

*V.M.Koshkin*  
**THE NATURE OF THE GOD CONCEPTION IS THE  
INBORN INSTINCT**

Is there any bridge between the Science and the Belief?

The tolerance can be based at the exact demarcation of boundaries. One assumes the presence of the God's Will, governing all Being. At this case all scientific laws are steps approaching the God's Absolute Idea as a asymptotical limit. This way is starting for everyone at the beginning of a life but its finish have to be AFTER one's death. Just AFTER the death one can catch the Absolute Idea if his (her) immortal soul will preserve a possibility as well as a wish for this task. The GOD is The CREATOR OF NATURE.

The self-understanding of a creatures, the human especially, is impossible (in the Goedel's sense). Or it would be insulting for the Creator!

This point of view have no any internal contradictions and is self-consisted really. But no one can cognize the SENSE OF NATURE within an Earth life and thus cannot prove this point of view either for oneself nor for somebody else.

Another way is to try to understand the Being as the Result of the Nature Laws. At this case one have to deliver a model of the conception of the God and the Belief in terms of Natural Science. So one have to propose a model of the GOD AS A CREATION OF THE NATURE. I will try to deliver some arguments for this second choice.

Let us classificcate inborn instincts (IST) of highest animals. First is the INST. 1 of a Self-saving being completely egoistic (E) instinct (EI). INST.2 is an Instinct of the Own-genus-continuation. For binary sex populations this INST.2, being of E-kind of course, possesses some portion of altruistic (A) features. Really! Let me know about even one case of a love story BEGINNING with no any manifestation of a care for a desirable sexual partner happiness! The INST.2 have in its nature not only EI but a share of AI as well. The INST.2 (the sexual love) is a beginning of social collaboration, when two persons have do some common (and pleasant! - you see) task. INST3 is the Instinct of Own-generation-saving, so called parenthood

Instinct. This one is the E-care for own genes of course, but it manifests also the A-behavior including even a death of a parent for children saving. The ENST.4, revealed by famous geneticist Dr. V.P.Efroimson [1], manifests clearly in apes community's behavior when one of the strongest individuals in a herd appears to be ready to risk by his own life for a rescue of a herd. Not his own genes only! I had given a lot of examples of such type of purely A-type behavior of fishes and birds and human in Ref.[2]. It seems the INST.4 (the completely altruistic one) is the peculiarity of all highest animals, not only human or apes.

I had supposed in [2] there have to be the RESPONSE INSTINCTS for all four instincts listed above. You may check this by your personal experience. I have to force your self-observations with one point only. Recollect your childhood, please: you were waiting for parents help at any case. Without exclusions. Absolutely. Your children are waiting for your support as well as you were in your early age. These are manifestations of the RESPONSE INSTINCT N 3 you see - the expectation of a help from parents. Z.Freud and E.Fromm had supposed precisely a child belief for the father's all-mighty and expectation for a rescue in life collisions is the beginning of individual belief for an individual savior.

What is the RESPONSE INST4? It should be the EXPECTATION OF THE SAVIOR which is not a parent but somebody strong from a population.

I'm sure Nobelist Dr. B.D. Josephson is right claiming a religion gathering great masses at the base of the internal, just personal calls of everyone have to possess a biological origin [3]. I'm sure also it must have its foundation in a genetics and is a result of a natural selection. But what is a strange mechanism, leading to such peoples movement, gathering enormous masses, and using just wishes and brains of each person (if one wants — their souls)? I believe the origin of humanity as well as other animals world is the same. Thus one must build the model of religion lineage using the common fundamental properties of beings taking into account peculiarities of humanity appeared at highest levels of the evolution.

The Josephson's considerations are based at the assertion that if the religion is so widespread, it would be advantageous for humanity surviving. But any religion is the Bill of Duties (not for Rights!), the rules for behavior in the community. Thus we have to analyze just behavioral, the ethological features of populations. Of course, those ones were elaborated and "printed" by evolution in genes. These basic ethological features are instincts. The part of them ensures a surviving and reproduction of a genome of a given individual. These are EI.

But precisely the existence of AI in highest beings populations is the deep root of any religion. It is easy to believe even without special proofs that an A-behavior appears to be advantageous for the population surviving at least in circumstances being crucial.

I know of course the brilliant logics of Dr.R.Dawkins in his famous "Selfish Gene" [4]. But I as to me, his explanation of parent's (and especially herd's or family's) sacrifice seems to be not too convincing. I'm sure roots of self-regulation of human as well as animals communities are quite more complicated and include some psychology - physiology mechanisms providing a prosperity of population as a whole. The phenomenological logics of N.V.Timofeev-Resovskii as well as a lot of physiological manifestations of somatic changes of individuals determined by a brothers-in-blood surrounding seems to be more preferable for me at least as to a role just of populations but not individuals only as a unit of evolution process.

A lot of years ago I had discussed when and why the conventionally weakest in a population at given circumstances become the future of a population [5]. It is one of reasons (precisely "population reasons"! ) why in any cruel competitions of sexual selection in the animals world there is absent (or almost absent) the mortal results.

The presence of AI (help for weakest by strongest) presupposes a RESPONSE INSTINCT, the passive one, just an expectation for a defence. This expectation appears in extraordinary circumstances for individual when he (or she) cannot save him/herself using own possibilities and "printed" as well as EIs in genes. The expectation of a help, of a rescue is the waiting for a savior. This RESPONSE INSTINCT is to be inborn as well as all others. It can be interpreted, if one wants, as an extrapolation of an instinct of a child by Z. Freud words mentioned - the passive response instinct for the parents' instinct. But the origin of all human Belief, based at existential everyone's child experiences seems to be less consistent comparing to the appeal to innate instinct of everyone to ask the rescue from somebody, not parents for the explanation of so uniform property of humanity as the Belief.

A savior described is still not a god, but only a more strong individual from the same herd or family. He is from flesh and blood. This one is the real person - mighty, but not almighty. The growing of a humanity determines interrelations inside a population to become more wide and more and more complicated. So the person of a possible savior became more and more uncertain. And at the ecstatic call for a help an individual appeals to Somebody from a population, not personally, but to the population as a whole. It is the call to community. This nonpersonified Savior is now the Lord. This is just individualized view of a personal Savior. But due to the very important human achievement to express fine emotions by words (and then by written words), the humanity obtained the generalized conception of the God. In this sense the God is the invention only of the human society. It is, to my opinion, the Nature of the God's conception. The Conscience is a measure of a strength of ALTRUISTIC INSTINCTS of each of us. The Belief, to its turn, have the response AI4 in its foundation. The God is the Symbol of a helplessness and hopes of everyone in the hostile world. So the God - Savior is the generalized Symbol of the response AI4. The conception of the God is the sequence of the Nature. That is what I think. But I understand you may and can have some other point of view. It has the equal rights for existing. I hope my one too.

I will omit here some passages as to the other side of all the gods in any monotheistic religions, precisely on the role of gods as the creators. Really, any all-mighty essence has not to be divided to two (or more) parts: the God-Savior and the God-Creator have to be the same. The greatest achievement of all the World Religions is the gathering of all governing and life determining forces in the One God Essence.

Trying to investigate the dialectics of human as well as animal instincts, one can reveal not only a sympathetic AI of populations but also some anti- altruistic instincts which manifestations are growing in dense populations. Those lead to gatherings of great masses of people believing for the same Symbol AGAINST different great masses believing for the other. This is determined by every individual wish to feel at least a hope for altruistic behavior of nearest surroundings. This is the origin of nations or confessions or classes enmity. The wars seeming to be the fight for the common Symbol is really the bloody fight for each individual feeling of kindness of surroundings. Even the death for this unreliable feeling! But this trend is immortal. This is a short abstract. Some more detailed consideration you can find in Ref.[2] being published in Russian. I hope I will do more comprehensive review in English within the nearest time hoping to discuss the contemporary trends of humanity development as a sequence of inborn individual instincts revealing in the humanity not too altruistic manifestations.

### **References.**

1. V.P. Efroimson/Novyi mir. 1971. N10. pp.193-214 (in Russian).
2. V. Koshkin/Oktyabr'. 1996. N7. pp. 139 - 155 (in Russian).
3. B.D. Josephson/Nature. 1993. v.362, p.583
4. R. Dawkins/The Selfish Gene - Oxford Univ.Press, England, 1989
5. V.M. Koshkin, Yu.R. Zabrodskii, Zhurnal Obschey Biologii, 1980, v.11, N1, pp. 37-44 (in Russian).