IJPS Interdisciplinary Journal of Partnership Studies
Volume 9, Issue 2
pubs.lib.umn.edu/ijps

HUMAN MORALITY: LOVE OR FEAR, PARTNERSHIP OR DOMINATION

Darcia Narvaez, PhD

Abstract

David Loye pointed us to one of Charles Darwin's aims that often has been overlooked, to explain the evolution of humanity's moral sense. Most people focus on Darwin's aim to explain speciation, changes in traits across generations. In studying the moral sense, Darwin assumed it was innate, though he found it more evident among non-Western peoples he met than among his British compatriots. His finding is not a surprise if you understand when and how most human sociomoral capacities are shaped—after birth, by immersive experience. Humanity's evolved developmental niche, or evolved nest, appears to be crucial for the development of moral sense because it provides the support needed to optimize the development of psychosocial neurobiological systems. To reestablish and maintain the moral sense, humanity needs to restore the provision of the evolved nest to all people, especially children.

Keywords: Evolution; Moral Sense; Evolved Nest; Evolved Developmental Niche

David Loye was a scholar, researcher, and author of many books about human consciousness and capacities, including *Measuring Evolution: A Leadership Guide to the Health and Wealth of Nations* (Loye, 2007b). He also wrote about evolutionary processes, as exemplified by the article, "Moral Sensitivity and the Evolution of Higher Mind" (Loye, 1990). In that article, Loye emphasized moral sensitivity as part of the cosmology of the world, as organic to life itself.

I became acquainted with his efforts to delve into an aspect of Charles Darwin's work that is typically overlooked: his focus on morality. Loye was instrumental in drawing attention to Darwin's emphasis on love and morality in human evolution, publishing a series of books on these matters, including *Darwin on Love: The New Story of Evolution (2007a), Darwin's Lost Theory: Bridge to a Better World* (2007c), and *Rediscovering Darwin: The Rest of Darwin's Theory and Why We Need It Today (2018).*My long-time scholarly interest has been to uncover how humanity (at least part of it) has become so destructive, belying its millions-year-old existence, and now bringing about the four horsemen of the environmental apocalypse—global warming; atmospheric degradation; mass species extinctions; and pervasive toxicity of air, soil, and water (Wilson, 1991). For centuries if not millennia, the west has been led primarily by a culture of people behaving in ways considered insane or immoral by most traditional societies (e.g., touting self-interest; Sahlins, 2008), a view forced on the world through colonization and globalized capitalism. My work provides an explanation for how part of humanity became so egoistic and destructive. I build on the insights of Darwin and Loye, identifying a key source of humanity's downturn, a degraded evolved nest.

DARWIN'S MORAL SENSE

My area of academic study initially focused on moral and ethical development, specifically moral cognition, exemplified by my article, "The Effects of Moral Schemas on the Reconstruction of Moral Narratives in 8th Grade and College Students" (Narvaez, 1998). David Loye's book, *Darwin's Lost Theory of Love: A Healing Vision for The New Century* (2000), and article, "The Moral Brain" (2002), jolted me into realizing the importance of evolution in discussions of morality. I had been skeptical of the evolutionary theory of natural selection that emphasized genetic and human selfishness (Dawkins, 1976). But Loye pointed out how Darwin's theory has long been misappropriated by those who would profit from its misunderstanding, specifically those with more privilege and power who promulgated Herbert Spencer's marketing of evolution as an inevitable "survival of the fittest" (Spencer, 1864/2015). This misappropriation still shows itself today in forms of eugenics that support economies

based on self-interest and dog-eat-dog social policies. In effect, those who cannot compete and win are seen as unfit.

Darwin had another emphasis beyond natural selection. Loye sought to resurrect one of Darwin's original aims: to explain humanity's moral sense as part of evolution. Loye unpacked Darwin's focus on morality, first by pointing out two aspects of Darwin's scholarship on evolution, which I will call Darwin-1 and Darwin-2. Darwin-1, as discussed in *On the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection, or the Preservation of Favoured Races in the Struggle for Life* (Darwin, 1859/1962), is the aspect taken up by ideologues and wealthy industrialists emphasizing the survival of the fittest, which condones brutality and selfishness.

Darwin-2, the other aspect predominant in Darwin's early notebooks and reflected in *The Descent of Man, and Selection in Relation to Sex* (Darwin, 1871), emphasizes love and moral sensitivity in evolution (Darwin used the term "moral" 92 times in *The Descent of Man*; Loye, 2007a). Darwin sought to explain how the moral sense became an instinct. Finally published in 1974 as transcribed and annotated by Barrett (Gruber, 1974), Darwin's private notebooks set forth a theory of moral agency (Loye, 2002). Darwin argued that "the moral sense" arises from the sexual, parental and social instincts. Examining characteristics that developed within the tree of life, he identified significant contributory factors that emerged over the course of evolution. *Conjugal acts* require cooperation, a basic form of sociality. *Parental instincts* came along next, with natural affection and unselfish care displayed toward offspring. These forms of affection and care extended to other members of the group, as *social instincts*, most apparent in social animal communities such as beehives or ant colonies, forming the glue of human and animal societies. Darwin discussed *conscience* among animals as the felt conflict between impulsive, momentary instincts (e.g., desire to fly off with a migrating flock) and persistent social instincts (e.g., attending to the brood in the nest). According to Richards (1987), Darwin thought the conflict caused an "uneasiness of spirit" (Richards, p. 118), and "The serene pleasure enjoyed in exercise of the social instincts and the pain suffered in their breach constituted the primitive feelings of duty

and sin" (Richards, p. 119). Darwin wrote in 1839, "By association one gains the rule, that the passions and appetite should (almost) always be sacrificed to the instincts" (in Gruber, 1974, p. 399). A person's active *sympathy* could make them forget themselves, aiding, defending and acting for others at their own expense (Gruber, 1974). Loye (2000) attributes to Darwin how the moral sense gives rise to the golden rule and the second commandment given by Jesus, to 'love your neighbor as yourself.'

To outline the components of Darwin's moral sense, Loye quoted from *The Descent of Man* (Darwin, 1871, pp. 72-73), with slight paraphrase:

> In the first place, the social instincts lead an animal to take pleasure in the society of its fellows, to feel a certain amount of *sympathy* for them, and to perform various services for them...Secondly, as soon as the mental faculties had become highly developed, images of all past actions and motives would be incessantly passing through the brain of each individual. Out of a *comparison of past and present*, the feeling of dissatisfaction, or even misery, which invariably results from any unsatisfied instinct, would arise. Third, after the power of language had been acquired, and the wishes of the community could be expressed, the *common opinion of how each member ought to act for the public good* would naturally become the guide to action…Lastly, *habit* in the individual could ultimately play a very important part in guiding the conduct of each member, for the social instinct together with sympathy, is, like any other instinct, greatly strengthened by habit, and so consequently would be obedient to the wishes and judgment of the community. [My emphasis added]. (Loye, 2000, pp. 128-129)

Frans de Waal (2009) has confirmed that mutuality, helpfulness, and empathy have a deep evolutionary history across multiple species.

Darwin (1871) noted that "primitive" peoples and his female English compatriots were more likely to display the moral sense than his male compatriots. If we take our ancestral context, small-band hunter-gatherers or nomadic foragers, as a baseline for

human species typicality (representing 95% of human genus existence and still in existence), a similar conclusion could be drawn. These hunter-gatherers demonstrate by and large ongoing social pleasure, empathy, social concern, and habit control—all components of Darwin's moral sense (Bird David, 1994; Fry, 2006; Ingold, 1999; 2011; Kelly, 1999; Martin, 1999; Narvaez, 2013b).

Components of moral sense, common in nomadic foragers throughout the world, are less visible in westernized, industrialized (and colonized, globalized) communities. In particular, data are suggesting that components of Darwin's moral sense have been diminishing in the US (of particular concern because the US exports its ways to the rest of the world). Here are some relevant data. Households comprising single adults have risen from 6% of households in 1960 to 32% in 2021 (U.S. Census Bureau, 2021). In 2021, 48% of Americans were unmarried, compared to 28% in 1970 (DePaulo, 2021). These outcomes may be consequences of a *decline in social pleasure* but also of less skillful sociality from decreasing play and face-to-face relations in the last decades as children moved to spending more time with screens (Louv, 2005; Turkle, 2011). According to data collected from college students over decades, *empathy has decreased* (Konrath et al., 2010) and *narcissism has increased* (Twenge & Campbell, 2009). In terms of conscience (or acting for the public good), in the US *cheating is widespread* and institutions and policies are designed to *promote sociopathy* (Callahan, 2004; Derber, 2013). An increasing number of families behave *antisocially* (Mooney & Young, 2006; Walker, 1993). *Habit control* and self-regulation also appear to be diminishing, with an increasing number of preschoolers exhibiting behavior dysregulation (Gilliam, 2005; Powell et al., 2003) and two thirds of adolescents reporting an explosive outburst in the prior year (McLaughlin et al., 2012). Half the US population suffers from an addiction (Sussman, 2017), signaling unresolved trauma of one kind or another (Maté & Maté, 2022).

What has gone wrong? My explorations have led me to conclude that we have unnested our children while their brains, capacities, and worldview are under construction (Narvaez, 2017b; 2018a). We have forgotten or minimized species-normal child raising,

resulting in biopsychosocial dysregulation, undermining wellbeing and the development of the moral sense (Narvaez, 2014, 2018a, 2018b). Instead of meeting the basic needs of the young, we have set them on a trauma-inducing pathway that continues throughout adulthood (Narvaez, 2022). We have increasingly thwarted species-normal development, in what might be called a moral devolution (Christen et al., 2017; Narvaez, 2012).

OUR SPECIES-TYPICAL NEST: THE EVOLVED DEVELOPMENTAL NICHE

Darwin proposed an *inherited* moral sense, at the time unaware of epigenetics or the extreme immaturity of human infants and corresponding extensive brain/body development that takes place postnatally for several years. The work I have integrated suggests that *the moral sense is mostly cultivated after birth,* when 75% of brain volume develops, shaped by experience through plasticity and epigenetic effects (Narvaez, 2014). We evolved to be super-cooperators based on community child raising (Burkhart et al., 2009), but as my work indicates, only with appropriate nurturing. It is my contention that our moral sense relies on the provision of our species' evolved nest or evolved developmental niche (EDN; Narvaez, 2014; 2017a; 2018b).

Every animal has a nest that evolved to optimize the development of the young (Gottlieb, 2002; Oyama, 1985; Narvaez & Bradshaw, in press; Stotz & Narvaez, 2018). Humanity's evolved nest or EDN is apparent all over the world among foragers who represent 95% of our species' history (Hewlett & Lamb, 2005; Konner, 2005). The EDN includes soothing perinatal experiences (mother and child are supported during gestation, there is no induced trauma perinatally, mother and child stay together); breastfeeding on request for several years; a welcoming social climate for mother and child; extensive affectionate touch and physical proximity with no negative touch; self-directed social play with multi-aged mates; a community of alloparents who, like mother, are responsive and supportive; nature immersion and connection; and routine healing practices. According to observation of foragers, all these practices, save the first two, are required throughout life to maintain humanity's cooperative nature

(Narvaez, 2013b). Indeed, our lab finds that EDN provisions are related to child and adult wellbeing and sociomorality (e.g., Narvaez, Gleason et al., 2013; Narvaez, Wang et al., 2013; Narvaez, Wang & Cheng, 2016; Narvaez, Woodbury et al., 2019; Tarsha & Narvaez, 2019).

To the westernized and industrialized adult, providing the EDN can seem indulgent or 'spoiling' ('I got spanked and I'm fine'), demonstrating a downshifting in baselines for child raising and for what capacities are expected from children and adults (Narvaez, 2016a). The modern industrialized adult is typically missing many capacities that are apparent in nested communities, such as receptive intelligence to a sentient Earth (Narvaez, 2014); a humble sharing orientation to the needs of others (Widlok, 2017), including children (Narvaez, 2019); multiperspectivalism and polymorphic perception of the world (Bram, 2018; Descola, 2013; Narvaez & Tarsha, 2021); and a transpersonal sense of self (kinship mind; Yunkaporta, 2020). The evolved nest enables the development and expression of these capacities, capacities that may maintain the moral sense.

FRAMING THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE MORAL SENSE

The primary motive for the evolved moral sense appears to be love. Along with David Loye, Darwin-2 was focused on love (with 95 mentions of that word in *The Descent of Man*; Loye, 2007a). "Love was the word for a vital force in the evolution of our species, as well as for most other species, for which [Darwin] could find no better word" (ibid, p. 42). For example, instead of calling it 'mating season' Darwin called it a season of love, after which comes a breeding season. Darwin noticed the sexual selectivity among females of multiple species, which only recently has been an accepted perspective (e.g., Roughgarden, 2014). Loye pointed out that Freud named the bond of love *libido*, focusing on sexual urges (Freud, 1905/1949/2011); Durkheim named it *solidarity* (Durkheim, 1893/1997); Ruth Benedict named it *synergy* (in Maslow & Honigmann, 1970); Arthur Koestler called it a *holarchic force of integration* (Koestler, 1978); Riane

Eisler (1988) identified it as the embrace of *linking-with* rather than having *power-over* others.

Biologist Humberto Maturana also emphasized love as central to human evolution, describing the *biology of love* and its unfolding in human evolution through the instincts for sex, parenting, trust, caring and tenderness, family life, pleasure, and joy (Maturana & Verden-Zoller, 2008). He defined love as "the domain of those relational behaviors through which another [a person, being, or thing] arises as a legitimate other in coexistence with oneself" (Maturana & Verden-Zoller, 2008, p. 39). In contrast, domination or aggression negates the other. From a biological perspective, love is the only emotion that broadens vision and expands intelligent behavior (Maturana & Pelle, 1999). By perceiving the other, we can enter into collaboration, accepting whatever conditions of existence as sources for being together. Maturana considered humans as a particular kind of primate whose evolution expanded living in love—we carry forward child-like needs into adulthood (neoteny), making us dependent on love so much so that "we become ill of body and soul if love is interfered with" (Maturana & Pelle, 1999, p. 59).

The EDN represents *love in action*, a partnership of being, shaping capacities for love and promoting mutual wellbeing (Narvaez & Bradshaw, in press). My work presents love as social engagement characterized by relational attunement, egalitarian respect, and interpersonal enhancement (Narvaez, 2014). Such partnership involves an egoless, creative co-construction of the moment together, tapping into *nous*, the divine intelligence of the Earth and her creatures (Lash, 2006). Love is a motivating force in development, from immediate responsive care in babyhood to enhanced social enjoyment. We are nurtured into love, especially through touch (Carter, 2019; Feldman et al, 2010), which is fundamental for co-regulating a baby's systems into a well-functioning body-brain (Field, 1995; Prescott, 1996; Narvaez, Wang et al., 2019; Tarsha & Narvaez, 2021).

In our ancestral context, love is quite tactile and sensual (Sorenson, 1998). Note, however, that Sorenson (1998) also documented how "preconquest" peoples learned that such affectionate expression offended European and American visitors and thus learned to hide it. Eventually, most preconquest communities were conquered by patriarchal Abrahamic religions, such as puritanical Christian beliefs, altering longstanding behaviors (Lutz, 1998). Love is embodied also through play (Maturana & Verden-Zoller, 2008) which is pervasive in societies representing our ancestral life, as documented in film and observational reports (e.g., Gray, 2013, 2014; Liedloff, 1977; Sorenson, 1998). In fact, play is phylogenetically ancient. Many species demonstrate play behaviors, from sharks and fish to turtles, lizards, and birds (Burghardt, 2005). All young mammals play, whether rough-and-tumble play or playful teasing. Rough-and-tumble play builds competence, autonomy, and reciprocity, fostering self-enhancement and joy (Burgdorf & Panksepp, 2006). Free play in the natural world builds a sense of belonging to place and biophilia (Burghardt, 2005) and, when it occurs with multi-aged mates, builds self-regulation, emotional intelligence, and adaptiveness (Pellis & Pellis, 2009). It seems particularly important for developing inclusive ethics (Donaldson, 1993; Narvaez, 2014).

What kind of ethics does the EDN bring about? An ethic is a favored, well-practiced way of interacting with others—individuals and community—rooted in emotion systems and that guides perception, affordances (action possibilities), and reasoning (Narvaez, 2014). The EDN supports the face-to-face capacities represented in an *ethic of engagement* (Narvaez, 2014). Engagement is about *relationship*, specifically, relational presence. It's about feeling connected and bonding in the moment, right now, with the one you are with, demonstrating empathy and reverence. EDN provision supports the development of engagement as *wu-wei*, living in a life flow as a compassionate, wise, and virtuous partner to others, spontaneously knowing and doing the good (Varela, 1999). How much one is able to do so is initially based on intuitions and skills formed in the preverbal years, when the right brain is developing rapidly (Schore, 2019).

Humans share an engagement orientation with other primates but have a further moral capacity that is largely ours alone, the *imagination ethic* (Narvaez, 2014). The imagination ethic is about *abstraction*, an extension of the present moment by accessing a sense of the bigger picture. In its fullest form it includes systemic thinking, accounting for the complexities of perceived patterns (Maturana &, 2008), and an integrative, concrete knowhow (Yunkaporta, 2020). When rooted in the prosocial orientation of the engagement ethic, it represents a *communal imagination* concerned for the wellbeing of all, attentive to consequences and effects of potential actions across the web of life, in the present and future.

EDN-INCONSISTENT CHILDHOODS AND SPECIES-ATYPICAL MORAL FUNCTIONING

What happens when the EDN is degraded? Instead of immersion in love and tenderness, the baby is marinated in distress, enhancing innate survival systems intended to keep an animal alive: fear, panic, and anger (Panksepp, 1998). These survival systems take precedence over the prosocial capacities scheduled to grow in the first years of life. The many threads and weavings of relational connection, in both orientation and skill, are broken or never established. The child is imprinted with disconnection, which is carried forward in their implicit worldview. When we are in a stress state, we are flooded with stress hormones which, in effect, make us 'stupid' (Sapolsky, 2004). Through repeated experience, states become traits (Perry et al., 1995). When undercare (unnestedness) is characteristic of early life, the foundations for humanity's intelligences are compromised, including capacities for receptive, multiperspectival, and transpersonal intelligence. The individual's moral capacities are also impaired. The person necessarily relies on innate propensities for self-protection.

The *security ethic* is rooted in innate survival systems for *self-protection*—fear, panic, anger—shared with all mammals (Panksepp, 1998). Although useful in acute moments of threat, chronic activation of survival systems leads to habitual use of self-protection in making decisions and taking action. The security ethic is triggered by threat—physical or psychological. There are two basic forms of security; one is anger-based and

aggressive (oppositional) and one is fear-based and unsociable (withdrawing). We all have these propensities within us that can arise when we are motivated to withdraw from a relationship or lash out in self-defense. However, extensive distress in early life or unhealed trauma can establish chronic use of self-protection. Regularly triggered perception of threat can lead to security as a dispositional safety orientation, as habitual oppositionalism or withdrawal based on the situation (Narvaez, 2009). Sociomoral capacities are not only face-to-face (Narvaez, 2013a). When abstracting capabilities are mixed in, the oppositional energy becomes a *vicious imagination*, seeking control, domination, or extermination of the other. When mixed with the withdrawing reactivity, it becomes a *detached imagination*, emotionally and relationally detached from connection and responsibility. Unfortunately, unnested communities foster security ethics as a matter of course, resulting in sociopathic institutions and practices that adults presume to be "normal" (Derber, 2013; Maté & Maté, 2022).

The security ethic is part of lower evolution (Darwin-1), driven by goodness of fit and self-interest, and has its place for individual and group survival (Narvaez, 2014). However, it is not the driving force of human evolution as identified by Darwin (Darwin-2); that force resides primarily in the engagement ethic, described earlier, which relies on a nested life.

A MORE INCLUSIVE MORAL SENSE

Like David Loye, Riane Eisler has been advocating a partnership orientation to social life for decades, a contrast with the dominator culture that predominates today (e.g., Eisler, 1988; Eisler & Fry, 2019; Eisler & Levine, 2002). As Eisler and Fry (2019) have pointed out, humanity has a choice, whether to foster partnership or dominator communities. Maturana names the choice as between cultivating *Homo sapiens-amans*, our heritage, or the recently created forms dominant today, Homo sapiens-aggressans and Homo sapiens-arrogans (Maturana & Verden-Zoller, 2008). The EDN promotes *Homo sapiens-amans* and partnership culture whereas its absence leads to *Homo sapiens-*

aggressans and *Homo sapiens-arrogans*, characterizing dominator culture. As my work points out, the pathway toward one or the other begins from birth, if not before. The dominator worldview propels a whole different way of living from the partnership or kinship worldview (Tope & Narvaez, 2022).

One aspect of the kinship worldview (Four Arrows & Narvaez, 2022) that needs more attention immediately is a shift in perspective to identification with Nature. We have examples among scientists themselves. German naturalist Alexander von Humboldt (1769-1859), noting how the natural world was of one piece and moved according to inward forces, warned that human activity was destroying nature's fabric; he advocated a love of nature, inspiring Darwin, Thoreau, and Muir (in Wulf, 2015). Loye (2007a) noted that Darwin's notion of love imbued his relation with the natural world. For example, Desmond and Moore (1991) report the recollections of Frank Darwin, Charles' son, who noted that his father was "infatuated with every rootlet and blossom," as living companions with whom he conversed unselfconsciously (p. 631). Darwin labored over his lifetime "to show the evolutionary kinship between ourselves and all other life forms" (Loye, 2007a, p. 65).

More recently, this kinship orientation to Nature has been reflected in the works of scientists such as Jessica LeClair (2021), who is calling for kincentric health education that understands human health as reliant on biosphere health; Evelyn Fox Keller, who emphasized "feeling for the organism" (Fox Keller, 1984); and Lynn Margulis (1998), who contended that creative evolution (vs. the 'maintenance' evolution of natural selection) was based on symbiosis (a close and long-term biological interaction between organisms from different species, which can be mutualistic, parasitic, or commensalistic—where one benefits and one is unaffected). Awareness of the sentience of the world and a kinship relational connection are common orientations among traditional Indigenous peoples and Native scientists (e.g., Cajete, 2000; Hernandez, 2022; Kimmerer, 2013), from whom we have much to learn (Four Arrows & Narvaez, 2022).

CONCLUSION

The goal of this article was to point to our evolved moral sense through Loye's uncovering of Darwin's second aim and to uncover its etiology. The dominator culture has infected our understandings of human evolution and morality. Marshall Sahlins (2008) pointed out how the western world took up a notion of human nature absent in virtually all other societies, one emphasizing egosim and an inchoate mix of religious belief in original sin, separation, and ultimate redemption (Lash, 2006). Accordingly, neo-Darwinian "science" aligned with the views of Thucydides (431 BC/2009) and Hobbes (1651/1958), emphasizing human lives under natural conditions as "nasty, brutish and short" (ibid, p. 107) and governed by self-interest and a lust for power rooted in greed and ambition, demanding ruthlessness to earn one's place. Across the world, such a view is taken as a loss of humanity. Sahlins noted:

> For the greater part of humanity, self interest as we know it is unnatural in the normative sense; it is considered madness, witchcraft or some such grounds for ostracism, execution or at least therapy. Rather than expressing a pre-social human nature, such avarice is generally taken for a loss of humanity. It puts in abeyance the mutual relationships of being that define a human existence. (Sahlins, 2008, p. 51)

Dominator logic is embedded in Western patriarchal culture and imposed on the rest of the world (Lash, 2006). The western world has undermined child raising for generations, shifting the focus to a domination orientation instead of a partnership orientation (Eisler & Fry, 2019). The effects are lifelong and long term. The ethics we learn to prefer are deeply related to the neurobiology we develop in early life, which drives our psychology as an embodied morality (Narvaez, 2016b). Our potential for cooperation and inclusive imagination is vast, but it must be nurtured in childhood and supported throughout adulthood. It is vital to understand that *ethogenesis*, the ontology of human morality, requires our species-typical nesting to unfold optimally (Narvaez, 2016b, 2018b), with greater awareness of how early experience can traumatize and throw off

our intelligences and humanity (Eisler & Fry, 2019; Maté & Maté, 2022; van der Kolk, 2014).

David Loye's contribution has been to point us back to an optimistic view of humanity, one that fits with the vast majority of community beliefs around the world. The common view in preconquest cultures around the world is that humans descended from the gods or the stars, that humans are one kind of person among many kinds of persons on the earth, and that each person is defined transpersonally, by their relationships across time and place. We must return to this moral sense that entails a greater sensitivity to the animism of the Earth, respecting the intelligences that plants and animals have, many of which humans can barely conceive (Harvey, 2017; Yong, 2022). But more, we must identify with and live through the natural world, as ancient wisdom understood (Lash, 2006). We are interdependently entangled in life forms (e.g., microbiomes in and on our bodies, Yong, 2018). Because of our imaginative and action capacities, we bear the greatest responsibility for planetary wellbeing. The evolved nest is central to fostering our fullest human nature (Narvaez & Bradshaw, in press). Perhaps only with these restorations can we take up our species' heritage to behave toward Nature and one another as partners, as kin, instead of dominators (Four Arrows & Narvaez, 2022).

References

Bird-David, N. (1994). Sociality and immediacy: Or, past and present conversations on bands. *Man, 29*, 583-603. https://doi.org/10.2307/2804344

Bram, M. (2018). *A history of humanity*. Primus Books.

Burgdorf, J., & Panksepp, J. (2006). The neurobiology of positive emotions. *Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Reviews, 30,* 173-187. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2005.06.001

Burghardt, G.M. (2005). *The genesis of animal play: Testing the limits*. MIT Press.

Burkart, J.M., Hrdy, S.B., & Van Schaik, C.P. (2009). Cooperative breeding and human cognitive evolution. *Evolutionary Anthropology, 18*, 175-186. https://doi.org/10.1002/evan.20222

Cajete, G. (2000). *Native science: Natural laws of interdependence*. Clear Light.

Callahan, D. (2004). *The cheating culture: Why more Americans are doing wrong to get ahead*. Harcourt Harvest.

Carter, C. S. (2019). Love as embodied medicine. *International Body Psychotherapy Journal*, *18*, 19-25.

Christen, M., Narvaez, D., & Gutzwiller, E. (2017). Comparing and integrating biological and cultural moral progress. *Ethical Theory and Moral Practice*, 20: 55. doi:10.1007/s10677-016-9773-y

Cory, Jr., G.A., & Gardner, Jr., R. (Eds.) (2002). *The evolutionary neuroethology of Paul MacLean: Convergences and frontiers*. Praeger.

Darwin, C. (1859/1962). On *the origin of species by means of natural selection, or the preservation of favoured races in the struggle for life*. Collier Books.

Darwin, C. (1871). *The descent of man, and selection in relation to sex*. John Murray.

Dawkins, R. (1976). *The selfish gene*. Oxford University Press.

De Waal, F. (2009). *The age of empathy: Nature's lessons for a kinder society*. Harmony.

DePaulo, B. (2021). The number of unmarried Americans continues to grow, latest census report shows. Downloaded on August 1, 2022 from: https://www.unmarried.org/featured/the-number-of-unmarried-americans-continues-to-grow-latest-census-report-shows/

Derber, C. (2013). *Sociopathic society: A people's sociology of the United States*. Paradigm Press.

Descola, P. (2013). *Beyond nature and culture (J. Lloyd, trans.)*. University of Chicago Press.

Donaldson, F. (1993). *Playing by heart: The vision and practice of belonging*. Health Communications.

Durkheim, E. (1893/1997). *The division of labour in society* (W. D. Halls, trans.). Free Press.

Eisler, R. (1988). *The chalice and the blade: Our history, our future*. Harper One.

Eisler, R., & Fry, D.P. (2019). *Nurturing our humanity: How domination and partnership shape our brains, lives, and future*. Oxford University Press.

Eisler, R. & Levine, D.S. (2002). Nurture, nature, and caring: We are not prisoners of our genes. *Brain and Mind, 3*, 9-52. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1016553723748

Feldman, R., Singer, M., & Zagoory, O. (2010). Touch attenuates infants' physiological reactivity to stress. *Developmental Science*, *13*(2), 271-278. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-7687.2009.00890.x

Field, T. (Ed.) (1995). *Touch in early development*. Psychology Press.

Fox Keller, E. (1984). *A feeling for the organism: The life and work of Barbara McClintock*. Times Books.

Freud, S. (1905/1949/2011). *Three essays on the theory of sexuality* (J. Strachey, trans.). Martino Fine Books.

Fry, D. P. (2006). *The human potential for peace: An anthropological challenge to assumptions about war and violence*. Oxford University Press.

Gilliam, W.S. (2005). *Prekindergarteners left behind: Expulsion rates in state prekindergarten systems*. Yale University Child Study Center.

Gottlieb, G. (2002). On the epigenetic evolution of species-specific perception: The developmental manifold concept. *Cognitive Development*, *17*, 1287–1300. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0885-2014(02)00120-X

Gray, P. (2013). The value of a play-filled childhood in development of the hunter-gatherer individual. In D. Narvaez, J. Panksepp, A.N. Schore, & T. Gleason (Eds.), *Evolution, early experience and human development: From research to practice and policy* (pp. 362-370). Oxford University Press.

Gray, P. (2014). The play theory of hunter-gatherer egalitarianism. In D. Narvaez, K. Valentino, A. Fuentes, J. McKenna, & P. Gray, (Eds.) *Ancestral landscapes in human evolution: Culture, childrearing and social wellbeing* (pp. 190-213). Oxford University Press.

Gruber, H.E. (1974). *Darwin on man. A psychological study of scientific creativity, together with Darwin's early and unpublished notebooks, transcribed and annotated by Paul H. Barrett*. Wildwood House. *Medical History, 19*(3), 309-309. doi:10.1017/S0025727300020329/

Harvey, G. (2017). *Animism: Respecting the living world, 2nd ed*. C. Hurst & Co.

Hernandez, J. (2022). *Fresh banana leaves: Healing Indigenous landscapes through Indigenous science*. Penguin Random House.

Hewlett, B.S., & Lamb, M.E. (2005). *Hunter-gatherer childhoods: Evolutionary, developmental and cultural perspectives*. Aldine.

Hobbes, T. (1651/1958) *Leviathan, Parts I and II*. Library of Liberal Arts.

Hrdy, S. (2009). *Mothers and others: The evolutionary origins of mutual understanding*. Belknap Press.

Ingold, T. (2005). On the social relations of the hunter-gatherer band. In R.B. Lee, R.B. & R. Daly (Eds.), *The Cambridge encyclopedia of hunters and gatherers* (pp. 399-410). Cambridge University Press.

Ingold, T. (2011). *The perception of the environment: Essay on livelihood, dwelling and skill*. Routledge.

Kelly, R. L. (1995). *The foraging spectrum: Diversity in hunter-gatherer lifeways*. Smithsonian Institution Press.

Kimmerer, R.W. (2013). *Braiding Sweetgrass: Indigenous wisdom, scientific knowledge and the teachings of plants*. Milkweed Editions.

Koestler, A. (1978). *Janus: A summing up*. One 70 Press.

Konrath, S. H., O'Brien, E. H., & Hsing, C. (2011). Changes in dispositional empathy in American college students over time: a meta-analysis. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 15*, 180-198. https://doi.org/10.1177/1088868310377395

Lash, J.L. (2006). *Not in his image: Gnostic vision, sacred ecology and the future of belief*. Chelsea Green.

LeClair, J. (2021). Building kincentric awareness in planetary health education: A rapid evidence review. *Creative Nursing, 27*(4), 231-236.

Liedloff, J. (1977). *The continuum concept: In search of happiness lost*. Perseus Books.

Louv, R. (2005). *Last child in the woods: Saving our children from Nature Deficit Disorder*. Workman.

Loye, D. (1990). Moral sensitivity and the evolution of higher mind. *World Futures: Journal of General Evolution, 30*, 1-2: 41-52. DOI:10.1080/02604027.1990.9972195

Loye, D. (2000). *Darwin's lost theory of love: A healing vision for the new century*. The Benjamin Franklin Press.

Loye, D. (2002). The moral brain. *Brain and Mind, 3,* 133-150. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1016561925565

Loye, D. (2007a). *Darwin on love: The new story of evolution*. The Benjamin Franklin Press.

Loye, D. (2007b). *Measuring evolution: A leadership guide to the health and wealth of nations*. The Benjamin Franklin Press.

Loye, D. (2007c). *Darwin's lost theory: Bridge to a better world*. The Benjamin Franklin Press.

Loye, D. (2015). Untangling Partnership and Domination Morality. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Partnership Studies*, *1*(1), Article 6. https://doi.org/10.24926/ijps.v1i1.91

Loye, D. (2018). *Rediscovering Darwin: The rest of Darwin's theory and why we need it today*. Romanes Press.

Lutz, C. A. (1998). *Unnatural emotions: Everyday sentiments on a Micronesian atoll and their challenge to Western theory*. University of Chicago Press.

MacLean, P.D. (1990). *The triune brain in evolution: Role in paleocerebral functions*. Plenum.

Margulis, L. (1998). *Symbiotic planet: A new look at evolution*. Sciencewriters.

Martin, C.L. (1999). *The way of the human being*. Yale University Press.

Maslow, A.H. & Honigmann, J.J. (1970). Synergy: Some notes of Ruth Benedict. *American Anthropologist, 72* (2), 320-333.

Maté, G., & Maté, D. (2022). *The myth of normal: Trauma, illness, and healing in a toxic culture*. Avery.

Maturana, H.R., & Bunnell, P. (1999). The Biology of Business: Love Expands Intelligence. *Reflections, The SoL Journal*, *1*(2): 58-63. https://doi.org/10.1162/152417399570179

Maturana, H.R., & Verden-Zoller, G. (2008). *The origin of humanness in the biology of love*. Imprint Academic.

McLaughlin, K.M., Green, J.G., Hwang, I., Sampson, N.A., Zaslavsky, A.M., & Kessler, R.C. (2012). Intermittent Explosive Disorder in the National Comorbidity Survey Replication Adolescent Supplement. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, *69*(11):1131-1139. doi:10.1001/archgenpsychiatry.2012.592

Mooney, J., & Young, J. (2006). The decline in crime and the rise of anti-social behaviour. *Probation Journal, 53*(4), 397-407. doi: 10.1177/0264550506069364

Narvaez, D. (1998). The effects of moral schemas on the reconstruction of moral narratives in 8th grade and college students. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 90*(1), 13-24. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.90.1.13

Narvaez, D. (2008). Triune ethics: The neurobiological roots of our multiple moralities. *New Ideas in Psychology, 26*, 95-119. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.newideapsych.2007.07.008

Narvaez, D. (2009). Triune Ethics Theory and moral personality. In D. Narvaez & D.K. Lapsley (Eds.), *Personality, Identity and Character: Explorations in Moral Psychology* (pp. 136-158). Cambridge University Press.

Narvaez, D. (2012). Moral neuroeducation from early life through the lifespan. *Neuroethics*, 5(2), 145-157. doi:10.1007/s12152-011-9117-5

Narvaez, D. (2013a). Neurobiology and moral mindsets. In K. Heinrichs & F. Oser (Eds.), *Moral and immoral behavior: Theoretical and empirical perspectives on moral motivation* (pp. 289-307). Sense Publishers.

Narvaez, D. (2013b). The 99%--Development and socialization within an evolutionary context: Growing up to become "A good and useful human being." In D. Fry (Ed.), *War, peace and human nature: The convergence of evolutionary and cultural views* (pp. 643-672). Oxford University Press.

Narvaez, D. (2014). *Neurobiology and the development of human morality: Evolution, culture and wisdom*. Norton.

Narvaez, D. (2016a). Baselines for virtue. In J. Annas, D. Narvaez, & N. Snow (Eds.), *Developing the virtues: Integrating perspectives* (pp. 14-33). Oxford University Press.

Narvaez, D. (2016b). *Embodied morality: Protectionism, engagement and imagination*. Palgrave-Macmillan.

Narvaez, D. (2017). Are we losing it? Darwin's moral sense and the importance of early experience. In (R. Joyce, Ed.), *Routledge handbook of evolution and philosophy*, 322-332. Routledge.

Narvaez, D. (2017). Getting back on track to being human. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Partnership Studies, 4*(1), March 2, 2017. Online free: DOI: https://doi.org/10.24926/ijps.v4i1.151

Narvaez, D. (Ed.) (2018a). Basic needs, wellbeing and morality: Fulfilling human potential. Palgrave-MacMillan.

Narvaez, D. (2018b). Ethogenesis: Evolution, early experience and moral becoming. In J. Graham & K. Gray (Eds.), *The Atlas of Moral Psychology* (pp. 451-464). Guilford Press.

Narvaez, D. (2019). Humility in four forms: Intrapersonal, interpersonal, community, and ecological. In J. Wright (Ed.), *Humility* (pp. 117-145). In book series, *Multidisciplinary perspectives on virtues* (N. Snow & D. Narvaez, series eds.). Oxford University Press.

Narvaez, D. (2022). Beyond trauma-informed: Returning to indigenous, wellness-informed practices. *International Journal of Existential Positive Psychology, 11*(1). Available at: https://www.meaning.ca/ijepp-article/vol11-no1/beyond-trauma-informed-returning-to-indigenous-wellness-informed-practices/

Narvaez, D., & Bradshaw, G.A. (in press). *The Evolved Nest: Nature's way of raising children and creating connected communities*. North Atlantic Books.

Narvaez, D., Gleason, T., Wang, L., Brooks, J., Lefever, J., Cheng, A., & Centers for the Prevention of Child Neglect (2013). The Evolved Development Niche: Longitudinal effects of caregiving practices on early childhood psychosocial development. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, *28* (4), 759–773. http://dx.Doi:10.1016/j.ecresq.2013.07.003

Narvaez, D., & Tarsha, M. (2021). The missing mind: Contrasting civilization with non-civilization development and functioning. In T. Henley & M. Rossano (Eds.), *Psychology and cognitive archaeology: An Interdisciplinary approach to the study of the human mind* (pp. 55-69). Routledge.

Narvaez, D., Wang, L, & Cheng, A. (2016). Evolved Developmental Niche History: Relation to adult psychopathology and morality. *Applied Developmental Science, 20*(4), 294-309. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10888691.2015.1128835

Narvaez, D., Wang, L., Cheng, A., Gleason, T., Woodbury, R., Kurth, A., & Lefever, J.B. (2019). The importance of early life touch for psychosocial and moral development. *Psicologia: Reflexão e Crítica, 32*:16 (open access). doi.org/10.1186/s41155-019-0129-0

Narvaez, D., Wang, L., Gleason, T., Cheng, A., Lefever, J., & Deng, L. (2013). The Evolved Developmental Niche and sociomoral outcomes in Chinese three-year-olds. *European Journal of Developmental Psychology*, *10*(2), 106-127. https://doi.org/10.1080/17405629.2012.761606

Narvaez, D., Woodbury, R., Gleason, T., Kurth, A., Cheng, A., Wang, L., Deng, L., Gutzwiller-Helfenfinger, E., Christen, M., & Näpflin, C. (2019). Evolved Development Niche provision: Moral socialization, social maladaptation and social thriving in three countries. *Sage Open, 9*(2). https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244019840123

Oyama, S. (1985). *The ontogeny of information: Developmental systems and evolution.* Cambridge University Press.

Panksepp, J. (1998). *Affective neuroscience: The foundations of human and animal emotions.* Oxford University Press.

Pellis, S.M., & Pellis, V.C. (2009). *The playful brain: Venturing to the limits of neuroscience*. Oneworld.

Perry, B. D., Pollard, R. A., Blakely, T. L., Baker, W. L., & Vigilante, D. (1995). Childhood trauma, the neurobiology of adaptation, and "use-dependent" development of the brain: How "states" become "traits." *Infant Mental Health Journal, 16*, 271–291. https://doi.org/10.1002/1097-0355(199524)16:4<271::AID-IMHJ2280160404>3.0.CO;2-B

Powell, D., Fixen, D., & Dunlop, G. (2003). *Pathways to service utilization: A synthesis of evidence relevant to young children with challenging behavior*. University of South Florida Center for Evidence-based Practice.

Prescott J.W. (1996). The origins of human love and violence. *Pre- and Perinatal Psychology Journal, 10* (3), 143-188.

Richards, R.J. (1987). *Darwin and the emergence of evolutionary theories of mind and behavior*. University of Chicago Press.

Roberts, D. (2022). *Torn apart: How the child welfare system destroys Black families and how abolition can build a safer world*. Basic Books.

Roughgarden, J., & Song, Z. (2014). Incentives in the family I: The family firm, an evolutionary/economic theory for parent-offspring relations. In D. Narvaez, K. Valentino, A. Fuentes, J. McKenna, & P. Gray, *Ancestral landscapes in human evolution: Culture, childrearing and social wellbeing* (pp. 221-240). Oxford University Press.

Sahlins, M. (2008). *The Western illusion of human nature with reflections on the long history of hierarchy, equality and the sublimation of anarchy in the West, and comparative notes on other conceptions of the human condition*. Prickly Paradigm Press.

Sapolsky, R. M. (2004). *Why zebras don't get ulcers* (3rd ed.). Holt.

Schore, A.N. (2019). *The development of the unconscious mind*. W.W. Norton.

Sorenson, E.R. (1998). Preconquest consciousness. In H. Wautischer (Ed.), *Tribal epistemologies: Essays in the philosophy of anthropology* (pp. 79-115). Ashgate.

Spencer, H. (1864/2015). *The principles of biology*. Andesite Press.

Stotz, K., & Narvaez, D. (2018). Niche. In V. Zeigler-Hill & T. Shackelford (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of personality and individual differences* (online source). Springer. doi:10.1007/978-3-319-28099-8_1554-1

Sussman, S. (2017). *Substance and behavioral addictions: Concepts, causes, and cures*. Cambridge University Press.

Tarsha, M., & Narvaez, D. (2019). The Evolved Nest: A partnership system that fosters child wellbeing. *International Journal of Partnership Studies, 6*(3). Open access: doi.org/10.24926/ijps.v6i3.2244

Thucydides (431 BC/2009). *The Peloponnesian War*. Oxford University Press,

Tope, W., & Narvaez, D. (2022). *Restoring the kinship worldview: Indigenous voices introduce 28 precepts for rebalancing life on planet earth*. North Atlantic Books.

Turkle, S. (2011). *Alone together: Why we expect more from technology and less from each other*. Basic Books.

Twenge, J. & Campbell, R. (2009) *The narcissism epidemic: Living in the age of entitlement*. Free Press.

United States Census Bureau (2021). Household statistics. Downloaded on August 1, 2022 from https://www.census.gov/data/tables/time-series/demo/families/households.html

Van der Kolk, B. (2014). *The body keeps the score: Brain, mind, and body in the healing of trauma*. Penguin.

Varela, F. (1999). *Ethical know-how: Action, wisdom, and cognition*. Stanford University Press.

Walker, H. (1993). Antisocial behavior in school. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Problems*, 2(1), 20–24.

Widlok, T. (2017). *Anthropology and the economy of sharing*. Routledge.

Wilson, E.O. (1991). Biodversity, prosperity, and value. In F. H. Bormann & S.R. Kellert (Eds.), *Ecology, economics, ethics: The broken circle* (pp. 3-10). Yale University Press.

Wilson, T.D., Lisle, D.J., Kraft, D., & Wetzel, C.G. (1989). Preferences as expectation-driven inferences: Effects of affective expectations on affective experience. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *56*(4), 519-530. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.56.4.519

Wulf, A. (2015). *The invention of nature: Alexander von Humboldt's new world*. Knopf.

Yong, E. (2018). *I contain multitudes: The microbes within us and a grander view of life*. Ecco.

Yong, E. (2022). *An immense world: How animal senses reveal the hidden realms around us*. Random House.

Yunkaporta, T. (2020). *Sand talk: How Indigenous thinking can save the world*. HarperCollins.

Darcia Narvaez is professor emerita of psychology at the University of Notre Dame and host of EvolvedNest.org. Her email is dnarvaez@nd.edu and her website is https://sites.nd.edu/darcianarvaez/.