

THE LAST FAITH

Karmak Bagisbayev

THE LAST FAITH

A BOOK BY AN ATHEIST BELIEVER

Translated from Russian by Joanna Dobson

CONVERSATIONS BEFORE DAWN

*“And I gave my heart to seek and search out by wisdom
concerning all things that are done under heaven:
this sore travail hath God given to the sons of man to be
exercised therewith.”*

Ecclesiastes

Copyright © 2016 Karmak Bagisbayev
All rights reserved.

ISBN: 1537271229
ISBN 13: 9781537271224
Library of Congress Control Number: 2016914251
CreateSpace Independent Publishing Platform
North Charleston, South Carolina

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Prologue	xi
Part I The Law of Gene Preservation	1
<i>Conversation 1.</i> The Law of Gene Preservation and the Self-Preservation Instinct: Which Comes First?	2
<i>Conversation 2.</i> Gene Preservation and the “Basic” Instinct.	7
<i>Conversation 3.</i> Gene Preservation and Preservation of the Species. War - Revolution - Patriotism - Heroism	10
<i>Conversation 4.</i> Gene Preservation and the Maternal Instinct	18
<i>Conversation 5.</i> Gene Preservation and Abraham	23
<i>Conversation 6.</i> Gene Preservation and the Jewish Phenomenon	25
<i>Conversation 7.</i> Gene Preservation and Monogamous Marriage	27
<i>Conversation 8.</i> Gene Preservation and Homosexuality	30
<i>Conversation 9.</i> Gene Preservation and Reproductive Beauty. Gender preferences and behaviour in animals and humans	33

<i>Conversation 10.</i> Gene Preservation, Levirate, Sororate and the Taboo on Cousin Marriage	38		
<i>Conversation 11.</i> Gene Preservation. Good and Evil, Adultery and Jealousy	41		
<i>Conversation 12.</i> Gene Preservation or Protection of the Offspring? Grandparents and Grandchildren	45		
Part II The Law of Freedom of Choice	51		
<i>Conversation 13.</i> The Law of Freedom of Choice. Homo Eligenti	52		
<i>Conversation 14.</i> Freedom of Choice, Free Love and True Love	64		
<i>Conversation 15.</i> Freedom of Choice and Adultery. Marriage and Divorce. Human Cloning	72		
<i>Conversation 16.</i> Freedom of Choice and the Upbringing of Children	81		
<i>Conversation 17.</i> Freedom of choice. Soul and Mind. Morality and False morals. The Limits of Morality and the Limits of Freedom of Choice. The Genius, the Criminal and the Revolutionary. Why We Love Our Friends. Thou Shalt Not Covet Thy Neighbour's Soul	88		
<i>Conversation 18.</i> Freedom of Choice. Equality and Slavery. Collectivism and Egoism. Revolutions and their Leaders.	103		
<i>Conversation 19.</i> Freedom of Choice, Suicide and Euthanasia	120		
<i>Conversation 20.</i> The Law of Humandynamics as the Main Driving Force for the Evolution of Mankind	125		
		Part III The Last Faith	135
		<i>Conversation 21.</i> God and the Universe	136
		<i>Conversation 22.</i> The Law of Humandynamics and the World Religions.	145
		<i>Conversation 23.</i> How Many Commandments, Two or Ten? Virtue and Sin. Celebrations and Phobias Arising from Gene Preservation and Freedom of Choice. The Last Faith. The Meaning of Life.	150
		<i>Conversation 24.</i> Jesus and Judas	179
		<i>Conversation 25.</i> Jesus Christ: Love or Compassion?	183
		Epilogue. Confession. Forgiveness and Farewell.	187

The physicist Leo Szilard once announced to his friend Hans Bethe that he was thinking of keeping a diary. "I don't intend to publish. I am merely going to record the facts for the information of God". "Don't you think God knows the facts?", Bethe asked. "Yes", said Szilard. "He knows the facts but He does not know this version of the facts."

Hans Christian von Baeyer,
"Taming The Atom"

PROLOGUE

As early as I can remember I have wondered what people live for, what the purpose of living really is. In my earliest memories of childhood I had already begun to question why people are so afraid of dying and why they may suddenly stop being afraid and risk their own lives to save the lives of others.

In my youth, the questions that concerned me most were related to the irresistible attraction all life experiences towards the opposite sex. Why do some people, albeit rarely, make the conscious decision not to procreate? When, how and under what circumstances did the kind of human sex arise, which is free from the purpose of reproduction, a phenomenon that so sharply distinguishes man from animals, for whom sex exists solely as a reproductive

act? Why such “free love”, which was derided for millennia, common among some nations today and not among others?

Why do people get married and why do they get divorced?

Why it is that throughout the world, monogamous marriage has almost entirely replaced polygamous marriage? Why do married partners cheat on one another and why do they suffer jealousy?

Why do we consider some women (or men) beautiful and others less so? Why do parents bring up their children in one style rather than another?

Why is the difference in gender specific education gradually being erased today when traditionally men and women among many peoples and various social strata have always been taught differently?

Why is it that until recently an intolerant attitude towards homosexuality was prevalent, and why are same-sex marriages recognised today in certain Western countries?

Why is virginity in a bride no longer a requirement in a significant part of the world, whereas until as late as the middle of the last century, it was a widespread condition of marriage?

Why are experiments in human cloning banned and how long might this ban last?

Why are almost all religions opposed to suicide? Why is euthanasia still illegal, and why is policy beginning to change in a growing number of countries? Does suicide exist among animals?

Why do we have so many moral rules: do this, do that but don't do this and don't do that? Who invents the rules and why should I comply? Where does our morality originate, in God, or do we make

it up ourselves? And if we do make it up ourselves, to what degree are we free to choose the morality by which we live our lives? How do our moral values change with time? And why has the rate of change so accelerated, that now, in the 21st century, a divide in moral expectations exists not just between father and child, but between older and younger brother. Why is society now adopting different moral values practically on a yearly basis? Why is the line between male and female behaviour so rapidly becoming blurred? Which laws determine the path of the evolution of morality?

Can a world without violence exist? If not, then when does man have a right to express violence and what type of violence is acceptable? What is the source of this right?

During times of revolution and war, why does a person who would otherwise feel an aversion to murder, become capable of killing without significantly damaging their sense of morality? Does man have a right of revolution?

Why is it that in the protest movements of the twenty-first century occurring in the United States, Europe, the Arab East, Asia, the Ukraine and Russia, we no longer see examples of undisputedly charismatic leaders, the type of which have appeared over several millennia at times of the world's most significant social movements? Why do we no longer see strong spiritual movements which are attractive and accessible enough to appeal to large segments of the general public? Why is the spiritual authority of all the world religions in such rapid decline?

How and when did patriotism emerge and why is it losing ground today, especially among the younger generation?

Collectivism emerged with man's very appearance on the planet and has over time played the same role for mankind as the herd

instinct has played in the animal kingdom, namely, survival of the race or species. So why is it that since the Renaissance collectivism has gradually been slowing down the processes of change that initiate human development? Why is it, that as of the 20th century, collectivism has become a great source of evil and can generally be seen to be relinquishing its position ever more freely to individualism, particularly in the West. Why do we consider Western countries more “advanced” and by which criteria do we measure “advancement”?

What is Love? Why do we no longer hear about the kind of love shared by Romeo and Juliet, Tristan and Isolde, Layla and Majnun? Can this kind of love still exist today? If not, then why not?

People are born with very different intellectual, spiritual and physical abilities. So why do we insist that we are all equal? In what context are we equal and what is the source of our equality?

Why is man such a curious creature? Why has man experienced the urge to create ever since his appearance on earth and why does he continue unremittingly to develop the sciences and the arts? What is a genius, a revolutionary, a criminal? What do these different types of people have in common? How are they different?

What is friendship and why does it occur?

Why are young adults so eager to leave home and achieve independence from their parents even if it means living at a lower level of material comfort?

Why did the colonial peoples living in relative prosperity, rise up and face a deadly struggle for independence in the middle of the last century? And why is it that despite the difficult economic

conditions that followed independence, these peoples did not push to return to colony status?

Why, in spite of everything, is the world becoming more tolerant than it was in previous centuries? What is driving the shifting pattern of greater tolerance in the world?

Why do all nations strive for democracy despite fierce opposition from ruling regimes?

This was the endless stream of questions that besieged my mind: “why”, “why”, “why”...

The body of world classical literature gives the reader a deeper, finer understanding of the motivations for human actions, but no body of literature, neither the Torah, the Bible nor the Quran explains in a simple, accessible way, what drives people to act in one way rather than another...

Meanwhile, having received an education in physics and mathematics, I was amazed by the achievements of Albert Einstein, who at the beginning of the 20th century, managed to unify space, time, mass, energy, and later gravity. Einstein set forth his framework for a unified field theory, something with which physicists continue to wrestle today, and not without some success. In all fairness, prior to Einstein, other great minds had worked continually in an attempt to unify the knowledge that had accumulated in their day. For example, Isaac Newton succeeded in creating classical mechanics by combining his great laws of the fall of a ripe apple, the flight of an arrow, and the movement of the celestial bodies. J. von Mayer united what in his time had been thought to be independent concepts of mechanical and thermal energy, and set forth his hypothesis for the general law of conservation of

energy. J. K. Maxwell brought together electricity and magnetism for the first time.

The various conservation laws of physics are essentially laws of unification and work to fully unify all the branches of physics continues to this day. The periodic table of chemical elements (D. Mendeleev et al.) combined all contemporary knowledge on the chemical elements into a single table by studying their common stable properties. At the same time as Einstein, the Gottingen mathematicians headed by David Hilbert began a course of work which was to be completed half a century later by the French Bourbaki mathematicians. This group succeeded in unifying all the seemingly fragmented branches of mathematics on a single axiomatic basis.

When we consider a wide variety of objects endowed with a single given property (the axiom), we may derive all other possible properties (corollaries) possessed by those same objects. Further, considering a narrower part of the original set, possessing other additional properties (the axiom), we find new corollaries, true only of the subset. In other words, we find a subset with a richer range of properties than the original set. For example, defining a rectangle as a four-sided figure with four right angles (the axiom-definition), we may generate another property-corollary being that the diagonal of a rectangle is divided in half at the point of intersection. Further, considering in a set of rectangles a subset referred to as squares and possessing the additional property of all sides being equal in length (the axiom-definition), we may derive a new property-corollary, true only of this subset: the diagonals of a square are not only halved at the point of intersection, they are also mutually perpendicular. In this process, it is important to distinguish

whether an assertion is the equivalent to another assertion, or whether it represents its corollary. For example, one may state that any property of a rectangle is true for a square but the inverse would not be true.

When one observes how scientific minds divide the objects they are studying into smaller parts, singling out primary factors and setting aside secondary factors, one thing becomes clear. It is easier to explore and understand a part than it is to study the whole. Sooner or later, however, one reaches a point at which it becomes extremely difficult for the mind to grasp a huge number of parts that have been examined independently.

However, this is also the most interesting stage of any scientific study because it is at this point that someone will notice a base property common to all the individual parts and succeed in bringing them together again in a single unified theory. Furthermore, at this stage secondary factors can be taken into account which were previously discarded when focus was centred on determining the common properties of the objects under study, rather than the detail of their individual nature. Of this process one could say: “after the time to scatter stones, comes the time to gather them.” In place of many laws, one new law can be written in such a way that all previous laws become a consequence of the new one.

What is the purpose of this process? Well, first and foremost, it is very beautiful! Aesthetics though, are not the only reason for the scientific process of unification.

Unification basically makes material science simpler and clearer and, as a consequence, facilitates qualitative breakthroughs in epistemology, which in turn makes it possible to

predict new objects and phenomena. For example, the prediction of the existence of previously unknown elements such as scandium, gallium and germanium was made using the periodic system of chemical elements. The existence of the planet Neptune was predicted on the basis of Newton's classical mechanics. In addition to the above, a new, more "basic" law helps define the limits to which any previous theory might be applicable and serves to explain any phenomena that exist beyond those limits. For example, Einstein's special theory of relativity explained the behaviour of bodies moving at very high speeds, close to the speed of light, whereas the general theory of relativity explained the curvature of light when passing near a massive celestial body. It predicted the existence of black holes and gravitational waves, phenomena for which Newtonian mechanics could provide no explanation.

The third benefit of the unification process in science concerns the problem of transmitting knowledge accumulated by humanity to future generations. Having consecutively passed through processes of accumulation, classification and theorisation, many sciences had amassed such a volume of knowledge by the turn of the 20th century that it would have been quite impossible to pass on that knowledge over a 4-5 year period of university education without creating basic general theories. It is not surprising that by this time the notion of the scientist-polymath had all but disappeared. Although the tendency towards generalisation arose with the very emergence of science, it was only in the 20th century that along with the other reasons mentioned above, it became an end in itself.

There is also a fourth reason why scientists search for the most basic, most fundamental laws of the natural world from which all

others derive as a consequence. This reason is, in my opinion, the most important to those who devote themselves to the search and it lies in the following: When a man discovers the most basic laws of the universe, he experiences an increasing intimacy, if not a full "interconnectedness" with the mystery of creation; he experiences his "God-likeness". The Bourbaki construction of mathematics on a single axiomatic basis was later termed the "bourbakisation" of mathematics. Russian physicist Y. Kulakov and his students brought about the "bourbakisation" of physics in the last quarter of the 20th century. The question is, is it possible to "burbakise" the behaviour of living matter, and especially human beings?

This book is an attempt to answer that question.

It is clear that living matter is also governed by the laws of Galileo, Newton and Einstein, but what makes it fundamentally distinguishable from inanimate matter?

Is the simple fact of the self-reproducing nature of living matter sufficient to explain all elements of its behaviour and the meaning of its existence?

And finally, human beings naturally conform to all her laws as an element of living matter, and yet they are still clearly distinguished by something else as well. The question is what? And is this "something else" capable of explaining human behaviour at the level of the individual as well as society?

Why has the individual en masse failed ever to observe (or perhaps been incapable of observing?) the Biblical commandments or indeed any other systematic paradigm? And it is important that we observe them?

Are they divine in nature? What “commandments” would God give to people if He or She¹ were to come down to earth today? Religions undoubtedly proffer consolation to the suffering of the weak but they take their freedom in payment; it is no wonder that in all major religions man recognises himself as a “slave of God”. Rather than limit the individual, is it possible for a “religion” ultimately to release the individual so that they become equal with God? What “commandments” does a person really live by and is it possible to formulate these commandments in such a way that man can actually fulfil them.

Does man really need God?

What is Good? And what is Evil? Is there a simple criteria by which one may distinguish Good from Evil?

Is there any true meaning to life?

In what direction is humanity developing? Is there a comprehensive law that governs the evolution of mankind?

Is it possible to give a clear, simple answer to all these questions?

It is in fact possible!

The book you are reading is neither scientific nor anti-scientific. And although it is written in the form of night-time conversations between the protagonist and God, it is meant to be neither theological nor atheistic. It is perhaps a first attempt to build a simple axiomatic model for the behaviour of living matter, including mankind, which may help us to explain, at least

¹ It is generally accepted by theologians that God is beyond gender. However, it has been traditional to refer to God as ‘He’. Quite reasonably feminist theologians have argued that it is equally correct to refer to God as ‘She’. To avoid controversy some writers choose to use ‘He or She’. For the sake of simplicity, in the text that follows God will be referred to as ‘He’.

as an initial approximation, much of what is happening in the world around us.

Finally, what kind of specialised knowledge is required in order to read this book?

The answer: None!

Who is this book aimed at?

The answer: Everyone!

“If a man’s brother die, and leave his wife behind him, and leave no children, that his brother should take his wife, and raise up seed unto his brother.”

Moses (the Gospel of Mark)



PART I THE LAW OF GENE PRESERVATION

CONVERSATION 1. THE LAW OF GENE PRESERVATION AND THE SELF-PRESERVATION INSTINCT: WHICH COMES FIRST?

“God, considering that You gave the law of self-preservation...”

“I did no such thing!”

“But God, what do you mean? Man and in fact all living creatures fear death more than anything else in the world and are busy desperately struggling for survival!”

“Then why do trout swim to the upper reaches of a river to release their spawn only to die immediately afterwards, giving their flesh as food to help the baby fish survive?”

Why does a swallow fly at the very tip of a fox’s nose risking its own life to draw the predator further away from its nest of chicks? Similarly, why does a female wolf deliberately place herself within shooting distance of a hunter to draw the threat of danger away from the den where her cubs lie hidden?

In a fire or earthquake, why is it that people will do whatever it takes to carry their child to safety without hesitating for a moment and often sacrificing their own life in the process?

Why do male marsupial mice copulate so frantically on reaching adulthood, fertilising one female after another to the total abandonment of food and rest, only to die as a result of complete physical exhaustion? If the males did survive they would represent competition for the next generation in the battle for food over a limited area.

When female daddy long-legs produce hatchlings, they bring their own life to an end by offering their body to the offspring as their first food victim.

I can go on giving more examples if you like?”

“Thank you Creator, that’s enough. I see your point!

You gave a law according to which all living creatures, plant, animal and man, strive to procreate and protect their own kind.

And in producing offspring, in other words, in passing on their genes, the parents devote the rest of their lives to preserving them, providing food, protection and education aimed at enabling their offspring to adapt to their natural and social environment, until such time as they in turn can survive independently and procreate.

This is the real law, because it functions everywhere, always and without exception!

Let’s call it the Law of Gene Preservation.”

“You can call it whatever you like.”

“Thank you. And God, may I now add my own example which You might not have heard of yet?” “Wise guy! OK, fire away!”

“In 2012, scientists from the University of Minnesota showed, that more than a billion years ago, the first multicellular organisms on Earth, sacrificed their cells for the sake of procreation². The same thing occurs in all organisms including the human body. There are cells which live exclusively to help the sperm and eggs transmit DNA to the offspring. Man lives for the same purpose as his cells.”

² Peggy Rinard. University of Minnesota biologists replicate key evolutionary step. *University of Minnesota*. [Internet] 17 January 2012. <http://discover.umn.edu/news/science-technology/university-minnesota-biologists-replicate-key-evolutionary-step>.

“And you are undoubtedly quite successful at it!”

“I am doing my best, God! It seems to me that in order to fulfil the Law of Gene Preservation, living matter will not only sacrifice itself willingly, as in the examples You gave, but will also rush to fulfil the law when it senses an external mortal threat. I can give You several examples.”

“Let’s hear your examples then. I’m listening.”

“More than 7,000 years ago the Chinese noticed that when the marshlands drained and the land dried out, the wild rice growing in the marshes would begin to bear fruit and give many times more grain than usual just before the plants withered and died. In other words, ‘sensing’ a mortal threat, the rice was compelled to produce and scatter a maximum number of grain-fruits in order to fulfil the Law of Gene Preservation before dying!

The same thing happens with tuberculosis patients. It is a well-known fact that at the peak stage of illness the patient’s libido increases dramatically.

The same thing happens to a person in the morning when they are suffering from a severe hangover, in the anticipation of death, as a certain poet once joked.

A similar phenomenon was observed among emaciated inmates dying in Nazi concentration camps during World War II.”

“Yes, that’s true.”

“There are endless examples of this in nature.

In bee colonies the male drones die immediately after intercourse. They leave their sexual organ in the queen’s womb, in an attempt

to stop other males from gaining access and leaving their own gene inside. In other words, even in the throes of death, the male protects his genes.

In other insect communities, such as grasshoppers and spiders, the female devours the male immediately after copulation which ensures that she receives enhanced nutrition essential for her to bear her offspring. You could say, that in giving of their flesh, the male contributes to the care of the future offspring.

I understand now Lord. *The self-preservation instinct with which we began our conversation, is not a law. It represents a consequence of the Law of Gene Preservation. It is essential to the law’s fulfilment and will yield to the Law of Gene Preservation, rather than come into conflict with it.* I used to think that animals could not commit suicide though.”

“It is not suicide. It is self-sacrifice for one reason and with one purpose only, that it preserve its genes. It is a gene preservation instinct!”

“Now I understand, Lord, why when my mother had brought up her children, when they were old enough to stand on their own two feet, she said she was no longer afraid to die.

And Lord, I also understand why people say that there is no greater sorrow for any living being than to suffer the death of an offspring.”

“Your understanding of the Law of Gene Preservation has begun to deepen.”

“There is one more question though, that I’d like to ask you today, Lord. What made You give the Law of Gene Preservation to all living things?”

“Do you really think you would be standing here before me today if it was not for this law?”

“Sorry, that was a stupid question.”

“Don’t worry. Until tomorrow then.”

“Until tomorrow? Thank you God.”

CONVERSATION 2. GENE PRESERVATION AND THE “BASIC” INSTINCT.

“God, is that You?”

“Of course. Do you have anything you would like to ask me today?”

“Yes. Today God, I would like to ask you about what we call the sexual instinct, or the basic instinct, or even the instinct of procreation, which people believe You gave to all living beings as a law of nature.”

“I don’t know what you are talking about. What are you referring to?”

“For as long as anyone can remember people have been thinking about it, writing novels, painting pictures, producing films, carrying out heroic feats and great crimes all in the name of this instinct.”

“And still and I do not understand what you are talking about.”

“Well, according to this instinct, all living beings of the opposite sex, even including plants, are drawn to have intercourse with each other, as a result of which Your Law of Gene Preservation is realised. So, perhaps this means that the Sexual instinct is primary and the Law of Gene Preservation is secondary?”

“Now I see what you are getting at...”

What you call the basic instinct is simply a means to realising the Law of Gene Preservation! Some of the simplest organisms and plants know nothing about the sexual instinct but that does not stop them from multiplying! There’s cell division, vegetative propagation, budding, and so on.

As far as the basic or sexual instinct is concerned, it is simply a starting mechanism for the realisation of the Law of Gene Preservation.

Take animals for example! They only copulate at a certain times in the year and purely for the sake of gene preservation. It is only man who has over time become more cunning about the matter. Nonetheless, even human beings get married eventually and apply their 'sexual instinct' directly with its true purpose of preserving their genes. You see?"

"Yes, Thank you, I see now."

"What do you see?"

"I understand now that the basic instinct is not primary but simply serves as a trigger for the Law of Gene Preservation. It is its point of departure so to speak. The gene preservation instinct in parents actually works much longer, right up until the moment that the offspring are capable of independent survival and reproduction.

Now I can cite my own example to illustrate the supremacy of the Law of Gene Preservation over the basic instinct.

Zoologists have recounted the following case about the lives of wild animals. In a family of wild Indian tigers a mother-tigress died, and the father-tiger took full responsibility for the upbringing of their two small cubs. At this time, a 'girlfriend' came to visit him, a tigress in heat from a neighbouring valley, who he had visited previously with the sole natural aim of mating. Sensing a possible threat to the cubs from the approaching guest, the father-tiger adopted a fighting stance and with a menacing roar drove the uninvited neighbour away, his whole appearance indicating that he was prepared to enter into a deadly battle for the sake of his offspring. It is only now God, after

your explanation that I fully understand the father-tiger's behaviour. He overcame his basic instinct for the sake of protecting his genes."

"You are picking up more quickly now. This is encouraging. Until tomorrow then."

"Wait, I have remembered another example, along the same lines from the life of African lions. It is a well-known fact that once a lion has driven away or killed the alpha male and taken over a pride, it will eat its predecessor's pups. This occurs when the mother-lioness is away hunting, otherwise she would engage the male lion in a deadly battle in order to save her cubs. When the lioness returns she sets about a sorrowful and futile search for her missing cubs. Afterwards, she will experience a sudden intense period of estruation and mate with her children's killer. Only now do I understand her behaviour which so shocked me when I originally heard this story. Once she is convinced that her cubs will never return she is ready to conceive again because she must preserve her genes. I can also understand the terrible cruelty of the lion-killer. In killing another male lion's cubs, it acts in the interests of preserving its own genes exclusively. That's all I wanted to add."

"That's a good example. Let's finish there for today."

"Ok, until tomorrow."

"Until tomorrow."

CONVERSATION 3. GENE PRESERVATION AND PRESERVATION OF THE SPECIES. WAR - REVOLUTION - PATRIOTISM - HEROISM

“Hello, God. Why do you always come so early, at dawn...?”

“Because that’s when you wait for me.”

“That’s true. It is in these minutes before the first rays of the sun have appeared, and the stars are fading, one by one, and the sky is beginning to lose its blackness, that I feel a kind of inexplicable excitement, a burning and trembling all over my body. I think I have been waiting for You all my life...”

“What will we focus on today?”

“The species preservation instinct, God, which is thought to be no less fundamental than the Law of Gene Preservation! It is also called the herd instinct.”

“Seriously? And what is it?”

“It is the idea that congregatory species and herd animals including humans, that is, members of the same species, will not eat each other and will come to each other’s aid. For example, adult elephants will rescue calves in adversity even if they are not their own blood. Fighting buffaloes-males will enter into a deadly battle with a pride of lions, in an attempt to rescue the entire herd. Dolphins will work long and hard to save a weak, sick or injured relative constantly pushing them upwards to the surface of the water to prevent them from drowning. In other words, the instinct of conservation of the species is a common action for the preservation of the collective gene. That’s all.”

“Do you understand what you have just said? What is a ‘collective gene’?”

And what do you mean ‘members of the same species do not eat each other’?”

And what about the example you mentioned of the alpha male in a lion’s pride, who came to power, and straight away ate the pups of the ousted leader, despite the fact that they shared a close genetic relationship? Cannibalism occurs in almost all predators when faced with extreme conditions of survival, including man. Herbivores when faced with conditions of hunger will take the last food from a weaker sibling, dooming it to death by starvation, to say nothing of what human beings are capable of.

Herd communities are unstable. They break up and will often fight to the death over food or territory with individuals who were members of the same herd just the day before. And wolves, for example, who regularly come together in packs will just as often break away to live alone or in pairs. Can you guess why animals come together in herds and why the herd breaks up or shall I tell you?”

“I’ll have a go at it myself. It must be Your Law of Gene Preservation again, God.

People and animals come together in herd-communities with their own kind exclusively to a single end. Each individual strives to preserve their own genes but achieving that alone can become extremely difficult or even impossible.

It is easier to find a partner for the realisation of the basic instinct as a member of a herd and so ultimately, the prime principle in

play is still the Law of Gene Preservation. It is easier to defend oneself from a more powerful enemy as a member of a herd. A pack of hyenas, for example, can face down a powerful predator like a lion, whereas an individual hyena would have no chance. In a herd it is easier to hunt and gather large sources of food, which it would be impossible for a lone animal to find. This is the case for lions, wolves and all other herd predators, including mankind.

The unification of human beings into ever larger communities, beginning with tribes and clans in prehistoric times, then nations and states in the Middle Ages, continues today in the process called world globalisation. The reason for globalisation is the same as it was a thousand years ago. It provides the best conditions for preserving one's own gene.

However, the communal existence provided by the herd develops a code of collective behaviour among its members which is required for this type of coexistence to be possible, namely, mutual support and assistance, as we saw in the examples of the elephants and dolphins.

The human collective behavioural code has acquired a particularly complex form but despite all this, the species preservation instinct instantly disappears when it is no longer necessary or when it conflicts with the Law of Gene Preservation, which remains the dominant factor in any set of circumstances.

Usually the entire herd serves to preserve the gene of the dominant family, helping to raise its offspring. But as soon as a non-dominant male tries to realise its own Law of Gene Preservation and approaches the harem of the dominant male, it will be immediately

expelled from the herd or even killed by the dominant male, who fearing the intrusion of a foreign gene into his harem first and foremost perceives a threat to the preservation of its own gene. Young sexually mature males tend to drop out of the herd, exercising their own right to gene preservation. No herd can prevent them doing so, however strong their bonds.

Here you can see, that *the Law of Gene Preservation is primary, and the species preservation instinct is secondary.*"

"I am glad that you understand the difference."

"I would like to point out though, that when the severity of external circumstances makes individual gene preservation impossible, the living organism will sacrifice itself in order to preserve other closely related genes. For example, in conditions of acute food shortage, the predatory bacterium *Myxococcus xanthus* aggregate in the millions to form a 'fruiting body.' Only the bacteria positioned at the interior survive, the rest perish. Biologists call this 'natural altruism.'

We can see from this example that the Law of Gene Preservation can function purely as a species preservation instinct while remaining its principal cause, whereas the species preservation instinct would not exist at all if it was not for the gene preservation instinct.

Among human beings, the most striking acts of self-sacrifice for the sake of others become the stuff of legend and are remembered for centuries. Judging by its consequences, the most impressive act of self-sacrifice for the sake of others occurred almost two thousand years ago.

And it is with this story that I would like to move on to discuss the instinct of preservation of the species as it exists in the human society.

Often you hear people claiming that this instinct does not work in man, because people are constantly fighting and killing each other. Now that I understand that the instinct for preservation of the species originates in the Law of gene preservation, I realise that this instinct actually works very well among people, it is just that our concept of species is neither static nor comprehensive. It is constantly changing according to circumstance. As a child taking part in street fights I knew for certain that my species were the other kids from my street because being together with them was the only way I would survive, i.e. realise the self-preservation instinct so that in the future I would still be able to fulfil the law of gene preservation. Whilst growing up, a person goes from one species to another, which they either recognise as their own, or they do not, in which case they will try to separate themselves from it.

When an external aggressor attacks a person's homeland they join in a holy war so that together with their fellow countrymen they may save their right to gene preservation. At this point a person's species is their country's entire population.

In this case the race-preservation instinct is called patriotism.

When the country's king and entourage or president and oligarchs rob their own people driving them into poverty and injustice, making it impossible for the individual to realise the right You have given them to gene preservation, then the people rise up in revolution. Now the species is a rebellious nation.

In this case, the instinct for preservation of the species is called Revolution.

The smallest, but the most reliable species a human being can belong to is the family."

"Ok, so tell me then, human being, can patriotism be reduced solely to a manifestation of the species preservation instinct, which, in your opinion is in turn an effect of the Law of Gene Preservation? What is the origin of Patriotism? On what is it based?"

"No, patriotism can't be reduced to the species preservation instinct. Patriotism begins with the most primitive living creatures, which mark their habitat and protect it fiercely in order to safeguard their existence, fulfil Your Law of Gene Preservation and pass the area on to their offspring. If the living creature is also a social being then patriotism centres not only on the protection of one's territory but the common battle together with one's herd or pack against external aggressors. Human patriotism also arose in historic times when no other contact existed between alien tribes other than mutual destruction. Patriotism represented a natural consequence of the collective striving for gene preservation."

"You have explained very clearly how patriotism emerged. What else is your human patriotism based on?"

"The foundations of patriotism were strengthened in the communality of language, preferences for the same types of food and clothing, in developed tribal (and within the tribe, family) traditions and rituals, manners, and more specifically views on the

manner and style of behaviour, in adaptation to a shared natural environment and climate, in communal song and dance, in shared culture and art forms and in the difference between this and the rest of the world. Yet the older generation, practically the world over compare themselves with the younger generation and complain that young people are much less patriotic than they. Is this true? And if so, why?”

“Let’s discuss that later, when we look at the evolution of human society more fully. You are not ready for that yet.”

“Ok, God, then I shall move on to the next theme. Now I understand, God, why we people love our heroes so much, why we compose songs and legends in their honour.”

“And why is it?”

“Because in leading us into battle, being the first to launch an attack on the enemy, our heroes do for the rest of us what we cannot do alone; they head the collective defence of the right of every individual to gene preservation.”

“Well, your thinking is generally valid. But are you certain that it is only the protection of the law of gene preservation that motivates you, human beings, to participate in mortal combat, war and revolution? For example, it is mostly young people who take part in revolutions, those who have no children of their own, and are still too young to think about having them. Could there perhaps be some other reason, so powerful that it motivates man to overcome the self-preservation instinct or even the Law of Gene Preservation?”

“It turns out that there is, but what is it Creator?”

“Once again, we will talk about this later when we discover how human beings differ from the animal kingdom. We have talked enough for today. Look, it is light already.

See you tomorrow?”

“Yes, see you tomorrow!”