The question to ponder asks if our primary purpose is survival and reproduction or if there is more to human nature. On the one hand we're created from evolving genes yet we look at ourselves as more than that. I'll argue that we are more than survival creatures since we value more and morality, ethics, and religion play equal roles in human nature.

Richard Dawkins believes that all animals are machines created by their genes for survival (Dawkins, 273). He describes a replicator molecule (DNA) that copies itself and stabilizes our world (Dawkins, 275). These replicators are what have created us as their means of survival and reproduction. Dawkins alludes to the possibility that our awareness of this is what allows us to override the instincts of our genes (Dawkins, 277). Though we may be machines to keep our genes alive, we are more than that.

Our intellectual mind is the root of what more we are. It is from this that the concepts of morality, ethics, and religion form. Genes are static instructions for how we look and what our instinctual reactions are, but our environment and upbringing are more of a determining factor for what we believe. In *Gattaca* a character stated that there is no gene for the human spirit. This is the mindset that I see as defining human nature as being more than just genetics. Maybe our close genetic species kinship ties with monkeys can be further evidence here, as our DNA is similar enough that if we were purely genetic machines we may be more like them, but it is our human spirit and intellect that separates us from them.

Altruism is one part of human nature that seems to disprove any claim that we are purely the creation of genes. In part this is because altruism reduces the

February 2013

chances of survival (Wilson, 265). To see why altruism still exists you must look at kinship. Part of human nature is the nurture of young and care for one another; this is the basic definition of altruism. Altruism, along with the fact that we're relational creatures, forms the basis of our extremely successful cooperative society.

That leads me into where morality, ethics, and religion are rooted. Everyone has their own ideas of what is ethical and moral, but despite that we agree on certain standard assumptions to help glue societies together. Maybe a serial killer would believe that killing an innocent baby is perfectly fine, but society teaches us that this is cruel and punishes those who kill anyone. Likewise religion formed as a way for us to reconcile ourselves with questions that remain unanswerable; it gives meaning to that which has no answers. Were we to have lost the trait of altruism we may not have had the ability to sustain cooperative societies quite the way we have today. Thus as altruism isn't genetic isn't our modern political map evidence that we're more than just our genes' survival machines?

Paul Bloom spends a great deal of time discussing morality, and he posits that the biggest testament to its centrality in human nature is how little we actually discuss it (Bloom, 130). He sees empathy as the start of morality, and human intelligence as what separates us from being just animals. As Dawkins' theory suggests our genes would drive us to be anything but impartial, yet morality depends on us being impartial to ideas (Bloom, 138), and this impartiality is a byproduct of our intellect (Bloom, 139). Ethics is much the same way; it comes about from our intellectual and relational abilities, not our genes. Morality and ethics both define part of human nature because they are further guidelines by which we live

February 2013 2

that aren't statically coded in our genes and are connected directly to the larger meaning we give to life beyond survival and reproduction.

Thus my view on this question is that we're more than our genes keeping us around for their survival. Though lots of what make us up may have evolutionary and genetic starting points there are things like morality, ethics, religion, and even altruism that are not entirely our genes. What these have in common is the importance of our intellect to maintain them. So my conclusion is that our intellect is the most important factor of human nature that isn't purely genetic. I cannot say that intellect is in part genetic, and certainly we are our genes' survival machines, but we are clearly more than just survival machines.

References References

Bloom, P. (2005). Descartes' Baby: How the science of child development explains what makes us human. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Dawkins, R. From *The Selfish Gene*. In David Barash (Ed.). *Ideas of Human Nature*, 272-277. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Wilson, E. From Sociobiology and On Human Nature. In David Barash (Ed.). Ideas of

Human Nature, 264-272. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

February 2013 3