

## **Scientific-moralism and the “selfish” gene: How the human mind so easily interprets nature, when nature is beyond interpretation.**

In a very interesting interview (<http://www.thinkingallowed.com/2krishnamurti.html>), U.G Krishnamurti explains that it is really very difficult for human beings to come into contact with the actuality of the natural expression within human relating. He points out that while we want to express a “fancy label” of “loving relationship” to particular people or situations in our lives we are unable or unwilling to look behind this to see what that is actually all about. He explains that what we call a “loving relationship” can so easily turn into a hateful or violent situation when that which we want for ourselves is denied. When there is a denial of particular situations or specific “rules” whether tacit or spoken that are “broken”, a relationship that was deemed “loving” and “complete” is seen as being “unfulfilled” and “broken”.

Very often in looking at the true nature of humans there is a duality in what we wish the human to be like, based on “good” or altruistic ideology, and what we see as “bad”/ “sordid reality” of a natural “beast” which is ultimately set on destruction of that which is “good” in society. However this is a misconception of the reality of the nature of the human being.

While Richard Dawkins’ book “The Selfish Gene” described the nature of innate “selfishness”, what is not seen is the broader picture of this expression. We are told of course that “selfish” is a metaphor in this context, but how can it really be possible to free ourselves from the drive to use these words, these words meant what Dawkins felt when he saw the genes and here in lies the beginning of bias. Dawkins makes the point which is undoubtedly true that the gene, which interestingly could be another word for “energy” or even “spirit” in ancient terms, is basically the direction of nature and so the human body has no other direction than to follow the genetic process of life. However, Dawkins goes further and describes that the organism is driven to Darwinian “success”, meaning the crushing of those weaker than oneself, and also of selfish focus upon those who maintain or exemplify its genetic material. In other words this kills the ideology of altruism that is innate, there seems to be no possibility of a “loving” world. However this view of the human being is unpalatable for Dawkins and for everyone else, for them it seems that the human mind has evolved beyond the mere functionality of the bodily genetics and so in a way the human mind can now fight its own genetics. In the BBC’s “Beautiful Minds” series (here: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=C2I8f4lpBLU>), Dawkins states that he would not want to live in a world based in purely what he published in “The Selfish Gene” because to his mind that would be a hellish world of political havoc, in fact a kind of animalistic anarchy. He asserts that...

*“While I am a passionate Darwinian who believes that it’s Darwinian natural selection that’s given us our bodies and our brains, I also believe that our brains have become big enough that we can rebel against that.”*

This statement is perhaps one of the best explanations of how deluded the process of the modern human mind can be at the height of so-called scientific integrity. The first bias is in the process of instigating and observing nature, in Dawkins’ case that he sees something he does not like about the nature of the human being. This is because it is viewed through a securitization, not just observed. His view of nature is so

limited that what he can see in the genetics and behaviours arising from them, seem to him to be “selfish”. He applies a moralism without really seeing it. To him the human is in the “glorious” position of being able to “go beyond this”, that in fact the human mind is something that now attempts to rebel against its own genetics...! This “mind” that essentially has created the entire human-delusion and all the suffering in the world is not a position of cure, it is the dis-ease.

Could it possibly be that we can't see the whole picture? What if we get rid of the idea of “selfishness” altogether and instead look at the situation whereby the human organism is a “puppet” of nature, a body animated by nature. In order to understand one finger on the hand of nature and its direction, one would need to get a sense of the whole thing. If all we can do is judge behaviour via a moral code of conduct that fights against nature then is it possible that it is our moral code is an aberration of nature rather than the natural process? Dawkins is a person who sees only through a narrow window and as a result all his ideology is biased due to the fact that he hasn't got the whole-view of reality. The nature of reality has no-self at work, there is no “ghost” in the machine, not even if we describe the “ghost” as “genetics”. The organism of nature is not fathomable by the mind. By calling it “genes” it is another label for “genie” or anything at all that is mysterious and of unknown intent can go in the slot of “genes”. As there is no ownership of any genetic material from any animal then nature has no knowledge of the lineage that supposedly is “successful” or not... how can there be “selfishness” without a “self”? There is no attempt to be successful in nature, this is all a Darwinian-Dawkins misconception, nature has no intention, no known parameter, it is just response, pure and simple. The direction is unknown. If we imagine that instead of “genes” we call these expressions within our cells “pockets of heat”, as the heat bubbles naturally expand from inside to the outside in a particular pattern, Richard Dawkins et al will all consider this as “natural selection”. Whereas in fact there is no selection taking place it is just things occurring without reason, with no particular direction to them. It seems both genes and God work in exactly the same way...mysteriously.

The point is that what Dawkins becomes afraid of is his own narrow nightmarish dualistic view of nature through the door-frame of his own moral belief system (borne of a Christian social upbringing, deeply and unconsciously embedded), something that isn't actually there, only imagined. Nature has no intention and Dawkins' depiction is that nature that does have intent. Nature has neither altruism nor does it have selfishness it just responds like a magnetic field. The problem is that in Dawkins' view organisms as separate structures, and as a result his world of everything being separate from each other, means that the whole world appears as a process of transactional relationships, every relationship being about the upholding of “myself” based on genetics. However without an actual “self” to uphold, without the genes actually having a “want to survive” the whole argument falls flat. If the genes don't actually want anything but are just responding to life then they have no “selfishness” at all, neither do they have any altruism. They are just responding in a way that human beings cannot fathom because they are not seeing them in the context of “human culture” which is totally dualist and all about a right-wrong of altruism vs. selfishness. The mere fact a scientist can call a gene selfish or altruistic, or not, means that science as a pure observation of nature is thrown out of the window. Instead what we get is moralism plain and simple. Far from being what he considers himself to be, a “rational scientist”, actually the expression is a pure dogmatism of viewing nature

anthropometrically and thereby not seeing the wood for the trees. This is exactly the same as other scientists from the Physics of Richard Feynman to the beautifully media presented poster boys of David Attenborough and Brian Cox...all of them have in common that they are explaining their fraternity's skewed vision of the universe through the cultural conditions they were born into and suggesting that science is "objective"! These are not our eyes and ears of nature, these people are the representation of the total dissection and misperception of nature, and yet we constantly take their word for it.

So the supposed innate "selfishness of the genetics strands" and also rampant attempts to destroy the other strands with malicious intent are all a human perception. There is no intent at all, life and death occurs without a separated-off gene, genie or god as their foundational direction. "Selfish" does not stand for amoral! Also there is no altruism, every time we see one animal attempting to "save" another from the jaws of death, "self-sacrifice" and the like we are witnessing something which is not an altruistic act at all, for there is no innate morality in nature based on "altruism". In the book "The Selfish Gene" we get the impression that the genes are selfish in innate intent so there is no real altruism possible genetically, i.e. this is suggesting nature is innately immoral whether Dawkins intends this or not, this presents to us his state of mind. This is why Dawkins is so happy to deconstruct religious practice, which of course is very easy. But in his deconstruction of dogma he must also realize his own, in that his disdain for what he has found and the ideology that one needs to "rebel" against the forces of nature (that are currently underpinning all of life) via the madness of the human mind is a totally ridiculous notion. This means that Dawkins' "selfish" ideology is indeed deeply unscientific and laced with his own morality, he sees selfishness as opposed to what is "right" being "altruistic goals".

Surely nature is more intelligent than that....? This is what brings us to faith and God...the true naturalist can get a sense that life is bigger than we know and then we are able to realize that we haven't got a clue and the human mind sees only through a deeply narrow window of expectation.

*"When we try to pick out anything by itself, we find it hitched to everything else in the universe."* - John Muir, Naturalist

The reality of genetics and why something happens the way it does, is an absolutely unknowable question and on that Dawkins' postulations actually don't add up... Darwin's "natural selection" is a secular term for "God", especially as the natural section issue is looked at through selfish vs. altruistic terms. This is the very language of religion, not of observational pure-science. In order to really see we have to have no question in the mind building an intent towards a specific goal, no looking to find something. When nature impresses on us then we get a taste of it.

U.G is such an expression, he points out the madness of both religion and science as being part of the same continuum. When there is no judgmental language being used and if we are going to say there is no creator or personalized "God" as Dawkins wishes to, then we also must understand that nature cannot be called a God in these terms either and we must realize that natural phenomena have no innate intent whatsoever, there is no direction or process that nature needs to follow or wants to achieve, no success or failure.

In society and in relating to one another we see all kinds of things that could be judged as being selfish, bad, dirty or just plain “wrong”, but when we stop the judgment about nature and are just part of it then we are vehicles of an energy we can never know the whole of, as we are fingers of a much larger hand. What is killing the human off is the intent to find out and to judge and securitize and unravel, for in this process the whole content of nature is made a mockery. There is no divine plan but neither is there a divine scientist observer, they are both biased by the contracted-mind through which they look at the world. There is no success or failure in nature, no right and wrong or up or down. This is something that is missing from every level of understanding human behaviour. What we see as self-serving or transactional relationships, of us doing something because of what we slimily are “getting” from it, it’s not “me” getting, it’s nature that’s doing the whole thing. There is no responsibility held by a “self”, there is just a response of nature that lives through us. If we deny and contract up these natural desires and senses the pressure and pain will build up until it finally breaks out in a form of violence, a manifest freedom, not of “me” but of life busting out of fiction.

Our focus is on the human brain which we consider to be an “interpreter” of sensory information, just as we consider genes to be “selfish”. It is this very language which is the error and the foundational misperception with which we constantly engage. When we look at nature we look at it as if it is human society, be it in the behaviour of animals and plants or in the behaviour of the inner workings of the cells of our body. This language, all language in fact, is something that misses the point entirely. Dawkins uses just the same moralism as the priests he condemns to express the nature of genes, which is actually a verification and upholding of religious not pure-observational scientific processes. The nature of the natural human brain is actually like a brick wall. A sense or stimulus is affected like a tennis ball, this hits the wall and the response is the ball bouncing off the wall the way it does. The brain is no more than this, it is not interpretation it is completely responsive, there is no intent. Interpretation requires intent or is biased. However the human condition means that mind and body *seem* separated. In Dawkins’ statement above we see that “selfish” is the description of the genetics of the body and “altruistic” is the process of the “mind”, so Dawkins bathes in the so-called glory of the dualism of body vs. mind, something that is a Cartesian and followed-on Victorian ideology set up in Darwin’s work.

The problem is actually that in science the mind is still seen as the greatest tool, the great interpreter of information, but in fact it sees merely a crack of light through a doorway and is dazzled by it and is then interpreting the world through this dazzledness. While it is so easy to identify the problems of religious dogma, the fact is that most religions have a point of “Unknown” that is usually the core of their tradition. If we take out all the pomp and circumstance of traditions and religious dogma in the end there is “faith” and this “faith” is a realization that the mind cannot go further. Sure, Dawkins can tear down religion all he wants but he will find he is losing his own religion at the same time if he digs deep enough. Inevitably there has to be a realization that the human mind is warped and forms a warped society that cannot be the judge of something as completely impossible to capture as life itself. This would be like trying to pour the sea into a glass jar, you will always be left with the contents of the jar no matter how much you pour in. These “beautiful minds” are

actually limited minds and one cannot enter the limitless through the limited. This therefore forms many of the core realizations of religions all over the world as well as of people without religion or science who sense that the end point of intellectual process and the process of intending to “become” or “do” is worthless. Underneath this there is a realization that there is a greater force at work from which there is no separation.

The last word is from the farmer, Masanobu Fukuoka...

*“The eyes of children looking at pictures see true beauty, but the teacher points to the crayons and paint set and teaches them, “These are the colours.” From that moment on, they lose sight of the true colours. The moment that the grade school teacher tells the children, “This is green and this is yellow,” the children are made to believe that the pigments in front of them, rather than actual colours yellow and green, are the true colours. They think that trees must be drawn with the colour “green.” The light that flows from the green leaves changes from instant to instant so that one wonders whether to depict the green of these leaves in which true God dwells as red, green, or perhaps yellow. Nature moves with such speed that there is no time to capture and draw it. The leaves sing a song and the drops of dew falling from them play music. The moment that teachers tear down the green of nature that is a single fabric of art and music - a harmonious whole of beauty and truth and virtue, and teach it to their students in bits and pieces, the minds of the children are split asunder. They break time up into teaching slots, saying, “Today we will have a poetry hour, a music hour, and a social studies hour.” That is when the eyes, ears, and voices of the children fall apart. The birds seen at first by the children were sacred birds, a harmonious unity of truth, virtue, and beauty. But once the instructor taught the children to look at the birds as biological objects, the moment he showed them how to depict and listen to birds as the subject of paintings and music, the moment that he pointed animals out as objects or moral lessons and taught the children to love the little birds and hate snakes, from that moment, the minds of the children were ripped apart into a thousand pieces. When the mind of a child is dissected, the sacred birds within the child’s mind are dissected and cease to be. Children originally, left as they are, have a true eye for beauty and a heart that resonates with true music. They have conscience that is a morality complete in itself without being taught morality; they follow the will of God and never violate the natural order.*

*But from the moment that children are taught to at school, the birds become mere animals, outsiders. And the self becomes an existence forsaken by God and the birds. The voices of the birds can no longer be heard and the beauty drawn. By explaining love, adults teach children hate. It is doubtful that the teacher is deliberately aiming to broaden knowledge and wisdom useful in separating man from God and nature, in discriminating between and dissecting all things, and in deepening confusion. The mission of the teacher should be to try to unify and integrate nature, God and man; to get rid of the*

*knowledge that drove man from Eden. The proper way is to acquire learning directly from nature that requires no formal studies.” - Masanobu Fukuoka, from “The Road Back to Nature”, p.299*

David Nassim  
11/5/2013