.

Being chair in those intergroup settings gave me an additional set of useful opportunities to do some experiments and to test some theories and approaches in real world intergroup situations.

As part of the overall community activity process, I have helped create several coalitions on relevant public issues. I have used the approaches that are described in *The Art of Intergroup Peace* book to

help set up joint efforts at various levels between the various organizations and groups who have been participants in those coalitions.

That has been fascinating and sometimes fruitful work. Some of those joint efforts have actually helped to create better care outcomes in specific settings. Some of those collaborative efforts, I believe, have also helped to improve public policy in a couple of settings and situations.

I have found that being chair of multi-group organizations and the convener of multi-party coalitions with diverse and independent components and memberships has been both a chance to use the alignment, and motivation tools that are included in those books and a chance to learn in practical settings about various ways of ending intergroup strife and creating aligned values and mutually supportive intergroup behaviors.

The Six Alignment Triggers Can Be Used In A Community

Context As Well

It is a good thing to help people actually do good things. Bringing people together in a common cause for good purposes relating to health care delivery issues and public health issues has been an experience

that has had some good consequences and also created a very useful set of learning experiences that have been part of the two decades of functional research that has resulted in the writing of these books.

My overall goal for the specific lists of situations, issues, tools, and strategies that are included in those books is to have the lists be universally useful both to groups of people and to the leaders of those groups.

My goal is not to simply use those tools to make businesses or other similar organizations perform at higher levels. Those tools actually do work for those basic purposes, but that was not the primary reason why I created them.

My broader goal has been to figure out how to make those same tools that work in our business and trade association settings actually useful and functional to the point that we can use those same tools to create positive intergroup interactions in a broader community context when those tools are needed for intergroup Peace in those broader settings.

I have been very intentionally working on strategies to achieve intergroup Peace since the early 1990s when I became so painfully aware of intergroup conflict.

My goal for that process has been to learn how to build tools to bring us together as a nation and that can also be used to create internal alignment in each community and in each relevant setting.

My work in those various community areas has not been purely academic or simply theoretical. It also has not been entirely anchored in pure and situation specific community service. I did the work to actually do good and I did that work to learn how to do good at the same time. That was a good dual agenda.

As a result of that approach, I have had a chance to field test the tool kit that is described in those books in very real ways and I can vouch for its validity in real world situations and real world settings.

Eleven Alignment Options — Six Alignment Triggers

Probably the most important list that I have used multiple times in a variety of settings is the set of six alignment triggers that can be used to bring people together to function as a group. That set of six extremely useful alignment triggers is described in more detail in this

book and in the *Primal Pathways* book, the *Cusp of Chaos* book, and *The Art of InterGroup Peace* book.

That list of six alignment triggers is in all four intergroup books because it is such a useful tool to understand and have.

I have used those six triggers very directly inside each of my own organizations and I have used them more broadly in a number of community settings. They work well in both contexts. It has been particularly reinforcing to use them to help create coalitions that shape public policy.

As one example, in Minnesota — a few years ago — when the health care reform process in that state was floundering a bit, I used those six alignment triggers and I used my role as the current chair of the Minnesota HMO Council to help steer and guide the reform process in that state back on track.

The Bill Was Floundering

I helped put together a broad, industry-based reform coalition that involved the health plans, the hospitals, the medical society, some political leaders, and some key labor leaders to tee up and then support

the process that was known as the second round reform agenda for Minnesota Care.

A Minnesota Care bill had been created by a very hard working and very bright commission that I had served on as a member. That official commission bill had significant merit, but it had not passed the Legislature the year before. Many people in the state thought that the health care reform opportunity was gone forever when that initial bill did not pass.

So the trade association team that I chaired the year after the Legislature had refused to pass the initial commission designed bill made some changes in the approach, put together a new coalition to support the reform agenda, made some collaboratively agreed upon amendments to the legislation, and we managed to succeed in passing a good bill. The Governor of the state both supported and signed that bill.

That bill ultimately brought the number of uninsured people in Minnesota down to the lowest level in America — exceeded or tied only by Hawaii who had their own universal care bill already in place at the time we passed the Minnesota Care Bill.

We used every step on the trigger pyramid described in this book to create that coalition of powerful parties. We identified the dangers of failure. We created a sense of being a reform centered “us.” We identified collective gains to be achieved by passing the bill. And we created a shared vision for that reform for the coalition.

The bill passed. It had a very positive impact on Minnesota health care. I loved doing that work and helping create that collaborative approach.

Helping bring that coalition together to pass Minnesota Care and to support the very good foundational work that had been done by the Minnesota Health Care Commission turned out to be a good training process for helping to organize and create a similar coalition to do very similar health care reform a few years later in California.

We Created A Minnesota-Like Coalition For California

Again, as we did in the Minnesota effort, we brought the California hospitals, health plans, physicians, community clinics, some business groups and a few key labor leaders together to propose a very specific major reform agenda for California.

Very intentionally and very deliberately, we worked as a team to bring those key groups together. We created shared support for the effort in California by involving and invoking all six of the trigger points on the pyramid — including identifying common enemies and creating a sense that bad and dangerous things could happen for all parties and for California if we did not succeed in getting that legislation passed.

That set of clearly communicated triggers helped to create and focus the coalition we needed in California and we almost succeeded in passing the bill.

That bill was supported by the current governor of California and it ended up being derailed by a single vote in a single Senate committee. It was a near miss. I still mourn that key and unexpected vote in that last committee.

No one expected us to get that far in California when we started the process. It was painful to lose by such a small margin — but no one believed we could get anywhere near that far when we started down the path to building that coalition and getting that legislation passed.

Again, that bill represented the work of a solid coalition of diverse, interested and situationally aligned parties who generally did not work

together on other issues to achieve common goals in those settings for that proposal. It was a good bill and that bill was made better because we had the coalition members each bringing their expertise and their own competency to creating that bill.

We used a number of the steps that are outlined on the alignment pyramid used in the Art of Intergroup Peace process to bring all of those parties together to support that bill. We listened to all of the parties and we interacted in a win/win context with all of the parties to create a better bill that all parties could support.

The National Reform Coalition Included All Key Parties

Similarly, when the national health care reform agenda was being written by Congress a couple of years ago, I had the chance to help bring together a coalition of the most relevant health care trade associations in the country in support of significant reform.

Again — as in Minnesota and California — we brought the hospitals, physicians, tech companies, pharmaceutical companies, labor unions and health plans at the most senior level for each industry together to create a shared pathway to reforming and improving American health care.

We built a lovely and practical vision for improving care in this country and making better care available to all Americans. We brought that set of key leaders for key industries together to the White House as a coalition and as a group to endorse an approach to reform that was based on care improvement rather than on care rationing of any kind as the underpinning strategy for reform.

The proposal we brought to the White House was a very good proposal. Again — as in Minnesota and California — the constituent parties in that coalition each added their direct expertise and their own competencies collaboratively to that process — and the result was a very well designed and well directed set of important reform elements for American care.

Those exact pieces, as we proposed them to the country in that setting through that coalition, were unfortunately not entirely included in the final bill that Congress passed. But those pieces and that coalition were both very important as a key step in getting people who had been on the fence relative to reform on the record and aligned in favor of real and meaningful reform.

That Reform Effort Was Focused On Better Care

Again, those of us who organized that coalition effort used each of the steps and each of the triggers on the alignment pyramid to help bring that group of key parties together. I had the good fortune to work clearly with a couple of collaborative geniuses to do that work.

I also know from direct experience in multiple settings that the pyramid works to help bring people together in a more focused organizational settings. I have field-tested it in the real world of both communities and companies and I have found it to be useful in almost every setting where alignment has been my goal.

As part of the national health care reform effort, I had written a book a year earlier about the key steps that were needed for the reform process in this country that was called *Health Care Will Not Reform Itself*.

Our collective efforts as a coalition of major health care players who were seeking care reform for this country in a collaborative way were intended to make my negative book title completely and entirely wrong.

The coalition we brought to the White House actually was a noble, well-meaning, patient-focused, and nicely designed attempt by key

elements of health care to actually reform itself. The group alignment process processes that are outlined in the *Art of Intergroup Peace* and in *Primal Pathways* worked to help bring those groups together.

We Created A Strategy For Internal Alignment

When I joined my most recent employer over a decade ago as CEO and Chair, I sat down immediately with the leadership team at a retreat and I shared that same exact six-element alignment trigger pyramid with that group.

I explained to our senior leaders the various ways that we would begin to use that pyramid in that setting to bring us together as an organization. I teed that strategy up in that initial meeting as the approach that we were going to use functionally and operationally to create internal alignment.

Then we actually used those steps in that organizational setting. Over the course of the next several years, we did exactly what I had predicted and had advocated that we would, should, and could do in that first set of meetings.

We created alignment. We functioned in aligned ways. Alignment was very real and alignment was extremely effective.

We Become The Highest Performing Plan and Care System

We became the highest performing health plan and the highest performing health system in the country at multiple levels and we did that because we were a total health care system and because we had all of the pieces of our total system aligned.

People in that care team setting loved alignment. People also loved being the best at doing a high percentage of the key things that were done to make care better for our patients and our members.

When Consumer Reports, Medicare, and JD Powers all ultimately gave number one ratings to that care team and to our health plan, that was affirming and reinforcing for all of the people who had achieved alignment in that setting.

Continuous improvement was a core point of that agenda. We cut the sepsis death rate in half and then we cut it again by almost half by continuously improving our hospital care. Sepsis is the number one killer in American hospitals, and we reduced the death rates to some of the lowest in the country.

We cut the HIV death rate for our patients to half of the national average by being completely aligned and by very systematically continuously improving our care for our HIV patients.

We cut the death rate for strokes by half as well by systematically going up stream in the care processes and in the health status of our relevant patients to both prevent strokes and improve treatments for stroke patients.

The book *KP Inside* outlines dozens of those achievements that were based on functioning in aligned and systematic ways to improve care for our patients.

I Am A Zealot For Continuous Improvement In All Settings

So when I write in this set of books about collective efforts that we need to do now as communities and as a nation in the interest of our common good, I advocate that approach from the perspective of being a believer in the value of collective effort and I do it from the vantage of being an actual practitioner who has done the work needed inside my own organization in practical and functional ways to help create both alignment and to tee up continuously improving operational successes.

I also write from the perspective of someone who has done a number of successful efforts in the outside world to get coalitions of various kinds in various settings to function together in aligned ways that also create excellent results.

The Partners For Quality Care coalition of labor unions and key health care employers, for example, put together some collaborative care improvement approaches that have saved many lives and that now influence health care policy in a couple of states. I had the great pleasure of sharing the Chair role in that coalition with the health care head of America's single largest union.

Currently, I am serving as chair of a lovely and focused statewide commission for the State of California whose role is to support development and best life outcomes for very young children. I am working through that First Five Commission for Children and Families to help create a set of collective efforts and related coalitions that can work together to support our children in ways that our children really do need that level of coordinated community support.

The State of California gives us roughly \$500 million in Tobacco tax money each year to do that work — but we can't succeed on our

own. We need a coalition of key players — caregivers, educators, faith leaders, community groups and leaders — to make that effort the success it needs to be for the children of California.

That set of child-related issues and opportunities, I believe, needs to be a major focus for public policy leaders for our country. The book *Three Key Years* explains the importance of that work and describes in practical terms what we can do as parents, educators, caregivers, regulators, and policy makers to support our children in their hour of need.

The first three years of life are the years when the key connections that determine the strength of each child's brain happen.

Children whose brains are exercised in those key months and years have stronger brains. Children whose brains are not exercised in those first years have smaller vocabularies, lower learning skills, significant learning challenges, and find it extremely difficult to ever catch up to the children whose brains were actually exercised — by talking, reading, and interacting with each child — in those key years.

That is my current top focus for my own public policy efforts and goals. We need to help every child. We need community support to be sure every child is helped in those key time frames.

I will be using all of the steps on the alignment trigger pyramid to help support that work.

We Need A Commitment To Win/Win Outcomes

Overall, in each of my work, industry, and public policy settings, I have had a great chance to work with multiple parties in a real world context to create alignment around shared objectives.

What I have learned in dealing with all of those parties in all of those settings — and what I have learned dealing with multiple parties inside the organizations I have served as CEO — is that a very effective way of getting people aligned and keeping people aligned over time is to create win/win situations and win/win outcomes for all of the key parties.

Win/win is the key to long-term success in many settings.

That was also not an approach that I understood or even knew about back in 1987 when I started writing those books. That was an

approach that I have learned over the years since that time and it is an approach that I now support deeply and entirely.

Win/win, I now know, is the best collective intergroup strategy. When all parties perceive that their group will end up with a win/win consequence for their own group, then getting support for that aligned work from people in each group is much easier.

That is not a rhetorical, theoretical, hypothetical, or even ideological statement. It is a functional reality. I have very directly field-tested win/win strategies in multiple settings and they work. I know from using win/win approaches in real settings that they work and I know from experience that they can achieve successes that can't be achieved any other way.

My most recent employer, Kaiser Permanente, put together a labor management partnership with more than 40 labor unions and more than 100,000 union workers. It is one of the largest labor management partnerships in the world. Books have been written about what we did.

That particular labor management partnership has been very intentionally and deliberately focused on win/win outcomes for the workers, for the patients, and for the overall organization.

The Kaiser Permanente LMP may actually be the longest lived, largest, and most successful labor management partnership in the world — and it has been built very specifically on team behavior, shared vision, transparency, trust, and a clear and honest shared commitment to win/win outcomes for all parties.

Win/win is a very powerful way of thinking and behaving. When everyone wins, everyone benefits. There is great power to that agenda and there is huge value that can be created by win/win outcomes.

Multiple Experiences Reinforce The Sense Of How Those

Instincts Affects Our Lives

Before I knew how to set up win/win outcomes, I saw a number of work related settings where us/them instincts were activated and caused people to turn their worksites into win/lose interactions and even in some sad cases — to lose/lose outcomes.

That particular problem of having people working to create lose/lose outcomes has not happened in recent years in my own direct

work sites. But I have seen intergroup anger activated at a very instinctive and primal level in various other work settings where those levels of anger and the willingness — and even eagerness — by various people in those settings to damage the other party in those settings in material and meaningful ways seemed illogical, unexpected, and even incongruous, but was entirely and sadly, all too real for those settings.

The anger and the intent to do damage to other people was all too real for too many people in too many of those settings. It was clear to me that the people who felt that anger in both sides in those settings believed their own intergroup hatred to be valid and justified.

We have all seen worksites at war with themselves where people do damage and feel very right making damage happen.

Those are extreme cases. It is, however, fairly common for less extreme levels of us/them instincts to be triggered in work settings that undermine the work done in those settings in ways that people feel good and to feel right about very dysfunctional behaviors and very damaging and destructive thought processes.

Several of the very first settings where I personally worked early in my career were training grounds for observing those kinds of dysfunctional and damaging instinctive us/them workplace behaviors.

A couple of very dysfunctional work sites that I was in early in my career taught me a lot about a wide range of intergroup anger activation issues. I have worked very hard since that time to avoid having those kinds of damaging work site behaviors and negative intergroup energies happening in the work settings where I have been a manager or CEO.

The Hospital Staff Was “Them”

I saw some hospital settings early in my career where the medical staff and the administrative staff deeply disliked one another and behaved in very negative, dysfunctional, and even damaging us/them ways against each other.

I have been in a number of care-linked settings where perfectly reasonable physicians who delivered care in that hospital would tell me how much they hate the people who run their hospital and where the perfectly reasonable people who ran their hospital would tell me with equal passion and equivalent clarity how much they hated at least some of those same physicians.

I have been friends with people from both groups. I know absolutely beyond any doubt that both groups have good, kind, intelligent, and caring people.

But I also know that when any set of people in any setting manages to get their us/them instincts activated, then each side in that setting can actually hate the other side and each side can far too often be willing to actually take very intentional and deliberate steps to do damage to whoever they believe in that setting to be their “Them.”

Amazingly primal behavior happens in some unexpected settings. I have seen those experiences and those behaviors at a very immediate and personal level enough times to know that those feelings and those ethical standards, thought processes, and behaviors are not limited to tribal conflicts and to armies at war.

Work sites often have us/them battles, where people suspend conscience in their dealings with other groups of people in the worksite.

The behaviors in many organizational settings end up to be very tribe-like in their energy, emotions, and thought processes. Negative tribal behavior for what are clearly non-tribal issues is often

comfortable, desirable, and even seductive for many people in the most badly divided work settings.

Academic Sites Functionally Tribalize

Care sites often functionally tribalize — as do academic environments. I have seen those particular sets of behaviors happen a number of times in a number of settings.

Tribalized sets of people in each of those settings sometimes hold internal wars with one another. A number of academic people make woeful and very profession-consistent jokes about some of the intense, angry, and often deeply petty intergroup political battles that can happen in academic settings.

People in some academic settings do fierce tribal battle with one another with a level of intensity that makes no sense at all to the people outside the scope and boundaries of those conflicted settings.

I have had a number of professors from various institutions tell me stories about fierce and petty internal political battles in their institutions of higher learning that were hard to believe.

One professor who knew I was writing this book told me he was going to write his own book called “Office Space and Parking — a Murder Mystery.”

Some amazingly mean-spirited petty, angry, dysfunctional, and deeply conflicted behaviors obviously can feel very right to the people in those settings. Some people, I have seen, actually make those internal political battles in both academic settings and care settings a major priority for their lives for significant periods of time.

It has also been painfully clear to me that various business settings can be hot beds for instinct activated negative intergroup behaviors as well.

Actuaries Were Clearly “Them” To The Sales Team

I have actually seen some amazing and intense us/them battles within insurance companies. In one setting where I worked, the Actuarial team and the Sales and Marketing team hated each other so much that they ultimately got to the point where senior management literally and functionally issued paper passports to allow designated people from each side to cross into enemy territory.

Again — I knew people on both sides of those conflicts. I knew them well. They were good people. But they hated each other in a very us/them way and they tended to demonize, denigrate, depersonalize, and dehumanize each other with great energy in their entirely internal intergroup conflicts.

The people on both sides in some settings where I worked ascribed very evil motives to one another and I knew from knowing those people personally that they each believed what they were saying about the other people to be true.

I have seen people in those work settings suspend conscience and lie to one another and deliberately deceive one another in their work context in order to prevail in their intergroup conflict issues.

All Is Fair In Love And War — Even In The Office

“All is fair in love and war and this, my friend, is war” was what one sales leader told me about a particular piece of his behavior that I asked him to help me understand. “This is war” seemed a bit extreme. But his face was blazing and the hand holding his martini was shaking when he made that statement to me.

“This is war” clearly made entire and complete sense to him at that moment in time.

He had just done what I perceived to be a very unethical thing and it clearly felt right to him to sink to that unethical behavior. He was telling the plain truth to me about what he had done to the other person in that setting with no sense of guilt and he didn’t disguise his actions as he told the story to me because I was situationally an “us” to him in that moment and he considered me a friend. He had great comfort in telling me clearly what he had done and he equally clearly felt no guilt or ethical qualms at any level about very deliberately not telling the truth to “Them.” He told me the story without changing the facts or disguising his actions because he believed that any true “us” would support his behaviors and would not question his decision to be unethical to “Them.”

The Truth Was Only Morally Relevant To “Us”

I realized in that moment that if that particular department head for some reason ever found cause of some kind to change my own personal listed and defined status in his mind from “Us” to “Them,” then he would also no longer feel the need to tell the truth to me.

That insight made me sad. My respect level for him diminished because I realized clearly as he was telling me with some glee and some basic and primal pride what he had just done to “Them” exactly how situational his own personal ethical standards actually were.

They were not absolute ethical standards. They were not inviolate personal ethical standards. They were not rigid standards of clear personal ethical direction. They were, instead, absolutely situational and entirely circumstantial ethical standards and he was very comfortable with using those widely variable ethical standards in very situational ways based on whether the person he was dealing with was an “us” or a “Them.”

I have since seen similar split behaviors in work settings relative to ethical standards since that time on the part of many people — with people who treat me personally in very ethical ways as an “us,” but who clearly treat other people with the situational ethical standards that their us/them instincts trigger for a “them.”

I had seen the situational impact of our us/them instincts on values and ethics long before I read the story about the concentration camp guard who acted in warm and caring ways in one setting and who

was pure evil in another setting that I write about in Chapter Two of my *Cusp of Chaos* book. That was a major reason why I knew so quickly that the guard that I write about in that chapter of that book actually had not done any things that were evil to local people in his exile years after the war. That particular guard had not activated evil in those particular exile years.

He lived with an “us” group of people in that postwar time frame and he exhibited the behaviors, thought processes, and ethical standards that are generally triggered in each of us by being in an “us” situation.

We Need To Create A Sense Of “Us” In Relevant Settings

I have learned over the years in all of those work settings that it is a very good thing to get the people in any setting to perceive themselves to be an “us” — in order to activate all of the ethical standards in that setting that we instinctively apply to our dealings with “us.”

I have also learned over the years that it can be a very bad thing when people in any work setting or community are perceived by other people in that setting to be “Them.”

We tend to do bad things to Them. Minimally we tend to feel some stress and to feel some levels of anxiety about the physical and functional presence and impact of “Them” in any setting

As a leader for the half dozen companies where I have been CEO over the past 30 years, I have worked hard to create a sense of us in each setting and I have worked equally hard to have no internal sense of “Them” in any setting

Because I have been the CEO, I have been able to steer people’s perceptions in those settings in those directions — and my experience has been that the steerage process has helped set up beneficial interpersonal perceptions and interpersonal behaviors in those settings. At a very practical level, my experience is that the steerage process that has happened very intentionally in those directions has helped make my job as CEO much easier to do in each setting.

My strong belief is that we need people in all settings — both leaders and group members — to understand those issues, thought processes and behaviors and we need all people to act accordingly in defining who we are and what we do in each setting.

Knowledge is power. It took me a very long time to learn enough about those issues to have the knowledge level reach the point where I could use it to influence behaviors and thought processes in various settings and situations.

That knowledge has definitely made my job in those settings easier to understand and easier to do.

We need to apply that same set of strategies to our larger settings — and we need to work hard to increase the sense of us and decrease the sense of “Them” in each community, organization, and relevant setting.

That will only happen if we understand those issues and deal with them directly in an organized and strategic way.

Chapter Four — We Need To Reach Out To Other People Without Feeling Guilt And Achieve Interpersonal Understanding And Trust

If we want to achieve intergroup Peace in our worksites, schools, organizations, communities, and other relevant settings, we need to very intentionally expand our sense of who is “us” in each setting and we need to decrease the sense that other people in our relevant setting are “Them.”

When we have a sense that everyone in a setting is “us,” then we tend to apply the ethical standards and the supportive behaviors that are instinctively aligned with “us.”

When anyone in a setting is “Them,” then our instincts that relate to “Them” tend to be activated — and we act in ways that are less positive and less supportive relative to “Them.”

We are clearly better off in every setting — workplaces, schools, communities, and organizations — when we have a sense in that setting that we are an “us” and we do not have a sense that other people are a “Them.”

We need to do very intentional things to create that sense of “us” in all relevant settings.

There are a number of settings and situations where that will not be easy to do.

We have a number of areas in our country where we are very clearly divided by ethnicity and race today. That separation often begins with where we all live. People tend to self-segregate — living to a significant degree in communities where other people from their own group live.

Our neighborhoods are increasingly defined by their ethnic and racial composition. That separation by group has some underlying economic and even political underpinnings — and it is driven by an even larger level, by the fact that people tend to feel comfort in being with “us” when that choice is available.

We feel comfort at an instinctive level when we are surrounded by us and we tend to feel anxiety, stress, tension, and even fear when we are surrounded by people we perceive to be “Them.”

Those sets of instincts have helped people survive for millennia by guiding people away from the presence of “Them.”

Those same sets of instincts also can cause us to be divided into ethnically concentrated neighborhoods. They also divide us voluntarily in functional ways in various community and public settings.

Our schools often give us functional and easy to see proof points for those sets of behaviors.

We actually have children in many communities who choose to practice self-segregation inside our schools. Our multi-racial, multi-ethnic schools that are officially integrated often have their own functional internal self-segregation processes — with students from each group in a school self-segregating at lunch, by class choices, and in other school settings.

Schools Often Self-Segregate And Trigger Intergroup Stress

When there are clear sets of people from multiple groups within schools, and when there are no successful efforts by the leadership inside the schools to reduce the relevant intergroup stress points and behaviors, there is often intergroup stress and intergroup tensions that can sometimes lead to dislike, intergroup distrust, and even intergroup anger.

In the highly diverse Minneapolis school systems fairly recently, there were actual intergroup riots, with students divided along ethnic lines and angry enough at each other to do real intergroup damage.

That level of angry division and situational riots happened in that Minnesota setting because there were several separate sets of students in those schools — each aligned with their own group that functioned as their “us” — and each feeling division, distrust, and even anger relative to each other group they perceived to be “Them.”

The children of Somali immigrants in that school system were one category of “us.” African American students were another category of “us.” White students were their own category of “us.” Native American students had their “us” alignments. Hispanic students were their own relatively small, but distinct group.

There was enough intergroup anger in those school settings that an incident in a cafeteria triggered actual riot-level behaviors. The African American and Somali students tended to have particularly high levels of anger toward one another in that setting and a number of students come to blows in the context of those interactions.

Leaders Investigated The Incident — Not The Patterns

When those riots happened, leading people in that school system initially cited the trigger incident and said that they were going to carefully investigate that trigger incident in the cafeteria to see what they could do to prevent that particular behavior and that specific type of incident from reoccurring. The focus was on the trigger event.

It was clear from anyone who understands the functional dynamics of instinctive intergroup interactions that the specific trigger incident that happened in the cafeteria of that school was functionally irrelevant to the overall and very real intergroup anger that created the riots.

The trigger event in the cafeteria was catalytic, but it was not, at any level, causal.

Anyone trying to solve those kinds of issues in any setting that is in a state of intergroup tension and protest needs to understand the basic divisions that exist in that setting — and not just look at a trigger event when protests occur in response to an event.

Schools are an easy place to see the impact of primal instinctive behaviors at several layers. School children in many settings break into cliques — with kids outside the cliques too often treated with

discourtesy, contempt and even with cruelty at some levels by the clique members.

Students Tend To Align With Their Own Primal Group

Kids in racially and ethnically diverse school settings tend to align very directly with their own most primal group — with racial, cultural, ethnic, and religious alignments all creating separation for the students into those groupings. When those divisions exist in school settings, the students often choose to spend their time almost exclusively only with other kids from their own group.

There are several components of pressures that push students into isolationist behaviors at the group level in those settings.

People in each group in those settings who choose to spend time with — or who directly befriend people from another group — are often ostracized, criticized, and even attacked by their own original group.

Those students who try to reach across group boundaries in those school settings can become outcasts. Sometimes those students are even emotionally and physically attacked by their own group for being a traitor.

They are often called “Traitors” to their own group. Being a traitor is a very painful thing to be called and being a traitor is something that no one wants to be.

That whole dynamic was one of the most important things I have learned about instinctive behavior for people of all ages.

Everyone Hates A Traitor — At A Deep Instinctive Level

Everyone hates a traitor.

That was clearly one of my earliest and most important learnings in my discovery process about our instincts and intergroup interactions. It was an extremely important thing to learn. Traitors are important. The reaction to being a traitor in any setting sets the tone for entire areas of interaction between people in that setting.

With great consistency, we all have very strong instincts never to personally be a traitor and we all have very strong instincts to dislike, reject, and even punish anyone we feel is a traitor.

Societies everywhere execute traitors. Some religions punish the people who attempt to personally convert away from their religion with death. Often painful death. The deaths of traitors in multiple settings are

too often accompanied by pain, torture, and deliberate disfiguration or dismemberment. Traitors are hated in a wide range of settings.

That set of issues and the behaviors that are triggered by our traitor instincts are described in more detail in both *Primal Pathways* and *The Art of InterGroup Peace*.

It has not been difficult for me to personally understand and directly appreciate that particular set of feelings about being a traitor at a very individual and experiential level. I obviously have those same instincts. I, personally, do not want to ever be a traitor. I take pride in not being a traitor. Not being a traitor is not a bad goal to have.

But what I discovered in my own life — to my own surprise — was that the instinct not to be a traitor sometimes created a personal barrier for me in some of my own chosen life interactions with other people. That particular instinctive reaction against being a traitor first happened with noticeable impact for me personally more than two decades ago, when I was first reaching out to have direct interactions and direct personal relationships with people from other groups.

I believed then and I believe now that we all need to reach out to other people. I believe that we each need to make friends with

individual people from other groups in order to increase our understanding of each other and in order to build both personal trust levels and personal levels of good will.

We Need To Reach Out To Other Groups Of People — **Without Feeling Guilt**

I was deliberately and intentionally personally reaching out at that time in my life to multiple sets of people, but I was feeling a slight level of vague and unexplained guilt at some points in the process for that specific behavior on my part. That sense of guilt surprised me. But the concern felt both real and legitimate, so I didn't ignore it.

What I discovered — in thinking in a very focused way about those feelings — was that part of me was wondering if I was somehow being disloyal in some way to some level of my personal “us” by reaching out to make friends and to create real 1-to-1 friendships and alliances with specific people and with specific sets of people who weren't from my own original primal group that most directly triggered my own personal sense of us.

I felt that discomfort about a couple of those relationships back in the early 1990s. That was disconcerting — and it made me unhappy

with myself relative to my own internal “political correctness” standards.

In response to those feelings, I deliberately made the choice to simply force myself to ignore that discomfort in my choice of behaviors and in my choice of friends. It was, however, both annoying and a bit confusing to me to persistently feel that mild guilt relative to those relationships.

Recognizing The Core Instinct Was An “Aha!” Moment

Then, I realized one day after listening to some people talking about feeling anger about the fact that a friend of theirs was betraying them by choosing to spend time with a person from another group, that the feeling I was feeling in those situations about the possible betrayal of my own group by me clearly had an instinctive origin of some kind that was influencing my thoughts and feelings.

I realized at that point in time that my own sense of unease and my own concern and personal discomfort about those intergroup interactions must be coming from an instinct at some level and I realized that the mild sense of guilt was not coming from an actual bad

or wrong behavior on my part. That was another “Aha” moment for me. It was a breakthrough moment, in fact.

I realized at that point that I was feeling that personal touch of guilt about those behaviors entirely instinctively — with the discomfort I was feeling for those intergroup interactions created very directly by my instincts that told me not to be a traitor to my own group.

I realized in that moment that I wasn’t feeling that mild, vague, and persistent guilt about those interactions because I was actually doing anything wrong that deserved to trigger a sense of guilt. It was just an instinctive intergroup reaction that was being activated at a preconscious level in my head by the possibility that I might somehow be a traitor because I was doing what I was doing.

I recognized very clearly in that moment that my feelings of vague guilt about those interactions with those particular people were very directly triggered by my instinct to not be a traitor and those feelings of vague guilt were not created by any actual wrong behavior on my part.

That insight helped me a lot. It was liberating, in fact. Until I recognized that my feeling of not wanting to be a traitor was entirely instinctive, I generally had at least a mild level of reservation about the

whole befriending and intergroup reaching out process that I had chosen at that point to be a deliberate behavior pattern for my own life.

People Everywhere Instinctively Hate Traitors

When I recognized the behavioral and perceptual barriers that the traitor instinct package was creating for my own life, I started looking for evidence of that same instinct and those same traitor-related behaviors in other people's lives.

As usual, when an instinct is involved, I found significant evidence for that instinct everywhere I looked and I found the evidence very quickly. I saw that people everywhere hated traitors and I saw that our instincts tell us all never to be a traitor.

That set of instincts has a major influence on our behaviors.

That set of instincts can create a real barrier to interpersonal and intergroup interactions for each and all of us.

I saw that the school children who were called traitors for reaching out to other groups in school settings almost always gave up the friendships that triggered that animosity from their own group.

It is absolutely clear that if we want to create positive intergroup interactions at a personal level for the students in our schools, then we need to teach our students about the existence and the power of those instincts and we need to very intentionally create cultures in those schools that makes reaching out to other students an accepted and desirable part of the culture and not a reason to treat students as if they are being traitors to their own group with those behaviors.

We can make those cultural changes in our school settings — and we can make them in our larger community settings — but I guarantee that they will not happen on their own.

We need to understand those instincts and we need to take steps to defuse them or they will not be defused. We need to defuse them, because they damage us now at multiple levels that we do not even suspect.

As I looked at the impact of those behaviors, I could see that group leaders in too many intergroup situations are actually reluctant to make friends with leaders from other groups for fear of being considered a traitor by their own group.

That is a problem for all of us, because those group leaders who feel that those barriers exist are less likely to lead our groups to intergroup Peace in those settings.

We actually need group cultures that encourage and expect our leaders to reach out to create those linkages. We need, as group members, to encourage our leaders to be friends with the leaders of other groups as part of their leader role.

Again — culture change for groups can be needed in some settings to make that happen. That is not how we usually think. We usually want our leaders to avoid the leaders from other groups. That is not the best path to intergroup Peace. We need to encourage those relationships.

If you are reading this and agree with that point, please share that insight very explicitly with other members of your group so that leaders for your group can feel empowered to create those linkages.

Some of the very best intergroup trust and mutual benefit relationships happen when leaders of various groups know, like, and trust one another.

Avoiding being a traitor or being perceived to be a traitor can be a very powerful motivator for behavior for all of us. Those feelings often create real barriers to intergroup friendships and understanding — particularly when we let those instincts guide us and when we don't realize at any level that we are being guided in our thoughts and our emotions by that particular set of instincts.

We Need To Successfully Address Our Traitor Instincts

So I knew back in the early 1990s that we needed to deal with that set of instinct-triggered issues or that those instincts and those behaviors would impede and prevent needed levels of intergroup trust.

I initially worked past that traitor-instinct barrier to intergroup friendships in my own life by choosing intellectually to look at the bigger picture for our lives. I grew to believe and to realize that we each really do need intergroup Peace for our own groups and that we each need to do explicit and intentional things to make intergroup Peace happen.

I realized and explained to myself that my own behavior in reaching out to other groups wasn't being a traitor to my own original primal groups. I realized, understood, and explained explicitly to myself

that my behavior in reaching out to other people from other groups actually supported and created benefit for my own core and most primal groups. My reaching out actions to create positive personal relationships for me with people from other groups actually made my own groups both stronger and safer.

That was a very important and highly useful point to recognize. I realized intellectually that my own personal reaching out behaviors would actually benefit my own primal groups in very real ways. I began to both realize intellectually and to believe experientially that each of the groups I relate to at a basic and primal level as my primal core us will benefit directly from intergroup Peace.

Our Most Primal Groups All Benefit From InterGroup **Peace**

I began to understand clearly — and I began to remind myself — that my own initial primal groups — including my own family — would each benefit hugely and directly from us all achieving very real intergroup Peace.

I was not being a traitor in reaching out to other people when the functional consequence of my behavior in reaching out to people from

other groups was actually to create a higher chance of Peace for the people who I care about and who I very much want to be safely at Peace.

That knowledge and that belief on my part that my own primal group will actually benefit from what I do in creating my intergroup friendships freed me very nicely back in the 1990s from the internal stress points that were being imposed on me at that point in time at a subconscious level by that particular traitor instinct.

I did not continue to feel that pressure and I did not allow that stress level to influence my behavior in any way once I realized what was actually causing it. I can say with great pleasure and a high level of personal satisfaction that the freedom that I received from the stress that was created by that understanding functionally allowed me to have real friends “across group lines” without hesitation or reservation.

That was a good place to be.

Reaching Out Because We Are All People — Person-To-Person

I am now personally at an even better place.

I have now managed to reach past those legacy intergroup barriers at another level. I have managed now to move past that need for situational intellectual validation of my direct intergroup interaction behaviors and I am now able to create a whole new level of 1-to-1 relationships and 1-to-1 friendships with other people at a person-to-person level.

My current person-to-person approach to those instincts is even better. I now relate to other people as people very directly at a personal level. The new person-to-person relationship approach is very effective for me and I like it very much.

I learned that new approach for me when I was starting a health plan in Jamaica and it has stood me in good stead ever since.

I no longer need to justify reaching out to other people from any group because that reaching out helps my own group. I can now reach out to many people very directly at a very personal level because I see now that we are all people and that reaching out helps all people.

Even when the person I am interacting with in any setting almost inevitably sees me as some category of people, I can now usually see the other person as a person. All of the definitions and each of the group

categories and definitions that come with each person as part of their personal package of realities now add to the things that make each person interesting and that make each person exactly who each person is.

I can see the actual person in the heart of each set of life experiences rather than setting that person off and defining that person in some definitional and cognitively dysfunctional group-linked way as a representative part of their group instead of as a pure and individual person.

People — At A Personal Level

I made my own personal progress in learning how to reach out to people very directly at a person-to-person level when I was doing the work needed to create a new health plan in Jamaica.

That Jamaican setting was initially very context jarring for me at several levels. I was often the only positional member of my original primal group in some Jamaican settings. Everyone else on my work team was Jamaican and everyone else in a number of settings was not White.

I worked directly with that set of people. Working with all of the people on that team directly and individually as people in the focused context of the work that a team of actual people needed to do in that setting actually taught me and caused me to interact with the people who were there simply, directly, and purely as people.

I forgot about categories and I forgot about labels. I worked with people. Working directly in Jamaica with people as people freed me from my earlier sense and my earlier level of intergroup differentiation as a key definer for whoever I was interacting with.

Focused on the project — when I was surrounded only by people who were Black Jamaicans — I stopped seeing the people I worked with as black people I worked with and I started seeing everyone around me as people I worked with who were black.

That is hugely better.

It was actually extremely liberating for me. I saw all of the people I worked with as people and not as some category of people. Their personal and individual legacy categories and their individual life experience reality still existed for each person, but that information about their life became an interesting set of facts about them, and it

stopped being the primary differentiation I used to relate to the people who I was with in that setting.

Friends Who Were Black...Not Black Friends

I came back to St. Paul from that experience in Jamaica and I suddenly saw my black friends in Minnesota as friends who were black rather than black people who were my friends. I felt like a huge burden and a cloud lifted from my head and my vision when that happened. Being black was still extremely and highly relevant — but in a different and much more revealing and informing way.

The fact that each friend who was black was black and that each friend had all the important and formative life experiences that came from being black helped define and explain my friends to me as individual people. That fact became a fascinating descriptive layer of their life rather than being “The” defining layer of their life.

I apologize to all of the people who have already had that particular insight and who may be wondering why it took me so long to have it. I had no idea that I was using the mental approach I had been using until the new opportunity presented itself to me and my mental approach made that major change.

Many other people have had those levels of insights for their lives about perceiving other people purely as people. I obviously did not invent seeing people as people. That experience was clearly not to unique to me. But that experience in Jamaica was important to me because it actually did happen in that time and in that setting personally for me. It was lovely when it happened.

It changed that aspect of my life. It gave me a much better way of seeing other people.

My understanding of those issues was transformed. I went through a wonderful and serious period of adjustment about many areas of my thinking about multiple intergroup issues that were happening in our own country and in my own settings because I could actually now see some of the key issues of being black much more clearly.

I Had Friends Who Were Black — Not Black Friends

I saw those issues and their impact more clearly when I saw my friends as friends who were black instead of seeing those friends as black people who were my friends.

That is not an easy insight to explain to some people. It was important to me. It still is important to me. That change of perspective did let me look at a wide range of racial issues in Minnesota and in the country with new eyes — and with a significantly greater and more direct sense of empathy for the challenges and the setbacks that can be imposed on people simply because the people are black.

I had a much better sense of what it was to be black in America when I had friends who happened to be dealing directly on a daily basis with the issues of being black in America. I was able to have much more direct and clear conversations about those issues with any friends where I had that expansion and that growth in my own direct sense of who my friends each were.

When I see news clips of events like the protests in Ferguson, Missouri, I can see the impact of a police line of armed and armored White policeman coming down a street toward a crowd of black people and I can put myself in the position of being a person who sees a wall of people from another group coming toward me with weapons in a setting where I knew that the wall of armed people perceived me to be a “Them” in that setting and in that situation.

That sense of not having a group identification as a key factor for my intergroup and interpersonal interactions has helped eliminate those traitor instincts from my own thinking almost all of the time.

Those traitor instincts are deactivated for me personally in my interactions when that perception of being a person is functionally activated and defines the interaction.

For our overall group interactions, I still want my own original primal groups to be safe and I very much want to avoid damage from people who want damage to happen to my original groups. I believe that one of the best ways of preventing those levels of damage is to create intergroup trust and to have all groups do well in a culture of inclusion and shared opportunity.

We Need Cultures To Embrace Interpersonal Interactions

We need everyone to understand how much our traitor instincts affect our beliefs, behaviors, and interactions with individuals and people from other groups. We need to create a sense within cultures of all groups that inclusion and interaction is not betrayal and that intergroup trust and interpersonal trust are both positive goals to achieve.

We can't ignore the fact that some people actually do want to do evil and damaging things to other people — but we need to proactively reach out to create intergroup understanding and trust in every setting so that we can collectively keep the people who want to do that damage from being successful in their efforts.

We need to deactivate and minimize the negative aspect of our traitor instincts as part of that process. We need to teach our children and show our children that reaching out in an inclusive way can make their lives and our communities better than they will be if we allow the old levels of divisions to continue to define and guide our lives.

For settings like the school system in Minneapolis, we need to work hard to get the students in that school to create a sense of us that is anchored in a very good way on collectively being students in that school.

We need students in all of our multi-ethnic, multi-racial schools to understand that negative instinctive intergroup behaviors can unfortunately feel right and can have their own level of seductive appeal, but we need the students in those schools to know and believe that rising to a higher and equally legitimate sense of “us” as a school

will benefit all students more than being divided in dysfunctional and damaging ways into each of the core groups in that school each acting on their own behalf.

School Spirit Can Become An Alignment Tool

Our school systems need to be candid about the divisions that exist in each divided setting, but each school needs to call for students to work together in a context of school spirit to have all students do well and to have all students be safe and thrive in each school setting.

School spirit may have a resurrection as a functional rallying focus for bringing people together in inclusive ways for the benefit of all students in each school setting.

Each of the alignment triggers on the alignment trigger pyramid needs to be activated in each school setting.

It is entirely possible to bring the students in each setting into a sense of being an “us” in the context of their school — but it will take a conscious and deliberate effort to create that belief and that perception and to make it a positive tool that serves the students in a way that benefits everyone in the school.

As part of that sense of “us” the people who run each school need to help students understand that they are not being a traitor to their group when they interact in negative ways with people from other groups.

We need to reach out without guilt and we need to align with enthusiasm in our mutual best interest.

That can be done — but it will not happen unless we do what needs to be done to make that approach a reality in each setting.

Chapter Five — An Instinct Perception Of Racism As A Reality

It was particularly useful for me when I was working in Jamaica to learn to see people as people and not as categories of people or as stereotyped examples of people. The fact that I could more easily see people as people helped me understand more clearly the reality of being Black in America and it helped as well in understanding the realities that result from being any other minority group in America.

My own personal levels of insight about what it means to be Black or Hispanic or minority in America took another massive step forward to entirely new levels a few years later when one of my sons and his wife gave me the great gift of multi-racial grandchildren. That gift has been one of the great blessings of my life. It gave me multiple additional levels of direct and personal insight into intergroup realities that were not available to me until that point in my life.

The world we live in looked very different to me at multiple levels when my own family was in the mix of those intergroup issues at a very personal level.

As I described in some detail in the *Cusp of Chaos* book, I had a spectacular “AHA! Moment” in my own head one day, when I heard from my son and my daughter-in-law that my multi-racial grandson had some kind of issue with another kid in early grade school. I immediately — in less than nanoseconds — wondered if the incident was racial. I was defensive to my very core in microseconds.

I was protective and I was instantly alarmed at a very basic and very immediate level about racial issues and about racist behaviors in that exact moment of hearing and learning that an incident of some kind had occurred.

I was even spontaneously angry in that same moment at the thought that someone might have done a racist thing to my grandson — even though I had no clue at that point about what had actually happened and I had no evidence at any level that the issue at school had any racial elements or even racial undertones.

One of the blessings of my life is that I have five sons. All five of my wonderful and good-hearted sons have an ample supply of personality. If I had heard that any of my sons had an altercation or an issue of some kind with another child at school, I would have immediately suspected

that my son might have been the trigger for the incident. When my grandson — also rich in personality — had an incident, I immediately suspected and deeply feared racism.

I said to myself — in that moment when I realized clearly what I had just done — “Wow — this is all going to be a lot harder than I thought.”

I have been working on my intergroup interaction books for years and I had been thinking about a wide range of intergroup topics at multiple levels for a long time before that incident. Prior to that wonderful learning moment, I still had vague hopes at some levels that we would all be able to reason together and that we could all mutually get to a good level of intergroup understanding that would basically fall into place on its own if I could just somehow help everyone to achieve a solid level of pure intellectual awareness about some key and particularly relevant issues that relate to instinctive behaviors and instinctive intergroup interactions.

My Initial Goal Was Intellectual Understanding

I had been writing multiple drafts of my basic interaction books before that time to help create a solid level of intellectual awareness for

people from all groups about those instinctive behaviors so we could all ride our intellects together into the future to create a new set of collective and more enlightened behaviors.

I had believed and hoped in writing those early drafts of the books that when we all recognized that our basic instincts create all of those problematic intergroup behaviors, then we would all be able to intellectually take steps to soften the impact of those incidents and we could spontaneously and collectively — with mutual good intentions — all take steps together to turn our basic instincts toward the cause of Peace.

My intention at that point was to have wise people make wise and fully informed decisions based on our improved and more complete intergroup understanding — I believed strongly at that point in time that simply explaining those instincts in clear and useful ways would cause people to give the issue a new start and would give the country a new beginning.

In that moment, however, as I wondered at a very visceral and slightly painful, fearful, and clearly primal level whether or not racism had just harmed my grandchild, I realized that our history, our

instinctive behaviors, and the fact that we do have people in our world who are doing very racist and damaging things to one another and who are doing those negative things to people in our country today have all put us in a much deeper hole than I had previously understood.

I knew in that moment that simply explaining those behavior patterns to relevant people would not somehow make them go away.

I also knew in that moment that we needed to start from a very deep and very visceral hole if we are going to successfully build the new levels of intergroup understanding and intergroup trust that I strongly believed we needed to create in order to have a nation with Intergroup Peace.

I also knew and recognized in that moment that I personally needed to get a much better understanding of how deep that hole was in order to build the strategy that will actually get us to intergroup security, trust, and Peace.

My Optimism And My Naiveté Crumbled Simultaneously

My optimism and my naiveté on that issue crumbled simultaneously. I knew that the real world that we have created and live in today was going to be a much larger barrier to the intergroup

interactions that are needed to be the foundation for Peace then I had believed before that “Aha” moment.

I knew in that moment that we could not simply assume good behavior for each other until we had so much good behavior in our lives that we could trust that good will and good behavior would both exist for any of us — or for all of us in any given setting.

I still believe that we do need to build that very basic level of collective intellectual understanding about the impacts of our instinctive behaviors as an anchor for the Peace process. Having everyone clearly understand those instinct-related issues is still a key component to The Art of Intergroup Peace and it is a top priority goal of mine to have everyone understand those issues, those processes, those challenges, and those opportunities.

I realized, however, in that moment, that racism was looming over our lives at a very visceral, continuous, and immediate level and I realized that racism was a constant and on-going threat to intergroup trust and to intergroup interactions at a very practical and functional level. That reality was my new reality.

My Racist Fears Were Legitimate And Justified

Racists exist. They do racist things. The fact that we do have real people who are doing racist things to other people today is a truth that has to be recognized as being real as we try to make progress in those key areas.

I very clearly realized in that moment that my own personal and direct concern that had risen spontaneously in my brain in that very moment about possible racism and about potential evil behaviors on the part of racist people relative to my own family had been entirely legitimate and justified. I realized that as we go forward to set up a country that is at Peace with itself that we will need to start with the cold and hard reality that every adverse event and every negative situation that we face might actually be racist because so many incidents and so many real life situations are, in fact, actually racist.

I recognized in that moment that is the real world we live in. I recognized that we live in a world where there are racist people who do racist and intentionally damaging things to other people and I understood far more clearly that, even though we have made huge and highly visible progress in many key areas and ways, that I had no way of knowing whether or not any given negative intergroup and

interpersonal incident might not be triggered and fed by racism, bigotry, and malice.

I also realized in that moment that each incident of real racism that actually does occur in any setting directly activates and reactivates a clear perception for each of us that racism is relevant. Each proof point — no matter how isolated — makes the case that the possibility for that particular kind of behavior exists and is real.

I realized that racism could actually be a key factor behind various behaviors at multiple levels for very real people for the foreseeable future and I recognized, painfully, that we will all need to deal with that reality because it is, in fact, real.

We Can't Talk Our Way Out Of What Is Real

Minority Americans who are reading what I just wrote are justified in saying — “Duh — why is that such a revelation? That is, my friend, the world we live in.”

It was, however, a major, unexpected, powerful, and paradigm jolting revelation for me to personally have that insight and that's why I am sharing it now in this book.

I truly had thought and hoped that we could somehow just talk our way much of the way to the ultimate positive and mutually beneficial intergroup and interpersonal outcomes that I very much wanted us all to have.

I was partially correct about the needed strategy of clear communications to achieve those goals. Talking to each other clearly about those issues is needed. We do need to talk.

But talking is clearly insufficient to create a buffer against the damage that can be done and that sometimes is done to people by the very real people who feel right in doing bad things to other people for racist reasons.

I realized that we needed to have multiple layers of consistent positive behaviors to support intergroup trust. I also recognized that words and communication approaches, alone, were not going to create that necessary and fundamental level of intergroup trust — because even if the people who are sharing the language of intergroup support and intergroup trust are entirely sincere and even if those people are entirely consistent in their own feelings and in their own behaviors, there will continue to be significant numbers of racist and bigoted

people who still feel intergroup hate and who will continue to have that racist mind set affect their behavior in negative and destructive ways.

Some People Will Do Evil Things

We need macro paths of consistent and intentional enlightened behavior to create intergroup trust. We all need to recognize that even when we get people to have those enlightened beliefs and even when we get people to behave in those positive ways, that not everyone will be sharing those beliefs or supporting or even accepting those commitments.

We need to accept the reality that there will be some people who will very intentionally and deliberately do evil behaviors in the future no matter how much the rest of us talk in enlightened ways and believe in enlightened values.

Some people hate so deeply that rational thinking on those issues is highly unlikely to happen at any point for those people.

It is not impossible to convert some of the people who personally hold those beliefs, so we do need to convert as many people as we can.

We need to do what we can do to very intentionally convert every racist person we can convert to non-racist beliefs — but we need to

expect that those will be people who will not convert and there will be people who will do racist things even if almost all of us reject racism and even if almost all of us want it to be gone forever at every level.

Forgiveness Is Impossible For What Has Been Done

About the same point in time that I learned those lessons, in another key learning moment, I received feedback from a good friend of mine who is an African American professional who read an early draft of this book. That draft had fairly extensively and — I thought — fairly clearly explained the instinctive reasons for our centuries of intergroup conflict and intergroup discrimination. That particular version of that book was, I thought, a clear and persuasive description of the basic intergroup instinct problem.

I called in that particular draft of the book for both clear understanding of those issues by all of us and for a level of intergroup forgiveness. I said in that book that we needed a fresh start. I also wrote that part of that fresh start needed to be for people in this country to forgive some of the prior levels of bad, discriminatory, and damaging behavior.

My friend read that draft of the book, looked me in the eye, and said — “No. I may understand but do not ever expect me to forgive. It is not possible to forgive.”

That was an unexpected feedback. I was again shocked and I actually was a bit rocked. A very wise and very good-hearted person had just told me that forgiveness was off the table.

That actually made great sense when I thought about it, but I had not thought about it. I had just plugged forgiveness optimistically into my proposed solution set at a key point in the strategy fabric in the hopes that forgiveness could happen and in the clear wish that it actually would happen.

That was one bridge too far. The sins that had been committed — by people who had very intentionally and deliberately committed those sins — were not forgivable sins.

The amazing and brilliant reconciliation process that happened in South Africa at the end of apartheid that was set up by Nelson Mandela as they created their new inclusive nation involved having the individual sinners in that country come to the commission as individuals who each very explicitly explained their own sins, and their

own guilt and then expressed personal sorrow and regret. Then, as the final step, they each actually asked for forgiveness.

I had a chance to have a brief talk with Bishop Tutu of South Africa about that process. In that highly structured setting in South Africa, Bishop Tutu said that forgiveness was often very painful but it was possible.

For us — with no clearly expressed regret and with no individual confessions of past sins by the actual sinners — forgiveness was not possible. That point was made clearly. It made great sense.

Awareness Was Not Enough

This whole process of creating intergroup Peace, I learned, was clearly going to be harder than I had thought at several levels. We could not just give ourselves a fresh start. We were not going to be able to talk ourselves out of those problems.

I realized at that point that awareness wasn't going to be enough.

I had intended to publish that particular draft of that book. I stopped the publishing process at that point. I went back into thinking about the issues. I refocused on designing and testing resolution

approaches that could give us a fresh start without seeking and using forgiveness as part of the package.

As a result of that extended thought processes, I began to develop a multi-level strategy development processes — aimed at understanding the functional realities and processes that will be needed to win people's hearts and trust instead of just winning people's heads.

The new strategy was based on the reality that we all will have the potential going forward to be both saints and sinners. We will need to very intentionally do the exact things we need to do to bring us all to win/win status and to activate our most positive sets of intergroup and interpersonal behaviors.

We need to create a functional and inclusive sense of “us” and then we need to build trust around that sense of “us” that is based on our actions, our behaviors, and our interactions in real and validating ways with one another.

We can't turn to forgiveness, but we can do what South Africa did and start fresh — with clear behavior expectations generating a sense of situational credibility and trust.

Suspecting Racism Was A Legitimate Concern

We need to interact with each other in ways that build trust. Trust can be built, but it will need to be earned. It will need to be earned in a context where there are very real and legitimate concerns about behaviors at a deep and personal level.

In my own head — and in my own heart — when that particular incident at school happened, I had personally gone to racism instantly and immediately as a possible cause for that behavior. I realized that my own personal response of suspecting racism as a relevant factor for that incident was a very natural and entirely legitimate response as a possible explanation for the incident.

As I thought that issue through more carefully, I recognized intellectually that my own thinking in that situation about that risk was valid and that my response in suspecting racism when that incident happened to my grandson was entirely appropriate.

Suspecting racism was not an error in my thinking. There is a lot of racism in the world. Racism might easily have been the trigger issue for that particular situation at school. It often is a trigger issue for things that happen in many settings in our country.

I had not personally faced any significant level of racist prejudice directly in my own life, but I had been writing about all of the evil things that people do to one another for racist reasons for several years — so my own evidence base about the amount of racism that exists in our world today filled a big enough space in my own head for me to legitimately have and feel that concern in that situation.

Any minority American who knows that reality from first hand and constant experience is probably wondering why that revelation was so shocking and why that particular learning movement was so powerful for me. It was so powerful because my personal life context up to that point had not ever caused me to feel personally defensive and personally threatened by possible racist behavior.

My context switched from empathetic and sympathetic intellectual awareness and ideological and philosophical support to deep personal relevance and to deep personal concern when that moment of truth about possible racist damage happened for my own family.

Context is everything. I personally needed to see that situation in a context that let me see what I saw in order to actually see it.

White Americans Need To Understand The Context of Racism

I also realized in that moment that we could not succeed in achieving that goal of creating intergroup Peace for our country until more White people in our country also had a sense of how much damage our racism has done and how relevant all of the racist pieces of our world are to people's direct experience and to people's personal expectations.

I realized that my own new enlightenment levels and direct insights on those issues needed to be shared in some clear way with other people who are White and who have also only seen racism and intergroup discrimination from a White and intellectual perspective.

For people who have not faced both direct and indirect incidents of discrimination and racist behavior — the topic can be intellectual, ideological, philosophical, and even theoretical. Racism is a much more powerful issue when it is also has directly functional realities for each person attached.

I later learned that racism actually had not been a factor for that particular incident at school. But that information did not make my fear

about racism in the moment of that situation one iota less relevant or any less appropriate.

We All Need To Understand The Damage That Has Been Done

I began to rewrite my books on our intergroup interactions from the perspective that we need to have all parties and all groups understand the damage that racism has done and we need all groups and all parties to also understand the threats that racism still presents.

I also recognized — as a side benefit relative to understanding those issues — that many incidents and occurrences that actually are not racist will be interpreted as either being racist or possibly being racist — and that we will need a process of diagnosing and discussing each of those incidents in a safe and clear way if we want to achieve intergroup trust and alignment and not have misconstrued incidents or outlier incidents that actually represent only individual sinners sinning function as trigger events that divide us or even tear us apart.

My sense now is that we need to create much higher levels of understanding about our collective history and our past behaviors — and that we need to build a culture of inclusion and trust for America.

We all — people from every group — need to have a clear understanding of our current reality and our historical reality in order to determine where we are now and in order to determine what we need to do going forward as a people and a country.

People tend to have very different perceptions of the historical realities for this country. My sense is that we need to collectively agree on some key parts of history so that we can go forward from here to build the new history and the new culture of Peace that we all want to create.

Building the needed new levels of trust will require behaviors that are clearly based on win/win outcomes for all relevant groups of people. Building the new levels of trust will require White Americans to have deeper insights into why trust does not exist today — and to realize how important it will be to collectively earn that trust going forward from where we are now.

Building a country with a culture of Intergroup Peace will require both a shared set of values that can align us and a clear set of behaviors that create trust that we are all sharing that alignment.

All of those behaviors will need to be anchored on a clear understanding of the historical realities that created where we are today.

Chapter Six — We Have Discriminated As A Country Based On Who Is “Us” And Who Is “Them”

We all need to understand where we have been as a country in order to understand where we need to go next as a country.

We all need to have a clearer understanding of our history of intergroup interactions — and we particularly need to understand how our basic sets of instinctive behaviors have given us the history we share today.

It has been truly fascinating, very insight provoking, and extremely useful for me to look at our history as a nation very directly from the perspective of our instinctive intergroup behaviors.

Once I had a good understanding of the range and variety of ways that we instinctively treat people when we have both our most positive and our most negative intergroup instincts fully activated, then major areas of our history made much more sense.

We have been both saints and sinners in our national intergroup history in ways that were clearly influenced and shaped in major ways by our intergroup instinct packages. I could easily see a number of significant areas where we had sinned badly as a nation and where we

had damaged people in very intentional ways based on having our “Them” related instincts activated.

I could also see a wide range of areas where we have clearly had our “us” instincts in full gear and where we have done some of the very best things we could do as people for one another. We have been one of the most internally supportive nations on the planet when we have had our collective “us” instinctively activated.

We Are Good At Our Best And Evil At Our Worst

At our best, we are really good to one another. At our best, we act in enlightened and caring ways in our group interactions and in our personal interactions with one another.

At our worst — we do evil things to one another and we feel no guilt doing those evil things. At our worst, we do damage to groups of people and to individuals within groups in truly unconscionable ways and do not activate our conscience in the process.

That set of often-contradictory behaviors has shaped who we are and it has shaped what we have done for a very long time. I began to understand that we can’t really collectively understand our history as a

nation until we all understand and appreciate the impact of both sets of behaviors.

As an “us,” we have been a beacon of enlightenment for the world. We have created what was, for a very long time, one of the best and most inclusive public school systems on the planet. We have been exemplifiers of democracy, free enterprise, and true individual opportunity for people at multiple levels.

No one in the world has exceeded our commitment to free speech and to freedom of religion. We have preached liberty and the pursuit of happiness and we have celebrated, endorsed, and supported both of those sets of beliefs and behaviors.

Our national rhetoric about respecting who we are as individuals has been a model and an inspiration for similar belief systems across the globe.

People have perceived us to be the land of freedom and the land of opportunity for centuries. For the specific subsets of Americans who have been fully included in that enlightened vision, America has been the best place to live and America has been the best place to be in the entire world for a long period of time.

The Majority Has Discriminated Directly Against People Perceived To Be “Them”

At that same time that we have been a beacon of enlightenment at many levels, we have discriminated extensively and very explicitly by race, by ethnicity, and by gender. When the majority group who has governed this country has perceived any sets of people to be a “Them,” the consequences of that perception have created — and still create — major problems for those specific groups of our people who are perceived to be “Them.”

There is no way that we can deny our damaging intergroup behaviors that have been done very intentionally to specific groups of people in this country for very long periods of time.

At our worst, we actually enslaved people. This country committed that extreme sin of enslavement very explicitly and very intentionally by race for a very long period of time.

So as I looked at our history in the context of our us/them packages of instincts, it was clear that those specific packages of instincts have influenced us and guided us at very high levels in both positive and negative ways for our entire existence as a country. We

have made many decisions about our behaviors and our values based on the guidance given to us by our intergroup packages of instincts.

In some cases, those behaviors and the values that have emerged from those instincts have been damaging and even evil at their core.

The primary realization about our intergroup packages of instincts that gives me hope for a better future is that I have come to understand and believe that even though our basic us/them sets of instincts can't be erased or even changed, we do have significant flexibility in determining who is us and who is them in any setting and we can structure and channel those sets of instincts to create better and more enlightened outcomes for us all.

We can extend the blessings and the beneficial behaviors that relate to "us" to more people simply by very intentionally adding more people to the group we perceive and define to be "us."

We Can Be Flexible In Seeing People As "Us"

I learned very early in my study of the impact that those instincts have on our behavior and on our collective history, that we functionally have some flexible and extremely useful patterns and processes relative to who we define as us and them. It was clear to me from looking at

people in multiple settings and situations in our country and around the world that we actually have significant flexibility in creating our categories of us and them and then in determining who fits into each category that we create.

Once I understood that flexibility to exist, it became clear to me that the flexibility we have on that issue of defining categories of “us” can be a great asset to us and that it can, in fact help us to achieve Peace in settings that would otherwise be conflicted.

It can be good and very useful in many ways to be able to have multiple categories of “us” in our lives because we do so much better in our interactions with other people when we perceive other people for any significant reason to be “us.”

As I looked at those sets of intergroup issues over time, it became clear to me that deliberately and strategically creating the right categories of us can functionally help us do some of the good things that we need to do for each other at multiple levels.

It can be very good to be a country where our best and most enlightened features and our best us instincts extend to all of us in the very best and most inclusive ways.

When those “us” related instincts are activated in any setting, they make certain positive and supportive behaviors feel right to us in that setting.

That flexibility in defining who is an “us” is critical to our chances of creating intergroup Peace for our entire country and in all of the communities that comprise our country.

We Begin By Dividing By Family, Clan, And Tribe

To make that strategy work, we need to expand who we consider to be “us.”

We all usually begin by determining who is our own basic “us” by our tribe, clan, and family. Those basic, functional, and very primal alignments of “us” tend to feel “normal” to each of us. Each of those basic and fundamental alignment categories can feel very right to us and we generally all find it easy to align with those basic categories of “us.”

Those are, in fact, the first categories of “us” that we all find relevant in our lives. Those categories of us have multiple levels of benefits for us — because it is a good thing when our family and the people around us are an “us” and treat us as an “us.”

Those particular basic categories can sometimes create their own sets of problems, however, because when we define our own family as “us,” then it can be equally easy to define other families as “Them.”

That can be a bad thing, because we each tend to distrust, dislike, and even mistrust any “Them.” The basic instinctive reciprocity processes that occur in each setting from us seeing someone to be “Them” then tend to cause each “Them” in that setting to echo our reactions and to distrust, dislike, and even mistreat “us.”

That set of reciprocal interactions can create its own obviously problematic and even perverse outcomes in the settings where they are activated.

Some family feuds in some worst case settings result in people killing other people from other feuding families for generations — even centuries.

The good news for us relative to all of those interactions between local sets of us and them is that we are not limited to those definitions of us and we can expand beyond family in determining who we perceive to be “us” in any situation or setting.

We actually all have a wide variety of possible other “us” groupings that can also each feel appropriate to us. Each of the other “us” groupings that we create can also each feel right and each can structure our thoughts and our behaviors relative to other people in a setting at the time and in the places that we create and use those additional “us” groupings.

We Can Create Multiple Categories Of “Us”

The reality is that we generally have the ability to assign an instinctive sense of “us” to any grouping of people that fills the operational role of being an “us” for what we perceive to be a relevant purpose or a relevant function.

We can be Marines as an “us” or we can be priests as an “us” — and both of those categories can trigger a sense in us that we are part of an aligned and real “us.” We have the ability to create and use multiple functional categories of us that can each trigger a sense of alignment for us with the set of people who fit that functional definition.

For each category of us that we create, we tend to be both inclusive and accepting of the other people who we perceive to also fit

the definition and who we perceive to also be included in that specific category of us.

We Can Function As An “Us” At Many Levels

We can identify in a patriotic and overarching way with “us” as a nation. We can be Americans as an us. We can also be an “us” with fellow fans of the same athletic team.

We can also identify as “us” with other people who share our core beliefs. We can create an ideological us.

We can be an “us” with people who share our trade or our profession.

Union members can be an “us.” Unions tend to have a very strong, very intentional, and highly deliberate sense of being an “us” for their union members.

Professors can be an “us.” Professors of English literature can be a clearly defined subcategory of “us.”

People who define themselves as members of any particular us tend to feel an alignment with their own group for relevant issues.

People in each category and setting have the potential to define their own category of us in both narrow and broad terms. When the definitions used for a particular category of “us” are narrow, English professors, for example, can feel that other types of professors might be, for some purposes, “Them.”

Each of those definitions of “us” is relevant relative to the people who have the personal attributes that qualify for inclusion in each specific level, type and category of us.

I have seen all of those categories function with people I know to create a sense of us. I have seen many people who build major parts of their lives around their interactions and alignments with their favorite “us” and who focus significant energy on their own relative personal function and their own personal role in the context of their chosen and preferred “us.”

It Feels Right To Be In Our Categories Of “Us”

When we are in a category of us that makes us feel right, that can be a real blessing for our lives and can give us a context for our thinking and our behaviors that lets us work together and live together in mutually supportive ways.

I have found, in a wide range of settings, that I can generally personally interact with the people in almost any setting to figure out what category and definition of “us” might be aligning for that group and for that setting.

Getting a group of divergent health care specialists in a meeting setting to overlook their current us/them inter-specialty feelings and inter-specialty divisions that each person had coming into the meeting by having the group redefine itself to be “patient centered caregivers,” for example, can be transformational in getting people in a care setting to be synergistic and collaborative rather than being more feudal and functionally tribal along specialty alignments.

Connecting With “Us” Feels Natural And Normal

It was clear to me fairly early in the learning process that when we relate to an “us” of any category, it generally feels natural to connect with that “us.”

That connection with each “us” just feels normal. It is the “natural” thing to do. We don’t even make those links consciously, in many cases, because we often don’t tend to think explicitly about doing most of the things that feel normal to us.

We tend to take anything that feels normal for granted and we simply do things that feel normal as an unspoken guidance for our behaviors.

My experience has been that we very often do not recognize or know at an intellectual or consciously cognitive level that we have activated a set of “us-related” instinctive behaviors and instinct-linked thought processes in our minds for any set of people that we identify as an “us.”

We simply activate those us-linked thought processes and behaviors whenever we have a situational sense of being an “us.” The subsequent connections and the subsequent interactions we have with that “us” feel right, normal, and entirely appropriate to us.

When those sets of instincts are activated for any category of “us,” they affect the way we think about our “us” and they affect the way we think about anyone who is not our “us” relative to that “us.”

Those thought processes have a constant impact on our lives. They tend to create a significant context for the way we think about the various people in our lives and in our world.

Fans Of Soccer Teams Can Riot As An “Us”

When I first started to study those issues, I was surprised to see how wide the range of categories was that can drive a range of fairly influential us/them thought processes and behaviors. I was also surprised to see that even some relatively trivial categorizations of us and them can actually activate that very basic set of reactions and emotions and drive our thinking and our behaviors in fairly powerful ways.

Support for athletic teams, I saw, could create enough allegiance to an “us” that some people in some athletic team-related settings do extreme things out of fan loyalty. Soccer fans with those instincts activated may even riot and do very intentional damage to who ever in that setting is perceived to a “them” to their team and its fans.

I have been in several cities in both Europe and South America where friends told me not to attend a soccer game in person because I might accidentally cheer in a way that would make me a “Them” to some of the local fans.

Those unintentional behaviors on my part could, they assured me, actually cause people around me to hurt me in some way or even actually kill me if I felt to those fans to be a pure “Them.”

Soccer stadiums in multiple cities actually have chain-link fences to separate the fans of the teams that are playing there. Police with well-designed enforcement equipment keep those fans in those stadiums from crossing the intergroup lines that are created by those fences.

I do not personally scoff at those athletic-team related feelings of allegiance to athletic teams. I have a couple of teams that I personally have a fan allegiance relationship with. I understand clearly what power those alignment feelings can have for other people in some situations because I have had those particular highly instinctive impacts happen in my own head on more than one occasion.

I once barely resisted the temptation to throw a beer bottle from an open box at a very effective and insulting heckler from another team who was in my home team's stadium.

I did not throw that particular bottle — available to me as a glass bottle in a stadium setting only because I was watching the game from another CEO's private box — but I did feel a very clear and even powerful temptation in that moment to throw that bottle I was holding. I clearly envisioned its direct trajectory to that deeply annoying person's head.

That incident was, of course, a very clear us/them situation and a pure us/them response in my own head. The fan who triggered my situational anger with his taunts was wearing a Styrofoam cheese head hat out of loyalty to his own team, so I suspect the actual damage to his head from the thrown bottle would have been minimal.

Overall, as I looked at all of those sets of instinctive behaviors and at multiple levels of us/them differentiation that we use in many settings, it was clear to me that whenever and however those perceptions are activated, we each tend to act far too often in very predictable and consistent ways toward whoever is us and toward whoever is them.

Which Us/Them Categories Have Had The Biggest Impact On Our History?

Knowing those behavior patterns that result from our various us/them differentiations to be true, I spent some time looking at our history trying to figure out what sets of us and them differentiations had created the most difficulty and had set up the biggest intergroup challenges for us as a country.

It was clear to me that we have had significant levels of intergroup damage in this country that had those packages of instincts at their core. I took a look at our history to see which sets of us/them differentiation factors had the longest and largest historical impact.

I looked carefully to see if the major negative group interaction patterns that have created the most damage and had the biggest negative impact on our history as a country were created by tribe or by ethnicity or by race.

I also looked to see if our centuries of intergroup problems and negative intergroup behaviors came from affiliation with a religion, a philosophy, an ideology, or some other kind, type, or category of belief systems.

My goal for that us/them category delineation analysis approach and thought process was to zero in on the main triggers for our historic problematic behaviors so that I could figure out functional and consistent ways for us to have a positive and ameliorative impact on those specific problematic intergroup triggers for our future as a country.

In the spirit and mode of data driven and fact-driven continuous improvement methodology and in the context of a very intentional continuous improvement anchored tool kit and analytic thought process, I looked hard to see which specific and explicit differentiation factors have had the most impact on us and which differentiation factors have given us the most grief as a nation.

We have clearly discriminated as a country against our various minority groups at multiple levels. We have had a history of legal and economic discrimination that had clear linkages to race, ethnicity, and gender.

My goal was to figure out which of our categories of us and them have created the most problems for us as a country.

I sorted through our history and our current behaviors at multiple levels to figure out what those particular differentiations were that have created our biggest problems — and also created our best and most inclusive behaviors.

What I found initially surprised me — and then it made perfect sense. It was so painfully basic that it initially took my breath away —

and then it made some very basic levels of both analysis and strategy development much clearer and easier to do.

That set of basic us/them trigger factors that have created most of our key intergroup problems was so important and powerful that it deserves its own chapter.

The next chapter of this book deals directly with those factors and issues.

I wanted to figure out what particular triggers have existed in our country that have created those consistent long-standing patterns and far too consistent instances of discriminatory behavior.

Sight And Sound — At a Core Level — Help Define Us And Identify Them

I was initially surprised at what I found as the basic patterns for our most consistent discrimination when I did that search.

As I looked at our basic patterns of instinctive intergroup behaviors in this country — both current and historic — it became clear to me that we have very consistently discriminated against people who have been perceived to be “Them” by the majority group in this country

— and that the two very specific triggers we have used most consistently in our country for a couple of centuries to identify who is “us” and who is “them” is literally how we look and how we sound.

Sight and sound turned out to be the two key underlying intergroup differentiation factors that have existed for all of the main and long-standing negative patterns of negative intergroup behavior that we have as a country.

That seemed to be too simple to be true. But when I looked at all of the various issues and categories of intergroup discrimination and negative intergroup interaction that we have faced as a nation for the past couple of centuries, the evidence was pretty clear that those two, very basic, perception-based factors are, in fact, the two most significant and consistent intergroup differentiation triggers that have steered us for centuries as a nation down the problematic paths we have followed for our most important and long-standing intergroup interactions.

We have discriminated as a nation against my group that did not look like the White American majority group and that did not sound like the White American majority group.

After thinking about that very consistent discrimination pattern to figure out why it might be true, I concluded that we have followed that differentiation path between group that is created by those two triggers because sight and sound tend to tell any us at a very core and instinct-linked primal level if someone is an “us” or if someone is a “them.”

The Intergroup Discrimination Patterns Have Been **Extremely Consistent**

I looked long and hard at our history. There has been short-term discrimination against people from every group, but all the major, basic long-standing negative patterns of major intergroup prejudice and intergroup discrimination in this country have very consistently travelled that explicit two-factor perception pathway for long-term patterns of intergroup discrimination.

That particular intergroup differentiation pattern that is based on our appearance and that is based on how we sound when we speak has held true for a very long time. It was clear to me — once I saw that pattern to be true — that those specific differentiation factors shape and influence our perception patterns and our behavior patterns even today.

This nation has clearly differentiated in a negative and consistent way as a nation against anyone who looked different or sounded different than the White majority group who has held power in America for all of those years.

We are just now freeing ourselves from the grip of that specific underlying guidance and that particular group definition path for some of our key intergroup interactions as a nation today.

The basic pattern has been this. We had a majority group who set the laws of this country who has tended to discriminate in very explicit ways against anyone who did not look like that majority group and who discriminate as well against any group or any people who did not sound like that majority group.

That approach was very inclusive at one level.

People who looked like and who sounded like that particular group were accepted as an us. But people who looked different from that us were all treated in various ways as a "Them."

It was painfully clear from our history as a nation that the White majority group has very clearly and consistently discriminated against

and even oppressed any group that did not both look White and sound White.

Anyone Who Was Not “White” Faced Discrimination

That particular differentiation pattern that is based at a very core level on the people in the “us” group in this country looking alike and sounding alike has benefited some people in this country and it has clearly hurt others.

For the majority group of people in this country who have looked alike and who have sounded alike for all of those years, that approach created a clear “us.” The people included in that “us” were given clear and direct access to the American Dream and those people were given equal protection under the laws of the country.

For the people who looked different or who sounded different than that specific majority group “us,” those groups were perceived to be various types of “Them” and people from those groups were treated in various ways like “Them.” Discrimination against each type of “Them” has been a consistent and constant reality for each category of “Them.”

Laws were written that discriminated explicitly, intentionally, and directly against each set of “them.”

That pattern of discrimination against people who did not look White or who did not sound White has done damage to many people for many years because of multiple layers of negative behaviors that were done to the other groups in this country by the majority group White “us.”

“White” discrimination existed in explicit and intentional ways against any “Them” who was not White.

That seems too simple to be true — but it clearly is true. Once I perceived those patterns to exist, I could see those patterns as absolute patterns everywhere I looked.

From the perspective of data based, process improvement-linked, problem delineation, and process focused thought processes, it was clear to me that was the exact package and pattern of intergroup behavior that happened in almost all settings for groups of people in this country.

When I looked at a purely analytical level to see what the key differentiation factors were that had been the underlying issues for those centuries of negative intergroup interactions, it was clear to me that sight and sound have been two key and consistent differentiation

factors that have triggered and activated the instinctive alarm systems and thought processes for the majority group in this a country and that have kept those alarms activated for a very long time.

The White Majority Was Not Aware Of The Instinctive Origin Of Its Behaviors

White people who discriminated for all of those years have generally not been conscious or aware of the specific instincts or the basic thought processes that actually sat under those discriminatory intergroup behaviors at a foundational level.

The majority group in this country has unconsciously, but very consistently, functionally used those two basic triggers as a nation to decide who was us and who was them — and then this nation has acted accordingly.

Those two basic and primal triggers tend to operate at a thinking level and in a thought process that we generally do not even know exists. It simply feels natural to differentiate between people based on those factors. Those differentiation reactions have deep instinctive roots — and they continue to affect how we think today without us being

aware that those instincts are shaping our behaviors to the degree that our behaviors are being shaped.

Those perceptions about other people based on what people look like and on what people sound like still tend to be triggered today. They are, as a matter of course, triggered in each of us consistently and constantly.

We all — from every group of people — generally each react situationally at an instinctive level to those differentiation factors without realizing consciously what the specific factors have been that have actually caused each of us to personally and situationally differentiate between people and between groups of people.

Baby Brain Scans Differentiate By Sight And Sound

We all do that kind of differentiation based on those specific factors because that way of thinking is built into our very basic perceptual mental structures.

We tend to have subconscious alarm bells going off if people look different or sound different than us.

Those bells actually begin when children are in the crib. Brain scans of babies tell us that babies differentiate in very early months of

life when people look different or sound different than the sight and the sound that the baby is used to seeing and hearing from the baby's personal experience.

Those specific bells exist for us at that very basic perceived differentiation level because those bells have actually helped people survive in a wide range of primal settings for a very long time.

Those Alarms Have Helped People Survive

The alarm bells exist and they are triggered when people look or sound "different" than us because people historically have been at risk from damage done by "Them."

People have lived in tribal groups and in clans going back to the dawn of history. The functional reality is that the clans and the tribes in all settings have tended to be people who looked like each other. Those tribes sounded like each other and who often lived in a state of conflict with their neighbors, tribes, and clans who tended to have their own apparel, language, and differences in appearance from one another.

Each group made their own primal group their "us" and each group made every other primal group a "Them." People then supported "us" in local settings and often damaged "Them."

That set of significant consequences for being us or them is not only ancient history. Those consequences are still relevant today in many settings.

Far too many people in various settings in the world today still live literally in situations and settings where their lives could be at risk anytime those people are actually in the physical presence of “Them.”

I had to recognize that sad reality about current risk levels as I thought about this set of issues and as I felt bad that those sets of instincts had influenced us in our country in such negative ways for so many years. That set of intergroup danger issues has been around for a long time and it is very real for people in far too many settings today.

It was easy for me to see the historical and functional roots for those differentiation defining approaches and behaviors. Our own most primal ancestors faced very real life threatening risks from local “Them” groups at multiple levels in many settings.

Our ancestors who paid attention to their instincts to avoid “Them” were more likely to survive. People in those early days who ignored that instinctive avoidance of “Them” were at higher risk — and

those people are less likely to be our ancestors because it is hard to be an ancestor when you die young.

That is a useful set of instincts. It has been very good for people across the planet and back through history to know exactly who is “Them” when the “Them” group in a setting actually are our very real enemies and when “Them” wants to do evil things to us.

It is particularly useful to know who the enemy is in a setting when that enemy in that “Them” category actually wants you damaged or wants you to be dead.

We Bond With — And Look Like — Our Most Primal “Us”

We all tend to be functionally safer when the people around us are an “us.” That is true for many categories of “us” and it has been particularly true for our most primal categories of “us.”

Those primal and most basic categories of “us” tend to anchor and define our set of appearance based learned perceptions and our core interpersonal interaction thought processes.

At a very basic level, our family tends to be the most primal group for all of us. Family is the most primal alignment level for most people ...

and we all tend to be safer and more likely to be both protected and nurtured when the people around us are our own biological family.

For obvious and clearly biological reasons, the functional reality we all face is that our own particular family primal group almost always looks like “us” and our own personal family group also generally sounds like “us.”

We each tend to identify the other people in our primal us at a core and almost immediate perceptual level by sight and by sound because people from our most primal group for each of us almost always does sound and look like us.

Our thought processes and our emotional responses tend to be affected at both conscious and subconscious levels by that particular perception of us and them — once we have perceived that sense of difference between an us and a them to exist in any setting.

If feels good to be surrounded by “us.”

At a fundamental and basic instinctive level, we each tend to feel some comfort and we each tend to have a sense of relative safety when we literally can see and hear us all around us. We each tend to feel concern at an equally instinctive level when the way that other people

who are around us either look or sound tells us that we are functionally currently surrounded by “Them.”

Detecting “Them” Can Help Us Survive Even Today

In another chapter of this book, I tell the story of personally having those sets of instincts activated in ways that set off major alarm bells for me personally at a deeply instinct-linked level in both Jamaica and Uganda.

I had a sense of pure instinctive intergroup panic that was triggered in my head in specific us/them perception situations that happened in those settings that temporarily paralyzed, panicked, and incapacitated me twice, even though the truth was that my life was actually not at risk in any way in either setting.

After having those two personal panic attacks, I will never again underestimate the negative impact we can each feel at a very basic instinctive level when it feels to us that everyone around us is a “Them.” In my case, there was no real and functional threat in either setting, but my own sense of being surrounded by “Them” literally incapacitated me both times.

In any case, we sadly need to honestly recognize the fact that it is not inaccurate to say that the instinctive concern we often feel about being surrounded by “Them” is, in fact, sometimes functionally relevant and it is entirely legitimate for large numbers of people in various settings today to beware of “Them” for at least some of the time.

“Them” in today’s world — and in our own settings and communities — can be dangerous and even evil. We have clearly not eliminated evil and or eliminated damaging intergroup behaviors from the modern world.

People Are Being Killed Today For Being “Them”

Some people who I have talked to about those sets of issues have told me that they believe that those kinds of primal instinctive reactions to other groups of people are not relevant or needed in modern times.

Those people are wrong.

There are groups of people in the Middle East and in Northern Africa today, as I write this page of this book, who are killing entire groups of other people just for being “them.” People are being killed, captured, and even enslaved in a number of settings because those people are a category of “Them.”

Those behaviors in those settings by those people in those situations could not be more primal — and those kinds of evil primal intergroup behaviors are clearly not limited to the Middle East and Northern Africa.

I have looked everywhere to see how relevant those instinctive behaviors still are. Myanmar and The Dominican Republic are expelling people today based entirely on their ethnicity. Multiple groups in Asia, Indonesia, Sri Lanka, and Africa are killing other groups of people and are killing those people from other groups today as I write this page.

We clearly have not achieved a world of intergroup Peace and intergroup harmony where those kinds of internal instinctive warning signals are functionally irrelevant to people across the planet.

Knowing who is “Them” in a setting is still extremely relevant for large numbers of people in the world today — and we all can easily see that the knowledge about who is “them” has been important for people as far back in history as we have interacted as groups of people in any setting with other groups of people.

We Have Some Neighborhoods Where Those
Differentiations Matter For Reasons Of Personal Safety

It is often very important in many settings around the world for people in those settings to know who in their setting is us and to also know who in their setting is them.

In our own country, to be honest with ourselves, we also have a number of neighborhoods in various cities today where those particular differentiation factors can also affect people's personal safety and even survival.

People from various groups can be at risk in some of our cities at least some of the time if people go into the "wrong" neighborhoods for their group.

I have had that experience myself. When the most recent riots happened in Oakland, California, where I worked at that time, there were a couple of days where we shut down our business operations and we had people stay home.

The security team I had working with me at that time made it very clear to me with a high level of energy that I personally needed to stay out of the intergroup danger zone for that riot.

My own personal very positive belief system about enlightened and mutually beneficial intergroup issues and my own strong belief

about the need for us all to win and for us all to be at Peace with each other in every setting would not have been as relevant to the people who were rioting in those particular streets at that particular moment in time as my appearance and the way I sound.

The way I look was directly relevant to me at a very primal level in that moment because my appearance could have placed me in harms way for at least part of those days of troubled circumstances in downtown Oakland had I gone out on some of those wrong streets at the wrong point in time.

I resisted the temptation to test the risk level out at a personal level because the upside benefit of not being damaged did not come close to offsetting the downside risk of being damaged in that setting and situation.

There are major areas of Chicago, Detroit, Los Angeles, and Richmond where gang dominance over particular neighborhoods makes it unsafe for people from other groups to be alone and on foot in those settings.

Sight And Sound Can Trigger Us And Them Instincts

Sight is not the only perceptual trigger that tells people whether another person is an “us” or a “Them.” The way people sound can also get people categorized in some settings and situations as a “Them.”

Sight, alone, is not always sufficient as a group differentiation trigger because sometimes the “Them” in a relevant and dangerous intergroup setting actually looks just like “us.”

But the reality often is that the relevant “Them” in many intergroup settings actually has a high likelihood of not sounding like us.

Individual groups in each setting each tend to sound like themselves. Groups tend to have their own dialect or their own language — and the way people sound can tell other people what group a person is part of. In most purely tribal settings, the relevant groups of people each tend to have either their own separate group language or their own version or dialect of a shared language.

We Have A Remarkable Ability To Discern Differences In Sound

That set of language differences by group is important to help us detect “Them” — because even when people in a setting might look very much like “us,” they might not actually be us. People from another tribe

can easily be a “Them” who is motivated in various ways to do damage to “us.” In the real world, we can often discern those differences in groups for each relevant person with a high level of accuracy by listening to how each person sounds when they speak.

If the people we are talking to seems to have a different language or even just a different dialect than ours, the truth is that our ears are actually extremely good at hearing even minor differences in accents or in dialects.

We clearly each have those specific instinctive sound differentiation abilities for language differentiation built into our mental tool kit at a very pure and powerful level for very good reasons. Those very effective sensory distinctions have also been embedded in our consciousness and in our subconscious mind as a basic survival tool because they give us information that can improve our chances of survival.

As I mentioned earlier, we do actually do know now from new electronic scanning technology that babies only a month old have different brain waves when people next to them either look different or sound different. That discernment process based on how we sound

starts young and it lasts a lifetime. We continue to have a reaction to people who look or sound different than our “us” for our entire adult lives.

We don’t tend to think explicitly about those particular factors or those explicit trigger issues when we make our intergroup differentiation diagnosis.

It simply seems “natural” to us to make those distinctions and to have those sets of feelings about the people who trigger those specific perceptions.

We fall into categories of reacting to other people in ways that seem right to us because those behaviors fit our working sense of what is normal for us and what is normal for them in each setting.

America Has Discriminated Based On Sight And Sound

Our history as a nation has clearly been influenced and shaped to a significant degree by those perception issues and by their links to our instinctive thought processes, emotions, and behaviors.

The majority group in this country has discriminated explicitly for all of our history against anyone who did not look like the majority group “us” or sound like the majority group “us.”

The “us” that created those basic discrimination rules and practices for our country for the last couple of centuries have been White Americans who spoke the American version of English. That particular set of people looked White and they sounded White.

That set of people with those specific characteristics became the “White American Us.” That set of people with those particular characteristics made up the majority group for this country for a few hundred years.

It continues to be the majority group today, although the degree of relative majority status for that group is shrinking fairly quickly.

The Majority Group Discriminated Based On Sight And Sound

The historical reality that we all need to understand and remember is that we have discriminated massively and we have discriminated very consistently as a country against everyone who did not fit that particular definition of “us.”

That consistency in discriminatory behavior is painfully obvious. Discrimination has happened at some levels to all groups who fit perceptual categories that trigger a sense of “Them.”

Sight and sound have been the triggers and the key difference factors for those overarching patterns of negative intergroup behaviors. Groups who did not look White or who did not sound White have faced discrimination from the people who were White from the earliest days when the first people who looked White invaded those continents.

We have created a wide range of excuses, explanations, and rationales for that discrimination — but at a very basic level, we made up those excuses to give us intellectual justification for what was actually a purely instinctive and very primal behavior pattern based on group perceptions.

It Felt Right To Discriminate Against “Them”

People in the majority group in this country have felt right in creating both laws and expectations that had those distinctions and those group differentiations at their core because those specific intergroup behavior patterns have been rooted directly in the instinctive sense of us and them that all people have as a core package of instinctive behaviors.

Each law that discriminated against “Them” felt right to the group that perceived itself to be “us.” Banning Asian Americans from buying

homes in parts of California felt right to the majority White “us” in those cities because group ethics and basic morality standards only apply at an instinct-supported level to our “us.”

Discriminating against Hispanics in Tucson and San Diego felt right to the White majority “us” because the people who were discriminated against in those settings felt to the White majority group to be a “Them” who needed to be constrained in some way and not supported or empowered in any way in that setting.

It is sobering and more than a little discouraging to discover that all of those patterns of negative behavior have hinged on those two, too basic, perceptual triggers. We acted for centuries based on those triggers without recognizing or understanding their function and their direct linkage to our instinctive thought processes, behaviors, emotions, and beliefs.

We allowed our instincts to sculpt our behaviors and we set up our cultures to support the behaviors that were triggered and sculpted by those instincts. That powerful process was intellectually invisible to us — so our intellects were under the invisible but powerful influence and direction of our cultures and our instincts rather than giving us

tools to use to act in more enlightened ways that were based on values and not just instinctive reactions.

We can choose that set of processes. We can now choose to recognize those triggers for what they are — and we can choose to set those triggers aside and replace our sense of who is us and who is them using other triggers and other group delineation factors that are much more inclusive and far more enlightened.

Knowledge is power. This is clearly an area where our knowledge can give us far better thought processes and behaviors.

Now that we know that the discrimination was based on sight and sound — and now that we know that we can create other categories of “us” that overpower and neutralize the differentiation behaviors that stem from those basic perception factors — there is no excuse for us not to overpower those factors today in favor of an entirely new and more positive definition of “us.”

That gives us a wonderful set of opportunities going forward. We need to link those opportunities with the various triggers that can cause people in any setting to come together and create a sense of “us.”

Six basic alignment triggers that can help us do that work are described in the next chapter of this book.

Chapter Seven — Six Basic Alignment Triggers Can Get People To Form Groups In Almost Any Setting

When people in any setting are internally divided — aligned in various ways as separate groups of people inside the setting — it can be very difficult to get people in that setting to work together in cooperative and collaborative ways as a group.

When people in any setting are internally divided, it can be extremely difficult to have that setting function with a high degree of interpersonal and intergroup trust.

Division contains the seeds of dysfunctionality in communities, schools, organizations, or work places.

In very clear contrast to being divided — when people in any setting have a sense of being a working and aligned group for that setting, then it is much easier in that setting to achieve collective goals and shared objectives — and it is much easier to achieve a sense of internal Peace and harmony for that setting.

We are much more likely to achieve Peace in any setting when the people in that setting have a sense of being, at some relevant and functioning level, an “Us.”

So creating a sense of “us” is a good thing to do if your goal in any setting is to achieve Peace. That can usually be done.

We actually have the ability to create multiple definitions of “us” that can each have the ability to generate the benefits of being “us” in a wide variety of settings. So our challenge and our opportunity in each setting is often to figure out how to incent and trigger people to create and form a functioning and effective level of us — a kind of internal alignment — for that setting.

Figuring out how to achieve those goals of triggering a sense of group alignment in various settings was one of my first major challenges that I took on as an analyst, strategist, and author when I began looking at our various intergroup issues, processes, and realities.

It turned out to be possible to achieve that sense of alignment a very high percentage of the time. There are six basic triggers that we can use to do that work of creating alignment that work well in a very wide range of settings.

Those tools anchor *The Art of InterGroup Peace* as a key set of field-tested strategies and approaches that can create the foundation for intergroup Peace in any setting where they are used.

I have personally used those tools in multiple settings and I have used them many times. I have used them to run companies, to chair trade associations, boards and commissions, to create coalitions, to build cultures, and to support public health and public policy agendas — and those basic alignment triggers have been useful to me in every setting.

I Began In Sun Tzu's Debt

Those tools are useful in business settings and they also can be used to deal with intergroup issues in larger community settings.

We need to use those tools in any setting — large or small — where we want people to feel a sense of alignment as a group. They can be used at a worksite, a school, or a community setting to create a functional sense of group bonding and alignment in that setting.

Our thought processes are very similar in all of our intergroup and interpersonal settings. Certain factors drive us apart — and those factors should generally be avoided.

Other factors can bring us together — and those factors should be used very directly to create alignment that help us achieve our collective goals.

We need to have a clear working understanding of the key functions that can trigger alignment and can bring us together and we need to use those factors to create situational alignment everywhere that alignment is needed.

Six of those trigger points are described below.

I now have that set of functional alignment trigger tools in my tool kit and I use it all the time. The tools that I have created in the process have actually been very useful to me in a wide array of settings. Those alignment triggers have been well tested. I have used them to get many people in a wide range of settings aligned.

Those tools anchor the key strategies for *The Art of InterGroup Peace*.

Sun Tzu Pointed To The Unifying Impact Of Danger

As I started looking to figure out what tools might be useful to do that work, I had an inspiration from a very old service. Sun Tzu, in the book *The Art of War*, pointed me very clearly to one very effective and easy to activate alignment trigger — shared danger. He explained that danger could create unity.

Sun Tzu wrote that “When the Men of Wu and the Men of Yueh — enemies to each other — find themselves on a sinking boat, they would abandon their hatred and they would come together to save the ship.”

I began my thinking on those sets of triggers that can bring people together in Sun Tzu’s debt.

Sun Tzu, in *The Art of War* wrote that shared danger could be a sufficient trigger and catalyst to bring different groups together, even when they had been opposed to each other and actually may have been enemies before their shared danger became relevant to them.

I could see from my own life and from my own experience in work settings and in the communities where I lived that Sun Tzu was right. Danger unites people. Sun Tzu said that when enemies were together on a sinking ship, they would unite to save the ship.

I could see that when there are floods or fires, entire communities come together to fight the floods or fires — and it was clear that people set aside prior intergroup differences to collectively respond to the danger created by the flood or fire.

I could see that when people were convinced that a danger existed, those people could be aligned if it was clear to the people that alignment could, in fact, help mitigate or reduce the danger.

With that basic belief and concept in mind, I started to build my working list of alignment triggers using that exact same trigger — danger — as the anchor trigger for the list.

Maslow's Hierarchy Of Needs Was Equally Inspirational

I was also very directly inspired in the process of building my list of alignment triggers by Dr. Abraham Maslow's famous "Hierarchy of Needs" work. I loved his way of thinking about personal priorities.

Dr. Maslow offered us brilliant insight into the factors that can motivate each of us personally at different stages and different circumstances for our lives.

Dr. Maslow built a very workable list of influence factors that had six motivation triggers included in it. Dr. Maslow identified how each factor on his list worked.

He also identified the relative power and the relative impact of each trigger. He used a pyramid format to display his sets of "needs" — with the most powerful need at the bottom of his pyramid.

In putting together my own list of group alignment trigger, I borrowed shamelessly from Dr. Maslow's insight and approach.

I also used a similar pyramid based graphic visualization tool for my instinctive group alignment triggers. I very intentionally built my own alignment trigger pyramid to look like his pyramid.

Instead of building a Hierarchy of Needs pyramid, I put together a Group Hierarchy of Alignment Triggers pyramid.

We both put danger at the base of our pyramid.

Danger Is At The Base Of Both Pyramids

Dr. Maslow put danger at the base of his pyramid as a highly powerful motivator and said that danger tends to be the single most powerful personal motivator when it is functionally relevant in a person's life.

Danger also anchors the group alignment trigger pyramid. Danger is also, I believe, a very powerful motivation factor for groups of people and creates clear patterns of collective behavior when it is activated.

I know from both observation and personal experience that a sense of danger could — as Sun Tzu said — bring people together to work toward a common goal.

Dr. Maslow knew that when people feel a sense of danger, that sense can be the highest priority decision-making factor for a person. He made it clear that responding to that particular motivator can become the primary need for the person who feels a sense of danger.

Dr. Maslow capped his pyramid with a goal of self-actualization — or personal fulfillment. He believed that people who don't have competing, conflicting, or offsetting priorities on any of the other motivation levels will take on behaviors and will create personal activity priorities and behaviors that can lead to personal fulfillment.

Like Dr. Maslow, I also put a group and individual actualization goal at the top of the alignment trigger pyramid. I also used mission or vision as the sixth level alignment motivation factor.

For the group alignment pyramid, I put the goal and the motivational trigger of mission or vision at the pyramid peak.

I knew from experience and from observation in multiple settings that groups could be brought together and groups could be aligned

using the trigger and the motivation of a shared mission or a common vision.

As a person who managed companies for a living, I knew when I started to build that list that it can be extremely useful to have the people in any organization have a clear sense of mission and a clear vision both for where the organization is going and for what the organization should be doing.

So the two pyramids have similarities.

Both pyramids have a foundation level base-line motivator of perceived danger and both pyramids have a peak top-level motivator of perceived mission or actualization.

Danger Can Trump Mission For Individuals — But Mission Can Trump Danger For Groups

In Dr. Maslow's pyramid, danger can — and usually does — overpower a sense of mission. Survival, in his paradigm, very consistently trumps vision. He believed that if you discover at a personal level that you are drowning, you will stop writing a poem and you will focus on not drowning.

In my own group alignment trigger pyramid building process, I saw that survival issues and a clear sense of danger could actually be the top priority for some people and can trump mission. I knew that a sense of personal danger could trump and overpower many people's sense of group purpose and mission — just like the process embedded in Dr. Maslow's hierarchy. But it was also clear to me that there are people in the world whose sense of mission can and does overpower and trump their sense of danger.

As I looked at the overall alignment trigger pyramid from a broader perspective, I ultimately began to understand that the mission/vision motivator for some people in some tribal, political, ideological, or religious settings could actually overpower and overcome a sense of danger.

I saw that the vision or belief system for many people could continue to be the main motivator for those people's behavior even in the face of very real threats and very real danger.

The two pyramids do not parallel each other beyond that point. I identified four other motivation factors that obviously bring people together in alignment with each other when the people share a sense of

the trigger being personally relevant to them as both individuals and members of groups.

It became clear to me that there are four other very commonly used motivators — including shared gain, a common identity, resisting a common enemy, and various levels of team collective behaviors — that can cause people to be motivated, guided, and triggered into clearly aligned behavior.

Each of those triggers can cause people in a setting to work together. Each of those six triggers can cause people to have a sense of shared status as an aligned group when the triggers are relevant and when they are perceived to be true.

I built the pyramid, shown below, based on that full set of six triggers.

[future — show pyramid here]

The Alignment Pyramid Is Useful In Multiple Settings

I started to actually use that basic six-factor alignment motivation trigger pyramid as a very intentional tool kit for bringing people together in various settings as a group back in the early 1990's.

I used the pyramid to guide my own strategic and tactical thinking relative to bringing people together and getting people aligned in both my work places and in the various associations and community groups that I chaired or steered.

The formal work organization that I led back in the 1990s had multiple layers. We had dozens of care sites, multiple sets of caregivers, several unions, and a wide range of professional groups and work teams who all benefited from being aligned.

The entire alignment trigger pyramid turned out to be very functionally relevant to that organization — beginning with danger.

When I wanted to bring people in my own work settings and in various industry trade association settings together, I knew that triggering a sense of collective danger would be a useful thing to do. Creating a sense of collective danger and risk can be a very powerful group alignment motivation trigger.

Our personal survival instincts can actually be a part of the instinct package that is activated when danger is relevant to any setting or situation.

I also tended to create a sense in each of those settings that there was a common enemy that needed to be responded to in an aligned way. Having a common enemy is a great alignment trigger. There is a reason why the phrase — “The enemy of my enemy is my friend” — has survived for so long. It survives because it is often true.

The common enemy trigger needs to be believed by the people in a setting to be real — but the danger from that enemy doesn’t need to be immediate for the trigger to work.

I have actually used the common enemy motivator a number of times to help bring people together. In a work setting, the common enemy can be the competitors who want to steal our patients or take our customers away.

I have used the names of CEO’s from competing organizations to personify our common enemy and I have said things to our people like — “Harold wants to steal our patients. He wants to weaken us as an organization. We need to perform at such a high level that Harold cannot defeat us and Harold cannot steal what is ours.”

When that threat from Harold is perceived to be real, the common enemy trigger can help people inside the organization who have their

own internal division points in place set their own prior internal division points aside in favor of a common internal effort to defeat Harold.

I know that strategy can work because I have used it and it did, in fact, work.

People Need To Perceive Triggers To Be Real

One of the things that I learned early in the process about each of the alignment triggers is that each of the six triggers works best when people both understand the trigger to be real and believe it to be real at a significant level.

Theoretical, rhetorical, or hypothetical threats are significantly less motivating and significantly less effective for triggering danger-based group alignment responses than real and valid threats.

Too many leaders invoke dangers for groups or promise collective gains for groups that are not believed or not perceived by group members to be both real and true.

When that lack of belief about a motivation trigger happens, the credibility of the leader can be undermined and cynicism can result.

Cynicism is not a good building block for high performance in any group or organizational setting.

Team Instincts Can Be Very Powerful

As I looked for other factors that I could use to create alignment, it was also clear to me very early in the process that we have very strong instincts to build and participate in teams. Our team instinct can be highly motivating for people when people are actually on a team.

People on teams tend to overlook multiple prior levels of differences in order to function as team members in the interest of the team.

Teams create their own loyalty and their own internal energy. Getting people to function on a team can get people who were not aligned before the team formation to have a very strong team alignment.

I did a lot of functional experimenting over those early years with the formation, structure, and use of teams. I learned that just calling people a team did not trigger team instincts.

Writing memos that said — “We are a team” — did not, I learned, tend to cause people to believe we are a team and did not cause people to act in any team ways.

Over time, after extensive experimentation, I put together a set of working guidelines for how to get people to function as a team with their team instincts fully activated.

Teams Need Identity, Purpose, And Leadership

For people to function as a team, I learned that it is a very good thing to have a clear team identity.

You also need the team to have a purpose and a defined set of members. People need to know who is on the team.

People in a team very much need to have something team-like to do in order to get team energies flowing.

Defeating another team is one of the easiest to invoke motivators to trigger team instincts. Accomplishing a specific targeted task is another easy team level motivator. The actual team task to be done needs to be clear to the team members in order to achieve its maximum alignment function and to have a meaningful motivation impact on the team thought processes and belief systems.

Team identity is a very useful tool. Team names help. “We are the Apex team” gives people a label to use to create context for their efforts.

Both Hunter Teams And Gatherer Teams Need Leaders

Teams need leaders. There are two basic kinds of team leaders, I discovered. Each type of leader has its role and use.

I figured out very early in the process of studying instincts for group activities that we have instincts to function as hunters and we have instincts to function as gatherers. Both hunter instincts and gatherer instincts can be very relevant to getting things done in any community or work setting.

Those sets of instincts are both explained in more detail in the *Primal Pathways* book. The processes of hunting and gathering are different in many ways, but I learned as I looked at those issues, it is clear that we use teams and we use leaders for both processes.

The team leaders for the hunter/war party processes tend to be directive, alpha leaders who have clear command authority and clear control roles on their team. Captains of one kind or another can fill that role for that hunter/warrior model.

We have team captains, ship captains, and various unit captains for our highly task focused hunter-model work teams.

Killing a deer or killing an elephant, in primal days, often involved a hunt leader who made the key decisions for the hunt and who functioned as the captain of the hunt.

For the gatherer teams, by contrast, the management style that works best and that has the highest level of success is for the leader to be much more collaborative and inclusive.

Gatherer teams tend to work together to figure out what needs to be done and who needs to do it. Gatherer teams do collective work and team members tend to reinforce each other in their work — with a leader who facilitates, guides, and even structures the process, but who is not the explicit chain of command captain and Alpha decision maker for each step and part of the process.

Our \$4 Billion Project Had A Gatherer Leader

I have seen in my work place operational settings that both styles work well for specific functions. When I put an electronic medical record system in place that was a complex \$4 billion project involving literally thousands of people and including hundreds of separate care sites, I had that project led by a woman who was the master of a collaborative approach to leading.

She began her leadership role for that huge project by assembling more than 100 of our senior medical leaders from across the country to do what the group called “A Collaborative Build.”

That collaborative build process actually cost many millions of dollars.

Some people were critical of that particular cost. But that collaborative build process was invaluable for both getting the input and the wisdom from all of those very intelligent leaders, and for figuring out what the key steps of that incredibly complex and massive process actually needed to be.

I do believe and know there are many times when we are much smarter collectively than we are individually smart. That was true in this case.

There Were Teams At Every Rollout Site

That whole relevant rollout process for that massive system was anchored in teams. There were clear teams at every care site. There were teams at every work site. They each had their identity, knew their role, and they each had a clear sense of what they needed to do to win as a team to achieve their rollout goals.

All of those teams won. It was a massive project. The biggest systems project ever done anywhere in the world for any non-government entity was completed on schedule and it was done within very close range of its targeted budget.

The system, itself, has been a major functional success and it has provided extremely good care support tools for the caregivers that it serves.

That extreme usefulness and the functional high impact of the final system is also due in part to the collaborative process that was used to tee it up and to then make it happen.

A Hunter Leadership Style Could Have Crashed The Project

If that whole process and that massive system rollout had been done by a hunter/warrior leader — using commands from on high to tell people in each and every care site what to do to implement the system — I believe that project would have crashed and failed.

The Government of Great Britain actually tried to do a very similar care support computer system project at that same time. They used the hunter-model chain of command central control model for their version

of the medical record system rather than using the collaborative team based rollout model that we used.

Their project spent twice as much money as we spent and their effort did crash and burn. They spent nearly 10 billion pounds on that project by the time they were done. They wrote most of it off. It was sad to see.

We had advised them to use our more collaborative up-front process, but there were some key people leading that effort who felt more comfortable telling people what to do rather than getting people's help in figuring out what needed to be done.

Their leaders needed to be obeyed rather than followed. That was a very expensive need.

Unit Based Teams At Care Sites Also Improved

Performance And Morale

As part of our extensive and clear commitment to teams, we also created multiple unit-based teams for almost all of our care sites. We had people in each site working as teams to collectively improve service and improve care quality.

The unit-based teams in each care site focused their team efforts on a “value compass” that was explicitly and deliberately built into our labor union partnership contracts. The value compass and its core goals set a clear context for the unit teams.

The unit-based teams we put in place across a wide range of settings had both higher care quality and higher staff morale scores than the units that were not functioning explicitly as teams.

Over 100,000 front-line workers were included in those unit-based teams on the day I retired from that particular CEO job. Their success levels set standards for both care delivery and patient service.

I knew from direct personal experience in multiple sites and settings that teams can do excellent work — and I knew from that same experience base and I knew from direct observation in many other relevant settings that people on teams tend to feel good about being on teams — particularly when they succeed as teams.

Those efforts to function as teams for care delivery were also explained in more detail in the *Primal Pathways* book and in the *KP Inside* book that I wrote a couple of years ago.

In any case — as I was putting together my list of group alignment triggers back in the early 1990s, I put team instincts at the third rung of the pyramid because team instincts can obviously bring people together in ways that cause other differences to be set aside in favor of alignment in any setting.

Team instincts are also on my useful tool list from an executive perspective because the team model can create great performance outcomes in work settings when it is well done and when it is focused on the right issues and the right processes.

People Like To Be “Us”

The next step on the alignment trigger pyramid is to create a sense of “us.”

Getting people aligned is also clearly easier, I learned very early, when people in any setting have a reason to perceive the group they are in to be an “us.” This book has discussed those issues of being an “us” at length.

As I worked on the initial drafts of the alignment trigger pyramid, it was obvious that one of the key triggers at the heart of the pyramid

needed to be to create a sense of “us” for the people we want to be aligned in any setting.

I knew from experience that when people have a sense of being “us,” people tend to be supportive, cooperative, trusting, ethical, and to have a sense that their “us” is on their side in key ways.

I knew from both experience and observation that organizations with that level of internal identity and internal alignment as an “us” are much more likely to perform well. I have found that to be particularly true in health care settings, but I have seen it to be true in a number of other settings as well.

The good news about creating a sense of “us” in any setting is that we have very flexible and positive instinctive reactions relative to seeing ourselves and perceiving ourselves to be an “us.” We tend to react in positive ways for almost every category of us. That is very useful, because there are actually many ways to be an “us.” We can be an “us” based on our family, clan, tribe, culture, ethnic group, race, nation, belief system, or religion.

We functionally invent many categories of us in various settings. When any of those categories of “us” have relevance to people’s lives,

they can trigger the right set of positive instincts for the people who feel that sense of “us.”

Labor unions can create a sense of “us.” Being the citizens of a city can trigger a sense of “us.” Religions can create a sense of “us.” Being fans of the same athletic team can even trigger a sense of “us.”

As individual people, we tend to feel comfort and even safety in any setting where we have a perceived reason to feel that we are part of an “us.” It feels good to be an “us.”

I have discovered that we can trigger, activate, and support us-related behaviors and us-related roles in any context where people feel like an “us.”

These can be very good roles to invoke. Academic settings can create a sense of “us.” Professional certification often creates a sense of “us” for the people who receive the certification.

Academic settings can also create bitter us/them wars when people in the setting perceive other people to be a “Them.”

We need to avoid having people in any setting to be perceived as “Them.”

The key to remember is that alignment as an “us” causes people who feel that alignment to act in positive ways relative to other people who share that alignment. Acting in positive ways with other people is a very useful function of that perception... and it is good to know what triggers exist to create that perception.

The right sets of instincts and instinctive thought processes, behaviors, and emotions are triggered whenever we perceive that the group we are in functions in a meaningful way as an “us” and when we believe the group allows us to safely activate our “us” related instincts.

We Are The People Of Kaiser Permanente

A major goal for me in each of my own leadership settings has been to very explicitly generate a sense of “us” for each setting.

Both Health Partners and Kaiser Permanente are direct care systems with related health plan based revenue streams. HP has roughly 10,000 employees and KP has nearly 200,000 employees. Most employees in both settings deliver care.

Both settings have multiple professional groups, multiple unions, and multiple geographic and site related internal alignments. Each of those internal subgroupings in each of those organizations has the clear

potential to split-off and to create its own separate sense of “us” for that portion of the group.

When internal groups split off in any setting and became their own separate “us,” it significantly creates a very real and negative risk that the divided “us” will identify someone else in their setting to be “Them.”

It can operationally be dangerous, damaging, and very dysfunctional when people in any setting have an internal perception that someone else in that setting is actually a “them.”

Behaviors relative to a “Them” in any setting can be dysfunctional, dangerous, and ugly. I have learned from several painful experiences and from close observations in multiple other settings that it is very important to work very hard to avoid having any internal people in the settings we are part of to be perceived as “Them.”

I saw some extremely dysfunctional post-merger behaviors in my first major employer that caused damage to both people and to organizational performance.

In each setting where I have been the CEO, I have spent time helping create a sense that we were us.

I called us “The People of Kaiser Permanente” or “The People of Health Partners. I spent time communicating to our staff that the fact we were an “us” in each setting meant that we had shared values, shared beliefs, and a common reason to support one another in achieving our shared and collective mission of serving our patients.

The book *KP Inside* is a book of letters that I wrote to all 200,000 of our KP caregivers and staff members every single week for five years. Those letters were written in part to help create a sense of who we are as the People of Kaiser Permanente.

If you read that book, you can see easily what I was trying to do with those communications. Those letters explained clearly to our people why it was a very good thing for us to be that “us” in that setting.

Trade Associations Can Also Become “Us”

I have also used that same set of triggers in my various roles as trade association chair, commission chair, coalition chair, and task force organizer or chair.

I have chaired multiple kinds of organizations. One of the things I have done in each of those multi-group, multi-organizational settings was to work very intentionally to create a sense of “us” for that group.

In leading a couple of trade associations, I spent time in a very direct way creating a sense that even though we were all competitors at one level, when we were all inside of our trade association and when we were functioning together in our trade association context, we needed to be an “us” — focused on the issues we had in common and not on our differences.

As chair of half a dozen health care improvement organizations and coalitions, I have used similar messages calling for us to function as an “us” in the context of each organizations mission.

I have often used the common enemy alignment trigger and the danger alignment trigger to get people in each of the trade association to function in an aligned way — rather than being competitors at war with one another.

Those triggers have all worked fairly well in each of those settings. I learned from multiple experiences that it is impossible to be too simplistic or too clear in making those points in those kinds of settings.

So creating a sense of “us” is high on the group alignment trigger pyramid and I have used it with some success in a wide range of settings.

I know from seeing other organizations sad and damaging experiences that if you can’t create an overall sense of “us” for all people in some of those settings, then the normal alignments that people will feel to other definitions of “us” can create very dysfunctional and even damaging behaviors inside those settings.

Common Gain Is Also Unifying

The trigger level that is one step higher than creating a sense of us on the alignment pyramid is to have a common sense of gain — to have a sense that we will all do well in some important way if we all work together in an aligned way.

People, I found, will work together if there is a sense and a belief that everyone will benefit in some real way by working together.

There are intangible benefits that can motivate people, and there are tangible collective gains that can motivate people.

Money, in some form, often works to trigger the common gain alignment motivation.

If people in a setting believe they will benefit financially from being aligned in either the short term or the long term, then alignment is likely to happen in those settings.

Other collective benefits can also bring people together. Having a safe and good place to live can create a sense of alignment. Having a safe and good retirement plan can trigger a sense of alignment.

When looking for motivation tools that can create alignment, looking for things that people want and linking those things that people want to alignment can be a successful approach for triggering alignment.

On some early versions of the pyramid, I labeled that particular trigger “gain/greed.”

The point of that particular trigger is that we can trigger alignment in some settings if people perceive and believe that they will directly benefit from the alignment. If we have a sense that we will all gain financially from being aligned, then being aligned can be a good thing to do.

Inside organizations, there are multiple ways of creating a sense of common gain. *The Art of InterGroup Peace* book explains some of those strategies in more detail.

Mission And Vision Top The Pyramid

The top level on the alignment trigger pyramid is mission and vision. It was clear to me very early that we can often get people and groups of people into alignment by persuading people to work together to achieve a shared mission and a shared vision.

A clear and compelling mission can bring some people together who can't be brought into alignment with any other motivation triggers.

I have used that very explicit group vision and mission approach with each of the health care organizations that I have led with some success. People in health care can become aligned with significant success around the goals of delivering great care or around the mission of meeting patients' care needs particularly well.

People in care-related professions have a natural leaning toward service-related shared missions — and a clear sense of vision and mission in those areas can often be aligning and motivating for the people in those settings.

We focused on continuously improving, data supported, patient-focused team care at Kaiser Permanente and our caregivers aligned with continuous improvement as both a commitment and a skill set that was focused on delivering top quality care.

That particular alignment motivation level is most likely to work well when it is aligned in various ways with other levels of the pyramid.

If we feel that our mission also helps us defeat a common enemy and if we believe our mission helps us function safely as an “us,” and if we feel that our mission can cause us or our group to prosper — than the pyramid is even more useful as a package rather than just having people whose alignment is triggered by any of the individual pieces.

Hitler Used The Whole Pyramid

As I was building the alignment pyramid and testing its use, I looked directly for historical support and evidence for those specific factors. I was both horrified and reinforced to figure out that Adolf Hitler actually used all of the steps on that pyramid to gain and keep power in Germany. He used every trigger very explicitly and he used every trigger very well.

He started with danger. Adolf Hitler invoked a clear sense of the danger that was faced by the German people.

He clearly utilized the common enemy approach — directing group hatred against the Jews of Germany in a very concentrated way.

He also invoked team instincts with team members, team displays, and defined groups like the Gestapo who had both a team mission and a team identity.

He worked hard to create a sense of “us” for Germany. He invented an Aryan Race to invest his “us” identity in — and he called his “us” the master race. For many Germans, being the “master race” was a particularly seductive definition of “us.”

He also triggered the group gain/group greed motivation level by promising the Germans that they would own and rule the world.

His mission/vision piece was also very explicit. He wrote *Mein Kampf* and he did an extensive series of speeches and put in place multiple other communication efforts that extended and promoted the mission and the vision of being a Nazi.

That book and those lectures, speeches, and propaganda campaigns about mission and vision would have had much less impact

on the German people, however, if he had not also skillfully triggered, linked, and coordinated all of the other five explicit steps on the alignment pyramid.

The Pyramid Can Be Used For Good Or Evil

The Group Alignment Trigger Pyramid — like all of our instinct-related behaviors — can be used for good or it can be used for evil. It can be used for war or it can be used for Peace.

It is a powerful tool. When I realized how powerful that tool kit was and when I realized that evil people could use those triggers to do evil things, then I had to stop the writing process to think through whether or not to share that alignment triggering tool kit with the world.

I did not want to make evil people better at being evil. That can easily happen. A couple of people who read early drafts of those books told me they had that very explicit fear about giving evil people better tool kits after reading those books.

That was a sobering thought. It gave me pause.

I concluded, after fairly deep consideration, that the people who do evil things already tend to use those basic triggers — either

instinctively or because they have developed their own science and their own instinct-linked tool kit on those issues.

I concluded, however, that the people in the world who are not evil will be better served when all of those instinct-related tools are more clearly understood and when we each understand how instincts affect our lives and how those specific sets of triggers can create functional levels of alignment.

My hope is that when evil people do use those tools to do evil things, then intelligent and fully informed people will recognize those tools for what they are and will be better able to resist them.

We will, I believe, all be much better off at several levels if we understand what those tools are and we will be better off when we collectively choose to use all of these tools for Peace.

Chapter Nineteen of this book and *The Art of InterGroup Peace* book both explain how that can be done.

Those Tools Have Worked Well In My CEO Settings

As the CEO of the organizations I have led, I have used those alignment triggers at multiple levels.

I have helped people internally appreciate the dangers we face. I have identified, named, labeled, and pointed clearly to our various external common enemies. In the settings where I have been CEO, we know who to fear and we know why we should fear them.

I have identified a sense of us in each setting — with people in my worksites most recently being either the People of Kaiser Permanente or the People of Health Partners.

I have identified to the people in each setting the various ways we will all benefit from being mutually supportive with one another.

And I have very carefully and clearly identified, supported, publicized, and communicated a mission and a vision in each setting that was set up for us all to use as a guide and, hopefully, as an inspiration and a motivator.

My various health care reform books have all been a very intentional part of that vision-building tool kit. I learned years ago it is sometimes more effective and easier to make a key point to the people I work with in a book than it is to make that same key point about a core belief or point of view in a memo or a speech.

Having a Mission Of Helping People Can Be Aligning

The mission trigger has been a fascinating and very useful tool.

For some people, the most important thing in their life is their belief system or their sense of purpose.

In both of my last organizations, we had a mission to deliver great, patient centered health care and we had a mission to deliver great care in a continuously improving, data supported way. That mission is a very motivating mission for a health care organization and for health care workers.

It was particularly motivating in those settings because people who voluntarily choose the health care professions for their life's work tend to be people who very much want to help other people. That's why people become nurses or therapists or physicians. People who choose those jobs want to help people.

So having a group mission of helping people can be motivating and that mission can help create a shared sense of "us." That mission also helped us recruit caregivers of every type and category of caregiver relatively easily to a number of key jobs.

We also used that mission to attract people to our computer teams in those healthcare work settings who felt right and who were

directly motivated by the fact that we were using our computers very directly and explicitly to help make care better.

We clearly used our computers very extensively in both organizations to support care and to make care delivery better. Our computer teams loved that use of their computer-related talent to make care better and the computer teams felt, appropriately, that their IT teams were key parts of our care teams.

I heard the same feedback dozens of times from our computer people — “We love being key members of the care team,” they said. “We feel like we are saving lives when we make that patient information available to the caregivers.”

They were, in fact, both right and accurate. Those computer support teams did make information available to caregivers that saved lives.

I believe those computer support teams did their work better in those settings because we were clear about the full implications of what those teams were doing and we were clear about how their tools were used.

Mission can be a very powerful and useful motivator. It helps people in a setting to have a collective identity as the people who believe in that mission.

Leaders Function As The Mission Focus In Some Settings

I was confused for several years — through most of the 1990s, in fact — about why some organizations seemed to function as though they had strong level of mission alignment and as if they had a common purpose, but I could not see that those organizations actually had either a clear mission or a clear purpose.

Then I realized that the leaders of some organizations personally fill that mission spot and role on the motivation pyramid for their organizations. Some organizations function with a very strong sense of personal loyalty to their Alpha leader as their key functional and motivating mission that give directions and even purpose to many of the people in the organization.

In a number of settings, the unifying sense of collective purpose that is generated for the group is to follow a charismatic leader for the group and to support that leader in loyal ways.

Following a leader, I began to understand, also is a common and clearly instinct-guided behavior pattern. It can feel very good for people to follow a leader in a deeply personal and loyal way.

Having the leader in any setting fill the hierarchical function of mission on that alignment and motivation pyramid is often the primary and long-standing reality for those settings where the culture, itself, creates hereditary leaders.

History gives us many examples of loyalty to hereditary leaders. People often feel deep loyalty to kings. Kings tend to both expect and receive loyalty.

Hereditary leaders create their own functional paradigm of what constitutes a working mission for a group. It can feel very right to people in those cultures who have hereditary leaders to feel great loyalty to their hereditary leader and to act accordingly.

Some people can even feel very right prioritizing their own lives to have loyalty to their king or to their chief as their own primary reason to exist and as their own main reason to function.

That is not the model I prefer to set up in settings where I have been able to set up the alignment motivators, but I can see why people

use that leader centered approach and I can see that it does work much of the time.

Servant Leaders Can Help Achieve Missions

In quite a few settings, loyalty to a gang leader or to a cult leader fills the spot where other organizations place mission on the alignment hierarchy pyramid.

The highest step in the group alignment pyramid in both gangs and cults is generally centered very directly on that Alpha leader loyalty factor for the cult or gang leader.

I personally prefer the model for my own organizations and for my own communities where a clearly stated mission is the pyramid focus point for the group and where all of the leaders in that setting are servant leaders who do their personal alpha functions well and explicitly in the interest of being a servant leader and of being a lead keeper of the shared mission.

I prefer the model where people are loyal to the organization and not to the leader of the organization. I believe that it can improve organizational success levels in many settings at multiple levels when

the leaders in that setting see themselves as servant leaders — and act accordingly.

If an organization uses an overall gatherer leadership style and has both a clear mission and clear value-linked elements of their culture, then the leaders of every subunit in the organization have the ability to thrive and to flourish in making the overall goals of the organization a success.

Creativity tends to be less likely to happen in strictly hierarchical situations. Also, when the leader of an organization is personally the organization's key goal and top priority, then the organization is functionally less likely to continuously improve in doing what it does. If continuous improvement is the goal, existing to serve a leader is less likely to help a setting achieve that goal.

Both models and approaches are functionally solid at an instinctive level. Both models fill the pyramid peak for group alignment triggers with a workable focus factor — either a mission or a leader.

**We Need To Make All Six Alignment Triggers Work For
Peace**

What I have seen to be true in multiple settings is that we always need to have the top of the pyramid alignment pyramid filled in some way that feels right to the relevant group. We instinctively need the top of the alignment pyramid filled and we instinctively need our group leadership hierarchies filled as well.

Those are very instinctive behaviors.

It has been fascinating and rewarding to work in a wide range of settings and to figure out both what alignment triggers exist and how to use them most effectively in each setting.

We need to use the entire set of alignment triggers to create a culture of Peace and inclusion for America. We need to use those triggers in each and every setting, and we need to use them broadly to steer us all to a future of collective alignment.

Once we understand each trigger, they are much easier to use. We need to be accountable to make sure those triggers are used to bring us together and not to drive us apart.

Chapter Eight — We Used The Six-Step Alignment Pyramid To Organize Groups In Uganda And Jamaica

The basic alignment approaches and alignment triggers have been field tested in a number of settings — both in our country and abroad.

I used those six alignment triggers that were described in the prior chapter of this book in several other countries as well as using them in our own country and for the organizations that I personally served as CEO, Chair, or equivalent leadership roles and assignments. Those six alignment triggers have worked very consistently everywhere that I have used them.

One of my great pleasures and joys of my career has been to have the chance to actually help start and implement health plans in half a dozen countries. I worked very closely for several years with a couple of those plans and learned a lot about group and intergroup behaviors in each of those settings.

The local health plans that we started in Jamaica and in Uganda were particularly useful learning opportunities for me on multiple levels.

I used the six-trigger alignment pyramid explicitly and extensively in both settings to get the plans started and to structure them for success.

Uganda Involved Creating Village Co-ops

In Uganda, we set up very local co-ops for health care. We worked in small rural villages.

In each setting in that lovely country, we very intentionally invoked each of the alignment trigger. We were able to get the villagers aligned around a common mission and we were able to get villagers in each setting aligned around a collectively shared objective of caring for their children and caring for their families.

We talked in each village about the dangers of not having care for their children.

We created some very powerful and effectively bonding team experiences in each setting by having teams of people in each Ugandan village help with the enrollment process and then help again with the local public health campaigns and with the renewal of enrollment that we had to do each year in each setting.

We built self-sufficient and self-governing economic and operational models in each village and we set them up to function as teams with team goals and team identities.

Economic realities are very relevant in those health plan care delivery settings.

Those plans in those tiny villages will fail financially if they don't get enough people enrolled so that the premiums that are paid by the healthy people who enroll in each village are sufficient to pay for the care needed by the people who enroll in each plan who were not healthy.

We needed people to function as a team in each village to get the clear majority of people in each village enrolled in those very local health plans, so that the plans could survive financially.

We formed enrollment committees in each village that functioned as enrollment teams — and those committees in each setting created the kinds of collective energy and the internal alignment that well done teams instinctively generate in all settings.

We identified the benefits to each villager of having people join the plan.

We carefully explained to the people in each village that in order to succeed and to survive financially, the health plan we built in each village had to have enough healthy members enrolled to create the cash flow needed to help the sick members enrolled in each village who used that money for their care.

We taught each village that we needed broad enrollment levels in order for each local plan to survive economically.

We worked with the village leaders in each setting to enroll a sufficient percentage of local people before we could and would activate each local plan. We explained those economic realities to the people in every village and the people in every village understood those issues.

Those truly are common sense issues. We couldn't begin operations for each plan as a stand-alone insurer in each village until the plan in that village had enough people enrolled to make it economically viable as a functional insurer.

The Target Enrollment Level Was 75 Percent

The actual target enrollment percentage number that was set for every village was 75 percent.

We knew that if 75 percent of all eligible local people were enrolled in the plan and if those enrolled people were all paying their monthly premium, then the cash flow that was generated from all of those people would allow each local co-op to have enough healthy people paying their monthly premium so their money could be used to buy care for the sick people who needed care in each setting.

We used voluntary teams of people in each village to do that enrollment work.

Those teams each created their own team instinct activation in very good ways.

We explained the team nature of health insurance to the people in each village. We helped people in those villages understand that insurance premium is a team sport because premium from team members is the only source of cash that we could use to pay for people's needed care in an insurance system.

I love being in the health insurance business in all of the settings and places where I am in the health insurance business because I personally always want people to have care and I know that the only way can pay for care in any of those settings is to use health insurance

approaches that allow people who need care to be able to use other people's money to pay for their care.

Use Other People's Money To Pay For Care

Health insurance — at its essence — is simply a functional way of using other people's money to pay for your care.

In Uganda, roughly the first 10 percent of the people in each of the villages who agreed to enroll in each new plan were the people in the village who had HIV or heart disease or the women who were already pregnant. Those particular people clearly all needed and wanted someone else's money to pay for their care.

If those first enrollees had been the only people who joined the co-ops in each village, then the premium needed in that village to pay for their care would have been a premium based on the actual care costs that were created by just those sick people.

Premiums, Everywhere, Are Simply The Average Cost Of Care

Premiums, everywhere, are simply the average cost of care. That premium level that would have been needed from paying only for the

care needs of just those very sick people would have been unaffordable to each village. Those village insurance plans that only enrolled the very sick people in each village would have immediately failed.

People in each village understood that reality and they understand the process. There is a lot of common sense in those villages.

Some of the best actuarial discussions I have heard in my entire life were in windowless huts with no electricity where the local people who were building the local plans debated about how to best create a sufficient risk pool for their own village.

Common sense and basic cash flow practicality issues made it clear to everyone in each setting that we needed healthy people in each village to enroll as well as having the new plans enrolling the sick people.

I have testified in front of several Congressional and Legislative Committees on a wide range of health care issues. I have tried to explain some of those same key and basic health care related actuarial issues to policy wonks in a number of Washington settings.

My experience has been that the basic understanding of those key issues at a practical level tended to be better in those Ugandan villages than it was in most of the policy settings that have addressed those same basic issues in our nation's capital. A couple of my health care policy books have tried to address that issue at fairly specific levels — and those books have had only partial success in helping people understand those key issues.

The Ugandan villages that needed self-sustaining risk pools to have their health insurance approach survive understand them very clearly.

Local Leaders Took Lead Roles

The key point to make in this book is that we used all of the steps on the persuasion pyramid to get people in those Ugandan villages to enroll in their local plans. We identified the danger of not having a health plan. We created team enrollment processes. We created team governance processes.

We identified the common benefits of all people having care.

And we shared the vision of having good health for all people in the plan.

It wasn't easy to persuade very poor people in small rural villages in that equatorial African country to put their hard earned money into the pot for a brand new approach for the purchase of care that had no local precedents, but we did it and it worked.

It usually took the direct personal persuasion efforts of respected village leaders in each village to persuade enough local people to enroll.

People in many Ugandan villages had already had sad and painful experiences with people from outside their village cheating them in various ways. I heard horror stories in the villages about deception and theft.

We needed local leaders who were willing to put their own credibility on the line to assure people that enrollment in the plan was safe and that the process wasn't just a fraud designed to steal their money. We turned each health plan into its own local "us." That created both the internal value systems and the higher ethical standards that people tend to follow in the context of being an "us."

We needed the local leaders who were already "us" for each village help us do that work of enrolling local people, because we needed trust to be part of the process.

We needed people in each setting to trust each other part of the process. Each health plan created its own local “us” based on membership in the plan.

Our lead staff in Uganda was made up entirely of Ugandans who we had trained to do that work. They also put their credibility on the line to do that work.

Local leaders and local staff made those efforts locally very linked.

The Culture Needs To Be Linked To The Strategy

To build a health plan in Jamaica, several years earlier, I had used a very different model.

The first leaders we put in the key positions to run that Jamaican plan were from the United States. We flew managers from the U.S. down to that country and we installed those executives in lead jobs. That created a number of problems.

Our American management team imports were very good people, but they tended not to be in full synchronization with the local culture.

There were some direct functional issues about our implanted team leaders linking well with the local people who we needed to both lead the plans and enroll in the plans.

The truth was — we were not an “us” in Jamaica. I learned that we needed to get the culture right for our team in that country in order to get the strategy there to work.

I also learned about the need to be an “us” in Jamaica with our targeted buyers and with our prospective members in order to get the trust levels where they needed to be for us to be successful as a plan.

My own experience in Jamaica in learning the importance of being in sync with the local culture and to be an “us” with the local culture was invaluable to me later in Uganda. I made mistakes in Jamaica. The Jamaicans were forgiving and they were willing to teach.

The plan in Jamaica did not flourish, however, until we trained Jamaican leaders to do the key jobs and then had our new Jamaican staff actually run the plan.

Culturally linked and culturally embedded leaders who could be seen as “us” ultimately made that Jamaican plan a success.

We Used Only Ugandan Staff From Day One

In Uganda, with that experience from Jamaica in mind, we started with only Ugandan local staff from day one. That approach was much more successful.

We also had local people serving as the chairs of each local plan and we had local people as the board of each local co-op in Uganda. Those people were well linked to their village and they were very directly in touch with the needs of each community.

They helped structure each local plan and they made key decisions about each plan. They created a local “us” for each plan

It was very impressive to watch those leaders put their own credibility on the line to enroll the people who joined each plan and to keep the people who enrolled renewing as members into the future.

I learned a lot about personal credibility and direct mission driven leadership from watching those local leaders lead the people in their villages.

Mergers And Trade Associations Can Use Alignment

Triggers

I actually have used that same basic alignment pyramid in a wide range of other organizational settings, as well.

In the U.S., in one setting, I helped a trade association that was losing membership and momentum rethink its mission and its strategy in the explicit context of the six pyramid alignment triggers.

The leader of that particular Association understood the tools very quickly, trusted the process, and used all six triggers in very targeted and intentional ways with his board and his membership to realign and revive his trade association.

That group is still doing well two decades later.

Trade associations have their own fascinating sets of issues. They tend to be comprised of organizations who ordinarily compete with one another — sometimes in very fierce ways — but who are aligned in a trade association for certain political and policy issues that affect an entire industry.

Trade associates tend to be lobbying organizations — so they work together to either create or oppose various kinds of laws and regulations. I have chaired four different trade associations and I have enjoyed the experience every time.

Chairing a trade association made up largely of competitors and helping them get to strategic alignment inside the association on key policy issues has been a fascinating learning effort — one that is described in more detail in both the *Primal Pathways* book and *The Art of Intergroup Peace* book.

The Art of Intergroup Peace book identifies nine ways that groups can enter into Peaceful interactions with one another. Creating an Association or its functional equivalent is one of the nine intergroup interaction tools.

Some or all of the six triggers can be used to help create an openness to alignment in a setting and then the local groups of people need to figure out which alignment category is needed to most successfully meet the newly aligned group's functional needs.

I have also used that pyramid internally and very explicitly in my places of work after doing corporate mergers or acquisitions to help bring the new employees in each setting into comfortable functioning alignment with the new management approach.

I have done half a dozen mergers in various settings and the basic steps in the pyramid have worked well to create very smooth mergers for all of the merger situations.

In each of those settings, the various alignment triggers were all useful to the task of bringing diverse sets of interests together to achieve common goals.

We Need To Use All Six Triggers As A Country

The alignment pyramid works in a wide range of settings. It was very useful to me to learn those tools and those techniques.

The triggers are all effective in settings when they are real in those settings. They can help create very productive alignment inside of organizations and communities.

The books *Primal Pathways* and *Art of Intergroup Peace* both explain how we can use that basic pyramid to help bring us all together as a country. I believe that those sets of alignment triggers can actually help us to do that work.

I believe that to be true because I have seen the triggers work in so many settings. I have seen other people use each and all of those

triggers in various settings with great success and I have used them myself multiple times — with very useful results.

The learning process has been fascinating and very useful.

A related learning that has also been fascinating and useful relates to the use of cultures to create success in settings once we have used the alignment triggers to get people in a setting to function as a group.

Every group needs a culture. If we get people in any setting to think of themselves as a group, it is also necessary to do the right sets of things to give that set of people a culture that identifies how members of the group will interact with one another and explains in basic terms what form the interactions will take.

Cultures are key to that process — and cultures are, therefore, the focus for the next chapter of this book.

Chapter Nine — Our Cultures Shape Our Behaviors — So We Need To Shape Our Cultures

Our instincts have two primary tools that they use to shape and influence our behaviors. The first tool is our emotions — and that tool can have its own wide range of obvious connections to what we do.

The second tool is our cultures. Our instincts clearly use our cultures to set up the processes and the behavioral expectations that steer us in ways that help our instincts achieve their goals.

It was clear to me very early in my study of instincts that instincts can create a number of emotional reactions — and one of the most powerful and effective emotions is to make certain behaviors “feel right.”

Maternal behaviors, territorial behaviors, hierarchical behaviors, and tribal behaviors all feel right to us because those behaviors are directly and clearly aligned with key sets of instincts that are each supported by those behaviors.

When we act in accord with those sets of behaviors, it “feels right” at a very basic level to act in those ways.

I learned that relationship between instinct-aligned behavior and “feeling right” fairly quickly in my study of instincts.

Then, to my great delight, I learned that our cultures also have that same remarkable power to make behaviors feel right. I learned very early in the process of studying those sets of behaviors that we can instinctively also feel very right when we are acting in accord with our cultures.

Our cultures can make some behaviors feel right.

And — just like our instincts, our cultures can also make some behaviors feel wrong.

When we have a culture in place in any setting, we tend to feel right when we are acting in accord with that culture. We tend to feel wrong or we experience a sense of stress when we are acting out of alignment with our culture

It was extremely useful for me to realize in what I now remember to be a moment of sheer intellectual joy and pure cognitive happiness and pleasure that cultures can also guide our lives at that very

important level. I felt great joy because I realized in that moment that although we cannot change, erase, or eliminate our instincts, we actually can choose — with great intellectual control and a high degree of very intentional leverage — to change, design, modify, channel, direct, steer, and manipulate our cultures.

We Can't Eliminate Instincts — But We Can Shape Cultures

For me as a work site process re-engineering practitioner, that was an extremely useful and highly functional point for me to understand. It was extremely important to understand that opportunity because that power to shape cultures gives us an invaluable tool that we can use to shape and guide the behaviors and the thought processes that we need to shape and guide to be at Peace with ourselves in all of the settings where we want to be at Peace with ourselves.

It was already very clear to me that our actual instincts could and did cause certain behaviors to feel right.

Maternal behaviors, I knew, felt right because our maternal instincts cause them to feel right.

Having someone trespass on our property feels instinctively wrong... and that instinctive reaction makes our basic behaviors that we

engage in to protect our property in that situation feel right. Territorial behaviors feel right in all of our territorial settings because our territorial/turf instincts cause certain territory-related behaviors to feel right.

I understood those kinds of linkages between our basic instincts and our feelings and I could see how they influenced our behaviors every day of our lives.

I did not expect, however, when I started looking at those issues and those processes that our cultures could have an equivalent power to make specific behaviors in a setting feel wrong or right.

Our Cultures Cause Some Behaviors To Feel Right

I learned that power of cultures to make behaviors both feel right and feel wrong as I looked both at our instincts to build cultures and at the tools that our cultures actually use to structure and guide our instinctive behaviors.

That ability to make a behavior “feel right” is obviously a very useful power for cultures to have. It gives cultures both relevance and leverage over the behaviors of the people in the culture. It makes functional and logical sense for instincts to give cultures that tool kit to

work with because our instincts need our cultures to achieve most of their goals.

When we understand the usual relationship that exists between cultures and instincts — with cultures functioning as a key tool to help us achieve our instinctive goals — then seeing that both instincts and cultures can and do share and utilize that very useful power to give us a sense that a behavior feels right or that a behavior feels wrong makes great functional and practical sense.

Our cultures tend to function very directly as tools to actualize and achieve the goals of our instincts. We have hierarchical instincts — so every culture invents its own rules for hierarchies. We have strong instincts to be territorial — so every culture creates its own rules for property and turf.

We have strong instincts to be paternal and maternal — so every culture creates its own rule sets of paternal and maternal behaviors.

I understood that link between cultures and instincts — but what I did not perceive for many years was the fact that the linkage works to a very large degree because our instincts grant our cultures the ability

to cause specific behaviors embedded in each culture to feel right and to feel wrong.

I could see fairly early in the process that our instincts used our cultures to give our instincts a context and a tool kit to achieve their goals. Our cultures are obviously one of the very best and most effective tools that our instincts have in their tool kit.

What I could not understand clearly for several years was how cultures did that work. And then, once I recognized the linkage between certain behaviors feeling right and feeling wrong and our direct cultural expectations about those specific behaviors, it made obvious sense that the primary tool used by an instinct to achieve many of its goals would be to give at least some of the power of an instinct to make behaviors feel right or to feel wrong as a direct and clear leverage factor that helped each culture succeed in actualizing each instinct.

We Can Change Cultures But Not Instincts

I already knew at a logistical level that we actually cannot change our instincts. The actual instincts that we each have are embedded in each of us at a very primal level and they cannot be changed.

We each have the same basic sets of instincts — and there is no way of extracting or removing any of those instincts from the basic package of who we each are.

We each spend our lives dealing with the instincts that are embedded in each of us.

As a change agent, I found that particular piece of information about the permanent nature of instincts challenging and a bit discouraging — if not intimidating.

However, as I also began to understand that our instincts achieve many — if not most — of their goals using our cultures and I also realized — fairly early in the process — from both direct experience and extensive observation — that we could, in fact, change our cultures.

That was one of the most encouraging and positive realizations that I encountered in the entire process of studying our behaviors with the goal of making our behaviors improve for key areas of intergroup interactions.

We Can, In Fact, Create Enlightened Cultures

I realized that we could not create more enlightened instincts, but we could, in fact, create more enlightened cultures. I realized that we

could make the intellectual choice to use our cultures as tools to channel and focus our basic inherent set of instinctive behaviors and I realized that we could use those tools to channel our most useful and beneficial instincts in enlightened directions.

That realization was a massive awareness breakthrough for me that gave me major hope relative to all of the negative intergroup behaviors that I had been seeing in so many places.

I realized that we could decide at an intellectual level to have enlightened and ethical behaviors guide us in our intergroup interactions and it was clear to me that process could succeed if we embedded those enlightened behaviors and behavioral expectations into our belief systems and our cultures.

Because our cultures make embedded behaviors “feel right,” I realized that we could use cultures to make our intellectually chosen enlightened behaviors “feel right” by embedding those behaviors in the culture.

That approach of using cultures to guide specific behaviors simply builds on the existing model and the normal set of linkages that we all use all the time to guide our behaviors. The approach simply echoes and

utilizes the normal relationships that cultures everywhere tend to have with our instincts.

Those links tend to be both tight and constant in every culture.

Instincts Are Implemented Through Cultures

As I looked at those linkages in setting after setting, it was clear that our instincts very consistently use our cultures to create the rule sets that help us achieve the goals that are set for us by our instincts in each setting.

We have instincts to mate, for example. We don't just randomly mate. Cultures tell us how to mate. Every culture creates a rule set that outlines how mating can be done and how mating cannot be done in the context of that culture.

We have instincts to own turf. Our cultures in every setting give us the rules that guide turf possession and structure functional property ownership in each setting. We each tend to feel right relative to turf owning behaviors in each setting in the explicit context for owning turf that is created by our culture for that setting.

Making a behavior "feel right" is an immense and useful power for instincts and cultures to have. Making a behavior feel wrong is also a

very powerful tool for both cultures and instincts. Those feelings guide our decisions and our behaviors.

It was clear to me that our cultures are used very naturally and normally as tools by our instincts to actualize our instincts and to achieve our instinctive goals. It was also clear that the rules of our cultures are used to control or steer our instincts in directions that each culture wants our instincts steered.

The two processes are mutually reinforcing. I actually had a chance to test that set of interactions in real world settings. Understanding how those processes and interactions work gave me a great tool kit to use in my day job as CEO and as chair or convener in more than a dozen intergroup settings.

I Used That Alignment Between Culture And Behavior In My Work

I have actually used that specific knowledge about the role of a culture to influence both group and individual behavior repeatedly in my work. When I became the CEO of my most recent organization slightly over a decade ago, I started with culture building as a key functional component of my CEO agenda.

I immediately did a very explicit culture diagnosis and assessment for the organization.

It was obvious to me that like all organizations, my new work site was clearly already guided in significant ways by its culture. Some aspects of the old culture were very much in line with where I believed the organization needed to go — but I could also see that some aspects of the culture needed to be enhanced and amended if we were going to succeed at the highest levels that we could achieve.

Instead of bemoaning or complaining about those challenging and less productive aspects of that existing culture and instead of wishing, hoping, or even yearning for a better culture in those areas, it was much more effective and far more useful for me to simply figure out the right culture pieces for that organization and for that setting and then to take the steps that were needed in that specific setting to put the right set of cultural components in place.

I knew what I wanted the new belief system and the new value system for that setting to be, so I did the things necessary through a combination of rules, guidances, pervasive, and consistent

communication approaches, process changes and structure design to make those specific aspects of the culture a reality.

I Shared The Culture Change Strategy With The Board Of Directors

I had been studying the component parts of organizational cultures since the early 1990s, so I knew both how cultures functioned and how cultures could be changed. I used that tool kit immediately at my new job — beginning with identifying what those key belief systems and expected behaviors of that new culture should be.

I shared that new culture design and the overarching strategy for changing the old culture at a very early point in the process with the Board of Directors.

Half of the Board was delighted with that culture change strategy and process and half of the Board thought that I was lost in some “mumbo-jumbo” theoretical and even ideological sidetrack that they tolerated at that point in time because new CEO’s tend to be given a lot of leeway by their Boards.

Later, when we had explicitly and clearly achieved all of the culture change goals that I had outlined to the Board at the beginning of

the process, a couple of the skeptics on that Board told me how deeply skeptical they had been. A couple of the people on the Board who thought that the cultures issues were irrelevant and extraneous to the actual functioning of the organization told me that they could see how powerful the tool was relative to basic organizational functionality.

I communicated the new culture at that point very clearly to the leadership of the new work team. Then I did the things I needed to do as a leader in that setting to model, reinforce, explain, promote, and even exemplify the new culture.

I wanted the new culture to be data focused, so I did multiple visible data focused things — and I worked hard structurally to make data available for the organization.

I wanted the new culture to be a culture of both continuous improvement and excellence, so I both used examples of best practices and engineering success and I set up support tools to help our team move down both of those pathways.

That process of implanting specific and targeted new thought pieces and new beliefs into that culture worked. The new total culture that was designed at the beginning of that process became a reality and

it did what it needed to do to make us successful as an organization that ended up being rated number one in the country in multiple areas of performance after the new culture and the new tools were in place and operational.

Process improvement skill sets tied directly to explicit culture change worked well to create a top performing care team and organization.

I mention that success here — in this book — because I believe we need to use that same basic overarching culture modification approach and strategy to achieve Intergroup Peace in multiple settings. I believe we can use that same basic very intentional culture/goal interconnectivity linkage very strategically as part of the Art of Intergroup Peace in our various work sites, in our communities, and for our country as a whole.

We can do that culture change work successfully in all of those settings if we are clear and explicit in our intent and if we understand exactly what we are doing and why we are doing it.

If we do that culture building job well, we can have the behaviors that we want to have in place in each setting to be in alignment with our

cultures for each setting and we will be able to continuously improve our interactions and our collective performance in each setting.

Cultures And Instincts Both Set Goals

Cultures, I know from looking at how we guide ourselves in our daily lives, are everywhere. Every group of people creates a culture. When I started looking at the array of intergroup interaction issues, I looked at a lot of organizational settings in a number of countries and industries. I saw cultures everywhere I looked.

Workforces create cultures. Tribes create cultures. And people who are brought together for any reason to form a group invariably create a culture for their group.

Cultures guide us in each setting. That's their job. We instinctively create cultures in each setting to do that work of guiding us in whatever context we are in.

The culture we instinctively create in each situation tells us what we should do, what we ought to do, and what we should not do for that setting and for that group.

People In Line Will Create A Culture For The Line

Cultures fascinated me when I began to study them.

People standing in a line will create a culture for the line. The line culture in a setting will tell people in the line if they can allow someone else to “cut in” to stand by them. The line culture tells the group whether bio breaks are allowed — and the line culture can even tell people how far you can move away from the physical geography of the line without being perceived as having lost your right to be in that particular line.

We create rules for that line — and we tend to become angry at a very basic and immediate level when someone violates the perceived rules for a line.

I have personally observed line cultures in London, Hanoi, Kampala, and Moscow and they each did tend to have some regional patterns about specific local rule sets — but people in each of those settings had the same functional pattern of creating rules about line behavior that felt right in that setting to the people who were in that line and who were subject to that cultural rule set.

People feel so right about their own line rules that people can become enraged when those line rules are violated. As an experiment, I

have deliberately done things to violate line rules in several settings. My wife hates it when I do that particular experiment and when she happens to be in the room where I do it. The anger that I have felt projected against me in a couple of line culture settings was almost frightening.

I was actually intimidated, myself, a couple of times by that anger. I have stopped doing those experiments.

Interestingly, the power of those culture-linked instincts to affect how we think and how we feel is so strong that I actually personally felt wrong and I personally felt slightly guilty for a couple of the experiments — even though I was only breaking the rules of a line culture and I was intentionally doing it as a very intentional and explicit experiment.

We do all — including me — tend to internalize our cultural expectations. People can become angry fairly easily when our cultural expectations are violated in some way.

Road rage can be triggered when road behavior expectations are violated.

People who have expectations about property or turf built into their culture can become enraged and can even damage people with a sense of being entitled to do the damage to people who violate those expectations and encroach on their turf.

Cultures Need And Use Rules

I was also fascinated and significantly encouraged when I started to study cultures to see and learn that we can set up or modify cultures in various settings by following a few key steps. Cultures tend to form in very predictable ways. They can also be amended in very predictable and useful ways.

Once we understand that all cultures are invented — and once we understand at an intellectual level that no cultures are actually inherent to any setting or to any group — then we can think of cultures more as a tool and we can choose to build culture in our various settings that meet our behavior objectives for that setting.

Building a set of relevant rules for a culture is generally a good place to start.

Cultures, I learned, generally need rules. Cultures tend to be anchored in rules. We tend to build sets of rules and explicit

expectations that tell us exactly how we should behave in the context of each culture.

When we know intellectually that the existence of rules as a key component of cultures is functionally true and relevant, then we can consciously design, build, and embed the rules we want into a culture.

We have several mechanisms that we use to enforce the rules of a culture. Some settings use laws and penalties to enforce the rules of a culture. That approach is used in a lot of settings and it clearly works in many settings.

Peer Pressure Enforces Some Cultural Rules

The rules in some settings tend to be reinforced by other people in the culture through various forms of peer pressure.

The rules of our cultures are also often reinforced by our tendency to “feel right” when we are acting in the context of our cultures. We self-reinforce those rules based on those feelings.

Those peer pressure and self-pressure enforcement approaches are both effective characteristics of a usual and normal culture rule enforcement reality.

When all people in a setting understand the culture of the setting, the people in that setting tend to use various kinds of peer pressure to encourage, force, and even coerce other people in the setting to comply with cultural expectations. Cultures in place in many settings tend to reinforce themselves by those levels of internal coercion.

Feeling right also encourages cultural compliance. When a cultural expectation is clear and we act in accord with that expectation it generally feels right to act in that way.

When we want a particular enlightened behavior to feel right and to be used in any setting, that can be done by embedding the desired enlightened behavior into the culture of that setting.

If we want courtesy to be a standard behavior, for example, we can make courtesy a cultural expectation and people will often take great pride and will “feel right” exhibiting and even perfecting the specific aspects and attributes of courtesy that is expected by their culture.

If we want respect for seniority to be a value that we want people in a setting to share, we can embed respect for seniority into the culture and people will feel right respecting senior people and will feel wrong

when the expected adherence and respect for seniority is violated for that culture.

Chairing And Managing Are Both Easier With Aligned Cultures

As I said earlier, I have been the CEO of half a dozen companies and I have also chaired more than a dozen other organizations over the past couple of decades. Once I learned the basic set of things that we need to do to create, implement, enforce, and reinforce a culture in any setting, I have found both managing and chairing in all of those settings much easier to do.

There is a long-standing organizational theory truism for businesses that says — “Cultures eat strategy for lunch.” People who run organizations know that your likelihood of organizational success is lower if your culture fights your strategy and your chance of success is enhanced if your strategy and your culture are aligned.

Many leaders, however, have a hard time creating that alignment of strategy and culture. Some leaders are simply hopeful that a supportive and aligned culture might somehow emerge for their group.

Hope is not the best tool for creating change — and hope is also not an optimal strategy for either structuring or building a culture.

Vague optimism, I have seen in multiple settings, is also usually insufficient as a culture-building tool.

Wishful thinking has its charm, but my experience has been that wishful thinking generally has marginal utility as a culture sculpting mechanism or strategy.

But, I have found, deliberate, intentional, and carefully structured culture building can be a very useful skill and a very good strategy for a leader to have.

Diagnose, Define, And Delineate The Culture

The basic process and culture change sequence that I used at Kaiser Permanente can be a good approach for many new leaders to use. New leaders can begin the process of culture change by understanding exactly and explicitly what the current culture of a setting is on key issues.

An honest look at the current cultural realities in the setting is a key and highly useful first step.

Leaders should then identify basic cultural elements that would be desirable for the setting — like a focus on customers or an eagerness to function as teams. Each leader should then do a very clear assessment of what the current culture in that setting actually is relative to that desired cultural belief.

That is a good time in the process for the aspiring culture change agent to be both brutally honest and very clear.

To use cultures as a tool in any setting, it is important to start that process with an accurate, honest, and realistic assessment of the functional culture that is currently in place in that setting.

Begin By Defining The Current Culture

It has been important for me in each of my work settings to figure out what the current culture of each organization was relative to key beliefs and expectations. Then it was very useful to me to figure out explicitly what set of values, expectations, and key cultural components would be most useful to achieve the things we wanted to achieve in each setting.

I carefully identified and developed key values for the desired culture in each setting and then I created the rule kits and the tool kits

that were needed in each setting to instill each aspect of the desired culture in its new functionality and core beliefs.

Being the CEO and chair of those organizations gave me a great leverage point to do that work. As CEO, you typically don't need to get someone else's approval to do that kind of culture related work. You do, however, very much need to get people's support — because support is key to any culture actually being implemented and internalized.

That means that getting support is also a good skill set for a CEO to have. It is important to figure out as a leader what the approaches are that are needed in each setting to get each key piece of the culture supported by the key people in your setting.

Convincing people that the cultural components you are building will create success and will improve people's work realities can be a useful part of the persuasion process.

Cultures Often Reflect The Values Of Key Leaders

The role of the leader is very often key to culture change in many settings.

CEOs and other Alpha leaders generally have a major role to play in setting up each organization's culture. As I have looked at both

leaders and cultures in multiple settings in several countries, I could see that the cultures that were in place in a very large number of settings have very directly and clearly reflected the behaviors and the values of the leader or the key leaders in that setting.

In fact, the truth is that we have a strong functional tendency in most settings to have the behavioral values and expectations of the group reflect the values and expectations of the leader. That can be true in large settings and small settings — and it is clearly dependent to a significant degree on the personality of the relevant leader.

People tend to directly observe leader behavior to figure out what the key cultural values actually are for any setting. Observing leader behavior is clearly an instinctive behavior in itself.

Knowing that my own behaviors as a leader in each setting would be closely observed, I have made my own basic, primal, direct, and personal commitment to the culture I was promoting in each setting that I have served as CEO very transparent, very obvious, and very clear to all people in that setting in a highly, almost obsessively, consistent way.

If you talk to anyone who worked with me or who worked near me in those settings while I served them as CEO, I suspect that those people will say that they personally knew at a fairly explicit level what my values and my beliefs were about key components of who we were and what we were doing.

A very important and highly useful message tool that I used very deliberately as I named and supported my own leadership teams in each organization, was to make very sure that our desired cultural values for that setting were reflected in both in my own behaviors and in the behaviors and the beliefs of our other key leaders.

Who You Promote Sends A Strong And Clear Cultural Message

Selecting people for key leadership jobs who clearly have the right values for the culture you want in that setting is another lovely, powerful, clear, and effective message to send and it is a lovely and clear tool that CEOs can often use.

People in any setting pay very close attention to who you promote and people pay particular attention to who you recognize, honor, and reward. I have used both the promotion tool and the reward tool in

many visible ways in each setting that I have led to communicate both values and beliefs.

I learned as I studied hierarchies that most people pay close attention to the hierarchical components of any setting. You can send particularly clear and influential messages to people about the real values of an organization based on who you promote.

When hard work in a setting results in visible and explicit career advancement, then hard work becomes a perceived and believed part of the culture.

When highly political and visible “jerk-related” behaviors result in a person being promoted, you can count on other people who aspire to being promoted to follow suit. When that happens, you can expect that your verbal efforts to convince people in that setting that your own real and primary value measure is for people to work hard and to work well with one another will be received with cynicism and disbelief by the people who see who you actually reward by your promotion decisions.

Every action is a potential message in those settings.

I have very intentionally used my own CEO leverage and pulpit to do direct communications on key values and strategies with the people

in each setting. Having a good communication platform is a key reality of being a CEO. The most successful CEO's are often very good at communicating both vision and values to their people.

People tend to pay attention to the activities and to the intended or unintended messages that emanate from the CEO as well as to the messages that emanate from other key organizational leaders.

KP Inside Outlines Cultural Persuasion Tools

One of my earlier books, *KP Inside*, contains 100 weekly letters that were written by me to the nearly 200,000 people on our staff at KP. Those letters, sent by me each week to all employees were, as you can see by reading them in that book, very directly and explicitly a culture-building tool.

Those letters to all of our staff members every week helped create a value system, a performance model, and a set of very specific shared expectations for that organization.

The letters celebrated and clearly described desired culture-aligned behaviors for the people who work in that organization. The points I made in those letters were obvious, simple, and they were intended to each be absolutely clear.

I celebrated our wins in those letters. I celebrated patient centered care. I also celebrated top quality care. I gave clear examples of wins, quality, innovation, and loving and respectful patient focus in those letters.

As a culture, we wanted ourselves to be a patient focused, caring, science-based, innovative, inventive, and continuously improving organization.

Read the letters in that book and you will see how those short notes on those issues that I sent to all of our employees every week explicated, endorsed, clarified, advocated, focused, and reinforced those specific aspects of our targeted organizational culture and value set.

The Branding Process Was Part Of The Culture Building Process

I also used the brands for each of the organizations that I served as CEO as part of the culture building process in each setting.

It is clear that the brand of an organization tends to become an important part of the culture of each organization — so as I worked on brands in each of my CEO settings, I did that work with the intent of having the brand reinforce and even partially define the culture.

I knew that people perceive organizations to have an identity — a basic brand — that functions like a paradigm to explain the organization to the world. Paradigms explain “why” things happen. Brands explain to the public — and brands explain to people inside organizations — why organizations do what they do.

People tend to interpret key data or information they hear about an organization in the context of the organization’s brand.

Since I ran health care organizations, I know that their brands were important at multiple levels for both caregivers and patients. I know that the brand of a care system could help with employee and caregiver recruiting. I knew that the brand of each organization was very useful for both customer/patient acceptance and customer/patient decision-making.

Growth in the marketplace for those organizations was clearly affected by the strength, attractiveness, and basic desirability of the brand.

Brands Tend To Become Part Of Many Cultures

For my most recent two CEO positions, the organizations were a combination of health care delivery system and health plan. Both

needed brands that made the people in the organization feel good about their place of employment and that gave potential patients and customers a positive feeling about getting their care and coverage from those caregivers.

A major goal for me as CEO was to have people join each organization as team members and to have people in the community trust us as patients and as customers.

To help achieve that set of goals, we ran fairly extensive ad campaigns in both places that created a sense of very human and personal caring levels for us as care teams. At Health Partners, we ran an ad campaign showing people with major health problems — serious and damaging congenital problems, heart failures, and cancer — who were all served and helped in a warm and caring way by Health Partners.

At Kaiser Permanente, we also had direct member stories in our television and radio ad campaign — including having a cancer patient explaining in a television ad — “I have cancer — cancer doesn’t have me.”

The Kaiser Permanente campaign also focused very heavily on a commitment to help people improve their health. “Thrive” was the theme and the goal of that campaign. The “Thrive” ads were witty and warm, friendly, humorous, and encouraging at a very personal level. There were billboards, bus banners, radio spots, and some truly memorable TV spots encouraging people to “Thrive.”

The goal was to create a brand paradigm for people in the community about that organization that said, “We are good and warm and witty people and we are very competent and caring caregivers who are entirely on your side. We want us all to Thrive.”

We Aimed For Heads And We Aimed For Hearts

We wanted to win people’s hearts in the public and also inside our own organization with both campaigns. Those campaigns in both organizations were aimed at shaping our internal culture as well as defining our brands.

Later ads that we run at both places also were aimed at winning people’s heads — talking about the significant reduction in heart deaths, the best cancer care, and the major reductions in diabetes complications for our patients that happened for patients cared for in both settings.

We accompanied, supported, validated, and enhanced the “head” part of the campaign at Kaiser Permanente by also publishing over 1,000 research articles each year in referred medical journals that were focused on improving the science of medicine and the knowledge base for care.

We carefully publicized those research findings in the popular media and the research papers from the KP care team resulted in tens of thousands of additional mass media stories and reports.

That research campaign and its public relations support tools were very clearly aimed both at our organizations external image and external brand and at our internal culture and brand.

The research promotion part of that strategy was actually very useful as an internal culture support tool. It helps shape the culture in a care setting in a very good way when our staff members know and understand that that powerful research is being done by “us” and that care is getting better across the planet because of that research that is being done by “us.”

We led with the warm and witty ads to win people’s hearts and then we ran the quality-based ads to get people to join up and become

our patients. We used that sequence of heart followed by head deliberately for both internal and external audiences.

People believed the quality ads when they ran because they first had built a positive paradigm in their own perception base that said, “these are good and nice and fun and warm people at Kaiser Permanente (or Health Partners) and they care about me.”

We Wanted To Create A Sense Of “Us” With Patients And Members

That point is relevant to this chapter about the use of instincts and cultures to improve our internal and external world because one major goal for the ad campaigns in the both of those care organizations was to help create a sense of “us” with our own staff and also to create a sense of “us” with the public and our patients.

The ad campaigns were each intended to brand each plan as a likeable “us.” People like and trust “us.” People want to be with “us.” Both strategies worked.

A major reason that those campaigns worked internally as well as they worked externally was that the brand themes were real. People tend to be very skeptical and will look for any deviation in behavior

between the brand claims and the actual performance of a care system. In both cases, the brand claims were supported by real and valid performance as care teams.

As a working CEO, I definitely found my understanding of our basic packages of instincts in those areas — to build paradigms and to identify who is an “us” — to be useful from a highly relevant business perspective.

We Can Create An American Culture That Feels Right

The impact that culture have to control and channel the impact of our instincts in various settings is the primary reasons why I now feel — and have felt — for several years — optimistic that we can end up with an American culture that can very intentionally meet our most enlightened collective needs as a people.

That is also why I am optimistic that we can create cultures of intergroup Peace in our various communities and in our various organizations and settings.

We need to do that work of creating an intergroup Peace-based culture that guides us to enlightened behaviors in a very intentional way.

We need shared American values as an anchor for that process. We need to do that culture building work in each setting with a clear and collective commitment to our higher shared values for the setting — and we need to make those values clear to us all so we can all use them well and so that we can all trust each other in their use.

Trust is a key part of the intergroup Peace process. Clear understandings about what our cultural values are can help create the consistency of beliefs and the consistency of behaviors that creates trust.

If we deliberately both identify and exemplify the exact values and behaviors we want for our overarching American culture, then we are much more likely to succeed in implementing those values and in embedding those key values in our culture in a way that makes us all feel right exemplifying and aligning our behavior with those values.

Using Culture To Create Improvement Works In The Real

World — Do Good, Feel Good, Be Good

We can do that work both strategically and intentionally. I now know from personal experience in several settings that we can use a wide range of tools to very intentionally help us define our culture,

codify our culture, explain our culture, and then enforce and support the culture in ways that cause people to feel right acting in alignment with the culture.

We want people to do good and we want people to be good. We also want people to feel good and we very much want people to feel right when people are doing good things in the right way in any setting.

We can get to that point as a country. We can also get to that point in our communities and our other organizational settings. That can be done if we use our culture as a tool set to help create the context and the structure for that entire process.

This isn't a hypothetical or theoretical assumption. As this book has been pointing out, I have tested that strategy and that goal set in the real world in several settings. I have been doing intentional cultural development in multiple settings for a couple of decades and that work has both gone well and been fun and encouraging to do.

I had a chance to do a significant number of culture building experiments with my multi-level, \$2 billion Minnesota health care delivery system and health plan more than two decades ago. I began

doing those experiments in the 1990s and I continued to do them for more than 15 years in that particular setting.

Those experiments were a functional success.

I have also done a number of culture building experiments with the trade associations that I have chaired and I have done some levels of culture building work with the various community coalitions that I have convened or chaired.

Getting To Zero Pressure Ulcers Was A Huge Culture Win

At Kaiser Permanente, we ended up with a culture in our care system that dropped pressure ulcers in our hospitals down to under 1 percent — compared to a community average for other hospitals of having more than 5 percent of their patients with that condition.

We supported that exemplary care by the caregivers with best science and with best technical practices — but the key ingredient that created that extreme level of success for patient safety was the culture of the caregivers in those Kaiser Permanente hospitals who refused to accept the standard community culture of other hospitals that those ulcers are just an unfortunate and normal fact of life for their patients.

The caregivers in our hospitals who had a patient-focused culture of excellence cut those painful, disfiguring, crippling, and sometimes fatal ulcers to the point where half a dozen hospitals did not have one single ulcer in over a year.

A culture of excellence and a culture of caring created a world of benefit for the patients who get their care from those caregivers.

That same set of care sites was recognized by both JD Powers and Consumer Reports for best levels of service. Service is also an organizational result that has culture embedded in its core.

Our Members Are Also An “Us”

We all benefit when we are all an “us.” That applies to patients and caregivers in very direct ways.

Internally, I have also worked hard to make it very clear in multiple ways to our employees and our caregivers that our patients and members are an “us.”

I wrote about pressure ulcers to our care team not as a statistic, but as a personal experience for individual people that caused very real and very personal individual pain for individual patients. I repeatedly said to our staff that we needed to be the care site where our own family

members could come to get great care if they ever needed our care because we cared about every patient as though every patient is family.

That approach was well received by our caregivers. It felt right. Because it felt very right, it became and was very real.

We Have Different Values For “Us” And “Them”

One major goal of those internal communications to our staff was to create a sense of “us” for our staff with the patients. I wanted that sense of “us” to exist because we have very different values in health care delivery settings when the patient is a “Them” instead of an us.

I have seen other care sites who have “Them” perceptions in place with their staff for their patients. The horror stories that can result from some of those care sites who see their patients as some category of “them” are far too familiar to all of us.

When patients are a “Them” to either leadership or staff in a health care setting, then the ethics and the behaviors that stem from that “Them” based value system are too often not good for the patients.

Creating a sense of “us” at multiple levels was my goal. The fact that we won awards as being a great place to work and also ranked

number one source and satisfaction in the Consumer Reports and JD Powers relevant surveys was not accidental or coincidental.

If our caregivers had perceived the patients we care for to be “Them,” those first place rankings would never have happened.

Near Perfection Can Happen

Health Partners has about 10,000 employees. Kaiser Permanente currently has nearly 200,000 members of its internal staff. Those are both fairly large numbers of people. It is impossible with that many people not to have some people on those staffs who were not doing the right things. Perfection doesn’t happen.

But near perfection can happen. It takes a combination of culture and process to achieve those near perfect goals. On an issue like pressure ulcers — where other care sites ranged from 5-to-10 percent of their patients in their hospitals who acquire those ulcers — Kaiser Permanente averaged fewer than 1 percent of our patients in our hospitals who acquired those ulcers.

I was delighted that half a dozen KP hospitals actually did not have one single pressure ulcer the year I retired. Not one.

Culture made that happen.

That kind of achievement does not happen based on management directives. That kind of performance to get care right for every patient takes a culture of caring and it takes each caregiver doing what needs to be done in a very personal and accountable way for each patient.

It takes the right science, the right processes, and the right culture.

Culture and processes need to be aligned to get the very best result.

In this case, that alignment has to include the caregiver treating the patient like “us” and not “them.” Any care system that treats the patient as “us” is more likely to provide patient friendly service and care — and more likely to have a patient focused culture of care for the care determined in those sites.

I believe to the core that you can’t have an unhealthy culture for your care team and still deliver great care or great service to your patients.

Health Care Leaders Should Create Great Core Cultures

My personal belief for my old day job is that creating the right culture should be a key tool for any health care system leader. My

observation has been that too many health care leaders in too many care settings simply let the cultures for those settings spontaneously develop.

A few very capable leaders — like the Mayo brothers who founded the Mayo Clinic — very intentionally and deliberately defined, taught, implemented, and enforced the cultures of their organizations and those leaders did that work with great focus and great intensity.

Those organizations have clearly benefited from that legacy of deliberate and clear cultural architecture done at the most senior leader level. The cultures of those organizations continue to support great care even when other care organizations do not even list great care as an aspiration — much less a goal or a reality.

We Can Build Cultures Of Peace Into Intergroup

Interactions

It has been very useful for my own learning process to be in work settings where I had the personal leverage and the positional vantage point to experiment in various ways with building both alignments and cultures with multiple sets of people.

As the chair and CEO in various settings over the past three decades, I have had the lovely ability to be able to make decisions, create rules, and to allocate resources in the directions that helped me create the cultures that I believed our organizations needed.

As chair and CEO, I also have had the flexibility to be able to fix my mistakes and the ability to learn from my successes with a flexibility that often doesn't exist for many people.

That learning process has given me the confidence to incorporate basic culture building strategies into the Art of Intergroup Peace. We all need to understand that our cultures need to function as our tools in each setting. We need to shape our cultures, rather than having our cultures shape us.

We need to create a culture of intergroup Peace for our country.

We need to create the right sense of group alignment as a nation to make our cultures relevant as elements of intergroup Peace. We need to understand where we are now as a country so we can guide ourselves to where we want to be.

We are not to where we need to be — but we are doing a much better job in many areas relative to getting to where we need to be.

One area where we still need our culture to continuously improve relates to all of the ways that our cultures affect women in our society.

Women have been badly served by our cultures in a number of ways. We need to do better for the women in our society if we intend to have a society and a country that extends the best of the American Dream to us all.

The next chapter of this book discusses what I learned when I looked at how cultures have tended to treat women in key areas of our behaviors.

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.

Chapter Eleven — Women In Business And Society Are Creating Major Successes At Multiple Levels

The relative status for women in this country has not reached the point where discrimination has ended in all areas, but we have made huge progress in many areas that we should celebrate and endorse.

Women are currently functioning successfully at just about every single level in our country. Unlike many areas of the world where discrimination against women limits the activities of women at truly repressive levels, we have women in all categories of jobs in our country — and we have very explicitly banned any behaviors that explicitly discriminate against women.

That is a very good thing for us as a country — and it represents real progress from where we were in many areas even in our country in relatively recent times.

I have seen significant progress for women happen in very direct ways in my own life and career.

I mentioned earlier in this book that I had a job in a local bank when I was in high school. My job was to be a bank clerk. I waited on

customers and I ran the machine that charged the checks that people wrote against each customer's personal bank accounts.

I wasn't particularly good at that job. I transposed quite a few numbers and I had to go through an almost daily process of finding and correcting my mistakes. I was guided and helped in that process every day by the women clerks who really ran that bank.

I saw those women do wonderful work with customers and with all of the layers of complex and basic functions that were needed to keep that bank running.

As I mentioned earlier in this book, I was shocked and a bit horrified to discover that those women made less than half as much money as a couple of male employees at the bank.

My sense at the time was that the male employees in that setting were doing adequate work, but the female employees were the stars — and the stars received less than half as much money.

When I wanted to protest, the women clerks told me to shut up and not make waves. They told me they did not want to lose what were, at that time, "very good jobs for women for a small town."

It made me angry — but I honored their request.

I left that very early worksite experience with a slight prejudice in favor of hiring women to do hard jobs. When I later became a hiring manager in my early twenties, I ignored very explicit expert counsel and direct steerage from our corporate human resources department who wanted me to only interview male candidates for several of the creative and analytical jobs that were in my chain of command and work team. I asked, instead, to see resumes from women candidates for those jobs.

Star Players Gave Us Star Performance

The resumes I saw blew me away. There were star players just waiting to be hired. I hired several of those star performers into various jobs and my department ended up being a star department.

Much of my early success in several key areas was tied to their performance.

I have maintained a similar hiring pattern for over three decades now. Those hires have continued to make my work team group performance levels very high. The CFO for each of my last two multi-billion dollar companies was a woman named Kathy. Not the same Kathy. The name was a pure and pleasant coincidence. But what wasn't coincidental was the fact that both Kathys functioned as star CFO's.

My COO for my Minnesota plan was a star-performance woman who succeeded me as CEO. She has been a star in that CEO job ever since she took the job over.

At Kaiser Permanente, when I retired, there were eight regional presidents. Four were women. All eight presidents were stars. My controller, head of communications, brand senior executive, and the audit head for our organization were all women.

The quality committee of my board, the community benefit committee of my board, and the compensation committee of my board were all chaired by women. White males only made up 40 percent of the Board of Directors for that \$50 billion organization.

All of those women in those senior executive roles and in those lead Board roles have been star performers for that organization.

The largest single privately funded systems project that was ever done by any private organization in the world was our \$4 billion complete computerization of our medical record and of our care support systems.

That massive and complex systems implementation project was led with great success by a highly skilled and star level woman

executive. She led that extremely complex and massive project in an extremely collaborative way.

Some Nations Had Star Women Leaders Who Were Clear

Alphas

In my early years of naming women to leadership positions and then to senior leadership positions, I looked at the patterns of leadership roles for women that I could see in history to find role models and approaches that had worked well. I could see that very few nations had ever been headed by women — but it was clear that some of the women who did personally lead nations did some spectacular work.

I could see that those leaders led their nations well and that those leaders were accepted by their followers and their country as their leader. Queen Elizabeth and Queen Victoria both created and successfully managed empires. Catherine the Great expanded and solidified Russia. Golda Meir and Margaret Thatcher were clearly highly competent leaders who had the support of their nations. They each clearly steered their countries in the directions they wanted their countries to go.

Because our traditional and almost universal pattern has been to have men as heads of families, heads of organizations, and heads of nations, the number of women leaders in various senior leadership settings over the year has tended to be fairly low.

When I began hiring people into executive level jobs, I studied the experiences that various senior women leaders had in other business settings. I saw both successes and failures. Some of the failures surprised me.

Stress Erodes When The Alpha Job Is Perceived To Be Filled

When I looked closely at a couple of those failures — some of the problem patterns were obvious. I knew, already, from my study of hierarchies that people in any hierarchical setting feel stress when the Alpha position in their hierarchy is not filled. A team who loses their coach feels stress. A ship that loses its captain feels stress. A department that loses its manager feels stress.

People in any hierarchy tend to feel stress when the lead position is vacant.

That stress erodes and melts away when the people in that setting have a sense that the Alpha job in their hierarchy has been filled.

The problem that I saw in a couple of settings and situations where the new Alpha was a woman was that the people in that area had expected a male Alpha to be in that job and some people actually did not perceive the job to be filled when a woman was named to the position.

I heard from a couple of people that they felt that the lead job was still vacant in some way — because they didn't have a clear sense that there was now an Alpha in the job.

That issue intrigued me. It seemed solvable. It was.

People Need To Perceive That The Alpha Role Has Been Filled

I looked at the support that is given to ruling Queens in various settings and I realized that the needed level of support as the functional Alpha was there for the Queens in those settings because Queens are perceived to be a culturally legitimate form of Alpha for the setting.

Those Queens in those settings fit an Alpha expectation. A woman, I could see, obviously could activate those sets of hierarchical instincts. So that was not an insurmountable barrier.

It was clear to me from several examples that it can feel right to people in a setting to support a woman Alpha where it is clear to people that there a legitimate Alpha in that role.

Several of my role models and mentors for Alpha behavior for women were nuns I knew who led hospital systems. I have worked directly in various settings with four different nun CEO's whose authority levels in their organizations were never challenged by anyone at any level.

A couple of those sisters negotiated deals with me. There was never a hint of doubt either about their authority levels or about their ability to do extremely good deals for their team.

I am still in awe of some of the approaches that were used to steer me exactly to where a couple of the sisters wanted me steered for the deals that we did with each other.

As I looked at multiple settings with women leaders, I could see that the women CEOs who were succeeding in various settings that I

looked at all had people in their organizations who clearly recognized their Alpha status. It was also clear to me that the people in a couple of settings where the new woman leader had failed had a sense that the new Alpha was an anomaly and might be some kind of placeholder, but was clearly not an actual Alpha.

It was clear to me after looking at a couple of settings where the new women leaders had been undermined and not supported by some of their team members that it could generally be useful for new women leaders in Alpha roles to do a few things early in the transition process that triggered an instinct-supported perception of their personal Alpha status.

To achieve that goal better for the women who I was promoting in my organizations into various departmental Alpha roles and to help women friends of mine who were being promoted into various Alpha roles in a number of other work settings that were unrelated to my organizations, I created a few basic tools that can be used to help trigger the perception of Alpha for new leaders in various settings.

To create the sense in those settings that there was now a legitimate Alpha in those leader roles, I generally coached the women

who I named to various Alpha roles to do several symbolic Alpha things very quickly that made it very clear to other people in each hierarchy that the position now had an Alpha in the Alpha chair.

People Hate To Lose Relative Power

One of the Alpha things that I advised each new women Alpha to do was to sit at the head of the table, convene meetings of her leadership team with clear and comfortable command of the agenda, and to announce at an initial meeting of that group that she was going to be asking each person in the room if the chain of command and the organization chart they were currently using was, in fact, the best organizational plan and the best chart and chain of command for that group to use.

Nothing puts people in any hierarchical setting into panic mode more quickly than the risk of personally losing relative status. People hate to lose power. People hate to lose the perception of power.

Instead of allowing each person who was already in that specific power hierarchy in each of those settings to simply continue to assume with complete comfort that their own current powerbase and their own personal relative hierarchical position were both rock solid and risk

free, a simple and very clear statement by the new leader that the new leader would now look very directly with discerning eyes at each and all positions in the organization was generally enough to erase that feeling of security and to create a level of personal status level vulnerability for the key people in each chain of command.

People very quickly figure out who actually is boss in a setting when they recognize, understand, and believe that their new boss might and actually could demote them.

That is sobering information. It gets people's attention. It gives people a very useful sense of their own hierarchical position and of their own hierarchical vulnerability.

My experience has been that people who had not been saluting the new leader before that moment generally start to salute at that point and — I was delighted to learn — they actually feel right at an instinct-linked level saluting because they suddenly recognize that there is, in fact, an Alpha there for them to salute.

Stress Levels Are Reduced When People Perceive An Alpha Is In Place

I will not describe all of the other steps I include in the alpha status recognition process here other than to say that they tend to work. The relevant people in each setting recognize that there is now an Alpha in the room and people begin to act and think accordingly. Support levels for the new leader tend to increase when people have a sense of relative status.

That is not an unkind thing to do to people. Getting clarity on that particular point actually helps reduce the stress levels in that setting for the other people once the alignment process is fully played out and once key people recognize at an instinct-linked level that the Alpha position in that setting now has an Alpha in it.

As an FYI — it really doesn't matter in the end if any reorganization of any kind actually does happen in those settings. The threat and the process are key — not the functional deed of reorganizing.

It very much does matter that a real org-chart review is done by the new leader and it matters that people in that setting and that chain of command know that the review is real and that a reorganization is possible.

I have also found that doing that particular review generally gives the new Alpha in a setting an extremely useful and timely insight into what each of the people in her area does and how the people in that setting all interact and interrelate with one another.

That specific review is worth doing in a setting for new leaders for that learning value alone — even if the review has no positive impact at any level on the activation of any sets of instincts and even if no reorganizations or reassignments actually take place.

We Organize As Hunters And We Organize As Gatherers

I have been fascinated for a very long time by the fact that we clearly do have a couple of very different instinctive leadership patterns. Those patterns are pretty basic and they relate back directly to points made earlier in this book about how our primal societies functioned and survived.

In our hunter/gatherer societies, it was true that we had both hunters and gatherers. They can be two very different sets of processes in the real world.

We clearly have the ability to organize in one set of ways as hunters, and we have the capability of organizing in other key ways as gatherers. Those two styles were addressed a couple of times earlier in this book.

Those two approaches are described in more detail in both *The Art of Intergroup Peace* book and in the *Primal Pathways* book.

I learned a very long time ago that both of those approaches can work very well in work settings to get important things done. Both genders can easily use either style. I have found, however, that men do tend to be more likely to use the hunter/warrior approach and that women tend to be more likely to use the gatherer approach.

But I have seen star leaders of both genders use both approaches. One of the most effective gatherer leaders I ever worked with was a man and a couple of the best war party leaders I have worked with have been women.

I personally began my career using the hunter style almost exclusively and evolved, over time, to a gatherer style approach to getting things done. Leading extremely complex settings with a pure hunter model would probably have brought me to failure in several settings and situations.

The Hunter Style Is More Directive — The Gatherer Style Is More Collaborative

At the most basic levels, the hunter style is more dictatorial and directive and the gatherer style is more collaborative and inclusive. Both can achieve major successes. The hunter style tends to be more obvious and more visible, so people in those settings generally know who the hunter group leaders are.

Gatherer leaders, by contrast, often succeed in part because they manage to have various other team members getting the credit for specific achievements of the group. That approach of sharing the credit for successes can motivate team members very nicely, but it can make the gatherer leaders own direct role in the entire process less obvious.

That gatherer-leader approach of sharing credit is one of the reasons why some organization Alphas have a hard time discerning the talent levels of the best gatherer leaders in their organizations. Many organizational Alpha leaders today are men who were promoted to those top jobs based on their own success in using the high visibility hunter leadership model and those leaders often do not know or recognize any other style.

A very high percentage of the people who run companies are men. The truth is that those leaders have often succeeded and advanced in their careers by being good at the hunter management style approach.

Those particular leaders, I have found, tend to be quite good at identifying the other hunter leaders in their work force, but I have seen that many of those executives are significantly less good at directly identifying or even knowing about the existence of the best gatherer leaders in their organizations.

That is due, in large part to the fact that good gatherer leaders tend to spend less time in the spotlight and that low visibility approach to getting important things done can make those gatherer leaders much harder for hunter Alphas to see and find.

Women who are promoted to various senior leadership roles in various settings often are promoted because they have had a high performing work unit or because they have led a very successful project. In either case, the leadership style that succeeded for the women who were promoted relative to that successful work team or that successful project was often to be a gatherer leader.

The gatherer style involves participative and collaborative work efforts, with people invited to be part of the project in inclusive and collaborative ways.

Today's Work Environment Can Involve Complex Projects

That collaborative and inclusive approach can be a really good approach to use for today's workforce. For many complex projects in today's organizations, that can be the best leadership approach to use.

I have led organizations at the most senior level for more than three decades and I can say with great certainty that some projects in today's world are too complex to have dictators in the lead roles.

It can be a very good thing for organizational success to promote gatherer leaders to many senior leadership roles.

I have done that a number of times. I have had some memorable successes. I also know from experience that it really can sometimes create at least an initial problem in the new job if the new women leader who has been a gatherer style performance star simply continues to use the gatherer approach from day one as her first set of visible leadership behaviors in her new job.

The problem that happens in some settings is based on the fact that many people do expect new leaders in purely hierarchical Alpha jobs to behave in Alpha ways. If the new leader in a setting is initially perceived to be too collaborative, I have seen that the risk is high that some people in the new work area will see that participative approach by the new leader to be weak and will not see that approach as worthy of obedience, compliance, or even support.

That's why conducting initial meetings from the head of the table — doing some Alpha-like communications to the workforce — and telling the key leaders in the hierarchy that a re-organization is possible all can have real value in getting people aligned with the new Alpha role.

Some people can actually have problems feeling sufficiently hierarchical and stress free in their own work role if the first actions by the new leader follow the gatherer leadership approach in very participative ways and seem to the workforce members to be indecisive rather than inclusive.

Some Teams Need Some Alpha Behaviors To Get Aligned

I have seen extremely good work — stunningly good work — done by people using the gatherer leadership approach. I personally

have spent years very intentionally learning to use that approach more effectively in my own approach to leading the teams I have led.

But the gatherer approach sometimes isn't the best way to first lead a new team immediately after a promotion. Some people do perceive the Alpha role to be unfilled if the new leader starts her leadership process with a less directive style of interaction.

As I noted earlier, that is not a hard problem to fix. My experience in several settings has been that if a women Alpha who is new in the job uses the hunter style in the new role for a while and does a few clearly Alpha things to settle people's hierarchical instincts and to get their sense of relative status in gear and then switches over time back to the gatherer style, that transition approach and sequence of leadership styles can work particularly well.

Later, when the gatherer leadership style is again used by that leader, that gatherer approach is then perceived to be inclusive by an Alpha leader in a very good way rather than being seen as being weak and indecisive.

Queen Elizabeth the First was known for her absolute comfort for being in command, and she was known for her equal comfort in being

surrounded by extremely intelligent senior advisors who helped her think through a wide range of factional and strategic issues.

Even though she was clearly the Queen, there were strong traces of gatherer leadership in her collaborative thought processes that helped her succeed as the Alpha for her country at literally historic success levels.

Her country was much stronger at the end of her reign. She used a mixed model that I believe has great potential for success in many settings in our increasingly complex world for both men and women in leadership roles.

We Are Making Progress At Multiple Levels

Today, we are making progress at multiple levels relative to women's issues in our country. We are making progress on economic issues and our political agendas now have women in key roles at every level.

Our society has collectively grown in enlightenment on many issues relating to women and we have incorporated our enlightenment in a very useful and functional way into our laws and our cultural expectations.

We now have laws that allow women to vote. Laws exist for that issue because it is clear that we need laws to protect progress in a number of areas after progress has been made.

Because we have actual laws about voting, we don't need to rely on the good will or the personal enlightenment levels of the people who are running the polling sites for any given election to allow women at any site to vote.

We had the good sense to build a law that codifies and guarantees that right to vote for all women at all sites. We also enforce that law with absolute consistency.

That enforcement makes both the practice and the law real. Enforcement, I have learned, is critical for many kinds of behavior change situations where we want enlightened behaviors to be the normal and expected behaviors.

Laws and enforcement are both needed to protect our values from slippage. If we did not both enact and enforce voting rights laws, voting rights violations would exist and people who did not agree with those values would create problems that would keep other people from voting.

For all areas where we have intergroup diversity, we need to embrace a culture of inclusion and of win/win intergroup interactions — and we need to protect the existence of that culture with rules and laws that make behaviors that violate that set of cultural expectations illegal. The law is our friend when we are steering primal behaviors. We are all smart enough to have our cultures embedded in our personal belief systems and that is most likely to happen in some area of behavior if we turn our enlightened values into legally enforced expectations.

We Have Excluded Half Our Population

For women's issues, we are now at the cusp of a positive new era.

We now need to remove the remaining barriers that exist to full inclusion for all jobs, careers, and roles for women.

We will prosper when that happens.

We have excluded roughly half of our population in this country from full participation in a wide range of our opportunities for a very long time.

We will be stronger as a nation when we extend those opportunities to all of us and in the process, we will literally double the

number of people who can make full contributions for us all and to us all.

I know that to be true from direct and real world experience. My old care system — with half of the sitting presidents women and with half of the senior leadership women — has won J.D. Powers, Consumer Reports, and Medicare star ratings as the number one system in the entire country. That same care system with nearly 200,000 total employees has a majority of women employees and also has 59 percent of its total workforce from our minority populations. The senior leadership levels for that organization were as diverse as the workforce.

Inclusion Works

Inclusion, I can tell you from direct and large-scale real world experience, works. We won multiple performance recognitions in a number of key areas of performance as a highly inclusive organization.

I absolutely guarantee that we could not have achieved those levels of success and we would not have attained that degree of functional excellence if I had excluded half of that leadership team from that effort based on their gender. We needed that entire team to do what we did. Inclusion worked.

I believe to my core that we will be stronger as a country as well when we make inclusion a core competency and when we receive the advantage of having full involvement from all of our team members at the highest levels. Those negative exclusion levels and clear elements of discrimination for both minority Americans and women need to be components of our past — but not key components of our future. That is, I believe, the path we need to be on now.

When you look at the world around us, a number of major companies are being led extremely well by women leaders. Xerox, Avon, DuPont, Hewlett Packard, International Business Machines, General Motors, and The Gates Foundation all are among the major corporations who have women leaders who serve as clear models for what can be done.

A decade from now, that list will be even more impressive. The message we can learn from that set of leaders could not be more clear. The key to success in a setting is to have the right person in each of those jobs — and “right person” is not linked to gender. Right person is linked to skill set, disposition, vision, and the ability to lead.

Choose leaders. Be leaders.

In today's complex and diverse world, the skill sets of inclusive leaders can be the key factor that creates organizational victories and it clearly will make us stronger as a country when we include the full skill sets of all of our people — both men and women — in our society at every level.

Chapter Twelve — America the Vulnerable

As I have been looking at the impact of our us/them instincts on our behaviors, it has been discouraging and even depressing to see how many other countries in the world are actually at war with themselves today. People in Chechnya, Syria, Sri Lanka, and an amazing number of other countries have armed groups of people who are killing other people in internal intergroup conflicts today.

It has actually been encouraging to me at one level to see that we do not have that degree and that extent of intergroup conflicts and intergroup damage happening in our country today.

We are not killing each other in groups, and we don't have armed militias representing groups in this country who hate and do damage to other groups in our country today.

We do have a small number of very unhappy people who actually do label themselves as being "militia" for a fairly obvious set of us/them instinct related reasons. But the people who call themselves militia in our country are clearly not functioning at the scale of militia groups in Sri Lanka, Pakistan, Syria, Iraq, or The Ukraine. That is encouraging and good for our safety and our success as a country.

It has also, however, been very clear to me that we very obviously do have major intergroup challenges facing us right now as a country. It is also very clear that we will need to successfully and skillfully address those challenges or they will damage us and they could damage us badly for a very long time.

The truly evil intergroup and even truly evil intergender behavior that is happening in so many places in the world should serve a clear warning to us all that we are not safe from comparable evil behaviors here. It was clear to me in looking at our history and at our current status that we have done evil things to ourselves in our own past and we need to be very sure that we are not evil to ourselves in any of those ways again.

We have people who are angry today based on years of prejudice and discrimination and we have people who are unhappy today because of differences in economic status, educational status, or employment level status by group.

We have some significant differences between groups of people — and there is no reason to believe that those differences will simply be reduced or disappear as our diversity levels increase.

We Don't Have The Strategies To Turn Our Growing Diversity Into A Significant Asset

We need to face some extremely important facts about our growing diversity. It is clear from looking at our population numbers that we are becoming increasingly diverse at a level where there will be no majority group in many areas of the country in the relatively near future. That new reality will create new levels of intergroup interactions in a wide range of places in this country in the immediate future.

The majority of births in this country this year were to our minority populations. The majority of students in our public school systems today are minority students.

We are not having public discussions about the likely consequences at that new level of diversity. We clearly do not have the right strategies in place that are needed to turn our increased diversity into an asset instead of having our growing diversity trigger a major and very real risk to us all.

As I have been doing the research for these books and studying those issues and demographic trends, I have been repeatedly impressed and mildly depressed by the fact that almost no one in our country in

any public settings is having any kind of systemic and open discussions about any of those issues. We have some very real intergroup interaction issues to be concerned about — and we do have periodic intergroup events and incidents that put those issues into public view — but we clearly do not have a process, a forum, or nay kind of mechanism to use to address those issues in any proactive, productive, or even preventive way.

We do not have wise people dealing collectively in various settings with the obvious challenges that will be created by our collective future of extreme diversity.

Far too many people actually very intentionally shy away from any discussions of ethnic, religious, racial, or cultural intergroup behaviors.

People tend to avoid those topics in public discourse — and when those issues do come up in various settings and circumstances, people tend to avoid any meaningful discussions of the real intergroup issues and the basic and relevant intergroup concerns that exist for groups today.

The topics are not politically correct topics in many settings and some people are afraid to discuss those issues in any direct way. My sense is that a number of people believe that other people will be angry or offended if those topics are even mentioned in many settings, so those topics are not mentioned or discussed.

We Shy Away From Direct Discussion In Public Discourse

That avoidance for those topics today is partly because we actually have often been fairly inept at having those conversations in the past. We have often discussed a number of those issues badly and in clumsy and sometimes dysfunctional ways in the times and settings where they have been publically discussed.

People who have tried to discuss some of those issues and who have managed to offend someone in their efforts have sometimes been criticized or even attacked for those efforts. Most people in this country have learned to avoid our basic intergroup topics and issues entirely in public discourse.

Within groups, many of those intergroup issues are very clearly addressed by group members with themselves. Very clear intergroup anger is often expressed inside of group settings to other group

members. But in mixed group settings, at very basic levels, it has been my experience that we are often afraid to say real and honest things to each other about those issues, and we don't have a safe context or a good format for those discussions.

We do not even talk explicitly and in clear fact-based terms about the pure arithmetic and mathematical realities of our growing diversity for all of our settings. We have been very careful not talk in any honest or open way about what we believe our increasing diversity will do to us and will do for us as individual committees and as a nation.

That is all an unfortunate and highly dysfunctional communications approach.

The Majority Of Births This Year Are Minority Births

We truly are becoming highly diverse at a rapid rate. We need to address that reality.

The majority of births in our nation last year actually were to our minority populations. The majority of students in our public schools this year are minority students.

Those are not long-term projections of theoretically and hypothetically possible future diversity levels. Those are today's numbers.

We actually face the reality of very real diversity today — and we need to be ready to understand and discuss that very real diversity today because that high level of diversity is happening now and it is the world we are in today.

Avoiding basic discussion of those numbers and those issues will absolutely not help us turn our diversity into a strength for America.

I have personally come to believe for many reasons that our diversity can be a huge asset to us as a country — if we are very intentional in creating the right intergroup approaches and the right intergroup directions for us all to use.

I have seen the most diverse care system in America turn its diversity into synergy and into a culture of caring that created best results in major areas of service and of quality of care. Inclusion of all groups into a shared agenda that was anchored on shared beliefs and shared values and functioned as a meritocracy can result in the best outcomes for both patients and caregivers.

I have great confidence that we can turn our growing diversity as a nation into a major asset that benefits us all — but we will not do that by ducking the issues or avoiding the key conversations we need to have about those issues.

The rights approaches and directions that will make our growing diversity an asset will not happen by themselves, however. We need to collectively and very intentionally steer ourselves to that particular right direction.

It will take honest, open, and well-intentioned discussions to get us to that place.

We clearly need to talk about those issues. We need to have those conversations in a safe and non-inflammatory way.

We Need Forums And A Context To Discuss Those Issues

We need to set up both a forum and a context to have those conversations. These books — *Cusp of Chaos*, *The Art of Intergroup Peace*, *Primal Pathways*, and *Peace In Our Time* — are all written to help create a safe construct and a non-threatening context to tee up and to help frame some of those discussions about the intergroup realities in America.

Creating a level of safe dialogue and building a safe mental model that can be used to help people in various settings discuss those issues is a major goal for these books. The books each make an attempt to talk about real intergroup problems and interactions in a way that we can all both understand and discuss.

We need those discussions to happen and we need a context that can make those discussions about our various intergroup realities and issues both effective and safe.

We also need settings for those discussions to occur. We need people to come together in various community settings to talk about the issues of intergroup understanding and intergroup stress and conflict in their communities.

We also need to come together in “virtual” settings to have those dialogues and conversations.

The Internet should actually become a major asset for us in that overall communication and learning process.

We Need To Use The Internet Well As A Tool For

Enlightenment

We very much need to use the Internet well at this point in time to support those discussions and to enhance and enable the overall learning process that can anchor our alignment and increase our collective and individual wisdom on those issues.

We need the Internet very intentionally and explicitly to be a tool for enlightenment. That can be done. We need to set up Internet discussions of the key facts and the key issues and we need to be able to use the Internet in a collaborative way to make us all better informed and situationally smarter.

The Internet is being used extensively now by racist groups and by negative groups who want to create intergroup anger, conflict, and divisions. People who see the world in dysfunctional and angry us/them ways use the Internet now — often very skillfully — to recruit followers and to convert people to their cause.

Those people also use the Internet to plan and coordinate attacks of various kinds against the people they hate.

We need to use the Internet to achieve the exact opposite set of goals — to bring people together in Peaceful and inclusive ways to create a collective sense of values-based “us.”

Computer systems in many areas of the system world are now often developed using “open sourcing” collaborative building approaches. We actually need to do something similar to do positive-focused “open sourcing” problem reduction work on the key and current issues of intergroup conflict, intergroup alignment, and intergroup Peace.

We need a collaborative build for the strategies that create Peace. We need to address those issues directly and openly at multiple levels and we need people to understand those issues so clearly that we can all be part of the solution.

We need to use the Internet well to explain the issues and we need to use the Internet well to get people to work together to solve those sets of intergroup problems.

When We Understand An Issue Well — We Can All Help

Solve It

When we understand an issue well and when we have common agreement on what our overall goals are as a people, then many people who share the goals, understand the key issues, and embrace the values

and the culture can jointly and collectively solve intergroup issues in each of the settings we are each in.

At a corporate leadership level, I know from years of direct, hands on experience, that when people in a setting understand the strategy, understand the culture, and feel aligned with the overall process of an organization, then management of key processes in a wide range of settings can all happen situationally by remote control.

People who make daily decisions in each organizational setting that has those underpinnings will make those decisions in the context of the strategy and the culture for the setting — and creativity can be unleashed in good, positive, and highly productive directions using that aligned approach.

People can solve problems together much more effectively when people jointly understand the problems and agree on the need for solutions.

Great creativity can occur when people understand the goal of the creative process in any setting.

I know that to be true, because I have used that strategy and that approach in several situations and settings and I know for a fact that it works.

We Need To Understand Where We Have Been

We will not make sufficient progress at this point in time in dealing with the issues we face today until we all take a good and honest look at our actual history for intergroup interactions.

We need to know exactly where we have been and we need to know where we are going relative to our intergroup realities. We all need to share that knowledge and we need to be honest about those realities instead of avoiding discussion on those topics or pretending that the most challenging and most negative parts of our history did not happen.

Some people are in a state of denial about our historic realities. It is hard to make progress on intergroup understanding today if we are in state of denial about key aspects of our intergroup past.

The truth is — for the last couple of centuries — America has been a national culture with a very large single ethnic majority group

that dominated the culture at every economic, functional, and legal level.

White Americans have made up the bulk of the population of this country for hundreds of years. African Americans and Hispanic Americans have had high population concentrations in some geographic areas, but have historically made up less than 10 percent of the total population. Asian Americans and Native Americans each have tended to represent less than 5 percent of the population.

Those numbers and that relative status have been true for a very long time. People with ancestors from the Middle East and Southeast Asia have also been here in functionally negligible numbers. Those people who come to this country from those specific ancestral settings tend to be widely and thinly dispersed.

Mosques and Buddhist temples have both existed in this country, but they have been rare and most were clearly anomalies for their settings — until relatively recently.

White Americans Have Been The Dominant Majority
Group — And Christianity Has Been The Dominant
Religion

Various categories of Christianity have been the primary religious belief system for the U.S. — and even those churches have had their own frequently visible history of us/them intergroup instinct activation. Church affiliation has been a significant defining category for us/them differentiation for a number of issues and behaviors in a number of American settings.

In the aggregate, however, our cities have tended to have a relatively small number of synagogues, a fairly large number of churches, and almost no mosques or temples.

White Americans — speaking English as their tribal language — have been the very large “us” group who ran the country. White Americans made the laws of the land, ran the government, and owned the vast majority of the nation’s wealth.

White Americans created a clear category of “us” and that majority “us” dealt with all other groups as various categories of “Them.”

The original founding principals of the country had some very enlightened beliefs about liberty, freedom, and equal opportunity to pursue the American Dream — but the implementation of those

enlightened principals was functionally limited for a very long time only to the category of “us” that ran the country — White Americans.

Freedoms Were Initially Limited To White Males

For a very long time, the ruling group in each community and setting who benefitted from that set of freedoms was actually limited to White American males. Even White women were not allowed to vote for centuries. White Americans — with most power given to White males — were the absolute majority group for most of the history of this country and that absolute majority ran things in almost all settings very clearly in its own group self-interest.

As we look forward to our immediate future as a country, we need to recognize the fact that those sets of ethnic majority dominance are changing — and we will need to reflect those changes in our intergroup behaviors if we expect to be a country that continues to be at Peace with itself.

We also need to deal with the immediate reality that major portions of our country now have their own local ethnic concentration realities that we will need to address and recognize in order to meet our goals in each setting.

People Have Replaced Forced Segregation With Self-Segregation

When I started looking at those issues two decades ago, no one anticipated the massive ethnic voluntary self-segregation we now have in all of our major cities. Our cities all have major areas of ethnic and racial population concentrations — and that concentration tends to be both historic and voluntary — with people choosing to live with other people like themselves.

That self-segregation in all of those cities actually makes complete sense when we understand instinctive behaviors but awareness of instinctive behaviors has not been an anchor for our public policy thought processes in the past. So we have been surprised and even a bit befuddled at a policy level by those sets of behaviors.

When people tend to choose for personal instinctive comfort to self-segregate our cities by race and ethnicity then we need to understand the implications of that instinct-guided reality for our public policy decision making.

Public Discussion Of Key Points Or Patterns Has Been Minimal

It was very clear to me when I started looking at those kinds of issues that our politicians had not figured out how to discuss any of those sets of issues in a safe and non-inflammatory way. That was true in the early 1990s and that situation has not improved very much since 1990. Public discussion of those points about our intergroup issues and intergroup realities has been minimal for that entire period of time.

The riots that happened at various points in cities like Los Angeles and Oakland occasionally put very clear intergroup issues into the headlines — but those behaviors have tended to happen in very setting specific ways. The riots and demonstrations have been very local — with local people expressing local anger.

More recently, the blowups in Ferguson, Missouri, and in several other cities have created major media attention at a national level. The people who are writing news stories about Ferguson and the people who are sending us electronic news coverage from Ferguson have sometimes mentioned some of the broader issues that exist for those settings, but the primary focus of the media for those stories has been on events and incidents, and not on patterns or issues.

The primary focus of the news coverage for each of those settings has leaned more to factoids, describing specific incidents, and reporting about specific events — but not describing or discussing the underlying issues and realities in those settings in any way that will help the overall public understanding of those sets of problems.

That reporting level is easy to understand, because our media has not been learning about or focused on the underlying issues for those communities or settings. Our media has just reacted to those events as events when they occur.

The public discussion about those intergroup issues in those settings that has happened has either been entirely situation based — with news-worthy intergroup trigger events of some kind creating event-focused public attention — or the media-linked conversations that did happen tended to be politically correct and timid to the point of people in the setting not putting real issues on the table or discussing them in any clear way.

We Need Better Conversations About Key Issues

We need to do better. We need to set up a better and more grounded public and private conversations than the ones we have had up to now relative to those situations and those issues.

If we can't have that discussion in either the news media or in related settings, then we need to create Internet friendly opportunities for that communication dialogue and shared learning to happen.

This book and its sister books are intended to help create a safe context for those conversations and that shared learning to happen.

It has taken me a couple of decades to figure out how to use these books to function as a communication support tool for people who want to understand and deal with actual intergroup interactions.

This set of books is intended to be a just-in-time tool for those people. I do believe that the time for those safe conversations is now and I believe that people need a context now for those conversations so that we can have the right set of intergroup and interpersonal interactions both tomorrow and today.

We Need People To Reach Out As People

Each of the books in the Intergroup trilogy is intended to help create a safe and clear context for those kinds of intergroup interaction conversation to happen.

The Intergroup books are also intended to encourage and enable individual people to reach out and make personal connections with people from other group s at a 1-to-1 level. We need to get to know people as people. We need to create trust and understanding between people as people.

We need to create friendships that reach across group lines and connect people with people as people — with the opportunity to get to know each other as people.

Those books are included to encourage and support that process.

We need people from each group who reach out to create friendships and basic understanding with people from other groups.

When we create those kinds of relationships and linkages, we can make our growing diversity a national asset.

We need people to create those relationships with a sense of the key factors, issues, and even instincts that are relevant in the process to each of us.

We need people in each setting to understand our basic us/them instincts. We need people in each setting to understand both the roles and the opportunities that those instincts create. We need people in each setting working very intentionally and deliberately to avoid triggering a sense of “Them” and we need people working to create a sense of “us” for each situation and setting.

Creating direct friendships with people from other groups can be a key part of that process.

We need people in each setting to recognize the actual intergroup history of each setting. We don’t want to dwell on past behaviors in a way that rekindles anger and keeps us from positive future interactions, but we need to recognize the full context for where we are today.

We need well-intentioned and committed people to take steps now in the context we have today to build intergroup alignment and interpersonal trust with the goal of creating better overall outcomes and better interpersonal relationships for the people in each setting.

The Majority Of Births Were Minority Mothers Last Year

We need to anchor those conversations by having all of us recognize the mathematical realities.

For the last half-century, a combination of a higher birth rate for minority Americans and a significant influx into this country of new minority group immigrants — both legal and illegal immigrants — has caused the minority population of this country to grow significantly.

Many cities now either have no majority group or one of the historical minority groups has become the current majority group for the city.

Most births in America this year were to our minority Americans.

It strikes me as extremely important for us all to know and understand that we have now actually reached the historical and mathematical point where the majority of new births in this country this year are from our minority populations. That actually did happen this year. That is a watershed event. It is historic.

This year, for the first time, the majority of the students in the public school system of this country will be from our minority populations. The private schools tend to have White majorities — but the public schools will now have a majority of minority students.

In less than a decade, the majority of new workers who will be getting jobs in this country will also be from our minority groups. Very

soon after that, we will see a majority of all workers in this country coming from our minority populations and from our new immigrants.

That is a huge change.

White workers made up more than 80 percent of the workforce of this country just a couple of decades ago. As our older, white, majority group workers age and retire, those old White workers are being replaced by a much more diverse set of workers from multiple ethnic and racial groups.

The Actual Diversity Numbers Are Irrefutable And **Inevitable**

Again — the demographic numbers are uncontested. They are what they are. Age differences by group are also obvious and extremely important to understand.

Older Americans are overwhelmingly White. That will be true for quite a while. The new and younger workforce that will keep America functioning for the rest of the lifetime of those older Americans will very soon be less than half White.

That will create some interesting political realities and it will even create interesting societal cash flow realities as we go forward.

The taxes that will pay for the care and that will fund the benefits and the community services that will be needed by those older white retirees over the next couple of decades will come increasingly from minority taxpayers and workers.

That future is the path we are on today. There is no turning back option for us. It is exactly what it is. It will be exactly what it will be.

Most White Americans still live in neighborhoods that are overwhelmingly White and most White Americans work, today, in work settings that are also still overwhelmingly White.

For those folks, for their daily experience, White is still the visible majority at a significant level. The actual numbers that show how diverse we are as a country for the overall country tend to be less visible to White people in those settings.

I have shocked some very intelligent and very well-informed White people in some all White settings by telling them those actual sets of numbers about our current diversity levels. We tend to believe that the world immediately around us is a representation of the entire

world. For White Americans in that particular perceptual cocoon, that is not true — and I have shocked some people in those cocoons by pointing out the actual numerical realities.

I have followed those revelations with a sense that the future we face can be a blessing to us all if we approach it in the right way.

We Can Turn Our Diversity Into A Strength And An Asset

My own belief is that we have two clear choices. We can turn our overwhelmingly new diversity into a major asset for our country — or we could turn that new diversity into a horrific and highly problematic set of intergroup tensions, intergroup conflicts, and increasingly dysfunctional intergroup behaviors. Vulnerability is very real if we choose that second path.

Both paths are easily within our reach. Either outcome is possible. If we want to succeed going forward, we need to start with the facts. We need now to collectively understand the basic fact that we will be increasingly diverse and we need to all accept the fact that the trend is indisputable, inevitable, and entirely irreversible.

We Have Led The World On Enlightened Behaviors

One of the things that gives me real and significant hope for the future of our country is knowing that we have led the world in so many areas of enlightened behavior. Some of our history involves negative us/them behaviors that are truly painful and hard to look at.

But other parts of our history are much better and those better parts of our history that are linked to our very best us/them behaviors give me cause for optimism and hope.

We do have a clear history that is rich in enlightened elements. We have done some good things at multiple levels that needed to be done. We have very intentionally embedded enlightened behaviors and enlightened beliefs into our culture and into our society at multiple levels and we continue to get better at expending our enlightened behaviors into new areas of our society and world.

We all know and celebrate the list of our enlightened achievements. Those behaviors are worth remembering and noting. We were democratic when the rest of the world was run by autocracies and ruled by kings.

We created freedom of speech, when other countries imprisoned people who told the truth about things that the people in power did not want said.

We stumbled badly for a long time on slavery, but then we did free our slaves and we outlawed slavery here before it disappeared in some other major portions of the world. We were not the first nation to outlaw slavery — but we were far from the last.

We then discriminated badly, intentionally, maliciously, and in some very cruel and evil ways against our former slaves. We also discriminated very intentionally in multiple settings against all of our various ethnic and racial minority groups in this country.

Every Minority Group Has Its Discrimination History

Every minority group can tell its own very real story of deliberate and damaging discrimination. I write about that history of intentional discrimination against each of our minority groups very explicitly in both *Primal Pathways* and *The Art of Intergroup Peace*.

Our us/them instincts caused the White majority group to act in very discriminatory ways against each and every perceived category of “Them.”

As I have explained in each of this trilogy of books — anyone who looked different or who sounded different triggered those instinctive reactions — and significant levels of discrimination happened in very negative ways for our minority groups who looked or sounded different than our White majority group.

But the reality is that we have now made major progress for many of those issues. That historical level of deliberate, intentional, and systematic discrimination is no longer the law of the land. It is true and good that we have in recent years grown increasingly enlightened in many of our areas of functionality and our governance relative to those extremely important issues.

That has been relatively recent progress in key areas, but it is real progress and it did happen. We can build on that progress. We only awarded women the right to vote 100 years ago — and the civil rights bill that was written to protect the voting rights of all Americans was passed only 50 years ago. We are still working on getting the voting inclusion processes right — but huge progress has been made.

We had hundreds of years of extremely discriminatory and unenlightened behaviors that we should feel shame for on both of those

issues — but we are on the right path on almost all of those key issues now. Major progress has been made in a wide range of areas that we should celebrate.

We now have formal equality under the law on a wide range of issues that extends across genders and reaches out to all ethnic groups and races. We have made significant progress in key areas and my sense is that we now need to understand that progress for what it is so we can build on that progress and those enlightened approaches going forward.

We Should Both Condemn And Celebrate

We did not get to where we are now easily. Each step in the process of progress had to be won on its own merits — and clear opposition has existed on all key issues. Ours is a painful history to study. People who did not want enlightened behaviors in multiple areas put up fierce and sometimes bitter and angry fights for long periods of time to keep the old practices in place.

The good news is that once we adopt a new and more enlightened belief as a nation and a culture, we tend to bake the new belief into our expectations and into our laws.

Our ability to bake a new belief into our cultures was a very useful point for me to understand in working on those issues. Our cultures give us rules for our decisions and behaviors. We function better in groups because we have rules to guide that functioning and to help us with behavioral decisions and expectations.

Those rules help each of us prioritize and channel the pull we feel from each of our own instincts. Our cultures function as the key element in that tool kit of setting situational priorities in many settings.

The guidance processes that are built into our cultures help us prioritize our thinking in practical ways when our various instincts are simultaneously activated.

We Use Our Cultures To Civilize Our Instincts

Our cultural expectations in most settings guide us away from — and protect us from — our worst sets of instinctive behaviors.

It was extremely important to my own learning process to understand that we use our cultures both to channel our instincts and to protect us from our worst instinctive behaviors.

We use our cultures in very basic ways to achieve our instinctive goals. We have hierarchical instincts, for example, so every culture

invents rules and expectations for hierarchies. We feel right following those rules because we feel right both in achieving instinctive goals and in complying with cultural admonitions and guidance.

We have instincts to acquire property, so every culture creates its own set of rules about who can own what — and every culture sets rules about keeping other people from stealing the property we rightfully own.

Those rules define how we can achieve our instinctive goals and they create safe grounds to help us protect our property from being taken from us.

Likewise, we have instincts that relate to sexual behavior, and every culture creates its own set of rules about acceptable and not acceptable sexual behavior. We use those rule sets to guide our behaviors.

I have seen culture after culture build sets of rules that channel instinctive behaviors into pathways that meet the needs of each culture. It is possible to build enlightened behavioral expectations into our rule sets for our cultures.

We Also Use Our Cultures To Protect Ourselves Against

Our Worst Instincts

I have also seen — in multiple settings — the sad fact that when we don't enforce some of the key rules that protect people in any setting, we run the risk very quickly of having a regression to more basic, negative, and primitive instinct-driven patterns of behavior.

Some of our instincts point us in negative directions relative to how we trust other people. We need to create cultural protections for people relative to those behaviors.

Our cultures create rules that protect us in those areas — and that protection is most likely to be successful if our cultures enforce those rules.

If we create enlightened rules about property protection, for example, or rules about consensual sexual activities and if we do not enforce those rules, people too often simply revert to the less enlightened and more primal and negative behaviors that those rules were created to avoid. Property theft, abusive sexual behavior, and discrimination can all be activated as negative behaviors when rules that govern those behaviors are not enforced.

Discrimination happens in many work settings when the discrimination rules for a setting are not enforced because people tend to feel right being with people like themselves, and people feel right helping people like themselves.

That set of “feeling right” behaviors for “people like us” can very naturally result in discrimination at some level against people who are not like ourselves. Like hires Like. Like promotes Like.

That is the natural instinct-incented behavior pattern that tends to self-create itself spontaneously in each work setting, unless we deliberately create rules that modify and prohibit that discriminatory behavior and create more inclusive hiring practices.

If we create rules that make discrimination illegal, then we can cut far back in very good ways on discrimination. Those rules become the normal behavior patterns in that setting.

If we, however, do not enforce those rules, then the old patterns of discrimination naturally reappear in each setting and those behaviors feel right to the people who are discriminating. “We” like “us.” Behavior patterns follow.

Sexual harassment rules follow that same pattern. If we bake those rules into our cultures and if we also enforce them, they become the normal behavior pattern and harassment is significantly reduced.

If we clearly do not enforce those rules, however, some people move to harassing behaviors. Harassment happens far too often when those rules either do not exist or are not enforced — and that behavior does damage to people when it happens.

Baking in enlightened behavior into a culture by enforcing the behavior is a key step in making progress in those key areas. That was one of my conclusions about the progress we have made and about the progress we need to make. We need to use our laws in very explicit ways to protect the progress we make in each of those areas where the more negative instinctive behaviors will otherwise create damage to people in multiple ways. If we skip that “baking in” step for those kinds of behaviors, we can put progress in each of those areas at risk.

We need to be very aware of our increasing diversity as a country. We need to take steps in every diverse setting to bring people together in ways that benefit all groups.

We need to reach out as individuals to make connections on a 1-to-1 basis either people from other groups — and we need to build the trust levels that happen best at a personal level through those interactions.

We need personal commitments to the goals of having us all succeed and having us all benefit from being who we are.

We need to take our great and growing diversity as a country and turn it into a major asset — having many people succeed and having our collective success based on the success of many people make us stronger as a country.

We are blessed not to have the kinds of tribal intergroup conflicts that scar so many other parts of the world. We need to turn our own diversity into a values-based and mutually supportive American “Us” that can give us the success levels we need into collective success for us all.

We need to begin by actually dealing very directly in safe ways with some of those key issues.

Chapter Thirteen — We Need To Communicate Honestly About Our Key Issues

We need to create trust by earning trust. We need to do things for each other that prove good intent in all settings and we need to communicate in open and honest ways with each other about key issues.

We will obviously not do that trust-building process perfectly. Errors will be made. We need to expect that to be true and we will need to deal with the errors that we make in healing ways.

Because we are imperfect, very well-intentioned people will sometimes say things or do things that are insulting, clumsy, and even damaging — without intending to be negative in any way or without understanding when a specific behavior might be perceived as having negative content or negative intent.

When that happens, we need to teach each other what we have inadvertently done in the spirit of having us all succeed in the end in becoming very effective and supportive in our interpersonal communications.

We all need to learn and we will all need to forgive other people's mistakes in the learning process. We need to be able to stumble, make mistakes, and then recover, because recovery is the only path to ultimate success in an imperfect process.

Inadvertent Misstatements Need To Be Corrected — Not Condemned

We need people who are offended by inadvertent clumsiness and who are offended or insulted by inadvertently insulting or negative words, deeds, or comments to reach out like sisters and brothers to help each other understand what we have said and to understand what we have done in ways that will let us all improve what we do and what we say for the future.

We need to reach out to readjust the dialogue when it is flawed, rather than just condemning inadvertent statements and attacking and rejecting things that are clumsily said or clumsily done.

Inadvertent misstatements and unintentional missteps need to be corrected, not condemned. We all need to help with that process.

To do all of that and to do it well, we need to build a collective community of trust.

Dwelling On Past Issues Can Perpetuate Old Issues And

Rekindle Old Angers

We clearly need to be able to move past old conflicts and old divisions in various ways that will help us create the needed sets of new alignments — and we need to do that work in ways that create stability for the new approaches.

We need to do that work in a way that combines honesty and candor about our negative past performance and interactions with a willingness to start fresh in each setting to build a current functional “us” for the settings.

We need to create a context of being “us” that works for each setting.

In several work settings where I have had a chance to bring people together who had been in a state of conflict and even intergroup anger before I had a chance to work with them, I have sometimes advised my leadership team to recognize the reality of that history of conflict and to clearly and completely understand those prior intergroup issues — but not to dwell on them going forward once we had given them a relevant resolution.

Dwelling on old problems and consistently recalling and talking about problematic past issues, I have found in many settings, can too often simply, directly, and very dysfunctionally continuously resurrect and reactivate old negative energies at times when that reactivation too often damages our current level and state of interactions.

My experience has been that if we have functionally moved past particular sets of issues in a setting in a positive way, then we are often well served by not bringing those issues up at future points in ways that resurrect the old anger or renew the old pain.

When we make progress in an area, we need to build on our progress and we need to build on our current success. We are often well advised to avoid resurrecting old angers when the old angers and the old and inflammatory issues are not currently functionally relevant.

The Art of Intergroup Peace describes that rationale and that approach in more detail.

The Puppy Should Not Be Recalled

People who have worked with me for any period of time in senior leadership roles can all tell you “the puppy story.” I have used the puppy story in a number of leadership settings as a teaching tool, as a reminder

and as a behavior prompt about the down sides of dwelling on old issues or the negative consequences that can result from revisiting areas of currently resolved and historic conflict.

The puppy story is this. A mother walks into a room and sees her child playing happily with his toys. She says, “Johnny. That’s great! That’s really good! You ate your lunch. You are playing with your toys. That is wonderful. You must have finally forgotten that your puppy died.”

Everyone on my leadership team in each complex intergroup setting tended to get the point of that story. Sometimes when an issue was raised at a meeting, we would ask ourselves — is that an actual issue for today and for now or is it really a dead puppy?

Avoiding dead puppies can keep groups who are making real and meaningful progress with each other from being emotionally sidetracked and even derailed by old, inflammatory, and currently functionally irrelevant issues.

That does not mean that we should ignore real issues. It also absolutely does not mean that we should pretend that the most significant intergroup damages for this country or the damages in any

local setting did not happen or that those sets of prior intergroup problems did not exist or that they do not have their echoes in behaviors occurring today.

I do believe, however, that we should not choose to spend our time or our energy now on revenge, retribution, or even on retrospective recollection and resurrection of remembered anger for evil and damaging past behaviors that are not functionally current and relevant behaviors for the settings where we are currently learning to be “us” and where we are functioning today in various “us” ways.

The Maid Of Sarajevo Has Been Gone For A Long Time

We have to walk a fine line between not forgiving unforgiveable sins and not having those past and historic sins keep us from making a fresh start today on key areas of intergroup relationships and intergroup interactions where we will benefit hugely from a fresh start and a collective alignment and commitment.

In the most recent set of very bloody Sarajevo conflicts, one side frequently invoked the death of “The Maid of Kosovo” as a reason for the war. Look it up in the history books. That death was not a recent event. But it did put a very divisive and a very incendiary puppy into the

context of those confrontations at a very consistent and directly inflammatory level.

That doesn't mean that old issues are not relevant. Issues that are relevant might be very old.

The truth is that there are still very real barriers that are still being created by being either a woman or a member of a minority group in America today and we need to recognize those issues and deal with them as we work to create Peace in each setting.

We need to get past those old issues by doing the right things in each setting today.

We Will All Do Well When We All Do Well

We need to make significant progress for us all by bringing all of us into the American Dream.

We will all benefit from bringing everyone into the American Dream and doing that now. We need to make a commitment to win/win results for all groups in America — and bringing all groups into full inclusion in the American Dream is an anchor element of that strategy and commitment.

We have made great progress in many wonderful ways as a country in achieving the American Dream with only a subset of our best resources in full play and only part of our population able to participate fully relative to the dream.

I strongly believe that we will do even better as a country when we bring all of our resources and all of our people in an intentionally inclusive way into our functional meritocracy and into our economy.

We will do well when we all do well. There isn't a cap or a limit on how well we can collectively do. Doing well is not a finite opportunity. We can all do well at the same time. We can all benefit from meritorious behavior when merit is inclusively activated for us all.

My own personal set of direct experiences in running a couple of large, complex, and ethnically diverse organizations is that meritocracies in those settings do work.

My own personal experience is that the performance levels are significantly higher for an organization when women and minority all have a chance to fully contribute and to be high performers.

I believe we are stronger and we are better overall in a work setting when all of our best players in the setting are very inclusively

allowed to contribute. That has worked in the places where I have worked and I believe that will be true for us as communities and as a nation as well.

Our Economy Will Be Stronger When It Includes All

Players

I believe that the truly beneficial and highly productive American Dream that has made America so strong, so safe, and so prosperous up to now will make America even stronger, safer, and more prosperous when we bring all of our people into full participation in the American Dream. I strongly believe that our entire economy will be stronger when the economy includes all players.

To create an environment where we have all parties included in our economy, we do now need to function as an inclusive American Us. When we are an us in any setting, we are more internally collaborative and we are more collectively productive.

We practice higher levels of internal ethical behavior, and we are more supportive of each other's successes when we see each other as "us."

That functional environment that is created when we are an “us” allows us to achieve win/win outcomes inside of our us and win/win outcomes across each set of “us.”

We need to create a sense of community identity in each relevant setting. We need to do team things that are real and relevant to bring us together in each setting.

Win/Win Is A Key Commitment And Strategy

Win/win is very important.

It took me a number of years to fully appreciate the value and benefit of win/win strategic directions and approaches. Early in my career, I was personally a win/lose strategist. I loved competition at any level for a very long time and I felt good when I won and my competitor lost.

There was a long period of time when I was fairly good at winning in the context of traditional win/lose business related situations. I did some win/lose contracts with other parties in some settings that were almost legendary for their one-sided impact in our favor. There are some people who were on the other side for some of those contracts who may remember some of them even today.

The leadership of one other company made an effigy of me that was based on a Grinch doll and I was told that some people in that setting did things that were not pleasant to that particular doll.

So I did not begin my own personal learning process about basic intergroup interactions or even about internal group actions from a win/win perspective. I had a win/lose perspective and I believed very much in having my side win.

Then I learned in a moment of enlightenment at one of the human potential training sessions that I attended that my thinking on that point had been both incomplete and wrong.

I had always assumed that there needed to be a loser in order for a winner to exist in any setting or situation. A lovely seminar leader showed us all examples where having all sides win was both possible and actually better for everyone than having one party lose and the other party win.

I literally did not sleep that night after that lecture because I was so sure he was wrong. I mentally prepared rebuttals both for his perspectives and for his approach to use in the morning. On day two, he offered us several more very real and functional examples that showed

that all sides in a setting could, in fact, win and could do better by wining in that way and I became a convert.

Win/Lose Settings Often Have Inherent Instability

I had already learned from both direct experience and frequent observation that any time there is a long-term context or long-term contract that has a significant loser embedded in it, that loser in that setting or circumstance tends to always be trying to create instability for the situation in order to reverse or even avenge their loss.

Losers tend to want to change their situation. Losers in any situation or setting often have consistent and constant motivation to create that change.

As I thought about the win/win alternative approach that was presented as an option by that lecturer, I understood more clearly that having a loser woven into any process or woven into any situation or setting very logically creates an inherent level of future instability and even future fragility for that process, situation, or setting.

I began to recognize and understand that in a standard win/lose situation even when you win, your own wins are always at risk to some

degree for the future if the loser in that setting or that situation has the power to survive and to try to turn your current win into a future loss.

Win/win outcomes, I learned, also gave me a win for my side that I wanted and they were often much less fragile and vulnerable than a win/lose outcome. Win/win solutions, I learned as an organizational leader and strategist, are often easier for me to both protect and sustain.

That win/win perspective had major positive impacts in multiple work settings. I also learned to value win/win outcomes in my personal life at a very practical and functional level as part of my own personal growth counseling.

I also strongly came to appreciate the value and the merit of shared winning outcomes with all parties in the context of what we used to call “common interest” labor negotiations.

Over the past couple of decades, I have experimented with win/win contracts, win/win agreements, and win/win alliances in multiple settings — and I have found them to be both an easier way to win and a much easier way to negotiate, once you get the win/win negotiation processes in place and then learn how to actually do them.

My strong sense today is that in a Peace by piece context, for our country, we need to figure out how each party in each relevant setting can achieve the win levels that each party in the setting needs.

We need to look at our cities and our schools and our work places to figure out how to create win/win outcomes for all relevant parties in each setting.

Win/Win Negotiations Make Us Smarter

I discovered fairly quickly that doing win/win negotiations actually also makes me personally smarter about any given issue or setting.

Win/win negotiations in any setting make me smarter because they require me to personally need to learn what the actual key issues are for the other side in any intergroup setting. *The Art of Intergroup Peace* book explains that phenomenon in more detail.

Sun Tzu, in *The Art of War*, calls for understanding the other side in great detail in order to damage and defeat Them. In *The Art of Intergroup Peace*, I also advocate understanding the other side in great detail — but the Peace book advises doing that learning in order to help the other party succeed.

When I am doing win/win negotiations myself, I clearly need that knowledge about the other side in my win/win negotiations because I can't help the other side win until I know what a win actually is for the other side.

I also discovered, to my great surprise, that I generally also needed to have a clearer sense of what a win was for my own side in order to create the best win/win positive outcome for my own side in a setting.

I did not expect to acquire that additional insight about my own side in a setting as a result of using that win/win approach. We often take that part of a negotiation for granted — assuming that we simply know what our own wins should be and assuming that we know what our side's actual wins will be if we do win.

I discovered that when I needed to understand my own needed wins better because I needed to know them well enough to describe my desired wins clearly and to explain their merit and their basic features to the other side. I sometimes gained very important additional insight into what was really needed by my side to best benefit from a situation or agreement.

I learned more about the real situation and the real set of issues for my side in the process of preparing to have those conversations with the other people to explain and defend my position about our issues.

I sometimes discovered in that process that I had been focused on a simplistic version of a win definition that wasn't as good for my side as a new definition that I functionally derived from going through a careful and intentional discernment process about my actual targeted win. That happened with a high level of frequency. My own wins actually often get better because of the fact that I needed to go through that explicit win definition discernment process.

Win/Win Outcomes Create Allies

I learned a lot about what an optimal win is for us in many situations by going through that process. I actually usually understood my own side's issues more clearly and more elegantly when I was working to create win/win outcomes. *The Art of Intergroup Peace* book explains a number of those issues and those strategies in much more detail.

Building win/win outcomes also creates allies. That also initially surprised me but then it made sense as well. It is, of course, entirely

logical. When both sides win, the other side becomes your ally in order to perpetuate their win for themselves.

Your instincts relative to intergroup interactions are triggered to reinforce and support each other when that mutual alliance and the intergroup support in a setting happens as the result of a win/win agreement.

Your Enemies Are Expensive

It is always good to have an ally. Allies are better than enemies. It is usually not good to have an enemy.

My father used to say — “Choose your enemies carefully. They are the most expensive things you own.”

I did not understand that piece of advice for a very long time — but once I finally did understand it, it became a key part of my own strategic thinking.

I now very strongly believe that we need to bring that level of win/win thinking as a key strategy for our intergroup interactions in this country. We need to bring that thinking to each community — in order to create Peace by piece in each setting.

Instead of creating win/lose intergroup situations in our communities, we need everyone in each setting very consciously and explicitly committed to win/win situations — with all of us helping all of us win in each setting.

Actually creating benefit for each of us is a key part of that strategy.

We need to look at each setting to figure out what a win/win outcome can be for that setting that benefits people in a real way.

We Need Team Goals And Real Teams

We need to look at the win/win opportunities that we have and we need to take advantage of those opportunities.

At a macro level, we need win/win approaches that will make our cities safe. We need win/win approaches that will improve everyone's health.

We need win/win approaches that will make our education system and our child support systems better so that those systems can produce top levels of education and success for all students from all groups from birth through college.

We also need our functional health care delivery systems in each setting to be accessible to us all. We need our caregivers to be significantly focused on best care and best outcomes for everyone.

We need jobs for all people who seek jobs and we need to have places to live in each setting that meet our needs for living places.

We need our communities to come together to do team things to achieve each of those relevant sets of goals. The goals need to be specific to the settings and our teams need to be set up to create internal alignment and mutual support around each goal.

We Need To Build An American Sense Of Us

We clearly need — in all settings — to create win/win for every group by doing the things that need to be done in each setting to help strong neuron connectivity levels in the brains of all babies.

We all love our children. Helping each other help all of our children to succeed builds on that love of our children and it has the potential to create intergroup benefits, intergroup support and interactions, and intergroup trust.

The book *Three Key Years* explains very directly and clearly how we can improve the brain strength and seniority levels for all of our children.

We need a combination of parenting, programs, and sheer levels of reaching out directly at a personal level to help with that process to get us to the success levels we need for all children from all groups.

We Need To Add A Layer To Who We Are That Is Based On Our Shared Beliefs

My core belief is that if we want to succeed as a country, and if we want our communities to be great places to live — then we need — at a very basic level — to create a sense of “us” for all Americans that is based on a shared belief system and a shared set of values.

We need to move past our various racial, ethnic, cultural, religious, and political categories of us in each setting and as a nation to create an additional overarching sense of us that is very explicitly based on our shared, enlightened beliefs.

We do not need people to change identities. We don’t need people to change our basic affiliations. We do, however, need people to add an

important functional layer to our individual and collective sense of who we are.

We need to continue to embrace and celebrate all of our primal definitions of us and then we need to very deliberately and intentionally add on top of those definitions another very real layer of “us” that is explicitly based on our shared beliefs.

I have seen that happen in a number of settings. I have helped that to happen in a number of settings. It can be done.

We now need to very consciously do it as a country and we need to do it in each community setting.

We Need To Be United By Our Beliefs And Values

We need to start with a set of core beliefs that can anchor all of us in a collective “us.” There are chapters in both *Cusp of Chaos* and *The Art of InterGroup Peace* that explain those shared values in significant detail.

That explicit and specific list of beliefs is anchored on the core beliefs that have given America much of its strength up to now. Those dozen beliefs should not be a surprise to anyone in this country who knows who we are and who knows what we need to do.

We need to make collective commitments at an explicit level to democracy, to freedom of speech, and freedom of religion, to equality, to inclusion, and to full opportunity that unites us as an American Us and that allows us to avoid division by race, ethnicity, or any other category of division.

The key for our success as an American Us will be to have those core values accepted by all of us in a way that lets us all trust one another and lets us help each other win in making those goals and those commitments real.

We need our police departments and our law enforcement processes in every community in our country to do the right things in inclusive, insightful and caring ways to earn the trust of all members in each community.

We need our school systems and our public institutions in every setting to equally serve and equally support all people from every group that makes up the complex, fascinating and highly diverse fabric of America.

We need to very intentionally reach out to do healing things in all of the troubled settings where healing needs to happen.

We have had clashes and incidents that need to be understood for the opportunities they are for us to help each other to do better now and to be better aligned in the InterGroup interactions that will define our future.

Ferguson and its protests and clear behavior patterns gave us an opportunity to learn. The energy and the focus of Black Lives Matter gives us another opportunity to listen and learn.

We are in a time of intense learning and we need to turn that time of learning into a time of caring and understanding and alignment.

We can use our core values to get us to a better place. We need to make the commitment together to be in that better place and we need to go there together, understanding exactly why we have made that commitment and how we will succeed in making that commitment real.

Peace in our time needs to be a strategy and a commitment. Not a slogan or a vague and unfocused wish or dream.

Chapter Fourteen — Peace In Our Time

We are poised on the cusp of major success as a people and as a country. If we do all of the things that we need to do to make this country as inclusive as it needs to be, I believe that we will succeed at multiple levels and that we can and will be a country at Peace with itself in every key setting and every key way.

We need to do several very right things to make that happen.

We need to help every child — beginning by setting up brain exercise programs for all children from all groups from birth on — taking full advantage for each child of those first biologically critical years in each child's life when brain exercise strengthens brains.

We need to have our police departments, legal systems, and government programs all earning the trust of every group in every community. We need to eliminate discrimination in our hiring practices and in our school settings. We are making major progress in those areas now — and we need that progress to continue and accelerate.

Knowledge is power.

We all need to know and understand how much our lives are affected by our instinctive thought processes and behaviors.

We particularly all need to understand our extremely persuasive and powerful instincts to divide the world into us and them and to then act in very different ways relative to each “Us” and relative to each “Them.”

The patterns are clear, but too they are too often entirely invisible to us — and we each need to know exactly what those patterns are and how they influence our thoughts, our behaviors, and our lives.

We need to understand what those patterns are for each of us.

When someone is an “us,” we are protective, supportive, and inclusive. When someone is a “Them” we are divisive, distrustful, and even damaging in a number of ways that are specific to the settings we are in and specific to the “Them” who we perceive to exist in each setting.

We tend to have high ethical standards that apply to our interactions with us. We tend to suspend ethics and we tend to feel no guilt doing unethical and even damaging things to “Them.”

We ethnically cleanse “Them,” discriminate against them, and even — in truly primal settings — enslave “them.”

Each of us is influenced at very important levels in our thoughts, perceptions, and behaviors by whether we perceive someone else to be an us or perceive someone else to be a them.

We can't get rid of our basic instincts. We can, however, take very deliberate steps to expand our sense of who we include as "us" and to reduce the activation of our sense that other people are "Them."

We Can Use Our Cultures As Tools For Better Behaviors

We can use our cultures as tools for that process. Our cultures tend to be the tools that are used by our instincts to achieve their basic instinctive goals.

We need to change that interaction and sequence and flip it around so that we can very deliberately and intentionally use our cultures as tools to activate our more positive instincts and to channel our best instincts in more inclusive ways.

Instead of having our intellect design cultures that simply, directly, and unconsciously serve the primal goals of our instincts, we need to have our intellects make value based choices as individuals and groups to do enlightened and positive things on behalf of all people — and we need our intellects to put in place both beliefs and cultural

expectations that activate and focus our best and most positive instincts in enlightened and positive ways.

We Can Anchor Our Sense Of Us On Core Beliefs

All of that is possible to do. We need to begin that entire process with a set of core beliefs that we all share and then we need to anchor our future interactions as a people on those core values.

We need to be united by our core beliefs, and not divided by our ethnicity, race, culture, or by any other divisive category or type of intergroup differentiation.

I have been on a long journey of extended learning for nearly three decades that has led me to that set of conclusions. I have seen people be saints — and do loving, caring, and heroic things in the service of each other — and I have seen people sin and do evil things to one another with no sense of remorse, regret, or guilt at any level.

We are all far too capable of both sets of behaviors.

We all need to understand how wonderful and desirably one set of those behaviors can be — and we need to understand how damaging, disgusting, destructive, divisive, and evil other sets of those behaviors

can be — and we need to very intentionally and knowingly steer ourselves collectively to the wonderful and loving behaviors.

People may disagree with being that direct and blunt about our situation and about our basic nature as people — but the evidence points to the conclusion that we can all be saints and we are all also very susceptible to being sinners.

Rather than feeling bad about that dichotomy, we need to proactively manage that functional reality and we need to simply make the sinning sets of behavior irrelevant and out of context for our collective and individual lives.

If we put ourselves in the position where we can truly be an inclusive meritocracy as a country, committed to win/win outcomes for all parts and components of our values-based and highly inclusive American “Us,” then we can involve and invoke the best behaviors that stem from our best and most positive packages of instincts and we can truly achieve Peace In Our Time.

**We Need To Make Morally Enlightened Choices And That
Can Be Done**

It will not be easy. We will need to make intellectually, morally, and ethically enlightened choices about what we believe and about how we will decide to behave and to interact with one another.

I have been looking at our interactions in a wide variety of settings for a couple of decades. There are grounds for being encouraged.

I have seen people do wonderful and loving things for one another in a wide range of settings across the planet. Loving and wonderful things can happen — but we need to avoid the seductive primal temptations and the insidious emotional pull of our most destructive us/them emotions and beliefs in order to make those loving things happen.

It is far too easy to be drawn into the seductive attraction of negative intergroup energy — hating our enemy with collective negative energy and feeling right acting in groups, teams, and even mobs in emotionally mutually reinforcing ways to damage whoever we perceive to be “them” when those most negative intergroup instincts are activated and in gear.

We should never underestimate the seductive power of those very primal instinctive emotions and thought processes. We should not only not underestimate them — we should very consciously and very intentionally make sure that those seductive energies are never activated in our settings or in our lives.

We Are, At Our Best, Wonderful People

We are, at our best, wonderful people. We are, at our best, inclusive, accepting, and mutually supportive people.

We are, at our best, believers in the ability of each of us to be supportive of all of us.

Knowledge is power. Now that we know what the actual situation is relative to our instinctive behavior packages, we need to make choices about how we will each lead our lives and about how we will all interact with one another so that we can, in fact, all win.

I started my learning process about all of those intergroup interaction issues in that small, backwoods town in Northern Minnesota more than six decades ago. I saw some of the best behaviors that could exist in that town— and I also saw behaviors that were petty, cruel, and

even evil for some of the interactions that occurred for people who lived in that setting.

I now have a sense of why we go down each of those paths. That particular sense of why is a source of power. Knowing why we act in those ways gives us the power of choice. We can each decide at an intellectual level which path to choose for the future for ourselves and for the people we include in our “us.”

We Now Need Intellect To Shape Cultures And Steer

Instincts

For far too long — back to the dawn of history — we have allowed our basic instincts to shape our cultures and we have allowed our cultures to shape our beliefs and our behaviors — often in negative ways.

We did not have a clue that our thoughts, values, and even emotions were being invisibly shaped by those factors and by those primal and embedded forces.

We have done some very good things under the influence of those forces and we have done some things that were not good to do —

including acting in ways that triggered evil behaviors in our interactions with some people.

We have done some things that were clearly not the right things to do and we felt right in doing them, without knowing why they felt right or why they were our choices.

Now — with better understanding of how all of those factors influence our lives — we can make enlightened choices about what to do next.

We can rise above those most negative primal approaches and make better choices now. We can build on our new knowledge and we can choose to act in ethical, moral, enlightened, values-based ways to create the world that we should build for the benefit of us all.

We need to recognize the risks that we will inevitably face.

There will be challenging times ahead. That is a certainty. Problems will happen.

Economic issues, environmental issues, disease, drought, and other damaging external factors all have the potential to impose external crisis and to create very real problems that can create major

challenges for us all that will have the ability to deeply divide us and cause us to do damaging things to one another in order to survive.

Those external factors will cause us to do damage to one another if we are not united and if we are not prepared to overcome each of those problems in ways that can cause us all to ultimately do well and to survive, prosper, and even thrive.

The future options and problems are fairly easy to discern and predict.

If we are not united when the full impact of our growing diversity reaches its logical consequences, then we will be divided at that point in time — and that division will damage us all because we do not do well when we are divided into us and them in any setting. We need to be “us.”

If we are not united when economic setbacks or environmental crisis and setbacks affect us, we have the potential to divide into separate warring factors who sacrifice each other in order to protect our own group.

We also need to be an “us” to survive and thrive in the face of those crisis and challenges.

We need to be "us" for the best chance of survival.

Peace in our Time. That is the path we need to be on.

I hope that my overall learning process and sets of life experiences has been informative and useful to you in making this set of issues more clearer — and I hope that we can all do now what we all need to do to create the future we all want to create.

It can be done.

We just need to very intentionally do it.

