

Professor Dawkins' Gods and Intelligent Replicators

Imre von Soos

Copyright © 2006

There finds itself between my collection of particular pet theories an especially splendid one, coming directly from the lines of the neo-Darwinian brotherhood.

Richard Dawkins, an evolutionary biologist and Professor For The Understanding Of Science at Oxford University, who enjoys the high regard of his mainstream peers both for his writings and his thinking, is an ultra-Darwinist, if there ever was one, even if his "Darwinism" has as little to do with Darwin himself as that of the rest of his clan's.

"It rapidly became clear to me – thus he – that the most imaginative way of looking at evolution, and the most inspiring way of teaching it, was to say that it's all about the genes. It's the genes that, for their own good, are manipulating the bodies they ride about in. The individual organism is a survival machine for its genes."

In his book *The Selfish Gene* he argues that genes are the fundamental units of natural selection, and calls them "replicators." He gives no reason to believe that he doesn't mean it seriously, that organisms, like also ourselves, are the "vehicles" and "propagators" for these "replicators." "Our genes are like a colony of viruses – he says – socialized viruses, as opposed to anarchic viruses. They're socialized in the sense that they all work together to produce the body and make the body do what's good for all of them. ... From the selfish-gene point of view, we are robot survival machines, and because genes themselves can't pick things up, catch things, eat things, or run around, they have to do that by proxy; they have to build machines to do it for them. That is us. These machines are programmed in advance." Their propagation, survival and, I suppose, well-being depends on their ability to make a good job out of building us well for their purposes. "If you pick any hitherto unstudied species – so he – and subject it to minute scrutiny, any evolutionist will confidently predict that each individual will be observed to do everything in its power, in the particular way of the species – plant, herbivore, carnivore, nectivore or whatever it is – to survive and propagate the DNA that rides inside it." They even induce us all to have progenies just in order to have and transport more of them, more of the "replicators". Accordingly, we have a replicator-centric planet, if not universe, and we humans, together with all the other living beings, are but marionettes in the hands and power of our genes. Well, at least we have some purpose after all.

Dawkins forgot to speculate on how marvellously creative and intelligent those tiny deoxyribonucleic acid "replicators" must be in order to be able to design and work out and create all of us various organisms to their liking, each in its appropriate ecology niche within harmonious feeding and symbiotic interrelations, some of us even developed to the extent as to be able to fabricate further vehicles just to ride, drive, ship or fly them about to any corner of the planet, where the little "replicators" can enjoy the sunny beaches and the whole general environment, which, by the way, their kind has also created all for tiny themselves, as the Oxford Professor informs us in his book *The Extended Phenotype*. Hmm, the clever little bastards. If that isn't outright "intelligent design"! And he seriously means it too, and considers it "the most inspiring way of teaching it" to all the young "replicator-propagators" of our species. But this, of course, is best Understanding of Science at Oxford University, science of the highest academic niveau, destined to keep all the "replicator-propagators" of the species *Homo sapiens* well informed in the cimmerian darkness.

Lacking, apparently, the correct comprehension, I fail to reconcile his purposefully, intelligently, interactively and co-ordinately "manipulating" genes, able to produce, and thus producing "survival machines" for themselves in the form of highly complicated "individual organisms", with his neo-Darwinian "randomly error-mutating" genes, lacking all purpose, intelligence, interaction and co-ordination in the process.

My insight does not fail me, however, in recognising the purpose behind all the scientific mambo-jumbo: the dogma-spreading of the nihilist-materialistic neo-religion lacking all rational foundation,

save the negative approach of discrediting the biblical Genesis fable; a feat that any reasonably intelligent child of unobstructed thinking can arrive at all by little himself, without inventing cock and bull alternatives in the process and without plunging right away into an opposite extreme, and also without hooking up all other, to him disagreeable ideas, with that obvious nonsense. But the professor is resolutely set to demolish a fable – addressing, in his latest book, *The God Delusion*, the intellectually less endowed and more jammed subspecies – by placing his key question of "either Jesus had a father or he didn't", apparently expecting a DNA evidence to settle a query, which would be scientific, but quite irrelevant anyway. Relevant are His words and examples as an independent outstanding individual and historical figure, which were powerful enough to uplift that generation and many to follow in many lands, even if those words were misused subsequently by those who organised their power-politics on its inertial force. The fact that very few people care nowadays about what He said, but only about the half-witted notion that He died in order that "man can live for evermore" irresponsibly and immorally, is only due to the inane mentality of a bovine subspecies cunningly manipulated by the mafias of organised religions.

For Dawkins, however, "the question is a scientific one, and scientific evidence, if any were available, would be used to settle it. The same is true of any miracle — and the deliberate and intentional creation of the universe would have to have been the mother and father of all miracles."

Why would "the deliberate and intentional creation of the universe" have to have been more "the mother and father of all miracles", than the actually suggested ad hoc appearance of a dimensionless point in non-time and non-space, containing all the actually existing energy, material and the laws of their being, actions and interactions in itself, which, then causelessly exploding with a big bang, happens to happen, through an infinity of further ad hoc events, into its actual state, including all organic matter, like us? There is no scientific evidence for any of the actually dominating cosmological paradigms, only idiosyncratically translated observational fragments guess-juggled into each other contradicting theories, mushrooming practically daily, but none of them getting even close to "settle the question". The high-priests of scientific dogmas have absolutely nothing over the high-priests of religious dogmas; and neither have their paradigm-sharing communities over each other. And the quite obvious fallacy of either is no proof of the correctness of the other one, even if it is the only trump the two camp is able to raise against each other and for its own justification.

Professor Dawkins fights all non-nihilist-materialist thought through the simpleton 'God-as-an-extrinsic-person' image presented by Moses (the kind who punishes the man who screws his neighbour's wife, and the child who doesn't eat his spinach), with the just as simpleton challenge that "God could clinch the matter in his favour at any moment by staging a spectacular demonstration of his powers, one that would satisfy the exacting standards of science." What a weird suggestion. Even if there would exist an extraneous, personal Almighty there where the wheeling systems darken in that infinity of an Universe, why would He be interested to "clinch the matter in his favour at any moment by staging a spectacular demonstration of his powers", just to convince, consistently with their idiosyncratic "exacting standards of science", some squabbling scientific specialists just about one third up the ladder of local universal evolution, living on a sextillionth fraction of that infinity?

"To be sure, – he admits – we do need some kind of explanation for the origin of all things. Physicists and cosmologists are hard at work on the problem. But whatever the answer – a random quantum fluctuation or a Hawking/Penrose singularity or whatever we end up calling it – it will be *simple*." *Simple* will have to be already the explanation for the origin of "a random quantum fluctuation or a Hawking/Penrose singularity or whatever we end up calling it" before any of their kind can be used as a *simple explanation* for the origin of all things.

"The first cause cannot have been an intelligence. – he states ex cathedra – Intelligent, creative, complex, statistically improbable things come late into the universe, as the product of evolution or some other process of gradual escalation from simple beginnings. They come late into the universe and therefore cannot be responsible for designing it." Beside not existing any scientific evidence about the "origin" of intelligence and creativity, save idiosyncratic guesses, the statement contains the already familiar semantic manipulation, hiding a "deus ex machina" within its lines: "evolution" is a process, not a subject, not an acting agent; intelligence and creativity can be the qualities of a subject, an entity, who can evolve his intelligence and creativity through self-generated action, but not originate them out of nothing. The ex cathedra statement has action and object, but lacks the acting subject, into the role of which the personified concept of a process was manipulated.

Thus personified "evolution" and "natural selection" are "perceiving", "testing", "selecting", "favouring", "intending", "allowing", "making", "producing", "operating", "amplifying" and generally manifesting all mental and physical action necessary to produce, maintain and evolve in dynamic equilibrium the whole planetary life-community. Only *who*, *what* and *where* are, and *when* and *how* have originated those two busy entities, and – primarily! – *why* do they, between themselves,

perpetuate all this infinite pandemonium, is missing from all the highbrow scientific theories, dogmas and credos.

It is worthwhile to study the whole line of deduction of the Oxford Professor, because it contains the arguments actually very much in vogue.

"In the familiar world of human artefacts, complicated things that look designed are designed. To naïve observers, it seems to follow that similarly complicated things in the natural world that look designed – things like eyes and hearts – are designed too. It isn't just an argument by analogy. There is a semblance of statistical reasoning here too – fallacious, but carrying an illusion of plausibility. If you randomly scramble the fragments of an eye or a leg or a heart a million times, you'd be lucky to hit even one combination that could see, walk or pump. This demonstrates that such devices could not have been put together by chance. And of course, no sensible scientist ever said they could. Lamentably, the scientific education of most British and American students omits all mention of Darwinism, and therefore the only alternative to chance that most people can imagine is design.

"Even before Darwin's time, the illogicality was glaring: how could it ever have been a good idea to postulate, in explanation for the existence of improbable things, a designer who would have to be even more improbable? The entire argument is a logical non-starter, as David Hume realized before Darwin was born. What Hume didn't know was the supremely elegant alternative to both chance and design that Darwin was to give us. *Natural selection* is so stunningly powerful and elegant, it not only explains the whole of life, it raises our consciousness and boosts our confidence in science's future ability to explain everything else.

"Natural selection is not just *an* alternative to chance. It is the *only* ultimate alternative ever suggested. Design is a workable explanation for organized complexity only in the short term. It is not an ultimate explanation, because designers themselves demand an explanation."

If you randomly scramble the fragments of a human artefact a million times, you could be lucky to arrive at one combination that would work like that artefact does, because all of its parts were ready in the device in which you have scrambled them, not forgetting, that both the parts and their scrambling were the results of conscious design and willed action. However, none of the fragments, or the genetic information of the fragments of an eye could appear by chance and independently from each other in various generations of a lineage, until, all having been collected and preserve, they happen to scramble-assemble themselves into an eye, once more all by chance, or, as suggested, be assembled by *Natural Selection* – that is, by a "Natural Selector" – with whom we are back at a "doer", a subject, a "Designer", whose "even more improbable" existence begs explanation. Unless all of the fragments, together with the genetic instruction of their assemblage, co-emerge, as so many ad hoc and coinciding genetic mutations, each fragmental genetic blueprint, being senseless and useless by itself, will be cleared out of the chromosomal spiral by repair-genes, right at their occurrence.

The reference to Darwin limps heavily too. What the scientific education of most British and American students should not omit is the study of Darwin and not that of so-called neo-Darwinism. Darwin held that new characteristics were acquired by an organism as a result of environmental influence and then passed on to its offsprings, a theory that has originated from Lamarck. This change, he believed, combined with what he called "natural selection", but called also the "survival of the fittest" (even replacing with it in one of his editions the expression "natural selection"), has resulted in the evolutionary progress in the lineage of that organism. The new characteristic had to be acquired first in its entirety by an organism – that is, the eye, or a more evolved edition of it, had to be already there –, which, if it represented an improvement in surviving, was used and perpetuated by the organism, because *it has made it fitter to survive*. In his *Descent of Man* (1871), published 12 years after the *Origin of Species* (1859), as also in his private letters, Darwin has clearly expressed, that he finds the idea of blind chance "abhorrent"; that he over-emphasized previously the idea of the "survival of the fittest"; and maintained, that "morality is the major evolutionary drive", and held the competitive individual to be the driving force of evolution, entering teleology into the evolutionary process as against blind chance.

And now compare Professor Dawkins' above exposed statements with those of the National Academy of Sciences, also championing the neo-Darwinian paradigm: "*evolution is a tinkerer, not an engineer.*" and "*Genetic variation is random, but natural selection is not. Natural selection tests the combinations of genes represented in the members of a species and allows to proliferate those that confer the greatest ability to survive and reproduce. In this sense, evolution is not the simple product of random chance.*" .. "*Natural selection – a differential, greater survival and reproduction of some genetic variants within a population under an existing environmental state – has no specific direction or goal, including survival of a species.*" Note the aimless *tinkering* of the already discussed personal "Natural Selector", replacing the just as irrational personal Biblical God.

All this boils down to the reality that *Natural selection*, or the "survival of the fittest", or "the strongest dog screws" is the assertion of a *fact of nature* that, due to particular specific rituals serving as means to prove relative individual excellence, only the most capable and the best will propagate; a fact of nature, of which only man has made himself an exception since he has abandoned the tribal traditions, deleting them from his practice, consciousness and conscience, separating himself thus from the Natural Harmony. It is also generally ignored that in order that this fact of nature can manifest, *particular individuals had to evolve themselves into the fittest*, which is an active – self-generated and self-activated – achievement and not a passive ad hoc fluky incident that could have happened to anybody, even if the actual degenerated Zeitgeist – scientific, religious or social – supports the latter. It is just as much ignored that DNA is not an active generating agent, but a passive recording and transmitting one: a genetic blueprint, the intelligent activity of which consists of recording the current state of the organism for the purpose of eventual organismic repair and genetic transmission, and of making self-repairs in case of faulty mutations. And what about the enigma that while "selection towards survival" should work towards fitting better into the environment, true evolution, and not simple survival or adaptive change, is marked by spearheads who entered unto hitherto untrodden, survival-unfriendly roads? a process that slowly splits a species and results periodically in evolutionary splits, all appearing as "punctuated equilibrium". And further: why do the frequencies of saltatory evolutionary changes, and thus evolutionary splits increase exponentially at higher levels, all connected also with increased cephalization, if the common and statistically functioning cause of evolution on any level is but mind-, purpose- and causeless random mutation?

The attribution of personal nature to the abstraction "Natural Selection" – which Darwin never did! – not only does not "explain the whole of life or raises our consciousness", but, together with all the contradictory uses, explanations, and all the fogging and squabbling around, and the knuckle-headed sticking to pet scientific dogmas related to evolution, would hardly "boost anybody's confidence in science's future ability to explain everything else".

As an induction to some fundamental thoughts regarding the origin of the All, and the chronology of consciousness, creativity and intelligence, I can only refer again to, and underwrite Schroedinger, Bohm and Einstein.

Schroedinger speaks of the "individuality" and the "identity" of "our ultimate particles" and of "small organizations of particles as atoms or small molecules", representing, or underlying their "shape and organization", and asserts that "for eternally and always there is only now, and the same now; the present is the only thing that has no end." But to understand this Reality, which also implies that it neither has a beginning, and is thus the womb of the infinite becoming, one doesn't only have to be one of the most outstanding nuclear physicist of the twentieth century, one also must be at a well advanced level of self-generated evolution and expanded consciousness, like was also David Bohm, contending, that "this approach of wholeness could help to end the far-reaching and pervasive fragmentation that arises out of the mechanistic world view. In this flow, mind and matter are not separate substances. Rather they are different aspects of one whole and unbroken movement. .. The ability of form to be active is the most characteristic feature of mind, and we have something that is mind-like already with the electron."

For Albert Einstein "The most beautiful thing we can experience is the mysterious. It is the source of all true art and all science. He to whom this emotion is a stranger, who can no longer pause to wonder and stand rapt in awe, is as good as dead: his eyes are closed."

There is no final goal for evolution, for there is no limit to it. Psychological growth, mental evolution manifested in physical development, is its own goal; each utopia is only a stepping stone that opens the view and the way to new utopias. Each sphere fulfilled, each act completed, turns out to be a fraction of a greater sphere, of an act of greater complexity. Accomplishment, like Joy, is in the way of growing.

The attack against what Dawkins considers his and his mechanistic world's greatest opponent is most emotional and biting, and is, by using the collective pronoun, pretending to talk for "science" itself, or at least for its numerical but not qualitative majority.

"Not only is the god hypothesis unnecessary. – declares he – It is spectacularly unparsimonious. Not only do we need no God to explain the universe and life. God stands out in the universe as the most glaring of all superfluous sore thumbs. We cannot, of course, disprove God, just as we can't disprove Thor, fairies, leprechauns and the Flying Spaghetti Monster. But, like those other fantasies that we can't disprove, we can say that God is very very improbable."

What he fights, in championing nihilistic materialism, is precisely the anthropomorphous, extraneous and personal god-image of the theomorphous western man, intending to prove through its obvious inadequacy, and with the existence of apparently personal "subjects", acting agents, like "Evolution" and "Natural Selector" – all hiding behind the semantic scenes – the non-existence of any

kind of mind-like, conscious, creative, intelligent and rational Underlying Principle and evolutionary process.

Why not respect any man's particular theistic or atheistic credo, regardless how naïve or primitive it may be, if it gives him peace in his evolutionary niche, and doesn't use it as a cornerstone for a rational argument; but fight against all and every one, who insists on forcefully brainwashing their pet dogmas into others, should these be religious or scientific, through schooling or any other field of the public media.

What the Oxford Professor, together with the rest of the neo-Darwinians fighting tooth and nail in the internet discussion forums, has convincingly proven is that scientific paradigm-sharers, materialistic dogmatists and atheistic sectarians can be as doggedly doctrinaire as can the most bigoted onhangers of any religious cult.

What appears to be the aim behind all the materialist – and sadly mainstream – scientific theories, is the advocating of a purposeless and senseless universe, and consequently earthly existence, where chance dominates the human lives, and where random occurrences and ad hoc "selection", "endowment", "favouring" and "privileging" by some disinterested impersonal extrinsic power – deus ex machina – rule the events, and remove with it all the obligations and responsibilities from all the decent and innocent human beings.

The interests of commerce, politics and organized western religions demand, for obvious reasons, the keeping the dualistic paradigm alive, in the service of which also the mainstream scientific community is employed. The scientific support of the worldview of a purposeless and senseless human existence through presenting a purposeless and senseless universe and life in general, helps in tearing down personal sovereignty, morality, and family life, like the third-rate educational system does in the schools.

The lack of personal sovereignty leads to mass-behaviour and pliability in the hand of the political and religious potentates, while the melange of aimless existence and materialism spawns material-mindedness, compulsive consuming, and transforms the values from education and culture to material possessions as status symbol. The materialist credo became, due to self-protective psychological rationalization, a religion as dogmatic and as full of bigotry as are the most obsessive ones of them. Profoundly integrated into the consumer society and its indoctrinated irrational social, political, religious and commercial irrationalities, mainstream scientists follow its circumscribed course, banning, even from the back of their thoughts and thus from their work and theories, anything and everything that would hurt the feelings of this society, and consequently close the taps of their research funds. But – and I have to stress this fiercely – the giants of past and present scientific and philosophical thought, the individuals of all scientific progress, whose spirituality and global vision developed out of their scientific knowledge, stand behind the idea, or rather, the knowledge, expressed concisely by the Nobel laureate biologist George Wald of Harvard: "The stuff of the universe is mind stuff." This, however, leading to a holopatheistic view, suits neither the materialists, nor the western organised religions, and globalising commerce even less so.

SesquIQ is a high IQ+SQ society with high ethical standards and with holistic and planetocentric (as opposed to reductionistic and anthropocentric) philosophical and scientific orientation. Contributing authors and critics are expected to stand with their names and rationality behind their statements.

Site Pages

[SesquIQ Home](#)

[Answers to IQ Questions](#)

[Free IQ Tests](#)

[High IQ Society Links](#)

[Information Page](#)

[Library](#)

[Sensory Research Project](#)

(\$100.00 is to be awarded to the participant with the best answers.)

Essays

[Thoughts on the Neo-Darwinian Theory of Evolution](#)

[Reactions to the essay of *A Strategy for the Future of Humanity*](#)

[Thoughts on Engineering Design](#)

[Cancerous Masses and Manifestations](#)

[Definition of Ethics, Morals, Virtue, and Quality](#)

[Definition of IQ](#)

[Environmental Sustainability](#)

[The Four Horsemen](#)

[The Integrarchic Society](#)

[It's Not the Speed, It's the Stupidity](#)

[Joe](#)

[Natural Order - Universal Relativity \(HTML\)](#)

[Natural Order - Universal Relativity \(PDF\)](#)

[Playing the Game](#)

[Professor Dawkins' Gods and Intelligent Replicators \(PDF\)](#)

[The Rational Evolution of the Specie](#)

[Thoughts on Absolute Reality](#)

[Thoughts on a New Image of Man](#)

[Thoughts on Dr. Stanley Milgram's Experiment](#)

[Thoughts on Education](#)

[Thoughts on Responsibility](#)

[Thoughts on the General System Theory - \[1 \]](#)

[Thoughts on the General System Theory - \[2 \]](#)

[The Unsustainable Degradation of a Runted Species](#)