## The Sparseness Adaptation Theory

The evolution of human genetic differences, and of learned compensations for them

### *Introduction*

This is a short book about a problem and a possible solution. A weakness in Charles Darwin's Theory of Evolution gives a first view of the problem: Power to predict is a mark of strong scientific theory, and Darwin's theory predicts only weakly. For example, the theory predicts something as basic as the advent of humans only through the addition of countless assumptions. By contrast, the standard theory of Celestial Mechanics predicts eclipses far in advance with few assumptions. The main problem, then, appears in science as a need to improve on Darwin. Darwin's theory is strong as far as it goes, but there is farther to go.

Given the predictive weakness of Darwin's theory it is natural that scientists seek to augment it. Here the problem intrudes bluntly. The Sparseness Adaptation Theory detailed in this book – and probably any earnest attempt to augment Darwin – show immediately that there must be in humans a powerful inborn tendency to violence and that this tendency must vary systematically with location of ancestral homeland.

Scientific reasoning leads to a dilemma: Either evolutionary theory remains a poor cousin to strong theories like Celestial Mechanics or there are systematic genetic differences affecting human behavior. Two common responses to the latter possibility are denial – the intellectual equivalent of hiding one's eyes – and genocentrism, in which self-aggrandizing wishes parade as science. One goal of this book is to face the inferred reality of human differences without abetting either denial or pernicious ideologies. To be clear then, **the Sparseness Adaptation Theory does NOT assert or prove the global superiority of any group.**

Where the probability of deadly violence is high the probability of large, stable societies is low. If many humans are predisposed to violence then how is civilization possible? Suffice it for now that the rise of civilizations coincided with the appearance of *learned* systems – particularly religions – that explicitly discouraged violence.

Religions notoriously foment violence between groups, but within groups their effects tend to the pacifying and stabilizing. There is no need to accept here that religion enables civilization, but there is a reason to consider the possibility. Civilization sped the accumulation of knowledge, and this ultimately gave birth to science, which in turn threw into question the very religion that, minimally, helped give it life. If civilization does rest even in part on a foundation of religion then it may be unwise to rattle civilization when its foundation is weakened.

I am proposing a falsifiable theory of innate human violence and systematic differences at exactly a time when science has eroded the religious foundations of civilization. This raises the question of whether it is wise for me to proceed. Is it wise and responsible to

pursue a potentially divisive theory when principled behaviors like truth-telling, tolerance, and even non-violence itself, have lost some of their ancient religious footing?

I propose that it is indeed wise to explore a theory of human differences publicly because such a theory is scientifically unavoidable. The alternative is for the best of science to be driven underground where, remote from the cares and the care of the uncomprehending, it will almost certainly fester and mutate into yet another incarnation of pseudoscientific genocentrism. No, it's much wiser to have a theory of human differences out in the open where all can keep a close watch on it and face its effects together.

Addressing the predictive weakness of Charles Darwin's Theory of Evolution opens a lid that cannot be kept shut. There is hope of course in good we don't control, but also in our practice as we face the difficult fact of innate human differences.

Before proceeding to the Sparseness Adaptation Theory itself I offer the following aids to its comprehension:

1) *Wants vs. Facts:* Nothing distorts perception of what is so as much as what one wants to be so. As Anaïs Nin put it, "We do not see things as they are: We see things as *we* are." To see what is so in the outer world first see what is so in the inner world of one's desires and fears. This is very important.

2) *Averages vs. Absolutes:* A danger of the Sparseness Adaptation Theory comes by way of people who can't tell an average from an absolute. Human brains favor absolutely distinguishable classes and this drives them to stereotype. However, it is essential that members of any group be considered as individuals who may differ from averages. The disaster of action based purely on stereotypes can be averted through attention and practice.

3) *Practice:* Even a few attempting the Perennial Practice outlined in *Dragon Puzzle Story* (see dragonpuzzle.net) and its central practice of stillness can create a zone where it is safe to explore how brains are and may be built – along with the resulting human differences and resulting differences between humans and their intelligent artifacts. This book itself will be more comprehensible to readers with a regular practice of quiet presence, and of the Perennial Practice generally.

⌒

We now return to the predictive weakness of Charles Darwin's Theory of Evolution, and to the answering Sparseness Adaptation Theory.