

The Success
Genome
Unravelling

TURNING MEN
FROM ROT TO ROCK

AGONA APELL

PREFACE

The means by which we may attain personal success is a subject that has persistently captured the attention of mankind ever since the first batch of men was wheeled out complete from the creation theatre. While this obsession has been consistent in degree across the spectrum of humanity, there has been a varied understanding of, on the one hand, what it means to be successful and, on the other hand, how one may go about the logical pursuit of that which he calls success. So whereas some think that success is an arbitrary concept, others take it that success is the attainment of some defined set of unchanging ideals. And while some assume that success is only bestowed by God on those with whom he is much pleased, there are many who believe there is a scientific way by which one can approach success, make a pass at it, court it, and finally get wedded to it for butter or for better.

We wish to join the fray with nature herself as our ally for in all our discourses on success, she persistently, albeit unobtrusively, counsels us with deeds rather than words, trying to show us her tested methods for securing the success that we yearn for and which she wishes us. But rather than profit from her efforts, we are often too engrossed in argument and guesswork to notice the value of taking a break from them and observing for once these methods displayed by nature so that we may draw appropriate lessons from them and thus formulate enduring principles of success for the human situation. This path that we neglect to follow is, however, the lone highway to the land of success. For if we are creatures of nature, and we exist in nature, and we are part of nature, then it must follow that our success is governed solely by the laws of nature. According to an old saying, a journey of a thousand miles begins with a single step. We shall add that this single step must be in a single direction; otherwise, we would not reach our destination. In this book, the direction we have chosen in our search for the principles of success is that pointed by nature. So *The Success Genome Unravalled* generates success principles that are modelled not on the successes of particular men, but on those of nature which, as we know, spanned a billion years at the last estimate

Agona Apell
1st April, 2006

CHAPTER ONE

The random patter of weary feet beating upon a cobbled walk always unite into a soothing melody in any pair of idle ears. The thought never occurs to the listener enjoying this sound that to the faceless figures in the striding throng, there is no such music in the patter of their feet and of the patter itself, they are scarcely aware. All that fills their minds are the diverse purposes to which they are headed, the pains from which they flee, and the futures after which they hasten. Away from the cobbled walk, a situation akin to this often looms between the writer of a self-development book and his audience, and the writer knows that he must bear it at the fore of his mind if he is to infuse his book with value for the reader. For while the chorus of turning pages gives music to his ears, the reader leafing through the book hears no such music. Yet the reader does thirst for music but, alas, music of a different kind: to him, lyrics are in the thought, melody is in the humour, and rhythm is in the poetry of the book's content. And that is not all: he also requires that the message the author offers be complete, for while half a loaf is better than none, a loaf in half is not a loaf enough. The style of this book and the scope of its content are founded on this insight.

As you progress through the chapters, you will find again and again that the object of all material presented here is to create in you a certain posture of mind as a measure to make you better assured of success. This apparent obsession with mental posture is not an accident but is inspired by the observation that just as bodily well-being may be marred by poor body posture so can mental wellbeing be marred by poor mental posture. By this we mean a peculiar bent of mind that infects our capacity for the assessment of perceptions with a crippling quality that makes us always gravitate towards inferior responses to our perceptions of the world. So take careful note of all the postures of mind urged on you along these pages so that you can urge such postures on your mind and thus be able to nail success more frequently and more completely.

Why this book? Well, all those who are born shall one day be bones. The great question in life is with what kind of days we shall bridge the daunting gap that falls between the day we are born and the day we are bones. When I turned thirty, my mind was seized by this very question in a vicious grip, and so I embarked on a review of my performance in life up to that point with regard to the enjoyment of three

classes of prosperity: professional prosperity, financial prosperity, and social prosperity. Here are the questions I sought to answer that day: How far had I advanced in rank and responsibility compared to my contemporaries at school? What had I gained in wealth and income compared to these same people? And what was my status compared to them in progress made towards raising a family and in offering leadership to the various communities to which I belonged? On all scores, I was dismayed to find that whereas I had always hovered about the head of my school class in all measures of intellectual brilliance, I was now skimming the bottom of my street class in all measures of prosperity. For a man of my qualifications, I still held an entry-level position, which some former colleagues had already risen above. What I called home was a single room with a communal toilet and bathroom furnished with a few articles of worn furniture, and in all the communities I belonged to, no one looked up to me for leadership in any matter concerning the community. By contrast, a number of my contemporaries at school, all of whom I had outperformed intellectually through our school years and all of whom still looked up to me in intellectual matters, had already accomplished so much more. Many held managerial positions in their places of work, rented decent houses in fairly decent neighbourhoods, and held leadership positions in their professional associations and in other societies of which they were members. This analysis aroused in me a few rough emotions, only two of which I now remember: a great sorrow and a deep thirst. A great sorrow in my breast that I had lost my old position as a superior performer and a deep thirst in my soul to reclaim that position. I knew that I would need a clever strategy to do this, so off I went looking for a book into which I could deposit my mind and have it carried by the mighty flap of its pages to lofty worlds where the truths of human success nest. The self-help market proffered a few promising titles, but they all suffered from a fatal affliction: none of them offered a mechanism rooted in science by which seekers of success could find the success they craved. And yet this is what I most wanted, for I completely believed that such a mechanism did exist and could not but be the most effective way by which to pursue success. Seeing no hope of finding it laid out anywhere, I embarked on developing such a mechanism for my own benefit. Within a year I had it substantially complete and would spend the next four years testing and refining it through personal experience. When I turned thirty-five, it was finally complete—and so was my tortuous flight to the top of my street class. It was time to tell this story to those who are similarly afflicted as I was in my thirtieth year.

What is success?

As we set out into the darkness, a darkness rich in the mighty truths of success, in search of the elusive well from which the fabled fountain of success draws its fragrant

waters, we shall begin by defining that which we seek since we cannot, in all probability, ever find something the look of which we do not know. So the challenge that we must confront at the outset is to find an answer to the question: “What, from God’s perspective, is a successful human being?” Notice that the object of this question is to probe for the global definition of success and not definitions of it that are inspired purely by individual tastes, for logic suggests that if we are ever to discover the one golden path to success, we must start from the one golden definition of it. That is why we have made reference to God’s perspective, for it is God who “invented” human beings and it is God, therefore, who must have the most appropriate reference against which to judge whether or not we are successful. If you happen to be an atheist and believe in evolution, the global definition of success deduced from the perspective of creation will still be valid from your perspective of evolution. This is because we shall deduce God’s notion of success entirely from the same set of considerations that evolutionists themselves would use to determine whether or not a person possesses what they might possibly describe as “survival-oriented fitness” but which we would call quite simply “success.” This book, therefore, proceeds on the insight that what constitutes human success should be the same for all people irrespective of whether they believe in evolution, in God, or in his double from hell.

Some quarters of my audience being convinced that success is best understood as a subjective thing will wonder whether a purported global standard of success has any practical value. Their skepticism should be allayed, however, if they take inspiration from an everyday practice that they themselves doubtlessly consider as sound: whenever we aspire to assess the success of anything, we always take as our point of reference the purpose for which it was made, and then proceed to weigh its performance against that standard. Therefore, if a kettle was intended for heating water, its success as a kettle in our view would depend entirely on how well it performed that function. We would not be convinced if it turned around and said, if it could, that its success as a kettle may be seen in how well it freezes water—for then, this redefinition of success would render it a successful freezer as opposed to kettle. Likewise, we must consider any person who attains a standard of success that is at variance with God’s global standard of success to be, perhaps, a successful cyborg, zombie, or some other such inhuman thing. This is because, as just pointed out, human beings are creatures of God, and therefore, human success can only be rationally defined if we formulate its definition in terms of the basic purpose for which we exist.

This last statement quite naturally leads to the following question: What is our basic purpose on earth? Whenever it is raised, philosophical tradition demands that much pontifical rambling be made in response to this seemingly perplexing question. But in my reluctance to further contort the Gordian knot, I shall avoid succumbing

to this tradition by stating the required answer in a simple manner: the basic purpose of each living thing is to preserve its life and that of its kind. This is the conclusion that any examination of a creature's biology must lead us to since all the capabilities and characteristics that each creature is invested with are ultimately geared to the preservation of its life. It is possible, of course, that our lives exist to serve some higher objective, but this need not concern us here because if such an objective truly exists, the fact that it has not been revealed to us either directly or through instinct and bodily urges can only mean that its fulfilment is not our primary responsibility. Our primary responsibility must be an objective towards which we are impelled by instincts and urges. And that objective is crystal clear: it is the preservation of one's life and that of his kind. Therefore, having identified that as the reason for our existence, we can now give the purpose-oriented definition of success as follows:

A human being is said to be successful if he possesses that which he needs to meet the life-preservation demands that are his natural responsibility.

The whole art of the breeding of personal success under earthly conditions flows from this statement. Its importance may be illustrated at once. Frequently, those who hold the opinion that success can only be defined subjectively are the same people who equate it with the mere possession of vast sums of money. But according to our definition of a successful human being, this is a simplistic conception of success: Suppose you were given all the money on earth and all the disease too, would you honestly describe yourself as a great success? Very likely you wouldn't. Because in that position, you would spend all your waking hours hovering above the grave; besides, the possession of that wealth would ironically amount to torture since being in no position to enjoy it due to ill health, its promise of happiness would only hang tantalizingly above you, always eluding your grasp. On the other hand, if you were the healthiest man on earth but had no money for food and medical bills, you too would soon come to grief because your sterling health would, in the course of time, perish from exposure to the hostile circumstances that we all come to encounter in life. Therefore, you too would hesitate to describe yourself as a success, seeing that your circumstances had you, most of the time, seated on the lap of death.

From these two illustrations, it is apparent that a given concept of success can only be viable if it gives due regard to our need to meet the life-preservation demands set for us by the deity. We cannot evade these demands altogether and at the same time expect to achieve success, for the laws of nature are such that while one can sometimes defy the odds, they never can defy the gods and have their plans prosper.

Which are the life-preservation demands?

In our definition of human success, reference is made to "life-preservation demands." What exactly do we mean by this? Well, upon a little reflection, one comes to realize that all threats to life may be countered through methods that are reducible to one or more of these three basic survival strategies: obtaining nourishment, engaging in reproduction, and applying measures of defence against physical threats or disease. These, therefore, are the life-preservation demands. They are in effect the objectives that man must fulfil in order to maintain health and renew life. The implication of our definition of human success, therefore, is that a successful human being must be able to meet the following requirements: secure food for his needs (which may include that of his family), contribute to the renewal of his kind through reproduction, and defend himself or his family when faced with a physical threat or disease. This is the minimum ideal success. I say "minimum" because it is possible for someone to provide for the preservation of life other than his own and that of his nuclear family—in which case we would be dealing with success of a superior degree since our definition implies that the greater the amount of life you can preserve, the greater is your success as a human being. American billionaires Bill Gates and Warren Buffett are stout paragons of this model of success. Each year, the philanthropic work that they perform through the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation contributes positively to the cause of food security for millions of people around the world and protects greater millions from preventable diseases that would otherwise have spelled an early demise for them. Given their work in philanthropy, their true success is not in the value that their billions give them as measured by *Forbes Magazine* but in the value that they give their billions as measured by the souls they save.

Quite a few people will wonder whether it makes sense to link success and reproduction when all around the world these days one comes across people who have chosen to remain childless so they can prosper as professionals. In their schemes of advancement, children are considered an obstacle to success, and indeed true to their calculations, such people unencumbered as they are by the burdens of childbearing and child-raising at times rise to the upper echelons of their professions and accumulate substantial wealth. When this happens, they are extolled as success stories while other people such as women who have chosen to lead their lives as mothers and homemakers are described as failures. How can one reconcile this observation with our given definition of success?

There is no denying that such career dwellers can rightly be described as successful; our definition of success attests to the validity of that description. But in the context of that same definition, theirs is no more than a qualified success—whatever the extent of their wealth—given that they can only meet two of the three life-preservation

demands: the need for nourishment and the need for self-protection—having decided to ignore the need for procreation. So from the perspective of our definition of human success, people of this kind may be regarded as highly successful professionals but only moderately successful human beings.

This last statement expresses a subtle distinction that frequently escapes the notice of those who dabble in the evaluation of human success. Such people never seem to understand that a man can succeed as a professional and fail as a human being; and conversely, that he can succeed as a human being and fail as a professional. This is precisely why they are always gloomy in their judgment of homemakers and exuberant in their judgment of career dwellers. To them the homemaker's lack of a hefty bank balance and substantial property means that she is a failure. From our definition of success, however, homemakers can actually be described as successful human beings provided they are able to cope with the life-preservation demands of their families. Their lack of glamorous occupations, therefore, in no way qualifies them as failures.

In most cases it is young men and women just out of school and eager for success that are normally confounded by the matter of what to make their priority between career and family if they are to lead successful lives. Whenever I meet this lot grappling with that age-old riddle, I tell them that the proper perspective from which to approach the issue is not from the perspective of one embarking on a lifelong journey but from the perspective of one at the end of that journey. Here is how I frame the issue to each of them: If life's journey carried you to a deathbed whereon you must expire, what would you rather have gathered around your bed to reassure you that your days on earth have not been a waste of time? Would you want appointment letters, titles to property, and medals of honour, or the solemn figures of your children and their children? In other words, at the end of life's journey, would you rather your success of the years past was laid out on cold plates and paper or in warm breath and flesh? How lucky they are to whom life puts this question in a moment of leisure! A few years ago, I confronted it in unenviable circumstances: I was stark naked, wet, and in the middle of a backwards fall out of the bathtub when in my fright and despair this very question appeared before me, and in that moment the thought flashed through my mind: "My God, my God, I have always delayed the decision, and now I die a childless man." It was the last thought to nest in my mind before my head crashed against the wall opposite the bathtub. In later reflection, I noticed that at the time I suffered this fall, this book was yet unfinished, but I gave it no thought at all. And I had much development work underway at my beloved Eden Yards farm by the River Nile, but I gave it no thought either. And my cherished Ford truck was parked just across the wall from my bathroom, but that too did not figure in my final thoughts just before I crashed to the floor. All I cared to think about were the children I never had.

The Success Genome

Just as human beings are formed by specific types of genes, success is itself a creature generated by certain specific elements the collection of which I refer to as the Success Genome. The inspiration for this idea arose from the global definition of success that we have already met. For if God—so the reasoning goes—desires that life be preserved, it follows that he has equipped man with—or placed within his reach—all the qualities and capabilities that foster the preservation of life under earthly circumstances. Such qualities and capabilities are therefore, by definition, the stepping-stones to success.

With this realization in mind, the next logical step is to determine the exact qualities and capabilities that make up the Success Genome. To do this it is worth noting that since such qualities and capabilities are conducive to the preservation of life, they may be expected to be most evident in circumstances where life is most vulnerable to destruction. Now, there is no instance when life is more susceptible to malevolent forces than at the time when it has just been brought forth into the world. The newborn baby left to itself is the most vulnerable creature on earth, yet in its puny form lies the entire future of life itself. So to come face-to-face with the Success Genome, we must find the answer to this question: Given the vulnerability of a newborn baby, how does it manage to survive and grow into a viable human being? Let us turn our attention to answering this question.

Without a doubt, the vulnerability of the newborn did not escape the nosy eye of God; he is, as we know, a very meticulous being. When fashioning a response to this situation, however, he must have realized that the measures to cope with its vulnerability had to come from people other than itself since it lacks both the maturity of mind and body to fend for itself. Its parents, in particular, must have struck him as the people best suited for this role since among all people it is they who have the greatest interest in its survival. In other words, God, seeing that the newborn could not be vested with the responsibility for protecting its own life, had to ensure that its parents must be eminently capable of meeting its nutritional and defence needs. So parents must possess the qualities and capabilities that can safeguard not only their baby's life but also their own since they have to be alive in the first place if they are to protect the baby. These qualities and capabilities, as we have seen, are what constitute the Success Genome. To ensure that this requirement of parenthood is met unfailingly, God must then have programmed human beings in such a way that prospective parents amongst us must assess their mutual suitability for parenthood on his behalf and mate if and only if they are satisfied that they meet the requirements he desires of parents. Therefore, what we must have here is a vet-and-mate procedure effected in the following manner: at the time of courtship, the male and female scour each other in search of the tell-tale signs of the

Success Genome; if this search yields positive results, that confirmation of suitability for parenthood then arouses in them the mutual sexual attraction for mating. We may thus conclude that the qualities and capabilities that constitute the Success Genome are those that draw males and females into procreative sexual partnerships.

There is a second way of reaching this conclusion. If we accept that it is in line with God's will that human societies prosper, then we must accept that he intended the foundation for this prosperity to be laid at the family level. The family would be the ideal setting for such a foundation because it is the smallest organizational unit of society and has the considerable advantage that of all social units, it is the only one that exists naturally and eternally. So, just as the viability of matter is determined at the level of its smallest unit, the atom, the viability of society, must likewise be determined at the level of its smallest unit, the family. Now, for the family to be successful, it must, like all organizations, have a leadership that can preserve it from danger in addition to effectively exploiting the opportunities through which its prosperity can be ensured—in short, it must have a competent leadership. Since a husband and wife form the leadership of a family, it follows that they must possess the qualities and capabilities that make for competent leadership from the perspective of family interests. To determine the identity of these qualities and capabilities, we have only to note that the husband and wife are driven to mate by the allure of certain qualities and capabilities that they notice in each other and which they believe are contributory factors to the success of a family. This brings us back to our previous conclusion that the qualities and capabilities that constitute the Success Genome are the very ones that draw males and females into procreative sexual partnerships.

Having established this result, the following question may now be posed: Given that males and females are attracted to each other by sets of qualities and capabilities that are comparable but not identical, which of them constitutes the Success Genome? For example, while women desire physical strength in men, men on the other hand find great physical strength in women an unattractive quality; and whereas courage in a man is a priority for women, it does not generally feature in the menu of desirable qualities that a man scans when evaluating the attractiveness of a woman. Although there are qualities and capabilities that both sexes find attractive in a prospective mate, it is clear that we cannot talk of the existence of a general Success Genome composed of mutually consistent qualities and capabilities.

This ostensible riddle is resolved at once when we remember that in the primordial family structure, husband and wife were assigned to prime and supporting positions respectively. In organizational terms, the man was to be the leader and the woman his subordinate. So, there we have it: the kind of Success Genome that draws women to

men is that which a man must have in order to ably execute the roles God consigned to his prime familial position. On the other hand, a man is attracted to a woman if she possesses the kind of Success Genome that will enable her to competently fulfil the responsibilities consigned to her in her supporting role. From this conclusion, it is apparent that our quest for the one holy grail of success has in fact yielded us two. This is the kind of result that we are often rewarded with when we conduct a methodical and principled search for nature's hidden truths. To put our result simply, we have a Success Genome suited for leaders (call it the *alpha Success Genome*) and one suited for subordinates (call it the *beta Success Genome*).

The elements that compose either kind of Success Genome can be resolved into three groups: competencies, attributes, and conduct. Of these, we shall at this stage focus our attention on conduct alone in order to establish some general principle; competencies and attributes shall be dealt with in the next chapter. To begin with, let us note that however desirable the competencies and attributes possessed by a husband and wife, the two will never stick together if either of them finds their partner's conduct repulsive. In other words, conjugal harmony is largely fostered by the agreeability of the conduct of husband and wife towards each other. When their behaviour towards each other is good, the strength of their mutual attachment is enhanced; when it is bad, the strength of their mutual attachment is weakened. Since in the natural marital setting the husband is seen as the leader and the wife as the subordinate, this observation can be generalized to the relationship between all leaders and subordinates. We may hence conclude that it pleases a leader when a subordinate behaves towards him like a loving wife towards a husband; on the other hand, the subordinate is much elated when the leader behaves towards him like a loving husband towards a wife. This is a legitimate generalization to make because contrary to popular belief, the conduct that women and men desire of their partners in a sexual relationship does not depend on ostensible natural gender preferences but on power differences within the relationship. That is why it makes sense to generalize the style of conduct they seek in their partners to all other human relationships where a comparable power differential exists.

Some years ago, at the end of the last century, a famous tennis star went to court to secure a divorce from a woman with whom she had been in a same sex marriage. As is natural in all cases where friendly relationships are crumbling, both parties had complaints to make about the pain they had suffered due to the poor conduct of their partners. Since this was a same sex relationship, I expected that the litany of complaints presented by both women would be similar to those normally presented by women seeking separation from their male partners. I was in for a surprise though. As I read through transcripts of those complaints, it became clear that the more dominant partner in the relationship—the tennis star—had complaints about the conduct of her

partner that were similar to complaints normally made by men about women from whom they wish to be divorced. This included complaints like habitual disobedience and her partner's failure to acknowledge her as the pre-eminent partner. On the other hand, her partner, who had less power in the relationship, had complaints about the tennis star's conduct which were very much like the comments that women normally make about the conduct of men from whom they wish to be divorced. In particular, she cited the lack of emotional and financial support and said that she felt unloved in the relationship. To me, this and other similar cases I later came across were an unmistakable indication that in any human relationship where a power differential exists, the style of conduct that the people in that relationship require of each other depends purely on their relative power in the relationship. In particular, the more powerful members are required to model their conduct on that of the traditional husband, while the less powerful members are required to model their conduct on that of the traditional wife.

This effect may be exploited for self-advancement wherever leader-subordinate relationships exist, and to illustrate this I shall recount an instructive personal story. When this idea first dawned on me, I had just recently joined an engineering organization as a junior officer, and I wanted to rise rapidly to the top of the section where I served so that I could earn a better salary. It was apparent, however, that substantial difficulties awaited me if I moved to realize this dream because the position that I coveted was, at that time, held by an officer with academic qualifications comparable to mine but with work experience ten years greater than my own. Naturally, he showed no desire to leave the position for me and to make matters worse, I had two friends, both at my rank but also with superior work experience, who wanted the same job for themselves. On the face of it, it looked like I was very much the underdog in this contest. Despite this, I felt confident that armed with my new knowledge about the Success Genome, I could disregard their advantages in experience and secure the office for myself. Since appointments to this office were made at the pleasure of the head of station, I recognized at once that I would have to surpass my rivals in the display of the beta Success Genome to him. In short, I would inveigle him into supporting my aspirations by doing those little things a traditional wife does in order to charm an equally traditional husband. Things like finding his jokes funny, affecting less intelligence than his, always seeing wisdom in his side of an argument, feigning satisfaction with her relative inferior position by showing no ambition to be his equal, managing humble duties well but consulting him in matters that require unusual wisdom—these and other such beguiling wifely manoeuvres became routine for me. Not surprisingly, my rivals promptly described me as “womanish”—a description that to the uninitiated may have sounded disparaging but to me was music because it was feedback that I had replicated wifely manoeuvres to

perfection, as required by my scheme. Admittedly, I too found most of these behavioural manoeuvres distasteful at the time, but I was smart enough to recognize that their purpose was purely to advance my interests and not to delight me. So, to me, as long as they were effective, there was nothing to be lost by sticking to them, for there seemed to be more value in being a womanish success than in being a manly failure.

With time, after sustained exposure to my behavioural affectations, the boss unwittingly succumbed to my designs as nature had programmed him to. One sunny morning he convened a staff meeting and announced that I would henceforth be head of the station's surveying and construction section—just the post I had aimed for. And days later while attending a party that my colleagues had organized to celebrate my promotion, he confided in me that when he was scouting for a candidate for that position, it was my character among my other positive qualities that had been my strongest recommendation. Evidently my trial application of the Success Genome had made me triumph over my two fellow protagonists, who, I may point out, had carried out their campaign in a manly manner. They tactlessly displayed excellence where the boss was mediocre and paraded themselves as his social equals in the false hope that this would breed camaraderie. And whenever they had a point to prove, they stubbornly held their ground in arguments with the boss rather than resisting or yielding tactfully—and generally did all other such things that made them glow while the boss shuddered in fear for his position. In short, they engaged themselves in displaying the alpha Success Genome to a leader—something which is about as endearing as a wife showing her husband that in wealth, strength, and courage, she matches or surpasses him.

Once I had ensconced myself in my new position, I set about attracting extra responsibilities to my office, along with the benefits they carried. The same theory by which I had risen suggested that to do this successfully, I would have to demonstrate outstanding leadership to my boss without making him feel insecure in the face of my excellence. In genome science, this meant that to my boss I would have to continue displaying wifely conduct, and to my subordinates I would have to display the qualities that a wife finds desirable in a husband. In other words, I was to be at once like a husband and a wife, only to different people! So I enlisted for short courses in order to be knowledgeable in areas where my subordinates usually needed advice. I also donated generously to their causes whenever I could, showed appreciation of their efforts at work, took time off to chat with them if we met out of the office, regaled them with humour, lent a hand in their work if it was particularly strenuous, and did all those other things that Mr. Right never fails to do. After some time, my efforts drew the reward I had sought: I was elected chairman for several committees and designated staff representative on various missions; additionally, I won the enhanced loyalty of my colleagues, a fact which boosted my effectiveness as a leader. All that

was the contribution of my subordinates; the boss himself, though, was not to be left behind. Whenever there was a critical project that called for exceptional staff commitment, he invariably put me in charge, knowing well that under my stewardship, our staff always served at the summit of diligence because of the excellent work relationship I had established with them. Thus did I secure a bridgehead at my place of work that set me on an accelerated rise to the top.

Apart from illustrating the efficacy of the Success Genome in aiding our efforts at self-advancement, this story also serves to show that where leader-subordinate relationships exist, the subordinate, irrespective of sex, can profitably employ a style of conduct modelled on that of the traditional wife when relating to a leader. And the leader, also irrespective of sex, can likewise benefit greatly by displaying a style of conduct modelled on that of the traditional husband when relating to a subordinate. All that matters then in your choice of conduct is your rank relative to the person whom you seek to impress: to whom you are a boss, behave like a model husband; and to whom you are a subordinate, behave like an ideal wife. To reiterate, this comes about because the conduct that men desire in their wives is also desired by leaders in their subordinates, and the conduct that impresses women in their husbands is the very one that subordinates also find impressive in their leaders. In light of this, it always strikes me as a great irony that in survey after survey women leaders worldwide are consistently rated by their subordinates of both sexes as less suited for the mantle of leadership than their male colleagues on account of their alleged abrasive manner when dealing with their juniors. One would think that women, given that they know better than men how they want a man to treat them in a relationship, should know better than men how to handle subordinates and so should generally make more amiable managers. But, apparently, this is not the case. I think this is because women managers forsake their innate advantage under the misdirection of erroneous philosophies which assert that they will only earn respect by acting aggressively when executing their workplace roles. This highlights once again the heavy price that we pay in life whatever our advantages when we rely on a defective philosophical compass to guide us through life's journey. In this case, women managers lose the natural head start that they have over male managers in awareness of how to connect profitably with subordinates when they let their feminine instincts that would have served them well in this cause to be pinned by the ponderous foot of a crippling philosophy.

When some day you set out to implement the strategies advocated here, do not be fooled by people who affect a preference for equality in their relationships with those who are less powerful than them. You will certainly meet these types as you go about your business, for I have long noticed that it is the fashion in today's workplace for bosses to make a show of their pretence that they, unlike the bosses of a bygone era,

do not wish to be treated with deference by their subordinates. You have my assurance that they only do this for the sake of their public image; in reality, while a boss may not be offended by a subordinate who relates to him as an equal, the one who treats him with deference shall always find more favour in his heart. If you should wish to prove this, just ask yourself which of your boss's children would please him if one called him "Daddy" and the other addressed him by his first name. Your answer to that question should convince you that all purported shifts in human nature are always a sham—people quite simply never change despite their claims to the contrary. In fact, if our prehistoric ancestors dropped in today and compared our time with theirs, they would at once note that while we now dwell in different huts, the hearts that dwell in us are still pretty much the same; and while we now drive different things, the things that drive us have also never changed. So go ahead and treat your boss to the charms of wifely conduct that bosses of yore enjoyed; you will find that he or she will always delight in your company—much to your profit. Only remember while you do so that by "wifely conduct" we mean a seemly deference and not servile obsequiousness. The difference between the two is that when we observe a seemly deference, we give respect while preserving self-respect; acting with servile obsequiousness on the other hand involves giving respect to others without maintaining a semblance of self-respect.

The Success Genome as a fountain of general success

Although we elicited the Success Genome from a purely sexual setting, I must make it clear that owing to its primacy in the events that lead to reproduction—and hence the preservation of life—God decided at creation that these very qualities and capabilities that attract and bind men and women in procreative sexual partnerships must also be the mark of excellence in all other spheres of life. For if sexually attractive qualities and capabilities are valued in all spheres outside courtship, then in an effort to excel in such spheres, people would have to develop and display them. And if they did that, they would definitely excite feelings of sexual attraction in observant members of the opposite sex and this development would lead to a relationship that ends in mating. In this way, God's objective of preserving life through reproduction would be satisfied using the momentum of man's propensity to excel. This is why the world of work inevitably swarms with office romances: the qualities and capabilities that earn one promotion—which are, therefore, the qualities and capabilities that ambitious officers shall labour to display—are the very ones that people find sexually attractive. Such qualities include eloquence, industriousness, intelligence, and boldness. So when a man labours to show his boss that he is worthy of a promotion, he also by that same labour ends up convincing some observant, nubile lady in the office that he indeed merits a promotion—but from a stranger to a friend to a mate in quick

succession. This dual potency of the Success Genome was God's own masterstroke in his effort to boost the incidence of sexual attraction and, therefore, the likelihood of reproduction.

As an exercise, you may list down any number of occupations you are familiar with and alongside each of them, write the qualities and capabilities that a person must have in order to excel in it. You will find that the array of qualities and capabilities matched with those occupations differ in some cases but are largely similar across all occupations. You will also notice that the one thing they all have in common is the power to render those who bear them sexually attractive. This supports the point made above that marks of excellence in all fields of human endeavour are imbued with the property of sexual attraction. To put this in another way, all things being constant, the extent to which a person will succeed in life is commensurate with the extent to which they possess the spectrum of sexually attractive qualities and capabilities referred to here as the Success Genome. The bulk of the rest of this book shall dwell on identifying those qualities and capabilities and shall further examine how they may be acquired and the ways in which they may be profitably applied.

When a river embarks on its journey to the sea, it is never aware of the route it will follow nor of the obstacles it will encounter on its course. And it sets out on this journey armed with nothing but its character and the firm belief that despite the countless, nameless barriers that straddle its course, this character shall bear it from source to sea if only it faithfully abides by it. The river's expression of that character of which we speak consists in flowing in the direction of least resistance whatever the prevailing circumstances. Thus does it flow through gorges, under dams, down valleys, and around mountains until it at last comes to disgorge its rumbling waters into the deep and thirsty sea. Let us profit from the lesson in its method: in your onward march to success, always strive like the river to rely on potent character and you will be able, like its waters, to make inexorable progress to a destiny that matches the oceans sparkle for sparkle whatever the obstacles that fate may cast upon your path. The particular character of which we speak that will give you the unstoppable flow of a river as you march to success is character modelled on the Success Genome.

CHAPTER TWO

Unravelling the Success Genome

We saw in the last chapter that the elements that compose the Success Genome can be resolved into three groups: competencies, attributes, and conduct. We have already determined what forms of conduct make us attractive when acting as leaders or subordinates, and so we must now progress to the matter of identifying the particular competencies and attributes that enhance our attractiveness in those same roles.

In primaeval societies, the role of leadership was reserved for the male, and so it was upon his shoulders that the survival and prosperity of his community largely rested. Therefore, for primaeval societies, the greater the number of men they had who were capable of good leadership, the more assured they could be of survival and prosperity.

Now, the attributes that make for good leadership are partly inborn and partly cultivated. For example, intelligence is a quality desired in leaders, and it is an inherited trait; on the other hand, persuasiveness, which is another essential quality of a leader, can only be developed through deliberate effort. We may therefore conclude that the maximization of the number of leadership-grade men in society is something that can be realized only through reproduction and personal effort.

God, in recognition of this fact and the role of leadership in the preservation of life, contrived to ensure that women should only feel sexually attracted to men who possess the critical attributes of a leader. For if women only mated with such men, the heritable attributes of leaders would be passed on to their children, and the men, in order to win the affections of the women they desired, would always aspire to upgrade their leadership abilities by developing the non-heritable attributes in themselves. In this way the stock of leadership-grade men in society would gradually expand with corresponding benefits to it. For this scheme to unfold as planned, the womenfolk had to be made good judges of leadership material so they could unerringly pinpoint men whose qualities were up to the mark. Accordingly, God planted in the bosom of every woman the checklist of leadership attributes against which men must be weighed in order to assess their suitability as mates. This implies that the women of this world know good leaders by instinct, and it is therefore to their instincts that we must turn if we want to know the competencies and attributes that make for good leadership.