

SEX 3.0

THE PRIMER

BY J J ROBERTS

COPYRIGHT © 2012 BY J J ROBERTS

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

Revision 1.3

FOR INFORMATION ABOUT PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE SECTIONS FROM THIS BOOK OR
TO CONTACT THE AUTHOR, VISIT THE OFFICIAL WEBSITE OR THE FACEBOOK PAGE FOR
SEX 3.0

<http://sexthreepointzero.com>

<http://facebook.com/sex3.0>

Dedication

This book was inspired by the women that I have been fortunate enough to have in my life and it is dedicated to them, especially my mother.

Preface

This book was written in a fairly unconventional way.

In August 2009, I packed my bags and embarked on the beginning of a round-the-world trip armed with nothing but a backpack, a bunch of clothes, toiletries and my not-so-faithful laptop.

The plan was simply to head west from London and to keep going until I got back to London again. Several motherboard failures, battery failures and a new laptop later - and many, many countries later - this book was born.

As such, this book was not written in any country. Parts of the book were written at the end of the world in snowy Patagonia, the eternal spring of Medellin, sultry Mexico, overlooking Ipanema beach or during a break from the delightful chaos of the SFSX music festival in Austin, Texas.

At times L.A. provided the backdrop and inspiration. Other times Machu Picchu, Sydney harbour, Hong Kong bay, Boracay white beach and the ancient city of Petra.

One comment that I heard quite a lot from people during my round-the-world research was this:

“You are writing a book about relationships? What does it cover? What kind of relationships?”

“Well it covers everything - all relationships but mostly sexual relationships.”

“Covers all relationships? Damn! That must be a huge book!”

The thing is that it isn't. The aim of this book is not to provide more and more information across thousands of pages. Information overload does not clear away the confusion.

The aim of this book is to provide more clarity.

As such this book is written in accordance with what I call “Pure Form Theory.” Pure Form Theory basically states that you can take something which appears to be complex – like relationships – filter it, simplify it, compress it, purify it then filter it some more, simplify further, purify and compress it over and over again until you have it in its simplest and purest form - expressed using the fewest words possible. You will find an example of pure form theory in action as early as chapter 4 of this book.

“Simple can be harder than complex: you have to work hard to get your thinking clean to make it simple. But it's worth it in the end because once you get there, you can move mountains.”

Steve Jobs

In total the research during the writing of this book took place across more than 40 countries during more than 2 years of travel.

This book is not written in a dry academic style so if you are offended by the occasional swear word, perhaps this is not the book for you.

Also this book is not specifically written for men or women nor is it written for any particular sexual orientation. It's written for everyone, includes everyone and covers the big picture. Rather than make the book un-readable by constantly writing things like “he / she” the sexual pronouns can just be interpreted to suit yourself and your situation. Common sense makes it clear where things don't apply to you.

This book covers quite a lot of large concepts and a lot of the paradigms and conclusions you might find somewhat counter-intuitive. As they are presented concentrated into “pure form” you may benefit from reading the book in more than one pass and you might get more from it if you take notes and read it again some weeks or months later.

A lot of what I say is also counter-doctrinal and goes against what society has taught you your entire life.

Bearing in mind the fine mess we have gotten ourselves into as a society when it comes to modern day sexual relationships, this might not be a bad thing.

“The future of the world will not be determined between nations, but rather, in the relations between men and women.”

D.H. Lawrence

1 – This Book Is Not A Book

This book is a map.

It may not look like a map but it is.

Maps are foldy-outy kind of things with pictures and symbols and this is more of a page-turny kind of thing with text which may lead you to the conclusion that it is a book but trust me it is not.

It is a map.

Ever heard the expression “the map is not the territory”?

This is a well-known expression coined in 1931, I believe, by a Polish-American philosopher and scientist called Alfred Korzybski.

What this phrase means is that although a lot of people think that their sense of reality is the reality itself, it is not. Their sense of reality is the map and reality is the territory. They are two different things which may correlate closely or may not.

People confuse their map with the territory that the map describes all the time.

Whenever you hear anybody say “The truth is...” followed by a subjective comment or a statement of their opinion, that is exactly what they are doing.

Let’s say you are walking around a city with a city map in your hand. You see a small park on the map and you head on over to the park. When you arrive, the park is not there and it has been replaced by a set of office buildings and a car park.

You would not look at the map and insist that the map is right and that reality is wrong. You would just assume that your map is out of date.

The map is not the terrain.

Now people carry all kinds of maps around in their head about how the way the world works. Maps concerning all kinds of things like politics, religion, relationships and so on.

Everybody carries around a map in their head called the “this is how sexual relationships work” map and it is precisely this map that we are concerned with here.

Everybody is born with a “this is how sexual relationships work” map and when they are first born it is blank.

Children ask questions about absolutely everything because they don't understand what is going on around them. They are trying to fill in their maps. So many things are mysteries to them and everyone starts with a blank map about so many things and they need to fill them in to survive. They need your help to fill it in.

Typically, as children get old enough to observe how mummy and daddy relate and react to each other; parts of their map get filled in. Being told fairy tales and bedtime stories about the beautiful princess and the dashing prince charming fills their map in a little more. Listening to the lyrics of love songs fills in their map a little more as does watching romantic comedies.

Gradually, even though the children are not ready to start using their map yet, they develop a clear set of expectations and ideals.

When children grow up and become young men and women they embark on their own relationships. These experiences colour their maps too.

Just like everyone else, I have a "this is how sexual relationships work" map.

I am not so arrogant as to claim that my map is better than your map but my map is almost certainly different from your map. As you are reading about sexual relationships then it would be fair of me to assume that you are interested in improving your map so let's see if I can help in that regard.

Over the course of this text I will highlight ways in which people's maps come to be so badly drawn. I am going to be highlighting mapping mistakes and detailing the reasons how and why these errors get on the map in the first place.

If you don't like having your idea of reality being screwed with, then I have good news and bad news.

The bad news is that by reading Sex 3.0 your idea of reality is going to be completely screwed with. The good news is that, all your life, society has screwed with your map and your concept of reality in a bad way by taking your map further away from the terrain. Sex 3.0 aims to reverse that.

So I am going to screw with your sense of reality in a good way as long as you want your map to reflect the terrain more accurately.

Hell, if I do my job correctly then by the end of the book you will be ready to completely shred your own map and you will be in possession of a brand new map that is a far better representation of the territory.

I am not going to redraw your map for you. If I did that then the responsibility for your map would be mine and you would be abdicating all responsibility for your love life onto me.

You are responsible for your map, nobody else. You are responsible for your love life, not me.

So, no I am not going to redraw your map for you but I am going to help you redraw it yourself.

2 – *Why Relationships Seem Difficult*

When children become young men and women and they embark on their first relationships they often realise that relationships are not quite like the fairy tales they were told as a child.

This can be quite a crushing disappointment and in the absence of access to a better map, they convince themselves that the person they loved so much was at fault and that person was clearly not the fairy tale concept of “the one” that they have been taught and they plough onwards with a new relationship.

In other words they insist that their map is correct and that reality is to blame.

To avoid repeating the same mistake of choosing the wrong partner and to find “the one” they also read advice columns, talk to their mates down the pub, read magazines and turn to popular culture like slushy ballads and soap operas on TV.

Unfortunately this compounds the problem and takes the map further away from the reality, not any closer, and here is why.

Society at large promotes a key concept which I am going to call “relationship duress.”

Let’s look at two definitions. Firstly, “duress” which is defined in the dictionary, like this:

du•ress - *noun*

1. *Compulsion by threat or force; coercion; constraint.*
2. *Law: such constraint or coercion as will render void a contract or other legal act entered or performed under its influence.*
3. *Forcible restraint, especially imprisonment.*

Secondly, “relationship duress”, or RD for short, which I am going to define as the collective term for the myriad ways in which society creates an uncomfortable environment for those who do not seem to be following the standard script of:

- 1 - Find partner
- 2 - Date in a “committed” monogamous relationship
- 3 - Get married

Relationship duress causes all kinds of mapping errors, and as I am a sexual relationship cartographer (hey – maybe I should put that on my business card!), I find this quite horrifying.

The relative benefits of following the date -> get married script compared to other kind of relationships is something that I will contrast and compare later in the book but I am not against it. I merely introduced marriage here as a way of introducing the concept of relationship duress because it is relationship duress that causes and perpetuates most of the mapping errors in sexual relationships and it is the mapping errors themselves that make relationships difficult.

Relationship duress is a constant and relentless bombardment and it is encountered in modern society from all sides on a daily basis from parents, friends and complete strangers. From every love song, soap opera, advice column, romantic comedy and so on.

People grow up being told that they have to “settle down” and “do the right thing.” This is a form of relationship duress.

Guys are told you have to “make an honest woman out of” their girlfriend therefore implying that a woman (and only the woman) is dishonest if both of them are in a sexual relationship but are not married and her reputation of honesty can only be salvaged by the man. This is a form of relationship duress.

Even girlfriends ask their boyfriends with a completely straight face “when are you going to make an honest woman out of me?” without even realising that they are implying their own dishonesty.

Both men and women experience relationship duress in different ways but both experience it for their entire lives.

Broadly speaking there are two distinct phases of RD. The first lifetime RD phase goes from birth until marriage.

During this phase, girls as they are growing up, are groomed to believe that one day they will marry their prince charming and that the wedding is their fairy princess day and that day is going to be the happiest day of their lives and that they will live happily ever after.

In the meantime, guys are told that, if you want a serious relationship then you have to take a woman's sexuality, throw it in a box and stamp and label the box as your property and that if you don't, it's not a real relationship.

This is all relationship duress although in the case of the “fairy princess day” it is the carrot and not the stick.

The second phase of lifetime RD is from marriage onwards. As, when people get married, they legally handcuff themselves to each other to prevent the other from leaving should they wish to. This is clearly a form of relationship duress albeit a mutual one-on-one form of it.

As we can see from the dictionary definition of duress, this forcible restraint is clearly a form of duress. Also, if we look at the legal point made in the dictionary definition of duress...

2. Law: such constraint or coercion as will render void a contract or other legal act entered or performed under its influence.

And you realise that it is not actually possible to grow up in society and never experience coercion to get married, you come to the amusing conclusion that, technically speaking, the contract should be null and void.

Relationship duress to have children, especially from immediate family members after the marriage, is routinely very strong also.

So the second phase of RD during your lifetime is basically:

4 - Have kids

5 - Stay married

There are countless forms of relationship duress. Too many to list in this book but, now that you know what relationship duress means, you will be able to recognise it and label it as such when you see it.

Trust me, you will see it practically on a daily basis. Now you have a name for it. When you see it, just snap your fingers, point at it and say, "that's RD right there."

New forms of relationship duress and new RD words are being invented even today in the 21st century.

Recently I read a magazine article about George Clooney's refusal to settle down where the author described him, and men of his ilk who refuse to get married as "kidults" a charmless and derisory term for a grownup who is somehow trapped in childhood and whose behaviour is deemed as juvenile and only suitable for a younger person; an adult who never "grew up."

A self-defeating notion when you realise that one of the marks of being an adult is making your own decisions about your own life and taking responsibility for them, which is exactly what Clooney did, and one of the marks of being a kid is being told by other people what to do which is exactly what the author of the article was clearly trying to do.

This is a form of relationship duress. Recognise it for what it is.

People that do submit to relationship duress then go on to parrot that same relationship duress and try to shove it down other people's throats as a way of convincing themselves their own map is correct and calming their own fears and their own doubts about whether they are doing the right thing.

The fact that they can point to so many other people in society who are also parroted the exact same RD messages convinces them even further that they are right.

"Of course I am doing the right thing," they tell themselves. Gosh darn it you should do the right thing too!

The fact that so many other people in society are parroted the exact same RD messages also convinces people, whose gut instincts tell them to disagree with the majority view, that their instincts are wrong and to forget their own best judgments and to conform to the majority view.

The Asch conformity experiments, which are possibly the most famous social-psychology tests ever conducted, demonstrated with brilliant clarity such conformity even in small group settings.

If you are not familiar with the Asch conformity experiments by the way then I strongly suggest you look up the videos on youtube.com as soon as possible. Preferably immediately and before you read any further.

If you are not online right now then I will quickly summarise. A volunteer is told that the test that he has volunteered to take part in is going to be a test of visual perception before sitting at a table with 5 other participants.

What he does not realise is that all the other “participants” at the table are all actors who are all going to volunteer the exact same incorrect answer to some of the tests and that he is the only participant that is being tested for real. The real test is not about his visual perception it’s about his level of conformity.

He is the only one who has a choice. He must either go against the group and give the correct answer to a visual test that was deliberately designed to be very, very easy to give the correct answer to (the length of a straight line), or he must go with the group and give the same obviously incorrect answer and conform.

On greater than 30% of the questions, the only real participant conformed with the group. Also, a massive 75% of participants conformed with the group on at least one question during the experiment.

When asked afterwards why they conformed they said it was either because they thought the group must be right and did not even believe what was literally right in front of their eyes (informational conformity) or they conformed to avoid the discomfort of being thought as wrong and deviant by the rest of the group (normative conformity).

If conformity is this easy to achieve with a just small amount of people speaking against such an obvious and easily visible truth, then just think how much easier it is to achieve mass conformity when most of the world is speaking against you about a truth that is far less simple and far less obvious to understand like how sexual relationships should work.

The need to fit in is one of the single most powerful forces in human psychology and is something that developed for very good reason during the Sex 1.0 phase of human evolution which you will read about in the chapters to come.

Now you can start to understand how relationship duress and group conformity combined can take already very badly corrupted maps that people are carrying around and can spread the problem by replicating the corruption and the mapping mistakes and by obligating all others in society into accepting them.

This is how the mapping errors spread like an unstoppable self-replicating virus.

This is exactly why relationships seem difficult.

They seem difficult because everybody is trying to navigate the territory using maps that do not reflect the territory and are full of mapping errors.

You know happens when you do that? You get lost and crash into things. Crashing into things is painful. In relationships the pain is mostly emotional and not physical but arguments that descend into violence are not exactly rare either.

Sometimes you crash really, really badly and the relationship crashes and burns totally.

Normally when somebody has a map in their head about a skill that can be done solo (like how to make a good lasagne for example) and the map is this bad then the map gets corrected. The continued stream of failed attempts at using the map will lead them to the conclusion that they don't have a very good map after all. They will conclude that maybe they need more practice or perhaps better raw ingredients or a better lasagne recipe and so the map gets corrected.

This is where the final cruel trick get played which is this. It takes two to have a relationship. Both are trying to navigate the territory together.

When the relationship crashes and burns and both parties are walking away from the smouldering wreckage, you know what they do?

They don't blame the maps. They blame each other.

They curse that "all men are bastards" and "all women are bitches" and lament that they must be "so unlucky in love" and "why can't I find the right person" and tell themselves that that person must not have been "the one."

Then you know what they do? This is the part where it gets really crazy!

They stick their map back into their pockets!!!

Instead of ripping up their map, burning what's left of it and stamping on the smouldering embers, they tell themselves that their map is perfectly fine and tell themselves "Well I can read and navigate with my map perfectly well. Why can't I find a partner who knows how to do the same!!"

Then what do they do?

Well firstly, past failures are backwards rationalised with favourite phrases like "you have to kiss a lot of frogs to find your prince" and ... well men don't really have an equivalent backwards rationalisation about princesses so they have to stick with the tried and tested "She was a bitch."

Then what do they do?

Following a sufficient period of emotional recovery, people then embark on a brand new journey with a brand new partner and the exact same map safely tucked into their pocket telling themselves that it must be different this time because they are in the car starting out on a completely new journey with a completely different person in the front seat with them.

Maybe this person is "the one."

3 – Why Relationships Are Easy

You are given one key indicator your entire life about the quality of your map and how easy your sexual relationships are going to be.

The indicator is this...

Do you find the subject of human sexual relationships, and your own experiences in them, to be troublesome, complicated or difficult? In your personal experience, would you agree that the need to “work on your relationship” is good advice as relationships are often a struggle?

If you do then your map sucks.

I have got to be blunt. No pulling punches, no apologies and no you can't be mad at me for saying so. I told you in the first chapter that I was going to screw with your reality (in a good way of course).

I also told you I was going to help you re-draw your map and take it closer to the terrain and it's totally impossible for me to do that unless I point out what I think the mistakes are on your map.

Don't be defensive. There is no reason to be. Lots of the mistakes on your map, perhaps even almost all of them, are as a result of relationship duress from society at large and were not even put on the map by you.

Also take comfort in the fact that you are not alone. In researching this book, a very common response I received when I told people I was writing a comprehensive book about human sexual relationships was either “Blimey that book is going to weigh a ton!” or “So, what conclusion does the book come to? Relationships are really complicated?” often accompanied by a wince of pain and a concerned expression.

If your map closely and accurately presents you with an absolutely great and accurate view of the territory then you will find it exceptionally easy to navigate it. In other words, you will find sexual relationships to be easy, a source of delight and pleasure and not problematic at all.

If you find that sexual relationships are difficult and you are encountering all kinds of common problems like jealousy, possessiveness, resentment, nagging problems, complacency, boredom, a withering sexual desire for each other in the face of familiarity followed by that desperate desire to “get the spark back”, then your map needs re-drawing and I am going to help you do it.

Sexual relationships are not difficult. They are easy.

Or, to be more precise, they are as easy as you make them. Make sure you have a good map and then make the right choices based on the map and you are good. I speak from experience.

Once you grasp this concept then it is an amazingly empowering thought. The realisation that all the stuff that society and relationship duress drew on your map is erasable. If you don't believe you possess an eraser capable of doing that then, by the end of this book, I sincerely hope that I would have handed it to you. I will make it my mission.

Its amazingly empowering to realise that how difficult or easy your relationships are is an option that YOU choose.

As I mentioned in the preface, this book is written in pure form style. If you skipped the preface then basically pure form theory means: Seek clarity. Drill down. Seek clarity. Drill down more. Seek clarity and repeat over and over again. Then express the results in as few words as possible.

This mentality is essential for taking the map closer to the territory.

In the interests of pure form theory and making everything nice and simple on your map, how about if I told you that the word "relationship" can be defined in just two words and that there are only two kinds of human sexual relationship in existence?

Does that sound too good to be true?

Read on...

4 – Relationships Defined In Just Two Words

To get our map closer to the territory, we need clarity so let's go back to basics and look at the word "relationship" and I use the word in its broadest possible term in this chapter.

In life a person has all kinds of relationships like employer and employee, student and teacher, friendships, boyfriend and girlfriend, landlord and tenant, customer and business and so on

Of all of the realisations, and there were many that I went through, in the years of travelling, writing, researching this book and talking to people from all different cultures there is one realisation that startled and surprised me more than any and that is this.

People do not understand what the word relationship means.

Don't get me wrong. People have a tremendous gut instinct of what a relationship actually IS.

This gut level instinct of what a relationship IS means they have a laser like recognition of when they have a relationship in their life and when they don't. Whether a particular relationship is desirable or not and when a relationship is over. They just know.

It also means that they know and understand when and why some relationships are closer than others even when they are presented to them in an abstract way when talking about a third party. This is a tremendous intuitive skill that people have that runs to a very, very deep level.

They just don't know what a relationship means. In other words their understanding is intuitive, not cognitive.

What I mean by that is that, when you ask most people to define the word "relationship" they really, really struggle.

They can't come up with a good definition.

Pause for a moment and try it yourself. The following are all kinds of relationships that people commonly have in their lives:

- Employer and employee
- Student and teacher
- Friendships

- Boyfriend and girlfriend
- Landlord and tenant
- Customer and business

All very different arrangements and yet we apply the word “relationship” to all of them. Why?

Well obviously we apply the word “relationship” to all of them because there is some quality that they have in common that makes them all a kind of relationship.

What is it?

When you ask people this question they usually come out with some vague and woolly definition of “shared emotions” or say things like there is “some kind of emotional shared connection or bond” but that’s not it. You don’t need that to order a DVD from amazon.com do you? You still would have a customer business relationship with them.

So, when people already have such an amazing intuitive understanding of what the word means then why the struggle to define the word?

Well, I have some news which might shock you.

You have been lied to your entire life. By who? Well, by pretty much everyone. By society. Perhaps even by your own family.

Lied to about what? Well about the nature of relationships, about what comprises a relationship, what a “committed” relationship means, what a “real” relationship is.

Hell, even the dictionary lies to you about the meaning of the word relationship.

A quick search on dictionary.com gives the following definition:

re•la•tion•ship – *noun*

1. *a connection, association, or involvement.*
2. *connection between persons by blood or marriage.*
3. *an emotional or other connection between people: the relationship between teachers and students.*
4. *a sexual involvement; affair*

That's not what the word relationship means. Let’s look at them one by one.

1. *A connection, association, or involvement*

What if you are kidnapped one day and held in a dungeon?

You would not be in a relationship with that person. Sure you have a connection / association / involvement. The involvement is one of kidnapper and kidnappee.

Unless you develop Stockholm syndrome and fall in love with your kidnapper then you do not have a relationship.

Therefore a connection / association / involvement with another person is not what constitutes a relationship.

2. *Connection between persons by blood or marriage*

What if you are born a twin and, completely without your knowledge, you are separated at birth and go your entire life unaware of the fact?

Do you have a relationship with your twin? Clearly not. You are related – of course - but that is simply a biological fact. It could not be a relationship if you never meet or are never even aware of each other's existence your entire life.

Likewise, if you have a member of your family that you don't have contact with because you don't get along. Again, you are related. It is a biological fact however, not a relationship.

Marriage? What if you have not had sex with your spouse for 3 years, live in separate houses and are not getting divorced "for the sake of the kids" or because you live in one of the two countries in the world where divorce is illegal or because the shame that your family and the scorn from society at large towards divorcees prevents you? Clearly the relationship broke down a long time ago.

The fact that they are still married would be a legal fact, not a relationship. So clearly marriage alone does not constitute a relationship even though most married people are not so unfortunate as the couples I just described above and do indeed have a relationship.

3. An emotional or other connection between people

Well I am sure you would feel emotion towards someone who kidnapped you but it is most likely to be hatred. So, simply having an emotional connection with somebody does not mean you are in a relationship with them.

4. A sexual involvement; affair

Anybody who has ever been sexually abused would not say that they were in a relationship with their abuser. So clearly a sexual involvement with another person, in and of itself, is not what constitutes a relationship.

So what is a relationship? Let's go back to our list from earlier:

- Employer and employee
- Student and teacher
- Friendships
- Boyfriend and girlfriend
- Landlord and tenant
- Customer and business

So why do we use the word "relationship" to describe all of these diverse arrangements?

What do they all have in common that causes us to apply the word "relationship" to all of them?

In short, what makes a relationship a relationship?

In the spirit of pure form theory, a definition is possible in just two words and I am going to give it to you.

Are you ready? (drumroll)

Mutual reward.

That's it.

That's all that the word relationship means – mutual reward.

All relationships are founded on the basis of mutual reward and break down when mutual reward breaks down.

Employer And Employee

You get your wages. Your employer gets your time and expertise to help him grow his business. There is the mutual reward right there.

You stop doing your job or paying your landlord? Mutual reward breaks down. You know what they are going to do next. You are getting kicked out.

Your employer stops paying you? Mutual reward breaks down. You are going to find another job.

Student And Teacher

Student gets to learn a potentially valuable skill that may help them in their life, career or physical health. The teacher not only gets the satisfaction of helping people but, if he is good at it, he can make a career out of it. Mutual reward.

Friendships

Same rules apply. Strangers become friends at the unspoken moment that they both realise that they both like hanging out with each other.

You are friends with somebody because you both like spending time with each other. That's it. There is your mutual reward.

Ever had someone who likes hanging out with you but you don't like hanging out with them or vice versa? Do you think you are going to become friends? Clearly not.

Ever had a friend that you had a falling out with and you were not friends anymore? Why?

Because the mutual reward broke down.

You might feel that it is because of the argument that you had or the falling out that you had or because it was the fact that you discovered that they were dishonest. However something like that is simply the catalyst to the mutual reward breaking down.

You are not friends anymore because the mutual reward broke down.

Ever had a friend that you think you are not friends with because you simply lost touch?

That is a relationship that you still have today even though you might not realise it. The mutual reward never broke down so you still have that relationship. You have just become disconnected from the relationship.

Boyfriend And Girlfriend

You both get your sexual needs met and spend time together in a loving and pair bonded bubble. Mutual reward exists.

Stop getting your sexual needs met? Fall out of love? Argue and fight?

Mutual reward breaks down. The bubble bursts. It's not a relationship any more.

Customer And Business

Stop off for a coffee at café, sit outside and enjoy the sunshine and then leave your money on the table and walk away? Do you have a relationship with the café? Sure you do. You are a customer.

What happens if you deliberately decide to just walk away without paying? Do you have a relationship with the café then? No. Why not? You got what you wanted didn't you?

This question is easy to answer now isn't it? No mutual reward.

You would just be a thief not a customer. Thief and victim is not a relationship.

So as we can see, a relationship is not defined by an exchange of cash for goods and services nor is it defined by a contract (although a written contract might detail the mutual reward). It's not defined by a sexual involvement, by emotion or a genetic link. It is defined by mutual reward.

Ok so let's redraw your map a bit by applying pure form theory to the definition of the word relationship.

Relationship – The Pure Form Definition

re•la•tion•ship – *noun*

1. *mutual reward*

That means that relationship rules can be broken down very simply, at least when it comes to how relationships are founded and dissolved, regardless of whether the relationship is personal, business, sexual or non-sexual.

The 4 Principles Of Foundation & Dissolution

- 1 - If mutual reward exists, a relationship exists.
- 2 - If mutual reward does not exist, a relationship does not exist.
- 3 - If mutual reward is established, but mutual reward breaks down, so does the relationship.
- 4 - If mutual reward breaks down but is later re-established, like when you argue with your partner but later make up, then so is the relationship.

Mutual reward = relationship. They are the same thing.

Why The Confusion?

If it is that simple then why is there is a great deal of confusion over the meaning of the word relationship?

Well there are 3 main reasons

- 1 - The word "relationship" is a polyseme. That is to say it is a word with different but related meanings.

Example: Let's say you have a sister and you have a cousin. Clearly you are related to both of them. Are you closer to your sister? Well there are two different possible answers here.

Let's say hypothetically that you are really, really good friends with your cousin and hang out all the time like best friends do but you don't get on with your sister very well and rarely see her.

Well you are still closer to your sister in one sense because she is a direct sibling. However, this is describing the level of biological related-ness between the two of you and not the relationship between you.

You quite clearly have a closer relationship with your cousin. Why? Because the mutual reward is stronger.

2 - Society lies to us, or at the very least, equivocates about the meaning of the word relationship.

When somebody updates their Facebook page to say that they are "in a relationship" it's a little bizarre when you realise that the word relationship only means mutual reward. In that sense, it could mean that they have just bought a new pet dog or found a new dentist.

Of course this does not cause confusion because we know that society says that to be "in a relationship", means to be in a monogamous sexual relationship even though that is only one example of the many, many relationships that people have in their lives.

Society equivocates and tells us that this is what the word relationship means because society promotes and endorses only two types of sexual relationships

- Boyfriend / Girlfriend
- Husband / Wife

Of course these are both types of relationship as long as the relationship is working out for both parties.

Why exactly society promotes and endorses these sexual relationships is something we cover later in the book.

3 - Linguistic mist or fog obscuring vision.

It's not unusual to hear expressions like "unhealthy relationship." Now bearing in mind that the word relationship only means "mutual reward" you can see that it is not actually possible to have an unhealthy relationship. You cannot have "unhealthy mutual reward." It is a contradiction.

You can find yourself in an unhealthy situation when a relationship breaks down, sure. You can even find yourself trapped in it for some time for legal reasons or through societal pressure but that does not make it a relationship.

All relationships break down when mutual reward breaks down. If, for example, a marriage fails and both parties end up hating each other and, during the 6 months of the divorce process, only contact each other via lawyers then clearly the relationship is already over. The fact that they are still married during the divorce process is merely a legal fact.

Linguistic Fog

This kind of linguistic fog is very common in modern language.

It occurs so often that, when we come across it in the book we will present it along with an explanation like this example here:

Fog Alert

Long Term Relationship

When somebody says they are in a long term relationship or LTR is it often understood to mean that they are in a sexual exclusive relationship.

The word relationship however only means “mutual reward” and long term simply means over an extended period of time.

Therefore “long term relationship” simply means mutual reward over a long period of time whether the relationship is sexual or not.

And “Long Term Sexual Relationship” simply means mutual reward over a long period of time in a sexual relationship whether it is monogamous or not.

5 – A Roadmap For All Relationships

Now it does not mean that just because you have mutual reward then you have a perfect relationship. You can have relationships that are far from perfect but are still relationships none-the-less.

Although mutual reward determines whether a relationship exists or not it does not determine how the relationship is run or the quality of it whether it is good, bad, great or awesome.

For that we need a roadmap. We need a universal roadmap that covers all kinds of relationships – business, personal, sexual, non-sexual, friends, family – all relationships.

In short, we need what I call pure form relationships.

Pure form relationships have 4 principles. If you like you can think of them as 4 cornerstones or 4 pillars that hold up the structure of a building.

The stronger these pillars are, the stronger the relationship. The weaker and more damaged they are, the greater the danger of the whole thing collapsing. The 4 pillars of pure form relationships are:

- Communication
- Honesty
- Trust
- Respect

Let's take a business relationship example. If you take a job and your boss turns out to be a bit of a dick and is in the habit of saying stupid things for reasons of ego and to make himself feel important like "remember who your master is," that's a pretty stupid thing to say to an employee and you probably are not going to respect him.

Respect is the fourth pillar so – boom – there goes one pillar.

In terms of the other 3 pillars, well he is communicating but in a stupid way so there is damage to the first pillar too. He is not being dishonest so no special problems there but you are probably going to trust him less so the third pillar – trust - is damaged too and the fourth pillar – respect is gone.

That's probably not a boss you are going to be motivated to work very hard for.

You still have a relationship because, remember, a relationship means mutual reward and if you still continue to receive your wages and you continue to go to work then mutual reward continues.

However, although you still have a relationship, you do not have a pure form relationship. Pure form relationships have 4 strong pillars, not 3 weak ones.

The Universal Map Of All Relationships

Applying pure form theory to laying out a universal map of all relationships gives us a unifying and universal map covering every possible relationship you can ever have in your entire life in just 6 words.

These 6 words are broken down into relationship definition (2 words) and relationship roadmap (4 words).

Definition – mutual reward

Roadmap – communication, honesty, trust, respect

Any time you feel a relationship of any type in your life is weak or in trouble, take a look at the roadmap. Take a look at the four pillars defined in the roadmap. Filter the relationship past the four pillars. Where is it weak? Where is it damaged? Where can it be improved?

There are very few things in your life that impact your happiness as profoundly as the nature and the quality of the relationships you have in your life.

Measuring the integrity of any relationship is the simple task of giving yourself an honest assessment of the integrity of the 4 pillars.

How strong do they stand? Are there cracks in the pillars? If so, which ones? Which ones do you find yourself working to constantly repair?

6 – *There Are Only Two Kinds Of Sexual Relationships*

Wouldn't sexual relationships, which people seem to think of as so, so complicated, become really simple if there were only two types of sexual relationships.

Great news! There ARE only two types of sexual relationships and this chapter explains them.

Yes, only two.

You might be thinking do I mean ? :

- Boyfriend / Girlfriend
- Husband / Wife.

Erm, no. That's what society wants you to think and that is exactly what relationship duress is for.

You might be thinking I must be leaving a lot out if I think there are only two. Ok, long term heterosexual relationships are the mainstream but what about short term relationships like casual flings? What about gay relationships? Lesbian relationships? Transgender relationships? What about relationships between married men and their mistresses? What about one night stands? What about BDSM?

There are a million different kind of sexual relationships surely?

No, there are only two.

And these two encompass all possible kinds of relationships leaving nothing and nobody out regardless of their gender or sexual orientation.

These two relationships are:

- Fenced
- Unfenced

Simply put, fenced means a sexual relationship based on the concept of sexual ownership and unfenced means not based on the concept of sexual ownership.

So, examples of fenced relationships include things like conventional boyfriend and girlfriend or husband and wife relationships.

If you are thinking that by “unfenced” I must mean open relationships well I don’t really like the term open relationships and here is why. The opposite of open is closed. So therefore an example of a closed relationship would be a marriage.

Shops and restaurants “close.” Lights out, metal shutters come down. Nobody is there.

People are not shops. We need a better term to actually reflect the dynamics of what is going on.

People don’t “close” or “open”, they either agree to be fenced or they don’t.

When a sexual relationship is fenced, like a marriage, people are still going to find attractive people attractive and might even enjoy the attention and the flirting even if they don’t act on it and that is totally fine.

In such a scenario such a person is leaning on the fence and enjoying the attention or flirting with someone on the other side of the fence but just choosing not to hop over the fence while their partner is not looking.

You might be forgiven for thinking that monogamy (one partner) equates to “fenced” and polyamory (many partners) equates to “unfenced.”

Not quite. There is a subtle but really, really important difference. Understanding this difference is the key.

The difference is this. It is possible to have a fenced relationship that is not monogamous and it is possible to have an unfenced relationship with only one person.

An example of a fenced relationship that is not monogamous for example would be swingers. Swingers are typically married couples. Marriage is by definition a fenced relationship. Swingers however, have a gate in their fence and, by mutual agreement, they might open the gate to let another person in or another couple in, typically another couple of swingers. Principally to “spice up” married sex life and to help prevent sexual boredom.

It is also possible to have an unfenced relationship with just one person. This is possible because unfenced does not mean you are having sex with more than one person. It just means that there is no fence. In other words, it means there is no enforced monogamy.

Unfenced means that you are sexually free. That you don’t make an agreement with anyone for sexual exclusivity. It means that if you wanted to have a sexual experience with someone else then you could and you would not need your partner’s permission, nor they yours.

It does not necessarily mean that you are polygamous and you have more than one sexual partner. It simply means that you have the option. Whether you choose to exercise the option is up to you. Whether your partner chooses to exercise their option is up to them.

Fenced, on the other hand, means that either you have agreed with your partner, explicitly or by default assumption, that it’s not allowed or that (as in the case of swingers) permission is required beforehand.

Relationships go through phases. If you are in an unfenced relationship and you are, for example, in the early romantic infatuation stage of your relationship then

you are probably not going to be interested at all in exercising your option. That's totally understandable and totally fine. So, just don't exercise your option.

It does not change the status of your relationship from unfenced to fenced just because you are not interested in exercising your option right now. It does not change it at all. You are still in an unfenced relationship. You are just choosing not to exercise your option.

Seeing things in terms of fenced and unfenced allows us a better way to describe the dynamics of what is actually going on in sexual relationships and so help us to clarify things and to help us get our map closer to the terrain.

Also this allows us to clear up a great deal of linguistic fog. For example, as discussed earlier, the word relationship only means mutual reward whereas a one night stand is not regarded as a relationship. Indeed it is often talked about as the opposite of a relationship.

When we find out a friend has found a new person and has hooked up with them, people often ask "A relationship or just a one night stand?" like they are diametrically opposed.

If both people got what they wanted – sex – then there was mutual reward. Therefore:

Fog Alert

One night stand.

This is often understood to be the opposite of a relationship.

A one night stand is a relationship.

It is an unfenced relationship of the duration of one night.

Now don't get me wrong, unfenced relationships do not just mean short term or casual relationships like one night stands, fuck buddies or friends with benefits.

Whether a relationship is fenced or unfenced has nothing at all to do with the level of the affinity, love or pair bonding that may go on in either kind of relationship.

Thanks to relationship duress, it's a common assumption that a relationship not based on sexual ownership must be a casual and uncaring one and, for a relationship to be a loving one, that it must be a fenced relationship.

It's a totally false belief but an extremely prevalent one.

Society wants you to think exactly that and employs an enormous amount of relationship duress to get you to do so.

It's tremendously important to society for you to keep this mapping error on your map.

In reality, the fenced world can provide you with a loveless marriage and you can have an extremely loving and caring long term unfenced relationship.

So why does society need you to keep this mapping error on your map?

Well to answer that question, we have to go back to the beginning ...

7 – Sex 1.0

Duration – All of human history until approximately 8,000 BC

In order to understand the title of this book and what Sex 3.0 is we must first look at what Sex 1.0 and Sex 2.0 mean.

Without the understanding of the path that human sexual relationships took and why we took this path, we cannot truly understand how and why we arrived at the present day situation or have a good grasp of our future direction.

In other words, we cannot have a good map.

All of human history, when you include the species we evolved from, is an awfully long time. It is millions and millions of years so let's just focus on the most relevant parts that mark out the path that human sexuality has taken.

In this chapter, and the next few chapters, we are going to look at the Sex 1.0 part of history which is, let's pick a round number, approximately 200,000 years ago up until 10,000 years ago or approximately 8,000 BC.

In the last 200,000 years of human sexuality, Sex 1.0 is what we have had for about 95% of the time.

We spent pretty much all of the last 200,000 years living as hunter gathers. We roamed in small tribes of typically a dozen or two dozen people. It was a nomadic existence, without permanent settlements, always moving to where food can be found, gathered and hunted. Wherever food, water and shelter was, that's where we had to go in order to survive.

During this time human beings had no concept of property.

This is the key to understanding Sex 1.0 – no concept of property.

Why? Because property was not necessary for survival back then. In fact, bearing in mind how nomadic people were and that you would need to carry any property that you owned with you (which would slow you down), owning property would likely *reduce* your chances of survival.

Without the concept of property you cannot have self-interest except in cases where survival resources were scarce and needed to be fought over.

In other words, the tribe would all look after each other. After a successful hunting and gathering foray, everybody in the tribe ate.

Hoarding food would be regarded as shameful behaviour and could get you thrown out of the tribe. If that happened and you were left to fend for yourself, your chances of survival would plummet.

The fear of getting thrown out of the tribe by engaging in behaviour like going against tribal codes or being disapproved of in any way is why people are so fearful of not conforming.

This is what the Asch conformity experiments demonstrated so brilliantly; the instinctive desire that human beings have to conform. It is an evolved desire which we still have today.

This desire to conform developed during the Sex 1.0 period as a survival mechanism. A form of fear that was very useful at the time to help guard against the risk of getting thrown out of the tribe.

It comes from an instinctual survival mechanism which was just part of our drive to survive.

8 – Nature's Desire

How many different animal species do you think exist in the world? Rabbits, Giraffes, Turtles, Cats, Penguins, Dogs and so on....

According to what human science has been able to document, there are 8.7 million different animal species on the planet, of which we are one, and we all share nature's desire.

First of all, we all share nature's primary desire – the drive to survive!

This is the primary thing that nature demands of all of us lest we share the fate of an estimated 99.9% of all species that have ever existed on the planet Earth which is, of course, extinction.

The Primary Desire

Breaking down nature's primary desire – survival – shows that it does not just mean the primary urge to avoid death and remain alive, it also means genetic survival; the continuing existence of our DNA and of our own blood line.

Survival also means protecting and looking after our children and grandchildren and ensuring that they are best equipped to thrive and survive themselves.

The Two Primary Instincts

Therefore, the primary desire breaks down into the two primary instincts which are:

- Survival
- Reproduction

Now if you want to break this down even further then the two primary instincts break down to the 4 basic needs.

The Four Basic Needs

These are the only needs so basic that, if we as a species all stopped doing any one of the four, then we would all share the fate of the dodo and the human race would become extinct. They are:

- Eating
- Drinking
- Sleeping

- Fucking

We all stop eating? We all die.

We all stop drinking? We all die.

We all stop sleeping? The body collapses. We all die.

We all stop fucking? The human race would become extinct within one generation.

Now I am not saying these are the only things we need. What I am saying is these are the only needs that are so basic that they are DNA encoded and, if we do not follow these needs, then the entire human race will be wiped out.

You might think you *need* your mobile phone but you don't. You ain't gonna die without it.

Nor am I saying this is all we need at DNA level for survival and reproduction but these are the only ones we need to concern ourselves with.

We need to breathe air but it's provided by the atmosphere. We need sunlight - the planet is just a big ice cube without it - but we need not concern ourselves with procuring it. It is provided.

However, we do need to seek out food and drink when we are hungry and thirsty. We need to find our sexual partners and we need to make sure we have a safe, warm, dry and comfortable place to bed down in order to sleep properly and be secure.

If it seems like I am stating the obvious here then you are right. Not only are these 4 basic needs obvious but we can also see that your pet cat or dog or rabbit has exactly the same 4 basic needs.

Worth noting as many human beings think that, for reasons of ego, we are somehow above animals. That we are better than them and we are above nature. If that's what you think, try an experiment. Don't eat or drink anything again regardless of how hungry you are and see how far it gets you.

Not only will you be above nature and above animals but you will not have to deal with all of that nasty expulsion of body waste that is so animalistic.

Now the reason for stating this obvious list of the 4 basic needs is that it is interesting to go down the list and regard how human beings and animals view and judge the basic needs.

Eating – If someone was hungry and they ate food, would you judge them for it?

Drinking – If someone was thirsty and drank something, would you judge them for it?

Sleeping – If someone was tired and went for a nap, would you judge them for it?

Fucking – If someone was horny and had sex, would you judge them for it?

If your answer to the last question was different than the first 3 then you need to ask yourself why?

The survival of the human race depends on all 4. If we stop doing any one of the 4 then it means the extinction of the species so why judge sex?

Animals certainly would not judge any one of the 4 so why do we?

Good question. It's not because we are "better" than animals. The answer lies in the evolution of human sexuality and we will come to that in the next few chapters but, before we do, let's take a look at why sex even exists in the first place.

You might think you know but the answer may surprise you.

9 – *Why Does Sex Exist?*

Why does sex exist?

If you are thinking “for fun” then you and I think alike. I raise a glass to you!

However, it's a serious question. If you do not know the answer to the question of why sex exists then essentially you do not know why males and females exist which means that you can't know why you are a woman or why you are a man.

Looking at the question from a more serious biological standpoint the answer is quite surprising.

In the last chapter, we already talked about the two primary instincts – survival and reproduction – so it must be one of those, right?

Yes it is one of those so pick one. Biologically, does sex exist for survival or reproduction?

If you ask most people why sex exists from a biological perspective they will almost always say it is for reproduction. This is where it gets interesting.

Anybody who took even basic biology at school will know that there is such thing in nature as asexual reproduction. That is to say, creatures who don't need to have sex to reproduce.

Ok, human beings don't do it but many frogs and worms do it. Even large birds like turkeys can do it. The female turkey will, when isolated from male turkeys, begin to produce eggs by herself that are already fertilised. Many species can either reproduce asexually or can alternate between sexual and asexual reproduction as an adaptation to their environment.

Now, bearing in mind that mother nature knows this neat little trick – how to get a species to reproduce without sex – and therefore proving that sex is not necessary at all for reproduction in nature, it begs a question.

If mother nature knows this neat little trick, why would nature evolve most creatures, including ourselves of course, into male and female sexually reproducing creatures? Clearly it's not necessary in nature for reproduction so why did nature do it?

There must be some survival advantage to it.

After all, sexual reproduction has many genetic survival disadvantages compared to asexual reproduction.

Unlike creatures that reproduce by cloning themselves, we have to go to all the trouble of not only going out to find a mate but we have to compete for them too, perhaps even to the death.

If you are picturing in your head nature documentary footage of peacocks going to all the effort of showing off their elaborate feathers and male deer clashing antlers and fighting to the death on the African savannah then you can imagine how easy the cloner's life is. A feet-up-in-front-of-the-TV and calmly enjoying their evening kind of existence if ever there was one.

On top of that we might even contract a sexual transmitted disease as thanks for all our efforts. Thanks nature!

No nasty sexually transmitted diseases for the cloners, no need for violent competition with other members of your same species and no need to ever leave the comfort of familiar and safe territory in the dangerous search of a mate across unknown terrain.

Wouldn't it be better if human beings reproduced asexually? Nightclubs across the world would be empty, churches would have to find something else to make people feel guilty about and blues and soul musicians all around the world would have nothing to write songs about.

However, the impact would not all be positive as we are about to find out.

The apparent genetic advantage of the cloners is always something that has always puzzled evolutionary biologists historically but a compelling theory has emerged which has been proven in lab conditions which I will share here as it may radically re-draw your map.

During asexual reproduction, animals essentially produce an exact genetic copy of themselves – a clone. Makes sense bearing in mind that their own DNA is the only DNA that they have access to.

The female Turkey, as we mentioned earlier, when kept isolated from make Turkeys will produce fertilised eggs by herself but the chicks will not be as physically strong and are more likely to become ill and succumb to disease.

The answer to the question therefore rests with genetic diversity.

When sexual reproduction happens, 50% of the DNA of the father gets thrown away as does 50% of the DNA of the mother and the offspring gets the rest.

Except in cases of identical twins (or triplets etc.) they won't get the same 50% each time which is why siblings of the same sex born to the same parents even 1 year apart don't look exactly alike even though they share almost all the same genes.

In a cloned species however, they are genetic copies of each other.

Now what happens if we introduce a parasite into the environment of these clones?

Well if a parasite is successful at attacking and killing even one clone in that environment and the parasite spreads to other members of the species, how successful is it going to be?

Clearly a successful parasite that spreads in this environment can easily wipe out an entire species without ever having to change or to evolve to deal with different genetic signatures.

In sexually reproducing species however, this constant mixing and re-arranging of genetic signatures keeps the species a step ahead of parasites and makes it very difficult for any parasite to wipe out an entire species.

It is this constant DNA reshuffling that gives new born babies genetic signatures that are potentially better at dealing with parasites that their parents have lived with their entire lives and an advantage over the parasites in this evolutionary and biological arms race.

Therefore, sex exists in nature for reasons of survival – not reproduction.

This is something that has been theorised for some time but has since been proven in lab conditions.

So applying pure form theory to the question of “why sex exists?” we can answer that question in to just 2 words – parasite defence – or, if you prefer just one word – biodiversity.

It gives you a new perspective when you realise that the reason you *are* a woman or you *are* a man is due to the requirement for a parasite defence mechanism.

That this is how and why both sexes exist in beautiful symbiosis with both sexes helping to ensure the survival of one another and the survival of human race.

It seems that, if you really enjoy sex, you have a lot to thank those pesky parasites for.

10 – Why Men And Women Don't Understand Each Other

There is one thing more than anything else that explains all male and female emotional and behavioural differences.

One thing? Really!

Yes, really.

As this one thing is being introduced in the Sex 1.0 section of the book, I will talk in this chapter about how this one thing worked in a Sex 1.0 era but its impact on the present day will become clear later in the chapter.

When you read as far as the Sex 2.0 section of the book, I will talk at that point about how the shift from Sex 1.0 to Sex 2.0 somewhat changed it.

Without knowing about this one thing, or knowing about it but later forgetting about it when drawing your map, it might seem like men and women are from different planets but we are not.

Men are not from Mars and women are not from Venus. Men are from Earth, women are from Earth.

So what is this one thing?

The Genetic Imperative

When I say “the genetic imperative” I simply mean the most efficient method possible for propagating one’s own DNA; the most efficient biological self-preservation strategy.

As men and women are biologically different, we have radically different genetic imperatives.

Once pregnant, and presuming that the pregnancy goes the full term, women cannot produce another viable egg for approximately 9-10 months.

Men can produce sperm however on a constant basis pausing only for what is called the refractory period which is the recovery phase after male ejaculation during which it is physiologically impossible for men to further ejaculate.

Women have no such refractory period and can often achieve further orgasms through further stimulation.

As men can produce sperm on pretty much a constant basis and women have a minimum 9-10 month pause before they become fertile again during which time

they are physically more vulnerable, less mobile and require more care, the genetic imperatives for the sexes are radically different and go like this:

Men = Have sex with lots of fertile females

Women = Seek high quality alpha male DNA and physical protection and security for both self and child.

Now the genetic imperative is not something that is specific to human beings. Mammals, where the female gestates the egg for months and males can constantly produce sperm will typically have the same genetic imperative.

The female need for security and protection, of course, is only heightened by the child rearing responsibility which women historically have carried the burden of.

Sizing The Prize

One of the things that humans share with all sexual species is that we “size the prize.”

That is to say that people not only size up potential mates according to how well they might be able to satisfy their genetic imperatives but they also size up themselves and their own value in the sexual marketplace.

The differing genetic imperatives in the Sex 1.0 era meant that men and women were naturally attracted by different things in a Sex 1.0 world.

Men? Signs of fertility and physical attractiveness in women. Men have always valued signs of fertility in women like youth, beauty and curves in all the right places.

Women? The most alpha genes and best provision of security for self and child.

These differing imperatives also meant that men and women naturally sought different things.

Broadly speaking, the differing genetic imperatives dictated that men have always sought to entice women into sex and women have always sought to entice men into commitment.

The Alpha Male

Social animals like human beings have always had higher ranking members in any particular social group or tribe.

The alpha male in a Sex 1.0 world would have been a leader. He would have been strong, capable and skilled at hunting and gathering. He would have been capable of providing and protecting. He would have been respected by the other members of the tribe which is why social proof is something that, even today, women find very attractive.

Other attractive and alpha qualities are pre-selection. There is nothing more desirable to women than a man that other women desire.

Alpha males are, by their very nature, dominant.

The Beta Male

The beta male would have been lacking in strength, leadership qualities, social proof and pre-selection.

He would have been too weak or scared to challenge the dominance of the alpha male.

Beta males are, by their very nature, pussies.

Men Are From Earth, Women Are From Earth

The differing genetic imperatives not only cause unhealthy thinking, like men and women are from different planets, it causes all kinds of “I don’t get it” moments for both men and women.

These “I don’t get it” moments about the opposite sex are often caused by not understanding the differing genetic imperatives at work in not just the opposite sex but in themselves.

Example? Men typically love competitive sports, both playing and watching, and might spend a great deal of time during their lives supporting their favourite team.

Sports stadiums around the world are filled with both men and women but, as you and I both know, it’s mostly men.

There are plenty of women I have spoken too who say that they don’t “see the point” of things like football. That they don’t “get it” nor do they understand that they are actually the root cause of it.

They are totally unaware that the very existence of competitive sports is as a direct result of the female genetic imperative.

The female genetic imperative dictates that the alpha or, in other words, the man or men in the tribe who are the leaders, the best, the most dominant, the winners are sexually desirable. They are what women sought in a Sex 1.0 world and what they were attracted to.

The winner is seen as the “last man standing”, an obviously desirable quality for a woman seeking to satisfy her genetic imperative not only to be protected, but for her children to have good survival genes. This imperative is still primary in women in the modern day.

I have personally witnessed women go into a state of awe-struck fandom when famous football players are spotted in a nightclub and immediately phoned their female friends with the news and the instructions to immediately come and join them even though these exact same women “don’t see the point” of football and are not inclined to either go to or to watch games.

Some men “don’t get” this.

The reason why women swooning over football players whilst having no interest in football is very easy to understand when you understand that to compete and dominate is not really part of the female psycho-sexual landscape but attraction to the alpha very much is.

The only competition that is part of the female psycho-sexual landscape is competing with other women over the alpha which is the root cause of female-on-female cattiness and bitchiness between women and which is why women often

call each other “slag” or “tramp” or some other derisory term in the face of female competition.

As a result of “the winners” being desired by women, men quite rightly as a response have always derived great enjoyment from all kinds of sporting competitions and battles of dominance.

It’s a guy thing.

Another example? At the World Series Of Poker, every year in Las Vegas the (mostly male) poker commentators wring their hands and bemoan the fact that such a small percentage of entrants into the competition are female.

They don’t get it.

After all, it is a competition that is open to all. They ponder what can be done to make poker more attractive to women.

What can be done? Well, change the genetic imperative and completely rewrite human nature would be the solution. Good luck with that.

Another example? Video game designers (again, mostly male) have historically struggled with designing video games that appeal to women. Why are they not so interested in blowing stuff up and beating up or killing off opponent’s characters as we are?

They don’t get it.

Women enjoy overcoming challenges every bit as much as men do but they are not interested in dominating and destroying so much so it’s not a coincidence that the most popular video games for women are games like the following :

- Tetris. A puzzle game which does not involve dominating and defeating an opponent.
- World Of Warcraft. A game in which people form tightly knit guilds or social groups, forge human interactions and work co-operatively on common goals, missions and objectives. Overcome challenges together.
- Wii Fit – A game that makes exercise fun and helps keep them looking and feeling good. Helps them get or maintain signs of youth and beauty.
- Guitar Hero / Rock Band type games – Games in which you can play together with your friends in a party atmosphere and co-operate on “playing” songs well and working as a team to make the band a success.

Whilst on the subject of video games it’s interesting to note that men who play video games are typified as nerdy and beta.

Alpha men enjoy video games just as much as beta men do but I believe that the reason that men who play video games are typified as nerdy is that video games allow beta males to indulge in alpha type dominance in a completely safe environment sheltered from the real world. Often they will do so as a way of consoling and comforting themselves over real-world failures.

“Ok so I may be 34 years old, live in my mom’s basement and don’t have a girlfriend but my level 15 warlock will destroy you on the internet!!”

Of course, even though alphas really enjoy video games too, they get less free time to play them because they are busy having sex.

In summary, men and women don't "get" each other in many cases as a result of not understanding the differing genetic imperatives or by projecting the imperative of their own sex onto the opposite sex.

Later in this book we will see examples of how this impacts modern day sexual relationships.

11 – *The Sex 1.0 Marketplace*

As mentioned in the first Sex 1.0 chapter, during the Sex 1.0 era, human beings lived in nomadic tribes and had no concept of property.

Now, that does not mean that people did not compete for survival resources.

Competition & Territory

All creatures follow nature's primary desire - survival. This means all animals will compete when they need to, for reasons of scarcity or any other reasons, over survival resources like food and mating opportunities.

Confusing competition over territory and survival resources in other creatures with the uniquely human notion of property is an extremely common mapping mistake.

You put 10 animals of any species in a confined space and only provide enough food for 2 of them then they will fight over it. Not because they think the food is their property but just because they have to in order to survive. They have no choice but to fight. Likewise, all animals will compete over mating opportunities if they need to.

Competition over survival resources should not be confused with concepts of property.

Being "territorial" should not be confused with property either. Being territorial simply means defending the space immediately around you, wherever that happens to be, and the survival resources within it.

You can be territorial, as a hunter gatherer, move 5 miles the next day and be territorial about the space around you again whilst completely forgetting the space you were territorial about yesterday. Property had no meaning. It did not exist.

What does this have to do with sex? Everything.

If you have no concept of property, what that means is that human beings cannot be sexual property.

Therefore, there was no marriage in Sex 1.0. As there was no concept of marriage there was no concept of boyfriend / girlfriend relationships either in the conventional sense as those are essentially try-before-you-buy arrangements with the intention that they should lead to marriage.

As a species, quite simply we just followed our sexual nature. In this respect, we were exactly the same as the other 8.7 million species on the planet.

In other words, ALL sexual relationships in a Sex 1.0 world were unfenced.

Men and women hunted and gathered and were pretty much equal in a socio-economic sense. Nobody was “rich” because there was no concept of money or property. Children were raised collaboratively by the tribe.

People, both men and women, simply competed in the sexual marketplace for what they both wanted and needed in order to satisfy their respective biological imperatives.

Females used their youth and their fertility to attract the best alpha males.

Alpha males used their alpha-ness, their desirable qualities like leadership, strength, dominance, good hunting and gathering skills and so on to attract the most fertile and attractive females.

The Spectrum Dilemma

Alpha males dominated the Sex 1.0 marketplace and dominated the opportunities for mating with the fertile females. The beta males were left out in the cold in that respect and got very little or no action. They lived a largely sexless life and the best they could hope for was to survive and that was not best achieved by challenging the alpha male dominance which might lead to a beating or to death.

This led to an interesting dynamic which is still at play today; alpha and beta males living in essentially two different realities even though they may live in the same social group.

For the alpha males, a reality in which women are attracted to him and available to him. An alpha's mentality would be one of sexual abundance where the best way for a woman to be especially desirable to him is to have signs of youth and fertility.

Beta males, on the other hand, lived with a scarcity mentality where they would take whatever they could get.

This is why men, even today, have a crushing fear of rejection and are scared to approach women and perhaps might never do it without the Dutch courage that a few drinks might provide.

This is also why, the more desirable the woman, the greater the fear. If you think about it logically, experiencing greater fear because a woman is more superficially beautiful makes no sense at all, bearing in mind that all women have the same sexual organs and bearing in mind the male genetic imperative is to have sex with lots of women.

In this context however, this fear is totally understandable as being rejected by a woman with less visible signs of attractiveness and fertility would be regarded as less of a slight in terms of pre-selection and social proof amongst a small tribe of people than the crushing rejection from a more obviously fertile and desirable woman would be. Also, the knowledge that a more attractive woman is far, far more likely to be sought after by alphas drastically heightens male fear as conflict with an alpha over a survival resource could mean death.

The spectrum dilemma for a beta male in the Sex 1.0 era always meant that his lack of success guaranteed even less success in the future. Women don't want a guy that is low in the social hierarchy and that other women don't want.

The spectrum dilemma works in reverse for an alpha. Receiving pre-selection from other women and social proof from the tribe in general would have made him even more highly desirable.

The spectrum dilemma at play in the Sex 1.0 marketplace would have had a clearly polarising effect for men, shoving them to either one end of the spectrum or the other and leaving very little in the middle.

Beta males in the Sex 1.0 marketplace mostly got weeded out of the genetic pool and their genetic survival chances were poor whilst alpha genetics thrived.

The Big Shift

The shift from Sex 1.0 to Sex 2.0 started about 8,000 BC during the neolithic era when humanity started to go through the agricultural revolution also known as the neolithic revolution.

We started to move away from being nomadic hunter-gatherers and started to rely on agriculture and farming. This allowed us to live in settlements for the first time in human history. It allowed us, for the first time, to have towns and villages and live a settled or sedentary lifestyle.

As we now relied on the food that we grew for our survival, human beings developed the notion, for the first time, of property.

The very first property that ever existed was land. Specifically arable or fertile land that was good for growing food.

Land itself was never scarce and, as the human population of the world was much, much lower back then (less than 1 person per square mile) there would be no reason to covet it and to want to own it especially if it was rocky or barren.

Fertile land that was good for growing food however, was scarce and so for the first time ever in human history we owned property.

This changed everything and was the catalyst for the transition from Sex 1.0 to Sex 2.0.

12 – *The Birth Of Sex 2.0*

Duration – 8,000 BC until the present day

Of the 8.7 million species of animals on the planet, we are the only one that has any concept of property. Dolphins don't own shit and it's not because they are so stupid and we are so intelligent. Dolphins are intelligent creatures.

Once human beings developed the concept of property we became unique on the planet but not necessarily in a good way.

The first impact on human sexuality was that it became very important for men to treat women as sexual property. The reason behind this is very simple. Once you have property like fertile land to grow food, farm animals, a house and other survival resources, a man wants to pass his survival resources down to his own children to best ensure the survival of his own blood line. Not to somebody else's children and someone else's blood line.

Now why would this mean women and not men become sexual property?

Well, regardless of what culture you grow up in, the language spoken, the ethnicity, region of the world or anything else, one thing never changes. When a new-born baby arrives it comes out of the body of the woman and not the man.

That means a woman NEVER needs to be worried about the possibility that she might be raising somebody else's child. It came out of her body so it's self-evident that it is her child.

Does not matter how many men she has had sex with, she knows for a fact that she is raising her own child because the baby came out of her body.

Men do not have that luxury.

A woman knows that all the time, emotional and financial effort she puts towards that child is an investment in the survival of her own blood line whereas men don't.

Men experience paternity concern (or PAC for short). Women cannot experience maternity concern because the self-evident nature of childbirth means they are left in no doubt as to the identity of the mother.

In the Sex 1.0 era, paternity concern was never really an issue of too much concern. During practically all of the Sex 1.0 era, calendars had not yet been invented. Without calendars, it is fantastically unlikely that people would have been

aware that there was any connection at all between having sex and, roughly 270 sunrises later, a baby arriving.

They would have assumed that the same pagan or shamanistic gods that governed the tides and the rains placed the baby inside the woman (a belief that led to rise of the notion of the virgin birth which later became a popular motif in many religions).

Also, with no concept of property in Sex 1.0, no property based self-interest, no material goods to pass down and all children being raised and looked after by the tribe as a whole, paternity concern was not really so important.

The invention of property changed everything.

During the conception and birth of Sex 2.0, if paternity concern was the sperm then the egg was the invention of property.

No creature, human or otherwise, acts against their nature unless they have a reason to.

The invention of property when mixed with paternity concern formed a combination so powerful that it gave us reason to do so and so powerful that it acted as the catalyst in moving humanity from Sex 1.0 to Sex 2.0.

In order to deal with the issue of paternity concern that men now had as the result of the invention of property and the role that property now played in the survival of their blood line, a new deal had to be struck.

A deal which was sought to ease male insecurity, best ensure the paternity of their children, perpetuation of their genes and property down their own blood line.

It had to be a deal which allowed men to claim women as their sexual property; one which demanded their fidelity to allay their paternity concern.

And so a new deal was struck.

13 – Marriage, The Sex 2.0 Deal

Marriage was invented during the neolithic era primarily to deal with this very problem.

As the written word in human history did not begin to appear until approximately 3,200 BC, the first marriages likely pre-date written human records by thousands of years. As such they would have been essentially verbally bartered agreements whereby a man agreed to provide care, security and access to survival resources to a woman in exchange for exclusive sexual access.

This would allow him to calm his PAC, assure him that his genetic legacy was safe as was the passing down of the survival resources to his own children and not to anyone else's.

No specific civil ceremonies were likely required and as the neolithic era pre-dates the main modern religions – Christianity, Judaism and Islam - by thousands of years there were no religious ceremonies either.

In fact, the origin of marriage has nothing at all to do with religion. Something which might come as a surprise as, in modern day society, they are thought to be closely connected.

The religions that existed at the time marriage was invented were the pagan religions of the many Greek, Roman or Egyptian gods or were shamanistic religions. However, the modern religions that came along later would have had to adopt certain pagan or shamanistic traditions in order to get people to convert to them.

Although people started to strike these deals thousands and thousands of years ago, it continues to the present day and forms the heart of the Sex 2.0 deal.

The Sex 2.0 Deal

We all live in a Sex 2.0 society today.

When you are raised in a Sex 2.0 society, men and women are taught that their roles are thus:

Women are raised and taught their entire life that they have to sell their sexuality in exchange for security, ultimately the security of marriage to a man.

Men are raised and taught their entire life that if you want to have a long term sexual relationship with a woman, you have to take her sexuality, throw it in a box, slam the lid shut and stamp and label the box as their property.

So:

Men – You have to make a woman's sexuality your property to deal with paternity concern (PAC) and best ensure you are raising your own kids and provide both wife and kids with security and in return ...

Women – You have to sell you sexuality to a man in exchange for security

The Sex 2.0 deal evolved in human sexuality in response to the invention of property when combined with the existence of paternity concern.

Women who don't follow the Sex 2.0 deal are widely insulted, derided and made to feel cheap and worthless, not just by men amazingly enough, but by women too. We cover this in more detail later in the book.

Men who don't follow the Sex 2.0 deal, in many cultures, are not considered men. They are not considered men until they are married. I remember when I was travelling Vietnam a local man told me that, regardless of how old you are, you are not considered a real man in Vietnamese culture until married so a married 19 year old is considered a man and an un-married 29 year old is not.

These pressures and enforced obligations placed on us by society are transparent forms of relationship duress.

As a result of striking the Sex 2.0 deal, something very interesting happened.

At this point in human sexual history, a schism was created which, although created thousands and thousands of years ago, persists to the present day; a schism which is the predominant cause of almost all confusion and suffering in modern day sexual relationships across the entire world right now.

14 – *The Root Cause Of Our Problems*

In the Sex 1.0 era, human sexuality operated on only one plane (or dimension if you prefer) defined by the word “natural.”

Like all of the other 8.7 million species of creatures occupying this beautiful planet, we lived in harmony with our sexual nature.

Then something happened.

Something changed.

Picture this. Visualise a single beer mat or a drinks coaster on the table in front of you.

If you actually have one, place it to your left hand side. If you don't have one then just imagine it there or use something else; a glass, cup, saucer or whatever.

This represents a plane of human sexuality defined by the word “natural.” In Sex 1.0 this is all we had. This is all we needed.



Back then we operated, sexually, just like every other species on the planet. We just followed our sexual nature.

We shook nature by the hand, smiled and we went along with it. Sure, we competed, we even fought in times of scarcity but we were in tune with nature.

When we moved from Sex 1.0 to Sex 2.0 however a fundamental schism was created. A split which meant that human sexually began to operate on two planes at the same time.

Now picture or place another beer mat or drinks coaster, or what you are using, in front of you and to your right hand side.

This represents the newly introduced plane of human sexuality in Sex 2.0 defined by the word “normal.”



The Sex 2.0 Schism

So you now have one on your left and one on your right representing the two planes of human sexuality in a Sex 2.0 world. The one on the left is the “natural” sexual plane and the one on the right is the “normal” sexual plane.

The word natural simply means “in accordance with nature” or “in agreement with nature.” It does not mean anything else. It is defined by nature alone and is and not defined by society.

Whereas the word “normal” is defined by society as, of course, you have the concept of the “societal norm” and it is not defined by nature.

This an important concept and worth repeating.

Natural = defined by nature and not by society

Normal = defined by society and not by nature

Under Sex 2.0, for the first time in human history, it became possible to have something that is completely 100% “normal” and is, at the same time, totally “un-natural” like hmmm, let me think like marriage, for example.

Marriage is totally normal. It is also completely un-natural as human beings are not, by nature, monogamous whereas marriage requires you to be monogamous.

When there is widespread, worldwide adoption of a practice, it does not make it any more natural at all. It just makes it more normal.

Marriage is completely 100% normal and you will have likely grown up in a society your entire life where, not only is it normal, but it is expected of you under relationship duress.

The shift from Sex 1.0 to Sex 2.0 did not change the underlying “nature” of human sexuality at all. We did not suddenly change to become sexually monogamous. We were just expected to behave as such.

Nor did it change the physical act of sex at all.

It simply changed what society expected and insisted as acceptable sexual long term relationships.

This simple change however created this amazing shift between operating sexually in accordance with our nature, as every other species on the planet still does today, and not only going against our nature, but being obliged to go against our nature under relationship duress.

The split from operating on one sexual plane – natural – to two sexual planes at the same time – natural and normal – is the root cause of pretty much all of the confusion in modern human sexuality.

Once the “normal” sexual plane is introduced, something very interesting happened and something very interesting did not happen.

The interesting thing that happened is that, once the normal sexual plane is thrown out there, relationship duress was introduced to cajole, pressurise and otherwise oblige and force people to choose it.

The interesting thing that did not happen is that human sexual nature did not change. Not even one tiny little bit.

Contrary to the popular saying, repeating a lie often enough does not make it the truth.

15 – *The Sex 2.0 Genetic Imperative*

The genetic imperative has always been about the best genetic survival strategy for men and women.

It has always been about simply the most efficient and effective gateway to genetic immortality via the survival of our immediate descendants and it continued to be so in a Sex 2.0 world.

As women are the ones that get pregnant, their genetically most successful strategy in a Sex 1.0 era was to seek and to be attracted to superior genes and stronger more alpha males for protection. By doing both she best ensured both her own survival and the survival of the children.

As men don't go through the 9 month gestation period a woman does, and can produce sperm constantly, their imperative was always to seek various fertile women and have as much sex with them as possible.

The arrival of the Sex 2.0 era somewhat changed the genetic imperative and somewhat didn't.

In a Sex 1.0 world women, like men, only had one genetic imperative.

Women = Seek high quality alpha male DNA and physical protection and security for both self and child.

Men = Have sex with lots of fertile females

In a Sex 1.0 world, with no concept of property or money, nobody was rich or poor. There was a social hierarchy but only one of alphas and betas and of youth and beauty. No financial hierarchy.

Once the concept of property and, later on, the concept of money was introduced it was inevitable that some became richer than others. Some made better farms or farming tools than others and acquired wealth that way or by providing better goods and services.

Others did not have a "job" and became wealthy simply because they owned the means of production or they gained wealth from being influential in decision making and granting monopolies. In other words, they became politicians.

For the first time in human history, we had an economic "elite."

If you married into such a family then your children would most likely be born into an abundance of financial survival resources.

The move from having just a social class to having both a socio and an economic class in a Sex 2.0 world meant that women, but not men, gained an extra genetic imperative.

Women's survival strategy altered and now there were two primary considerations that a woman had to take care of to ensure their best DNA survival strategy.

The female imperative changed from:

- 1 - Seek high quality alpha male DNA and physical protection and security for both self and child (socio)

And changed to:

- 1 - Seek high quality alpha male DNA and physical protection and security for both self and child (socio)

- 2 - Seek a partner who can provide financial security for self and children. Prevent other women from diluting such arrangement (economic).

We moved from a socio world to a socio-economic world.

As women in the Sex 2.0 era – the last 10,000 years - have largely carried the overwhelming burden of childcare and raising children, this second biological imperative is unique to them.

Men's biological imperative did not change at all and still dictates that men's genetically most successful strategy is to have sex with lots of young, fertile women.

The creation of the 2nd female imperative introduced hypergamy into the mix which means essentially "marrying up"; seeking a sexual-exclusivity-in-exchange-for-security contract with a man of high standing.

This could simply be a man richer, more powerful and more socially influential than her or, in the Indian sub-continent, marrying into a higher caste.

However, as a woman does not necessarily need to get both genetic imperatives met by the same man, and women often won't, marrying the beta provider millionaire and banging the alpha yoga instructor or gardener is extremely common.

This change in the female sexual imperatives had a radical effect on what was to become Sex 2.0 marketplace.

Further Reading

If you liked **Sex 3.0 – The Primer** and would like to read more then you will love **Sex 3.0 – A Sexual Revolution Manual**.

It picks up right where this book stops. In fact this eBook is the first one third of the book.

Sex 3.0 – A Sexual Revolution Manual contains 47 chapters and by purchasing a copy you will get access to the following new chapters:

- 16 - The Sex 2.0 Marketplace
- 17 - Why Marriage Is Not Natural
- 18 - Relationships Duress
- 19 - Jealousy And Possessiveness
- 20 - The Corruption Of Love
- 21 - Monogamy Is A Sexual Perversion
- 22 - The Pacman, The Slut And The Whore
- 23 - How Did We Get Into This Mess?
- 24 - Revenge Of The Nerds
- 25 - Why Women Nag Men
- 26 - Tame The Alpha (The Losing Game)
- 27 - Screwing Gays And Lesbians The Sex 2.0 Way
- 28 - Feminism Is Dead And How Feminists Killed It
- 29 - Men And Women Cheat For Different Reasons
- 30 - The Breakdown Of The Sex 2.0 Deal
- 31 - Twelve Angry Monkeys
- 32 - Groupthink And The Breakdown Of The Sex 2.0 Deal
- 33 - R.I.P. Sex 2.0
- 34 - Sex 3.0
- 35 - Why Jealousy Is Not Natural
- 36 - Slaying The Twin Headed Monster
- 37 - The Death Of The Pacman, The Slut And The Whore
- 38 - The Death Of Relationship Duress
- 39 - Un-Screwing Gays And Lesbians The Sex 3.0 Way
- 40 - Belonging In A Sex 3.0 World
- 41 - Fenced Or Unfenced?
- 42 - Marriage In The Sex 3.0 Marketplace
- 43 - The Breeding Ground

44 - Dating In The Sex 3.0 Marketplace

45 - Welcome To The Unfenced World

46 - Paint Your Life

47 - Design & Morality

One reader who read the first one third of the book for free made the following comment:

“Just finished reading the eBook this morning. Bravo, JJ.

I wouldn't have bought the eBook if I hadn't so thoroughly enjoyed the first third for free on your blog. But, man, the good stuff is in the eBook.

And it is unlike anything else that I've seen on the web relating to the realities of modern relationships...and what people can choose to do about it in their romantic lives.

I find that so very refreshing. ” – Jeff, TX USA

Other reviewers said :

A philosophical essay of sheer clarity A must-read for anybody who has ever looked at relationships and asked, “why?” – Bob, Philadelphia, PA USA

Blew my mind! JJ Roberts has sown the seeds for a sexual revolution. Sex 3.0 may well change your life. A must read! – Mark, Dublin

A guidebook to a new paradigm The book is very well simplified, very well filtered, very well crystallized itself. It is a handbook on “inner cartography”, on the mapping of human relationships – Richard, Derwood, MD USA

The book is available both in paperback and eBook format.

To purchase the eBook using either a credit card or PayPal, please visit the eBook store on the official Sex 3.0 website at the following address :

<http://sexthreepointzero.com/ebook-store/>

The eBook is also available from the Apple iBookstore inside iTunes in 36 different countries as well as on amazon.com, lulu.com and smashwords.com

If you prefer paperback, it is available in paperback from here :

<https://www.createspace.com/3743129>

It is also available from amazon.com in many countries but I have noticed in many countries it is listed as “out of stock” which may cause a delay in you receiving your copy of the paperback so I strongly suggest you order the paperback from createspace. Createspace is actually a division of amazon.com anyway (it is their

print on demand division) and ships rapidly everywhere in the world so it is by far the fastest way of getting hold of a copy of the paperback.

Beyond that, for further reading, please visit the official Sex 3.0 website.

There you can find free content, fresh articles and discussions.

<http://sexthreepointzero.com>

If you liked the content of the book then join the Sex 3.0 community online and help spread the word or even apply to become a featured writer at the site.

The official Facebook page is at :

<https://www.facebook.com/sex3.0>

And finally we have just started a Sex 3.0 community discussion forum. It is in beta right now until we have enough members and traffic to officially launch it but you can check it out here :

<http://sexthreepointzero.com/forum>

See you online.

JJ

About The Author

J J Roberts is a former rock journalist from England who followed the standard script of conventional dating or what he terms "fenced relationships" for the first half of his adult life before exploring sexual relationships not based on enforced monogamy or what he terms "unfenced relationships" for the second half.

The result was his first book, *Sex 3.0 : A Sexual Revolution Manual*, a fascinating insight into the modern day culture of Sex 2.0 which is based on fear and deception and its replacement Sex 3.0 which represents the death of fear and a return to nature.



J J Roberts