

Center for Humane Technology | *Your Undivided Attention* Podcast
[The Race to Cooperation with David Sloan Wilson](#)

Tristan Harris: It's easy to tell ourselves that we're living in the world that we wanted, where Darwinian evolution driving a win-lose game between competing technology platforms was destined to turn out a more addicted, outraged, polarized society. Where ruthless competition and markets between companies is destined to produce the world that we live in. Where a win-lose game between nations to maximize GDP and forget about carbon emissions is all that's possible, that evolution and competition are all there is. And if that's a complete description of what's driving the world in our collective destiny, that can feel pretty hopeless.

But what if that's not the whole story of evolution? Our guest today is evolutionary theorist, author and professor David Sloan Wilson, and he's documented where an enlightened game, one of cooperation rather than competition, is possible. His work proves that humans can choose values like cooperation, altruism, and group success over individual competition and selfishness. Because evolution isn't just genetic, it's cultural, and it's a choice. I'm Tristan Harris.

Aza Raskin: I'm Aza Raskin.

Tristan Harris: And in a moment in history, where where we're headed isn't what we actually want, it's time to slow down and ask, "Is a different kind of conscious evolution possible?" Today on *Your Undivided Attention*, we're going to update the Darwinian principles of evolution using David's critical scientific lens and find ways that we can cooperate, ranging from how small communities can do this all the way up to potentially global technology companies. And if the world doesn't have to be this way, that gives us real reason to hope.

Aza Raskin: Welcome to *Your Undivided Attention*. Today, I am thrilled to be welcoming David Sloan Wilson. It's a conversation I have been long looking forward to both Tristan and I because it's so foundational to our work. To just set this up a little bit for people, I think this interview in part is to give everyone a lens to see through called evolutionary theory. It's like competition, mutation, selection, replication. If you've been listening to this show, you know there's a way that we think and that way that we think is really built upon tools like David Sloan Wilson's work. And you might hear evolutionary theory and think, "Oh, that's just about biology and how animals get the number of limbs that they do." But it actually applies much more broadly.

These ideas apply to culture and to technology, which technology companies win, to which features within apps win. And sometimes I think if you listen to the show, you might seem like, "Oh, we're just doomed. If we don't do it, somebody else will." And the way you see past that problem is through the lens of evolutionary theory. So David, I'm so excited to have you on the show. I figured a good place maybe to start is actually something that I've heard you do it in your lectures and other things, to ask the listener about where do the things that we think of as noble, like our noble traits, where do they come from? Where do the things we think are not noble? Where do they come from? Are you good or are we bad? And maybe start there.

Center for Humane Technology | *Your Undivided Attention* Podcast
[The Race to Cooperation with David Sloan Wilson](#)

David Sloan Wil...: Well, in the first place, thanks to both of you, I'm big fans of both of you and this podcast. Please forgive me for taking off running from the very beginning. But you said something important that I just want to affirm, all of this goes beyond genetic evolution. So many people, when you say the word evolution, they heard the word genes and this is genes plus more. This is genes plus culture. This is genes plus our personal evolution. So everything taking place around us, good and bad, can be understood from this evolutionary lens. And so, what we need to ask the question is under what environmental context do the noble traits evolve in competition with the ignoble traits? And then if we actually unlock that, then we can consciously steward our cultural evolution and we can stack the deck in favor of everything that we think of as altruistic, noble. And that is what we're here to talk about.

Aza Raskin: And David, I think you have a story about chickens that might help explain this. Starting with the question, where do the noble traits come from and the conundrum that hit Darwin when he is like, "There's a thing that my theory can't explain." And that seems like a really gripping way to get people into these questions.

David Sloan Wil...: Yeah, I actually used a story in my conversation with His Holiness, the Dalai Lama, which was an interesting experience and it bears directly on animal welfare. So I mean, this is a cool example with many implications, but it's also something which is important in its own right. So I mean, let's say that you're an animal breeder and you want to breed a strain of chicken that lays more eggs. What do you do? So chickens have always lived in groups, nowadays, it's cages, I'm sorry to say, but you have many groups of chickens. You monitor the egg laying of each hen and then you select the most productive hen to breed the next generation of hens. So that seems to make sense except what you've actually selected is the biggest bully within each group. And after five generations, you've bred a strain of hyperaggressive hens that are literally murdering each other, plucking each other's feathers in their incessant attacks. And so, what seems to be like a benign form of competition turns out to be pathological.

So back to the drawing board. Now, let's say you monitor the productivity of whole groups and you select all the hens within the most productive groups to breed the next generation of hens. Now, you get a strain of cooperative hens that don't bully each other. And so, now in both cases, there's competition. Competition is not a bad thing. In fact, competition is needed for change, but it's the level of competition in this case that makes all the difference. And that's what Darwin discovered way back when. And it was a gradual process for him because at first, he thought that his great theory could explain everything that had been attributed to a creator, but gradually he realized that traits that involved doing unto others was the one thing he couldn't explain. Because if natural selection is about favoring individuals that survive and reproduce better than other individuals, then it's the pro-social individual that loses that contest. But what Darwin realized was that there is the version of the second chicken

Center for Humane Technology | *Your Undivided Attention* Podcast
[The Race to Cooperation with David Sloan Wilson](#)

experiment that even though selfishness beats altruism within groups, groups of altruists will robustly outcompete groups whose memories cannot cohere.

And so, the second part of that statement is altruistic groups feed selfish groups, everything else is commentary. And so, self-preservation is a good thing, self-dealing is not. Helping kith and kin a good thing until it becomes nepotism and cronyism. My nation first, a good thing until it leads to international conflict. Strong growing economy is a good thing until it leads to global warming. And so, what you find is almost everything that we see is a problem. Everything pathological is actually a form of cooperation at a lower scale. And so, that is not hard to understand, but it explains so much that what we think we want actually gives us a world that we don't want. And this is why evolution doesn't make everything nice. It's what all creatures, all life forms inflict upon each other unless the levels of selection are configured the right way.

Aza Raskin: This is so profound that I think it's worth stopping and dwelling on because it is a root diagnosis for climate change, for inequality. Every time that what's good for me is bad for a group above me or our nation, or what's good for our nation is bad for everyone, that can be explained by seeing the world through this competitive landscape and then asking, "At what level are we optimizing for?" And when we look then through the lens of tech, we are almost always optimizing for individuals, individual usage, individual engagement. So would it be surprising at all that it would cause the thing above it, like groups, coherence, governance to start breaking?

Tristan Harris: Yeah, your point about the chickens, I think, it's really worth pausing for people. So if I'm optimizing for what's the most producing chicken, if I just make a transplant of that metaphor to Twitter, what's the most producing attention user on Twitter? Well, it's going to be the out grouping, aggressive, loud mouth, cynical, commenting on everything as loudly as possible because that's what's going to get me the most attention. And so, how do we create these cooperative mechanics is what the core of your whole work is. And I would like for you to respond to the idea that cooperation is for patsies, the peaceful tribes get killed by the warlike tribes, Daniel Schmachtenberger talks about that. The extractive energy economies win over the sustainable energy economies because they just get more resources and then kill the other guy and take their stuff. What you're talking about is a flip to the logic. How do we switch from this kind of ruthless Hobbesian war of all against all individual selection into this group selection?

David Sloan Wil...: It's here that we could begin to outline an optimistic picture about how the end of the day we really have a blueprint, you might say, an optimistic blueprint for how to make things better at all scales, all contexts, including the global scale. But it begins with, I need to add a new concept which is the concept of major evolutionary transitions. And so, in nature, I mean, so often, we think that nature left to itself strikes some kind of harmonious balance. We could look at ecosystems or something and there's wisdom for us to learn and so on. But certainly most primate societies, including chimp societies, one of our closest ancestors, you would not want to live in those societies. Those societies would

Center for Humane Technology | *Your Undivided Attention* Podcast
[The Race to Cooperation with David Sloan Wilson](#)

be despotic in human terms, naked aggression is over a 100 times more frequent in a chimp community than in a small scale human community.

And so, in most species and ecosystems, you see some cooperation, but you also see a lot of disruptive self-serving behaviors. But sometimes what happens is you get a shift in the balance. So that basically altruistic groups beating selfish groups is what prevails. And when this happens, the higher level unit, the group actually becomes the new organism. And that explains what makes our species so special. Unlike so many animal societies where there's a little cooperation and a lot of competition, our ancestors evolved mechanisms to suppress bullying behaviors. So that between group selection became the predominant evolutionary force. And so, that's a major evolutionary transition. We're selected to cooperate originally in small groups, of course, just very small groups. But nevertheless, that cooperation caused the group to be the organism to a large extent.

And so, cooperation is required to explain our nature as a species. And I think it's become clear, it's a guarded form of cooperation. It's not just that we evolved to be nice, it's that we evolved to be vigilant and capable of defending ourselves against within group disruption. And so, if human history is a process of cultural evolution leading to ever larger scales of cooperation. So you can't just say the cooperation often loses, absolutely not. Cooperation wins much of the time and we need to cause it to win more so in a larger scale.

Tristan Harris:

You talk about evolution is the problem, not the solution. And conscious evolution is where we need to go. There's a sense that if I just tune into what listeners might be feeling, I look out in the world, I see that there's a sense that we're on a dangerous path as a civilization, and hey, we're letting just markets rule the world and we're letting what people click on the most rule the world. And if markets determine the world we end up in, and if you know what people click on the most is just a reflection of what people want, then why should we be sad about the world that we're getting? Because this is evolution that's just selecting for the best possible world that we could be living in. But I know that you would be shaking your head and saying, well, that's not true. And that's kind of what you're speaking about in terms of the need for conscious evolution.

Technology had a poor selection mechanism using your language that in the evolutionary view, the social media world has created this new evolutionary environment in which bad ideas, fake news spreads six times faster than true news outrage and out grouping political language massively out compete, non out grouping language. And if we make the mistake to say we are just selecting for what we want, I think the premise of this show is that that's not what this is all about and that you have a more optimistic view of human nature if you can see through the mirage that this is not conscious evolution as it is.

Aza Raskin:

And in that lens we can ask, well, what is Twitter doing? We now go back to variation, selection, replication. Twitter has sort of replaced a whole bunch of the gatekeepers. There are a lot more people, so there's a bigger variation.

Center for Humane Technology | *Your Undivided Attention* Podcast
[The Race to Cooperation with David Sloan Wilson](#)

There is less of a selection and a greater rate of replication. And if we ask what would that look like in the human body or our cells are dividing, they're mutating. Many of those mutations if they're not selected for can lead to cancer and if those replicate, your body dies. Well, that's actually a pretty good analogy to what things like Twitter do to the body of society.

David Sloan Wil...:

Cancer is just the right metaphor. I said earlier that a major transition is never complete. So if you look at multicellular organisms ourselves, what you find is most of the way we are is based on individuals or their groups who are surviving, going to be reproducing better than other groups. Cancer is an exception to that rule. Cancer is natural selection taking place among cells within our bodies, just the chicken experiment within our bodies. A mutant cancer cell is the mean chicken and it's proliferating at the expense of the cooperative cells. Evolution has no foresight, so the cancer cell is adaptive at that level. And of course, the fact that the whole body including itself might die is beside the plan. And so, against that background, if you just frameshift upward, and if we think of disruptive self-serving traits in a social group as like cancer, which is spreading at the expense of the cooperative strategies, then we can see something like what's taking place at Twitter on really a whole laissez fair economy.

The concept of laissez fair is what is revealed as being profoundly untrue. The idea that the pursuit of lower level interests robustly benefits, the common good is profoundly untrue. Now, the good news is that we have examples of if you actually look at successful change efforts, what you find is that people have pragmatically arrived at that goal without anyone thinking of it formally on evolutionary terms. Now, if you look for example at the famous Toyota lean methodology of continuous improvement. If you look at how a Toyota assembly plant is organized, you see they're actually selecting the practices on the assembly line in terms of the efficiency of the whole operation. And so, this is not brand new. This is something actually that us humans have converged upon again and again and again because it's frankly the only thing that works. Then we can begin to think about the common denominators of what our groups need is to cooperate and to be adaptable. That's true for all contexts, all scales, and seeing that in its general form is just tremendously useful. This is now why I can be both realistic and optimistic.

Tristan Harris:

The premise of the solution space we want to explore is the idea that there is a way to have a means of selecting for a pro-social future. So I would love for you to talk about your work with Nobel Prize winner, Elinor Ostrom's core design principles for how do we kick ourselves out of this win-lose rival risk game into a pro-social game.

David Sloan Wil...:

So the reason that Lin Ostrom is so important is that she actually solved that problem at a certain scale and a certain context, which is groups that attempt to manage a common pool of resources. We're talking about the famous tragedy of the commons, the idea that the only way to regulate, first of all, the tragedy will always occur unless you privatize the common or unless you regulate it from above. There's your top down regulation. And what Lin showed was that actually

Center for Humane Technology | *Your Undivided Attention* Podcast
[The Race to Cooperation with David Sloan Wilson](#)

not all, but some common full of resource groups are able to self-regulate. But only if they implement certain core design principles, which I'm about to list. And my work with Lin, I'm blessed by the way of just working with such towering figures. I mean, who could be more lucky than me to work with Ed Wilson and Lin Ostrom and many others. But what we did together was we generalized the core design principles.

These principles are needed not just for common pool resource groups. They're needed by all groups. Any group where people are trying to get something done together need these core design principles. And why is that? It's because they accomplish a major transition for the group. And I list them and as I do, I want our listeners to keep some group in mind. Think of a group that you know well and then ask yourself how well the group implements the core design principles. So number one, a strong sense of identity and purpose. A group needs to know that it's a group, know that it's doing something important, know who's a member. If you don't see it as a group, then it's hard for that group to do well. Number two, benefits proportional to cost, not sustainable for some members of the group to get the benefits, and other members of the group to do the work. Must be some calibration where what you get from the group is proportional to what you give.

Number three, fair and inclusive decision-making, not sustainable for some members of the group to call the shots and for other members to have no say. In the first place, that's a recipe for unfairness. In the second place, it doesn't make use of the wisdom of every group member. Number four, monitoring agreed upon behavior. Unless we know what we're doing, unless there's transparency, then of course, all bets are off. Number five, graduated sanctions. If you're not doing what you should, there has to be some corrective, but it doesn't have to start out mean, it can start out friendly and then escalate if necessary. And while we're correcting inappropriate behavior, let's reward good behavior. So abundant praise and reinforcement for good behavior coupled with mild punishment for bad behavior, which escalates when necessary. Number six, fast and fair conflict resolution. Conflicts will occur, they need to be resolved quickly and in a manner that's regarded as fair by all parties.

In a dispute, most people think they have a point of view. Number seven, local autonomy. A group has to have the elbow room to manage their own affairs. But then finally, number eight, appropriate relations with other groups which reflect the same core design principles. And so, here we have this tremendous conceptual simplification that the same principles are needed to govern relations among groups in addition to within groups. And so, we could use these principles to study a very small group or nations in the global village. That's how general the principles are. And so, I think that you can see that in a group that strongly implements the core design principles. It's just hard to be a cancer, it's hard to behave in a disruptive self-serving fashion. It's like the second chicken experiment, not the first. In groups where those principles are lax, then of course, you could be the mean chicken or you can be the cancer cell and the group will suffer as a result.

Center for Humane Technology | *Your Undivided Attention* Podcast
[The Race to Cooperation with David Sloan Wilson](#)

And what you find just as Ostrom found, not that all common pool resource groups do this, no, they varied, only some did it. And so, there's so much room for improvement. We've done studies that show that all groups need these co-design principles and business groups need the most of all business groups are most efficient in them. Why? Because they're the ones that are most brainwashed by the shareholder value model, by the neoclassical economic model. You can demonstrate that on average business groups are deficient in all eight of the core design principles. That's why the meaning system that we know of as neoclassical economic theory is just motivating the wrong suite of behaviors and we have to change the theory in order to substantially change the practice. And so, one of the things that this calls for is paradigmatic change and economic theory, which is one of the things that we're doing.

Tristan Harris:

I want to break down just so everyone's following along. We give this metaphor actually in the social dilemma. So long as a tree is worth more dead than alive and a whale is worth more dead than alive. We're going to keep cutting down trees, we're going to keep killing whales. And then if we run out, the problem that Ostrom was sort of became known for was how groups are managing common pool resources, common pool forests, pastures, fisheries, irrigation systems, and how common pool resources are vulnerable to overexploitation. And then just to link that to the work on social media, we have this new commons that we never even thought was a resource or commons before, which is the shared attention commons, or the shared reality commons, or the social trust commons. And as you start over exploiting for attention, just like one tribe might be over exploiting the number of fish in an area and then suddenly, there's no fish left for anybody.

Ostrom was sort of exploring there are ways in which without a central government, some top-down force with the monopoly of violence to tell both tribes knock it off, stop going for the fish so we can make sure that they grow back. What she found was this is a protocol. If you have these eight design principles in which many tribes so long as they're operating according to these principles could actually self-govern this multi-polar trap around a limited number of fish or a limited amount of trees in the forest. If I don't do it, I'll lose to the guy that will. So you get the idea. So it's profound solution to one of the most fundamental problems because if you zoom that all the way up, we have, if I don't mine the oil and fossil fuels and get cheap energy, and you do.

If I stop doing that and you keep going with that to, I'm trying to stop climate change, but you're willing to do the thing that's good for the short term to keep your economy running and growing, I'm going to lose to you. And so, we're seeing a kind of an exponential version of these tragedy of the commons. And now with our work on social media, we're seeing that same thing. And so, what I'd love to do is now apply that framework that you're outlining to, what would we do? So now we have TikTok, which is one tribe. We have the Facebook Zuckerberg tribe, we've got the Twitter tribe, and they're all mining for this shared resource of attention and they've been overexploiting it for a while and society's waking up to that fact.

Center for Humane Technology | *Your Undivided Attention* Podcast
[The Race to Cooperation with David Sloan Wilson](#)

And so, one solution is to take this some kind of global governance and say, we're going to shut each of your companies down if you keep mining for attention and ruining democracies. But then you're saying, "Hey, is there some way at this larger scale in which there can be cooperation or pro-social behavior that is self negotiated among the members?" I know it's a huge question, but that's kind of the bullseye of the big problem that we've been dancing around for the last many years here.

David Sloan Wil...:

Well, one point it's important to make because that everything needs to be coordinated with the global good in mind. So in some sense, what's needed is a whole earth ethic. I think that we need to be thinking my primary social identity is I'm a human being and I'm a citizen of the world. And even though that was beyond the imagination until a couple of centuries ago, now it is just the only thing that makes sense given all the forms of globalization that have taken place. Then we need to go to the opposite extreme and we need to have a cellular level of society. This is the level of the small groups where people are actually working, our schools, our neighborhoods, our businesses, our volunteer activities of all sorts, everything we do in smaller groups. It's not that small groups are good per se, they need to be appropriately structured.

But when they are, basically, then it's the best thing that you can do for an individual as a function in the context of meaningful and appropriately structured groups. And so, that's something that anybody can do. So here's a bottom up component to this. Before we get to anything large scale like Twitter and TikTok and anybody can basically work at this cellular level and there'd be tremendous benefit right then and there. I think there's examples of middle level entities. Any entity that's actually capable of influence can become benign if it adopts the right meaning system.

And an example of this has just come to my attention is Microsoft under its current CEO, Satya Nadella. And his book, 'Hit Refresh,' is a story basically about you have Microsoft, everyone knows about that. Bill Gates, hard driving, Steve Ballmer, the second CEO, even more hard driving. There was a humorous org chart that got published on the internet of the Microsoft org chart with every unit pointing guns at every other unit. It was like the first chicken experiment ran a mock. But then the third CEO, by virtue of who he is as a person, nothing he learned in business school, but who he is as a person. His cultural heritage in India and his background, he had a special needs child and so on, just had a holistic ethos and was quite amazingly able to propagate that through one of the largest corporations in America.

And Tim O'Reilly in his book, 'WTF: What's the Future and Why It's Up to Us,' makes some of the same points that if only you could get these corporate leviathans to just get it and set their sights higher in terms of what they should be doing, basically to convince them that if you're working on getting your packages there in a record time or maximizing clicks or whatever, how disruptive this is going to be. And then the impeccable arguments on that, anyone who gets that at that point can become part of the solution, not part of the problem.

Center for Humane Technology | *Your Undivided Attention* Podcast
[The Race to Cooperation with David Sloan Wilson](#)

Aza Raskin: I would love to make this more concrete for our listeners because I think we sort of quickly moved through the set of core design principles and it would be wonderful to see it in action. One way I might set this up is, all right, you, David Sloan Wilson have managed to convene all of the engagement companies. You have the CEO of TikTok and of Microsoft and LinkedIn, Twitter, Facebook, and they're all like, "All right, we're here. What do we need to do together so that we could protect the commons," which is the epistemic commons or cultural commons, reality commons, engagement commons? How do we do it? How do we start thinking about it? And if this one's too hard because you haven't thought it through, feel free to replace it with an example that you have thought through or have more touchpoints on.

David Sloan Wil...: Well, the only thing I'll do is scale it down. I've already said that the principles are scale independent. So what we do all the time is just that at the scale of small groups. So just imagine that we have a much smaller group and we bring them together and we ask the question, why are you a group? What's important about doing something together when you build up a common sense of purpose? That's the first core design principle.

Tristan Harris: You mean among the actors that are these tech companies as an example. So you're not asking each one, why is TikTok, TikTok, you're saying, why is TikTok and Facebook and Instagram, what makes all of us together a group as opposed to why is just one of the companies a group? Is that what you're saying?

David Sloan Wil...: Yeah. Although, I scaled it down. So imagine that it's a school or a neighborhood or a business, and then we can scale it back up. So basically if you build up the sense of identity and purpose, so now the whole reason to be in the group has been sharpened and now you ask the question, okay, what would we do in the service of those things? How do we act? We're agreeing that this is what we want to do, so we're tamping down differences of opinion. We're articulating the behaviors that will actually get us towards that goal. You can begin to see this as a form of managed evolution. And now, we have to visit some of the things that cause us not to do that, whether they pull us away from that sort of thing.

And then we have to make sure that we have to come up with some kind of contract or agreement or something like that. So if something goes wrong, then we notice it in the first place and then we pointed out and then we tried to correct it. And that can take place at the national scale or at the corporate scale just as easily as... Not just as easily, all right, I take that back. But all the time when I write about this, I say that it might be more difficult, but the problems are not different in time.

Tristan Harris: One of the big transitions I've heard you really articulate is the phrase that I have for it in my sort of internal encyclopedia repertoire of ideas is if might makes right, that world breaks because power leads to the full exercise of just these win-loss rival risk games, which then breaks society just get to the chicken aggressive society. And you talked about the need to switch to an earned reputational view that we don't view those who are powerful as being the best

Center for Humane Technology | *Your Undivided Attention* Podcast
[The Race to Cooperation with David Sloan Wilson](#)

or we don't look up to those. We look up to those who've earned the reputation through the moral high ground. And I think we're seeing that just want to give people a little bit of micro optimism at least, which is that there's New York Times saying that people don't want to work at Facebook and Twitter and TikTok.

And it's because they don't want to work at the places that even though they're the most powerful companies in the world, they know that it's starting to carry a little bit of a social stigma. I think things like *The Social Dilemma* have increased that inversion of what we used to think of as it's cool to work in tech, it's cool to start your next billion dollar social media company. And now it's like, "Oh, you're another one of those guys that's ruining the world." And so, that is shifting the currency, the cultural currency of what we look up to. And I do think that one of the things that stuck out for me and what you've shared is being able to change the currency of success that we are valuing. Selection only works if you have values.

Unconscious selection is just basically fitness without saying, well, what's the world that we actually want to create for our kids? And I think that more and more people, especially as they see the meta crisis, the mess of problems that we face from economic crises, culture wars, ecological crisis, social media, emergency trust crisis, that people want to focus on and work at the places where they can actually feel purposeful. And I think the price tag of not feeling purposeful is going up and up and up and up and more people are going to opt for meaningful purposeful work. I can only say that from the messages that we see and we hear from people - that increasingly seems to be the case and that's where at least getting some hope can lie for us.

David Sloan Wil...: And the idea that our meaning systems are like our genes really consolidates that. It clarifies what it means to change the way we think. That's not superficial, that's no small matter, that's like changing our genes. And I think that the more these behaviors that are taking place all around us are properly seen as cancerous and there's no real defense against that, then that puts the actors in a much more morally precarious position. Certain things that are defensible become indefensible. Then at the practice level, I think it's encouraging to know that if an agent, let us say a company really puts this into practice, it really is the case that altruistic groups beat selfish groups. And so, if you do have a corporation, let us say that truly practices these principles of caring and a stakeholder value model rather than a shareholder value model and really sincerely does that. It turns out that they perform very well, they beat the competition.

Tristan Harris: David, thank you for joining us on *Your Undivided Attention*. It's been great having you.

Aza Raskin: Yeah, real pleasure.

David Sloan Wil...: Thank you.

Center for Humane Technology | *Your Undivided Attention* Podcast
[The Race to Cooperation with David Sloan Wilson](#)

Tristan Harris: David Sloan Wilson is a prominent evolutionary thinker and biologist. He is State University of New York's distinguished professor of biology and anthropology emeritus at Binghamton University, and he's president of the non-profit organization, Prosocial World, a training platform whose mission is to consciously evolve a world that works for all. His most recent books are, 'This View of Life: Completing the Darwinian Revolution,' 'Prosocial: Using Evolutionary Science to Build Productive, Equitable, and Collaborative Groups,' and his novel, 'Atlas Hugged: The Autobiography of John Galt III.'

Your Undivided Attention is produced by the Center for Humane Technology, a non-profit organization working to catalyze a humane future. Our senior producer is Julia Scott. Our associate producer is Kirsten McMurray, mixing on this episode by Jeff Sudakin, the Original Music and Sound Design by Ryan and Hayes Holiday. And a special thanks to the whole Center for Humane Technology team for making this podcast possible. You can find show notes, transcripts, and much more at humanetech.com. A very special thanks to our generous lead supporters, including the Omidyar Network, Craig Newmark Philanthropies, and the Evolve Foundation among many others. And if you made it all the way here, let me just give one more thank you to you, for giving us your undivided attention.