

THE FATAL GENE /
UTOPIA GENEALOGICA

NAUTILUS.UNIVERSE

2016

Lisa Magnusson Bakersund

translation Anna Galt

The warning signal

We are currently experiencing a silent wave of protest at the gates of Europe. The call **“Refugees Welcome”** passed like a jolt throughout all third world countries that have been rattled by crisis and bombed to destruction. Thousands are responding to the call every day. The dam has been broken. Every day, thousands of people set off on the great journey towards the north and no danger, no sea, no storm, no border fence and no rumour will stop them now.

We are experiencing an influx of refugees from regions of hardship and war in North Africa and the Middle East never seen before who are flooding into wealthy Western European democratic countries and stoically demanding to their share in the wealth of the society of surplus.

Until now, Western economic nations have always managed to regain control and secure their hegemony using robust crisis management and clever political alliances. But the mood has turned sour. The geopolitical interests of the actors on the world stage are clashing violently with each other. Stronger autocratic regimes and new tiger economies hungry for resources are staking their claims.

Military interventions have been leaving a bitter taste in the mouths of those who have **been “liberated” for a long time now. And the schools and hospitals riddled with bullets** flicker like ghostly tabernacles on our TV screens every night. They are burned deep into our collective consciousness.

The flag over the ‘commonwealth’ still flies before sundown. GROWTH is still written there in large letters. But it is stained and tattered in the twenty-first century. The good old times are not coming back. We look away in shame or act as if it is nothing to do **with us. But can the “Golf generation” sacrifice its shiny chrome way of life?**

There is resistance both inside and outside of us. The moral scruples of affluent citizens cast long shadows in the glass facades of their glossy metropolises. For the third world is vehemently forcing itself into our awareness and our news reports. How long more can we look in the mirror in the morning with a clear conscience and talk down the gaping wound in our hearts?

The curse of humanity

There are many ideas about how to overcome the evil this world suffers from. The existential hardship in the poorest regions of the globe – the lack of food, water and basic medical care, the lack of basic rights, the permanent fear for survival in those troubled regions it seems cannot be subdued – that is what drives people to leave their homes and demand their most fundamental human right to life in the rich countries.

Do the rich countries have the capacity to take in all of the world's people in need? Will "Fortress Europe" fire at refugees? The waves of refugees will only be stopped without violence if the rich countries finally become willing to share a portion of their wealth. "Basic income for all!" is one of the ideas that have recently been ignited in many people's minds. Another is the demand for "fair trade", or much rather that of a "fair prosperity", equal opportunities in economic development for the entire human community, not just a few privileged, well-armed industrial nations. How can the exclusivity, with which the technologically advanced minority defends their way of life, be justified in future? "America first"? What moral privilege can we use to back this up?

Are a European's human rights worth more than those of an African?

Is there a human right to wealth? The desire for it is perfectly understandable, since it is one of life's basic impetuses, shared by all the individuals on our planet.^(Note 1)

A redistribution of our world's wealth appears to be unavoidable from a moral perspective.

If we want to defuse the smouldering powder keg, heal the body of humanity that is bleeding from so many wounds, we must overcome the "clash of cultures"!^(Note 3)

[We human beings must cease to view the world from our conflicting economic, ethnic or religious value systems.](#)

We must think as a collective species!

Wars have always been waged for economic interests. And these were always the interests of the political or religious elites, who slyly disguised them so they could write them on the flags of the common man and so that the common man believed they were his own ideals and that he was fighting for a just cause.

No human being voluntarily takes part in a military invasion if it is not suggested to them beforehand. No human being just decides to blow themselves up. It is foreign to the nature of the individual to defend abstract, ideal values like freedom, democracy or faith and to risk their own lives in the process, if it does not directly serve to protect their own existence and that of their offspring. People want to live and be with their families and friends. Yet people also allow themselves to be manipulated and are prepared to do horrific things if they think it will protect their community.^(Note 1)

In fact, it is even evident that people without property and without the right to **participate in society's wealth are not good soldiers, because the manipulation of their identity, their patriotism and their willingness to sacrifice themselves does not work.** If you do not give the poorest people in society the tiniest ray of hope that they can participate, then they will have no hope at all. They have nothing to defend.

Hope is a light in the darkness. **It is the idea that one's own fate can be changed for the better. The feeling of hope is always connected to a person's existential plight or that of their loved-ones.** Once the danger has been averted, the feeling of hope disappears, for it is no longer needed. The poorest people do not know what hope is, but neither do the privileged.

People with prospects of a small amount of wealth and personal happiness are the more passionate soldiers, both in developing countries and industrial nations. They are easier to seduce, because they must always fear that someone, whoever that enemy may be, could take their small amount of prosperity away again. They know the misery of those who own nothing, which privileged wealthy citizens do not. The more fragile their small amount of happiness is, the more heavily it weighs upon their shoulders. This fear clouds their judgement and makes them blind to the real danger.

Ethnic and religious differences between people make it easy to construct images of "the enemy". People with hope are easier to manipulate and instil hatred for each other in.

Military interventions in far-flung countries display a similar pattern to plundering campaigns and their motive is not economic hardship, but the prospects of ownership and economic gain. Throughout history, hardship has always caused people to set off on these journeys themselves. Out of hunger for power, they send their rapid reaction forces, drones and soldiers of God.

The mechanisms that lead to the outbreak of today's geopolitical conflicts are not "wars of liberation", nor the protest of the people's souls, born out of hardship. They are all about the increasingly scarce natural resources on our planet. Seven billion hungry mouths, which love prosperity, are simply too many! Once there were spacious buffer zones between cultural communities, today they are violently clashing.

Today's geopolitical conflicts are a battle for spheres of influence, ultimately for the economic interests and political power of competing economic or religious value systems.

If we gave the destitute Palestinians in the West Bank a basic income, they would not give up their claim to the Holy City. But surely it would relieve some of the pressure, for the more wealthy shop-owners in the Muslim quarter of Jerusalem are less radical than their fellow Muslims in Bethlehem or Ramallah. However, they would still mercilessly oppose each other, both the Israelis and the Arabs, whether they had a basic income or not.

It's no different in the Ukraine, in Syria, in Iraq, in Yemen, in the South China Sea, in all the hot spots in the world. It's about this: who put their foot on this piece of land first? Who can stay and who has to go? Who owns the pastures, the plantations, the fishing grounds, the water resources, the oil fields, the rare soil? Who can gain access to our world's natural riches via corrupt despots and mining rights? Greed. That little word

sums it all up. The dog has broken its chain now. I am using the biblical word for human hubris: [Greed](#).

A redistribution of our world's wealth seems unavoidable from a moral perspective. Yet by putting an end to existential hardship, we will not eliminate the lust for power or the motivation to acquire more wealth, an instinct which is fundamentally inherent to life in evolutionary terms.^(Note 1)

This remarkable gene, which has no doubt navigated us higher primates through the winding paths of evolution, begins to turn against us as soon as we feel we have outgrown our basic instincts and we revert to our animalistic natures. In the safe harbour of our growing civilisations, it is the time-bomb ticking in our cells all the time and will eventually destroy the civilisations we have built.

[The virulent gene, the ownership gene, the consumption gene, the enrichment gene, the power gene.](#) We can only keep it in check if we become aware of the demon in our own flesh.

.

Note 1)

Basic instincts determined by evolutionary history
/ Biological impetuses / Main tendencies of life:

First basic evolutionary instinct:

Protect one's own life and that of one's offspring /

Preservation of one's own state of existence

- *The evolutionary echo of Lenz's Law*

Second basic evolutionary instinct:

To spread one's own life form/species (one's own genes) /

Maximum reduplication of the self

- *A strategy of the first basic instinct*

Third basic evolutionary instinct:

Protection of one's own energy resources when there is sufficient food/safety is secured

- *Also known as "the path of least resistance"*

- *Strategy of the first basic evolutionary instinct*

Fourth basic evolutionary instinct:

The drive to improve individual biological resources

"The drive to acquisition and occupation" is the aggressive form of this

"The desire for wealth" is the non-confrontational form

- *Life takes energy economics and risk into account*

(although not in every case, only when the energy invested appears to promise success and the risks associated are reasonable)

- *Ultimately serves to create a better energy budget and minimise risk in the organism or the community*

- *Appears to conflict with the third basic instinct*

- *A strategy of the first basic instinct*

- *Tendency to acquire more resources than actually needed can be observed in higher life forms.*

(Note 2)

- *From the strategy of "providing for the future/stockpiling" via the "instinct to occupy" to "greed" (Note 2)*

Fifth basic evolutionary instinct:

Protecting one's individual resources

- *Life takes into energy economics and risk account (see fourth EBI)*

- *Serves the energy budget and the minimisation of risk*

- *The reverse conclusion of the fourth basic instinct*

- *A strategy of the first energy impulse*

Sixth basic evolutionary instinct:

[Spatial expansion](#)

- Is a manifestation of both the second and the fourth basic instinct
- A strategy of the first instinct

The virulent gene

Everything always comes back to the fatal ownership gene. It truly is Pandora's Box. But our beautiful world has become too small for our insatiable human hunger for resources, too small for the many mouths, for the clash of cultures and the irreconcilable, perpetually smouldering conflict of interests between different ethnic and religious groups or political powers.

Our world cannot find peace. The bickering of so many people over a slice of the ever-decreasing cake will not cease. The Earth has turned against us and it wants to shake off this voracious human virus. The Earth is tossing in the fever of global warming. Her white glaciers and polar ice caps are melting.

Man has not heeded the warning. He has nothing better to do than to watchfully eye his fellow man, while rattling his sabre, to see who will be the first to place his boot on the soon to be accessible Polar Regions, to start tapping the slumbering gas and oil reserves there. Untouched polar caps serve the homeostatic planetary immune system, which has been able to maintain the sensitive temperature balance of the biosphere since primitive times.

Yet our dominant little species, which has spread like a sticky, brown psoriasis into every corner of the world and its last natural biotope, will not come to its senses. It grows and grows, displacing every other species in its way; it feeds and discharges its industrial excrement into the atmosphere, which further exacerbates the greenhouse effect.

I have already expressed the idea of the just redistribution of natural resources.

"We can no longer view the world from the perspective of our value systems.

[We must think as a species." ... In my opinion, it's too late for that!](#)

We must finally realise what we are, what we are not and what we should be! We have not been *primus inter pares*, one species among equals, in a relationship of delicate balance with its neighbours, since the Neolithic period. ^(Note 4)

We are the all-dominating virus that occupies and swallows up everything without any consideration for losses, without thinking of the future or of our own offspring. We are the virus that endangers the host and which will now be vomited out to ensure the **host's survival**.

We are supposedly the dominant life form on this, our planet. We are the lords of creation, and for us the garden of paradise, Eden, was laid at our feet, to wander in like lords, making every stone and every beast our subjects.

Understandably, it is difficult, after 400,000 years of staring at our own naval – that is the time that has passed since our ancestors, *Homo heidelbergensis*, began to think about existence and the afterlife, since we invented religion.

Of course we find it difficult after 10,000 years of cultural society and 4,000 years of monotheism to think outside our box and recognise the most essential fact: where we belong.

10,000 years ago, we did not yet have a problem with our planet or vice versa. The debacle began when we passed the two billion mark at the start of the last century and continued to grow exponentially.

It seems we have almost reached the point of no return. There is no going back after that. As everyone must have noticed, our host is fighting back and is cutting off our lifelines.

No, we cannot even think from the perspective of the dominant species anymore! We must learn to think from the perspective of one species woven into the network of the entire biosphere!

If we want to survive, we must think of ourselves as a small part of the great superorganism GAIA!

Primus inter pares

A final, horrendous consequence, horrendous from our familiar human perspective, must not remain unsaid:

There is no place for the virulent ownership gene in our new world.

Not with seven billion people.

Ownership, property? How does that make sense? Ownership of what? Of parts of the densely woven, self-regulating, geophysical, biospherical network? The representatives of a species that is primus inter pares claims ownership of its host organism? Ridiculous! The primus inter pares is itself a host organism and would surely be baffled if our subordinate parts began to claim dominance over our being. Sometimes they do actually do that and take over our essential organs. Then the hours of the primus inter pares are numbered – we call it cancer.

It is better when the smaller parts of our organism are in balance with all the others. It is better for the superorganism Earth – or GAIA – too.

All parts are of equal importance in the network of the whole. If one single knot in the web is shifted, it has an effect on all the others. The impulse reverberates throughout the whole system like a wave until, after numerous feedback loops, the organism readapts.

The secret is biodiversity – thousands of different species all linked. There are a myriad of individuals like you and I. This mechanism keeps the great host organism and regulates its metabolism (= homeostasis).

This is how the composition of the atmosphere is regulated, this is how the oceans stay the way they are, this is how the climate works. This is how everything stays the way it is, although it always has to decay again (Second Law of Thermodynamics).

It is a perfect immune system. Thanks to it, the whole system is protected from harmful external and internal influences and the stay state equilibrium is maintained. The system protects itself from within through the equal cooperation of all its parts together.

One species in this myriad network, the human species, must once again figure out its place if it wants to remain part of the network.

By freak evolutionary chance, two and half million years ago, the network created a little bud among the primates, the human species, in whose perception its own existence and the entire universe is reflected. A little miracle.

From the unique perspective of this bud, it seemed to the human species that everything revolved around it. And that could only lead to one conclusion, because when the being reflects on everything that exists, everything that exists is reflected back on this one bud in the middle of the universe – namely that it is the centre of the universe.

A fatal error. Which the human species would only grasp gradually in a laborious struggle with itself.

This arduous process of its self-knowledge still continues.

..

Note 2)

Where does greed come from?

The oft-cited cliché of “harmony in the animal kingdom” is not quite accurate: “Every animal (individual) only takes as much as they need for their own survival.”

However, self-regulatory mechanisms in food chain networks/the biotope mean that behavioural patterns involving the excessive acquisition of resources among individuals and symbiotic communities balance each other out and are therefore less apparent. Surplus only makes sense if it fulfils a function. There is no waste in nature, since it places stress on the energy budget of the individual (see third evolutionary basic instinct).

Yet where does this impulse to appropriate more than we actually need come from?
Where does GREED come from?

Trend A: Energy efficiency / Third evolutionary basic instinct (EBI)

All individuals must ingest chemical nutrients from outside their bodies to maintain **their biological processes. In the process, they permanently swap their body's own molecules for foreign ones.** During these chemical reactions, energy is acquired for all the work the individual has to do, including for producing energy itself. It is therefore not effective to waste energy on searching for food that is not required in the end. (For example: a leopard hunts an antelope that is larger than its daily requirement so it can hide it in a tree to eat over the next few days. However, it does not hunt any other antelopes that would rot before they could be eaten. That would have no benefit; it would merely be an unnecessary risk and waste of energy.)

Trend B: Qualitative acquisition of resources / Fourth EBI / Tendency to greed

The drive to improve one's own biological resources is a fundamental biological instinct, which is likely to have developed with the earliest life forms more than three billion years ago (sulphur bacteria, cyanobacteria). Following this instinct, the individual is always attracted to the better biological environment. (For example: plants grow towards light, herds seek out better pastures.)

Harmful influences, competitors for food and scarcity of resources always have the tendency to impair the acquisition of resources and threaten survival. Thus, a counterbalancing instinct was required to motivate the acquisition of resources.

It is solely this immanent drive to not be satisfied with the resources available, but to search for better ones that we have to thank for life surviving on our planet despite all the odds.

The two instincts alternate with each other and remain in balance in simple life forms. In times of scarcity, instinct B has the upper hand and forces the life form to search harder for food. When there is sufficient food available, instinct A halts this activity.

Trend C: Quantitative acquisition of resources / Special case of the fourth EBI / Development of greed

The evolution of higher life forms on our planet follows the development from the “lone wolf” to “society formation” by individual groups (swarm/herd, pack, harems, formation of tribes) and “state formation”. Very early on, this led to individuals not just providing for their own survival, but their survival instinct also included other individuals. (For example: the way marsupials care for their young around 125 million years ago, state-forming termites around 150 million years ago.)

As the group grows stronger, the strategies of “stockpiling” and “oversupply” seem to turn into an evolutionary advantage, which also manifests genetically in the long-term. Group-specific social behaviour such as the shared care and rearing of the young, searching for food, defence and care for the elderly (= division of labour) require a rejection of the “providing for the self” principle in favour of “collectively providing for the future”.

In the behavioural pattern of the SWARM and the HERD, the simplest group models, we still encounter a number of “self-providers”. However, these strategies of living together do offer greater protection than those of the “lone wolf”.

On the contrary, in the behavioural pattern of the PACK, for the first time we find the complex principle of “collectively providing for the future”.

There are also beneficial functions in the group for weak and older members of the group unable to hunt. They are not ejected from the group, instead they are given some of the surplus food from the stronger members (with the exception of aging pack leaders, who are driven away by the new alpha male).

Once the individual has been energetically disconnected from the search for food and this principle becomes a complex behavioural pattern involving shared labour in the group, the third evolutionary basic instinct is also undermined. The energy budget is no longer defined via the individual but via the group. Some members of the group waste more energy acquiring food than they need for their own survival, because they are providing for other members of the group. The members of the group specialised in acquiring food have to produce a surplus that would not make sense, but would in fact be harmful, for a lone individual providing for themselves. This is how the “oversupply” instinct manifests.

It is likely that we encounter the first behavioural sign of GREED in HAREMS, which is a further step in the development towards complex social behavioural and available resource distribution patterns.

A further disconnection takes place here, which was previously an inseparable unit: the separation of biological resources from the act of acquiring them and the preservation of the individual. Previously, there is always a direct connection between resources and the survival instinct.

In animal harems, where the dominant male no longer participates in acquiring resources, but does however control the yield, the resource becomes a commodity, something speculative, an available object. The group members specialised in searching

for food are also no longer directly linked to the results of their actions. They have to deliver the food they have hunted and gathered. Only then does the dominant male give them their portion. He controls the availability of all the resources. In times of food scarcity or in competition with other harem groups, the more energetically the dominant male forces the others to increase their yield, the more advantageous it is for survival.

Here we can gradually start to identify an advantage of the behavioural pattern GREED. It is also more advantageous for other group members to assert themselves energetically when the resources are being distributed.

Since property is largely dependent on its owners being sedentary, one can only observe this aspiration in the behavioural patterns of nomadic tribes to a limited extent. Only when the early high cultures formed in the Neolithic period and tribal chiefs began to put resource surplus on show to demonstrate status, did the GREED behavioural pattern become fully established in its own right and begin to be passed on.

The trend of “society formation” by individual groups develops in parallel to “state formation” (primarily insects, with the exception of the snapping shrimp and the naked mole rat) on various evolutionary levels and independently from one another. Thus the development of state-forming animals and their social structures is comparable with those of “societies” (groups that have formed societies), but not identical.

Although the principles of the division of labour, stockpiling and collectively providing for the group can be found in all higher group models, the behavioural pattern of state formation in the animal kingdom (eusociality) has a more totalitarian and altruistic structure, right up to the infertility of the worker and soldier insects. The position and function of the group members (castes) are not interchangeable, but are genetically determined. The character traits and individuality of group members are not important, since they are all genetically identical (twins, genetically closer than offspring). **Social behaviour in “states” is managed by neurotransmitters, behavioural patterns and chemical signals and is most probably also genetically fixed.** There is therefore no such thing as free will or self-determination for the individual members. The superorganism behaves like one individual life form.

This may be a possible reason why the GREED behavioural pattern does not develop in “states”.

Social behaviour in “societies”, on the other hand, is a complex system of dependence between individual personalities with relatively free wills. The social position of the group members might be hierarchically determined, yet the individuals have a desire to improve their position in this collective structure (see fourth EBI). Their position and function in the group is not fixed, but can always be slightly adjusted in little power struggles within the group.

The speculative commodity of the resource plays a large role in the group’s complex structure of relationships and distribution. In more highly organised group models, a surplus of resources becomes an indication of social position (status symbol) and a replacement for mutual bonds between the group members (barter trade).

The growing desires for the speculative commodity of the resource increase the GREED behavioural pattern.

Note 3)

"Clash of cultures"

See "Clash of Civilisations", Samuel P. Huntington

Note 4)

Primus inter pares – Latin, meaning "first among equals".

Member of a group consisting of other equal members, without any special rights, however with an emphasised position of honour within the group.