International Journal of Psychosocial Rehabilitation, Vol. 24, Issue 05, 2020
ISSN: 1475-7192

Biological Metaphysical Scientism in Addressing the Issue of Altruism and Egoism

N.L. Varova, S.F. Denisov, L.V. Denisova, N.G. Zenets and
L.A. Maksimenko

Abstract--- *The relevance of the study is predetermined by the problematization of knowledge about a human in modern philosophic and scientific discourse, a crisis in understanding morality and moral being of a human, deficit of altruism and growing egoism in society. We need to comprehend modern approaches to the study of these ethical aspects, since, on the one hand, there is a contradictory and ambiguous view of altruism and egoism in humanitarian knowledge, and, on the other hand, some apology of naturalism when rapidly developing biological sciences are sure that they can explain this problem. Therefore, this paper aims at studying altruism and egoism and their functional peculiarities in nature and culture from the perspective of <> metaphysical scientism. The leading method of study is a dialectic method. It enables to discover the specifics of a new form of scientism, which implies that science (biology) takes the functions of philosophy (metaphysics) and tries to address the issue of altruism and egoism in nature and human activity independently. The novelty of this paper is a critical analysis of important biological concepts and approaches to the explanation of altruism and egoism. We have proved that their conceptualization in a biological discourse is, in fact, methodological and worldview expansion of biology, which can be qualified as a biological form of metaphysic scientism and denoted by the term "biocracy". We have revealed two types of such scientism – traditional, where nature is a subject, which exceeds a human in its power and wisdom and innovative, where nature is an object, which can be technically modernized up to biotechnological modernization of morality ("ethic eugenics"). We have shown that sociobiology is a kind of a reverse toward traditional biological scientism. It implicitly expresses a concern for modern scale of innovative transformations of human nature and argues that since altruism performs a function of species protection in the animal world, it has the functions of human protection and culture protection in human society. The materials of the paper are of practical and theoretical value for the research of modern tendencies in the development of natural scientific and humanitarian knowledge of altruism and egoism. They enlarge the field of reflection on the bases and methodological peculiarities of scientific and cognitive practices and new forms of culture scientification.*

Keywords--- *Metaphysical Scientism, Altruism, Egoism, Sociobiology, Evolutionary Ethics, Ethology.*

I. INTRODUCTION

Altruism and egoism are complex phenomena that affect the bases of our worldview and moral self-awareness. They are closely related to deeply-held determinations of human behavior and bearing constructive elements of culture. In its history, "every epoch had its degree and mass norm of personalization taken by this society as an acceptable and tolerable level of self-isolation and egoism" [10, p.463], just the same, it had its degree of altruism.

N.L. Varova, Omsk State Pedagogical University, Omsk, Russia.
S.F. Denisov, Omsk State Pedagogical University, Omsk, Russia.
L.V. Denisova, Omsk Academy of the Ministry of the Interior of the Russian Federation, Omsk, Russia.
N.G. Zenets, Omsk State Medical University, Omsk, Russia.
L.A. Maksimenko, Omsk State Medical University, Omsk, Russia.

DOI: 10.37200/IJPR/V24I5/PR2020162
Received: 10 Mar 2020 | Revised: 28 Mar 2020 | Accepted: 06 Apr 2020

A modern stage of society and culture development – "an epoch of global human empire" – was described as crisis as early as half a century ago. "Triumphal development of the Western civilization is inevitably approaching a critical frontier", wrote A. Peccei [20, P. 10]. Today, a range of all possible crises extends from "ecological crisis" to "anthropological" and ethical crisis. Now, the question "Can we trust ethics?" is rather rhetoric since "in our epoch of scientific development, it does not directly involved into a real moral life" [3, Pp. 6-7]. Modern ethical discourse shows that basic categorical opposition of ethics ("good-evil") became less abundant. All other oppositions are its derivatives. "To dethrone Good is the final goal of, we dare say, post-modernist 'ethics'." It reflects and enhances the process of its dissolution in real human relations [12, P. 76].

At the level of social being, this situation is detected as deficit of "spiritual bonds" in secular society, which are, in fact, none other than the values of altruism that modern culture and society urgently need. However, an obvious request for them coexists with the growth of human egoistic motivation, a cult of individualism, progressing estrangement, violence and aggression. We see a contradiction between two oppositely directed tendencies - a multiplying number of various social practices to activate altruism, on the one hand, and growth of amoralism accompanied by uncovered egoism and uncontrolled instinctive forms of behavior, on the other hand.

For a long time, the altruism-egoism opposition, like the entire problem of human nature in general, has been associated with the sphere of a philosophic thought and "sciences about spirit". Egoism was more often associated with a natural (animal) element in a human, while altruism was related to a cultural element. Classics of philosophy admitted that "animality is earlier and actually stronger than pure humaneness in its manifestations" [8, P. 581] and that a human is the only "freedman of nature" (I. Gerder). A human is naturally egoistic, he cares for his benefit. A moral task is to extend this care on others, which is a basic content of morality.

Egoism was one of the manifestations of individualism associated with the process of personality development in "social-cultural ontogenesis". I. Kant noted that "From the day when a man begins to speak in the first person, he manifests and establishes his favorite Self (Selbst) wherever possible and egoism is developing uncontrollably." [8, P. 358] It is spontaneous and natural, if we could say so; that is why, it seemed to be ignored for a long time. Egoism is "a product of ethical and philosophic generalization of a real morals description" [1], it was made a certain normative and behavioral model "post factum", since this generalized and descriptive reconstruction of anthropological reality was critically reflected.

There, altruism was something that is naturally cultivated and requires special efforts. Hypertrophic development of egoism was thought to even during socialization. The accent on the role of social factors in the process of personal development led to the understanding of egoism as a kind of social atavism. The correction of egoism was often believed to lead to altruism, philanthropy, focus on collectivist values and neurotic underestimation of oneself and ones interests. However, egoism is often preserved as a life-long property of a personality despite the efforts of society, education and culture.

Today's fear that a person can lose his humaneness actualizes the issue of ratio of altruism and egoism in a human and society, which are somehow rooted in human nature (through sociality, moral, psychology or biology).

DOI: 10.37200/IJPR/V24I5/PR2020162
Received: 10 Mar 2020 | Revised: 28 Mar 2020 | Accepted: 06 Apr 2020

Besides, we cannot but notice the sustainable growth of studies devoted to a kind of apology of egoism. In its extreme manifestation, it treats egoism as a benefit [23] and altruism – as "unspeakable evil" [24, 135].

This situation is indicative of contradiction and ambiguity in the understanding of altruism and egoism, as well as of their poor and often unilateral comprehension. This contradiction stimulates us to look for the reasons of what is going on outside sociocultural mechanisms. Today, we cannot but notice a deep interest in ethical problems expressed by biological sciences. The success in their development gives a large material and a good motive for this search.

The goal of this study is to give a philosophic analysis of the most pretentious approach to the explanation of altruism and egoism as the phenomena of both natural and cultural being of a human represented by the leader of scientific vanguard – biology. Nowadays, it tries on the role of philosophic metaphysics.

II. METHODOLOGY

Methodology of analysis is determined by the view on the continuing process of culture and philosophy scientification from the perspective of a dialectic method. The forms of philosophy (metaphysics and positivism) are not static in the spiritual culture of society. Historically, the revealed changes took place in two ways – naturalization of metaphysic philosophy and gnoseologization of metaphysics. Metaphysical scientism of the second type has been represented by various sciences depending on the dominance of a certain science for the last three centuries [4, Pp. 51-55]. Today, we see another change of a leader in sciences. Therefore, there is a new round of philosophy scientification and a new form of scientism, which claims to explain the issues of altruism and egoism in nature and human activity.

In scientific discourse, "altruism and egoism" as a categorical pair was first discussed (from the times of A. Comte and E. Durkheim) in sociology. The situation began to change with a rapid development of "sciences about nature" in the XX-XXI centuries, especially about "wildlife", which made a claim for supremacy and arbitration towards "sciences about spirit".

Now, sociologists are also inclined to treat altruism and egoism as social phenomena, though they have to admit that they are interdisciplinary. Nowadays, sociology has lost a battle for leadership in the discussion of altruism. Sociologists admit that here, the space of public discourse is divided between experts (evolutionary psychology) and everyday consciousness that balance from understanding altruism from "the divinity of moral norms" to functionalism of private judgements [37, P. 245].

Ethics, which focuses on altruism-egoism, happens to be useless now; however, there is hope for evolutionary ethics.

In the cultural situation of the XX century, we need to comprehend the issue of ratio of altruism and egoism in a human and society, when a human may lose his humaneness. In fact, psychology, at least, Russian psychology, was not ready to address this issue. The Russian psychologist I.E. Ilyin states, "Unfortunately, we know little about altruism. This component of human behavior *was almost unnoticed by science* up to now. Russian psychology has

DOI: 10.37200/IJPR/V24I5/PR2020162
Received: 10 Mar 2020 | Revised: 28 Mar 2020 | Accepted: 06 Apr 2020

no fundamental scientific work devoted to this issue, though altruism is an important side of person's moral development" [7, P. 114].

V. P. Zinchenko, another very prominent Russian psychologist, admitted that such ethical categories as kindness (good, benefit) and conscience are groundless: "We do not know where they came from. Kindnesses, compassion, love, and humanism is what we are given originally as the representatives of humanity. I don't know who gave them to us and why. However, society and upbringing largely determine how we can use these things." [6]

The assertion of the "situation of ignorance" always activates search. Those who think that they know where to find answers take matters in their own hands. The challenge was responded by *evolutionary psychology* – a synthetic trend of modern psychology, which studies specie-specific psychological peculiarities of person's behavior as a representative of Homo sapiens sapiens specie. Note that many "peculiarities" of a human were comprehended by philosophers as "existentials" and "the phenomena of human being". Evolutionary psychology explains them in terms of adaptations. Jack and Linda Palmer, the founders of evolutionary and psychological approach, state that it "enables to understand and explain the deepest phenomena of human behavior: love and jalousie, anger and compassion, friendship and aggression, leadership and altruism [18, P. 4]. These confident statements are associated with the victory of an evolutionary approach in psychology and human ethology, which also penetrated in epistemology and ethics. At the end of the XX century, this approach became dominant in these branches of science.

Evolutionary psychology borrows one of its main provisions from evolutionary biology (a principle of natural selection), and another – from cognitive psychology (a construct of mental mechanisms to process information for our wishes, drives and preferences etc.). Cognitive psychology uses a computer metaphor based on the analogy of the work of human brain and a processor as a basic metaphor to reveal mental mechanisms [19, P. 11]. These mechanisms "generate the behavior" adequate to environment. Cognitive psychology states that they are important for survival in typical life environments and fixed in brain structures (or the brain produces appropriate behavior). Interestingly, these are not behavior patterns that are selected but underlying mental mechanisms. These mechanisms are species-specific and conditioned by biological evolution of Homo sapiens specie. They enable to create quite many standard schemes specialized in certain tasks in the psyche (brain). In modern world, behavior patterns are multilayer. Social evolution overlaps biological evolution, which makes a situation more difficult. Many original mechanisms polished by millions of years of evolution do not meet today's needs. However, people always have a choice because these mechanisms are numerous [29, Pp. 332-333].

These are the ideas of evolutionary psychology in general. As can be seen, evolutionary psychology is none other than an attempt to biologize psychology, i.e. *bio* psychology. Now, this trend is accompanied by another tendency – the moralization of biology. It is manifested in the "appeal to nature as the only basis, fundament or 'harbor' to guarantee moral revival of humanity and correction of social pathologies [36, P. 109].

The research of culture scientification enable to identify three historical forms of metaphysical scientism: mechanistic (from the XVII century), cybernetic (from the middle of The XX century) and synergetic (from the 1970s). In these variations, metaphysical scientism tried to occupy a place of dethroned metaphysics. Since a true, <> but often covert purpose of any disciplinary ontology is to address the main philosophic and anthropological

DOI: 10.37200/IJPR/V24I5/PR2020162
Received: 10 Mar 2020 | Revised: 28 Mar 2020 | Accepted: 06 Apr 2020

issue of the models and strategies of salvation, every large construction of disciplinary onthology (i.e. "scientific-philosophic hybrid") creates its concept of salvation and appropriate social-ontological metaphors of society and images of a Savior. All these philosophic and anthropological constructions are created "with respect to all canons of good old metaphysics originated from Plato's philosophy" [4, P. 62]. Therefore, each of the above forms has its own savior – a "constructor", a "creator" and an "innovator".

At the end of the XX century, a leader in the system of sciences changed - physics gave place to biology. Therefore, a new leader began to conduct methodological, ideological and even political (government) expansion implicitly or explicitly. Therefore, now, we can discuss *biocracy* as a specific form of *biological metaphysical scientism* apart from *technocracy.* It can be of two types: let us call them traditional and innovative *biological metaphysic scientism.*

Traditional biological scientism is traditional, because it treats nature as a subject, which exceeds a human in its power and wisdom. Nowadays, this scientism loses to its "innovative kin" in the all-powerful market of knowledge and technologies. Today, it is biological innovations that are the most vanguard. They underlie all other innovations (nano-, info-, cognito- etc.) to outwit nature. They are realized in two opposite directions: on the one hand, technologies become biologized, i.e. they are increasingly based on biological structures and become new biology, i.e. new reality of life existence; on the other hand, life itself becomes more technologized – biology becomes a sort of technologies."[31, P. 199].

Innovative biological scientism erases the difference between natural life and artificial life. Its sharpened creativity produces a new type of artefacts, "Sometimes, new things are *done* quicker than *understood*". Therefore, now, when it comes to innovations, there are increasing concerns regarding sustainability and stability of this non-limited creativity. In the 1970s, the society was concerned about the idea of sustainable development, while now, it is interested in the idea of a sustainable innovative process." [31, Pp. 200-201] Probably, this is a hint that an innovator is exhausting itself in its innovations as a savior. There is a request for the figure of a savior in the image of a stabilizer.

Quite possibly, such an image can be found in *traditional biological scientism* as a variant of *metaphysical scientism.* At least, we can record that evolutionary psychology and sociobiology, which represent their philosophic and anthropological constructions of this scientism, look for it. <>Now, philosophy is a "servant of biology", while biopower and biopolicy are the forms of social representation of biocracy.

Evolutionary psychology as a kind of expert knowledge of a person is a direct successor of sociobiology – a new scientific trend created by biocracy. J. and L. Palmer state clearly in their book that after sociobiology had stepped on an "alien territory" and tried to explain altruistic behavior, morality and ethics from the positions of biological evolution and genetic determinism, it became like "a red rag to a bull" for criticists. The term "sociobiology" became associated with many negative notions (racism, sexism) [18, P. 32]; therefore a few persons were brave enough to defend it. At the early times of sociobiology, many socio-biologists argued that "their science may become important for making political decisions." [30, P. 32]. In Russian philosophy, socio-biology was also severely criticized, among other things, for political reasons ("for bourgeoisness"). It was criticized for

DOI: 10.37200/IJPR/V24I5/PR2020162
Received: 10 Mar 2020 | Revised: 28 Mar 2020 | Accepted: 06 Apr 2020

"uselessness" and contradiction of philosophic judgements" ("socio-biologists are not philosophers at all", "their ideas are quite dangerous"), for being speculative and for the uncertain place in the system of sciences ("this is not a scientific trend, but rather some hypotheses that are difficult to prove" [9, Pp. 186-188], and for biological reductionism [17].

Evolutionary psychology avoided severe criticism due to verbal mimicry: change of name enabled it "to dissociate itself from negative associations" with sociobiology. Palmers declare it openly. A. Markov, a famous Russian scientist and a popularizer of science, says the same things, "Evolutionary psychology and anthropology <…> enable us to understand why we are who we are. However, they remain silent about what we should be." [5, P. 491]. N.N. Moiseev, one of the bringers of universal evolutionism, noted, "People are not guilty that not all of them are honest, generous, and ready to self-sacrifice, they are what they are, – greed, aggression, and egoism are also inseparable from them. <…> This is their destiny, this is the history of the development of a biological specie Homo sapiens and its algorithms." [16, P. 350]

Apart from these new areas of science that represent biocracy, we should also name *evolutionary ethics.* It dates back to G. Spenser and Ch. Darwin. Modern evolutionary ethics rejects theoretical heritage of an ethical and philosophic thought and justifies morality as a form of reasonable or adaptive behavior.

We should note another related field of knowledge called *ethology* – a science of biological bases of animal behavior. The founders of classic ethology K. Lorenz, N. Tinbergen and K. von Frisch are Nobel laureates (1973). Ethology is mostly interested in the types of congenital behavior (instincts). Human ethology is considered the most challenging "area" of general ethology.

Thus, a range of "biocratic" sciences that pretend to discover natural bases for altruism and egoism involves sociobiology, ethology, evolutionary ethics and evolutionary psychology. We should note that it is difficult to differentiate them, though, certainly, they are separated from each other. At the same time, they are all derived from the ideas of evolutionary biology and transgressive in their discussions. A range of significant names – the founders of these trends – is quite large: from the evolutionists of the XIX century (Ch. Darvin, G. Spenser, A. Comte, E. Heckel and A Espinas, E. Durkheim, M.A. Engelhardt, P. Kropotkin etc.) to the XX-XXI century evolutionists (R. Dawkins, W. Wilson, J.P. and L.P. Palmer, A. Markov, V.P. Efroimson, K. Lorenz, Ch. Lamsden, M. Ruse, N. Timbergen, P. Trivers, B. Fuchs, G.V. Pravotorov, D. McFarlend, S. Pinker and others). We can be sure that the core of *traditional biological scientism* as quite a notable today "*scientific and philosophic neo-naturalistic hybrid*" is sociobiology.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Consider how the issue of altruism and egoism is discussed in the discourse of sociobiology.

Sociobiology as a *"scientific and philosophic neo-naturalistic hybrid"* established itself in the meta-territories between sociology, philosophic anthropology, culture studies, psychology, and animal and human ethology. It originates from a scandalous publication of *Sociobiology: a New Synthesis* (1975) by E.O. Wilson, a famous American entomologist and ethologist. Sociobiology studies *biological* bases of social behavior. Its founder E.O.

DOI: 10.37200/IJPR/V24I5/PR2020162
Received: 10 Mar 2020 | Revised: 28 Mar 2020 | Accepted: 06 Apr 2020

Wilson admits that it "originated mainly from the discussions on altruism": it became "a central theoretical problem of sociobiology" [cit. ex: 26, P. 132].

The problem was to agree the content of the notion altruism with general evolutionary representations, which created the image of nature as "vekovechnaya davilnya"/a perpetual crusher (N. Zabolotskiy, a Russian poet) based on the competitive struggle between individuals, which activates their egoistic urges or, in other words, natural selection, which encourages individual adjustment.

So, where does altruism based on victim behavior come from? Altruism in biology is a "technical term", which means "behavior that leads to higher adjustment (reproductive success) of other individuals to the detriment of one's chances for successful reproduction."[15, P. 295]. A sacral meaning of altruism is aid and support in the struggle for existence. Both empirical ethologists of the middle of the XX century and scientists and philosophers of the beginning of the XX century were sure that such behavior exists (A. N. Beketov, P. A. Kropotkin, P. Sorokin and others). Complex forms of social organization in wildlife are always supported by mutual help, co-operation, cooperative forms of behavior, and altruistic actions of particular elements of this organization.

Darwin's theory of natural selection confirmed and specified at the beginning of the XX century assumes that the unit of heredity is a gene, and the purpose of selection is a sign coded by it. However, it failed to explain why altruistic behavior is preserved during evolution, if it reduces the adjustment of an altruist. Evolution should wash his genes out from the population and leave the genes of egoists with its carriers. Wilson explains this defect of the classic theory of natural selection, "A brave warrior leads his tribe to victory, but dies in the fight. In the result, he does not leave successors or leaves a few successors. Genes of heroism die with him; however, the survived members of the group will prosper and reproduce."[33] What is biological meaning of altruism then?

Sociobiology as a "sub-discipline" in Darwinism decided to answer to these questions and as if outlined a program-minimum and a program-maximum. The goal of the program-minimum is to create an efficient model to explain how altruism could develop during evolution. The goal of the program-maximum is to agree "technical altruism" with "ethical altruism". "New synthesis" mentioned in E. O. Wilson's bestseller is a synthesis of general sociobiology (a division of ethology, which studies "social" forms of animal behavior) and human sociobiology. The last chapter in E.O. Wilson's *Sociobiology* was devoted to a human.

To address the first task ("program-minimum"), two sociobiological models to explain altruism in wildlife were elaborated: "kin selection" and "mutual altruism".

Kin Selection

The idea of kin selection was first expressed by a British biologist J. Holdein in 1955, but the theory of kin selection (model) was offered later, in 1964, by a British genetic W.D. Hamilton (1936-2000), "probably, the greatest theoretical biologist of the XX century" [15, P. 299]. The term kin selection was invented by another English biologist, a genetic J. M. Smith.

The essence of the theory is in the word "kin". This model states that under some circumstances, self-sacrifice (altruism) contributes to the reproduction of kin individuals; therefore, it is "profitable" for evolution. I.e., altruism

DOI: 10.37200/IJPR/V24I5/PR2020162
Received: 10 Mar 2020 | Revised: 28 Mar 2020 | Accepted: 06 Apr 2020

is a function of the power of natural selection. First, the genes that code altruism were supposed to be selected. It was assumed that in case of self-sacrifice for the sake of a close relative, these genes "will multiply, if compensation in the form of a number of successors for the recipient of aid exceeds the value of successors for an altruist" [32, P. 195]. Later, they began to calculate the win-compensation as overall adjustment through a particular individual instead of the genes as the units of selection. Thus, "close kinship, as underlined by E.O. Wilson, is a biological source of altruism and mutual help", and "a crucial factor that stimulates complex social evolution" [33].

In 1976, "an eloquent journalist Richard Dawkins", as E.O. Wilson called his future opponent, explained this idea to the general public in his best-seller *The Egoistic Gene.* An egoistic gene is the basic unit of egoism and a fundamental law to explain the egoism and altruism of a particular individual and even the impact of culture on the complex mechanics of evolutionary process. As written by R. Dawkins, "We are created as the machines for genes and grown as the machines for memes; however, we are capable of turning against our creators. We are the only creatures on the Earth who can rebel against the tyranny of egoistic replicators."[5]. By 2000, as resumed by E.O. Wilson, "the crucial role of kin selection and overall adjustment practically became a dogma" largely due to this rhetoric. Dawkins himself stated proudly in his preface to the second edition of his bestseller, "The main idea of the book was commonly accepted and entered text-books" [5]. However, it "became absolutely wrong" and was defeated by 2010.

Mutual Altruism

This explanatory model was offered by an American biologist R. Trivers (born in 1943). It is also referred to as the model of "reciprocal altruism" (from Latin reciprocus – reverse, mutual). The essence of the model is expressed in self-sacrifice for a non-kin individual, if he is ready to sacrifice himself in return.

Mutual altruism "functions like a certificate of insurance": there is a common pool made of "shares". Everybody can always rely on aid, since he made his individual contributions to the pool [22, p. 98]. This is something like benefit association. A core difference of this model from the model of kin selection is that "mutual altruism can encourage altruism between non-relatives": a person who gives aid expects a direct feedback.

In a program-maximum, these models concerned a human as well. Sociobiology insists that there are close relations "between in the wildlife and human morality". However, it is underlined that "no one argues that human beings are these increased and deteriorated ants." [22, P. 98]. Even R. Dawkins, a devoted fan of genetic selection, States that, "most of what is unusual in a person can be expressed in one word: "culture" [5]. He introduced the notion "meme" – a sustainable non-genetic unit for transmitting cultural ("linguistic) information. As stated by R. Dawkins, these units-memes form a meme pool – an evolutionally stable set of mems, a kind of a genetic pool of culture, which encompasses "melodies, ideas, fashionable words and expressions, ways of cooking a soup or constructing an arch" and many other things.

In the 1980s, E.O. Wilson and Ch. Lamsden offer their concept of genetic and cultural evolution, in which the bunch "genes-organism-culture" is also interpreted in the context of culture. In E.O. Wilson's expression, "genes hold culture on a leash"; however, "this leash is quite long" [cit. ex 30; P. 31]. The length of this leash consists of epigenetic rules (ER). This is a central notion in this concept. EP is understood as a congenital limiting element in

DOI: 10.37200/IJPR/V24I5/PR2020162
Received: 10 Mar 2020 | Revised: 28 Mar 2020 | Accepted: 06 Apr 2020

human psyche, which directs him, influences his thinking and supports the development of mind" [13, P. 336]. It is laid in a human due to selection for the purpose of adaptation, "We think in a certain genetically predetermined direction, since it is biologically favorable to do so." [22, P. 99]

EP are divided into primary and secondary. Primary EP are automatic processes that lead from sensor filtration to perception. They control the perception of "raw" sensory information. Secondary EP are based on any other information appeared in perception. They include the assessment of perception itself and, therefore, the selection of culturegenes – human states identified by a functional sign (labor, cognition, art, and faith). In other words, secondary EP process information in adaptively reasonable forms that enable to use them in environment (first of all, cultural). EP are a kind of mediators "between biology and culture".

Sociobiologists E.O. Wilson and M. Ruse tried to reanimate evolutionary ethics using EP and therefore to explain altruism and moral. They assume that "moral is cyphered in epigenetic rules, first of all, in the secondary epigenetic rules" [22, p. 99]. EP are based on mechanisms for cooperative forms of behavior and altruism. The essence of the mechanisms is selection. Biologically reasonable things are selected and encouraged.

E.O. Wilson and M. Ruse argue that "feelings of moral obligation are laid and fixed in the way of we think and act by natural selection in the form of EP." Morality corresponds to biological interests, "in this case, we act altruistically, and we do not have egoistic motives." [22, P. 100]. M. Ruse and E.O. Wilson underline that they differ from existentialists: they are convinced that a person cannot choose a model. Metaphorically speaking, morality itself "chose" a person and came to him in norms objectivized in culture. These norms underlie the meanings of biologically reasonable behavior. "We, human beings, assume that moral has a certain objective referent". However, E.O. Wilson and M. Ruse assume that this "assumption" is none other than a "collective illusion of humanity" [22, p. 103]. This useful illusion has no "otherworldly" or transcendent references. They assume that an objective referent is real, it "actually has a home of its own". Obviously, this home is nature.

E. Wilson reminds that "Humanity is a biological species in a biological world", [32, P. 334]. K. Loretz underlines that unawareness of the fact that human reality is a stage in the tremendous evolutionary process of nature, in its "great organic establishment", leads to "thinking in disjunctive notions and the construction of typological opposites" and, in the end, to the unawareness of "any historical interactions including phylogenetic, cultural-historical and ontogenetic interactions". The prominent ethologist notes that this is typical for "the philosophic anthropologists who <…>turn their back to everything common in human and animals and underestimate their real difference despite their belief in their disjunctive opposition [14, p. 393].

EP as a genetic leash thrown on culture by nature is still a stumbling block in the discourse on a human. What is more, philosophic meaning and claims related to the notion of EP are still very poorly analyzed. However, they are not simply rational; they have a claim on specific biological transcendentalism, where a-priori forms are associated with our "genetic soft". Now, a cursed question of "the freedom of will" is supplemented by another difficult question about "the freedom of our thought", and therefore about our "Self" as transparency of body and unity of the spiritual and the corporeal. A new "anthropological indulgence" ("this is not me but my brain") rapidly gains natural scientific arguments. It has a dramatic topic of the brain and world ratio: "The brain in the world and the world in

DOI: 10.37200/IJPR/V24I5/PR2020162
Received: 10 Mar 2020 | Revised: 28 Mar 2020 | Accepted: 06 Apr 2020

the brain". In the 1970-1980s, the famous experiments of the American psychologist B. Libert have shown that there is time gap between the awareness of the decision by "Self" and the decision "taken by brain". Further analogical research confirmed the concerns about our unfreedom and isolation of "Self" from the brain and increased this gap from initial 200 milliseconds of freedom to 7-30 seconds [34, P. 357]. All these scientific challenges strike directly in the heart of pure Kantian mind. They pose the issues of moral responsibility without free will and disturb a philosophic thought. New naturalism in the philosophy of consciousness based on the research in biology and neuroscience "makes us reconsider metaphysical justification of traditional ethic theories" [27, P.151]. Quite recently, "neurophysiologists and psychologists used to leave it to philosophers to discuss the status of freedom of will". Now, everything has changed. The latest experimental data do not allow physiologists to avoid central issues, while "philosophers should take these data into account" [34, P. 358].

This situation is a vivid example of the scientification of philosophy. Now, "science made philosophy be stricter to its thinking and linguistic forms and pointed at biopsychological background of intelligence and higher forms of spirit". Today, "scientific and philosophic hybrids" "already go ahead their first mother and lay new paths for reflection"[11, P. 162].

Another example of the scientification of philosophy is evolutionary ethics. M. Ruse, its most passionate defender, underlines that a "tradition" is understood in the evolutionary ethics as an appeal to the models of kin selection and reciprocal altruism. He admits that human altruism occurred on this way to a certain degree. The term "human altruism" separates "ethical altruism" from "technical altruism" – a biological notion. "When biologists discuss 'altruism', they mean social interaction, which enlarges evolutionary potentials where such potentials are usually expressed in higher reproductive success", reminds Ruse. In this technical meaning, ants are altruists. Ruse calls human (i.e. ethical) altruism true altruism, "our need for altruism is obvious" [21, p. 37].

"Technical altruism" occurs from some biological need, which provides biological success. In the evolutionary process, "as people were becoming more skilful in 'altruism', they resorted to it more often [21, P. 37]. In other words, there was selection by altruism, it was reinforced by selection.

Ruse is convinced that "<…> our biology <…> delicately influences the way we think and act, to act together and to be 'altruists' is in our evolutionary interests, since biological factors make us believe in unselfish morality. I.e., biological factors made us altruists." [21, P. 39]

Sociobiology made some adjustments in the understanding of biological factors as particular bases of natural sciences. In 2007, "the hegemony of the idea of an egoistic gene" as the main factor of evolution was over: "the mantra about an egoistic gene repeated by conservative psychologists and commentators is almost dead now". Another image of mechanisms and factors of altruism-egoism is reanimated: Humans are gregarious animals. We live and die in hordes. A group provides means of physical and mental survival to an individual. We need a group exactly so far as a group needs us. This in honest trade, which has been evolving for millions of years" [35]

Wilson remained loyal to his "final metaphysical position". He argues that altruistic behavior in a human is based on two types of natural selection – individual and group. He assumes that "the eternal dilemma of good and evil" is a cultural result of complex multilevel selection, so to speak. Its essence is that the same person is affected

DOI: 10.37200/IJPR/V24I5/PR2020162
Received: 10 Mar 2020 | Revised: 28 Mar 2020 | Accepted: 06 Apr 2020

by two oppositely directed forces simultaneously – individual and group selection. Individual selection is the result of the struggle for survival and competition for reproduction within a group. It creates egoistic instincts. Group selection is the result of competitiveness between groups (communities). It creates altruistic instincts.

The limitation between the levels is conditional. Kin selection can cause egoism and even nepotism, if they work for the common interest: probably, there were "primeval analogues of Medici, Carnegie and Rockefellers" in primitive society. Group selection can also support particular individuals: they could acquire a high status and privileges to propagate their genes for their outstanding services rendered to the tribe [32, Pp. 280-282].

This complex multilevel selection was responsible for our contradictory urges, "We are in a constant conflict between readiness to sacrifice oneself for our community, on the one hand, and egoism, from the other hand, which make us act only in our interests." [32, p. 338]

In fact, human nature, as understood by sociobiology, is determined by this alternate effect of selections. Wilson explains that the first selection is mostly responsible for what we call sins, while group selection is responsible for our virtues [cit. ex: 2. P. 98]. Thus, "ethic altruism" as an important element of a "collective illusion' – morality objectivizes a biologically reasonable result of the group selection of individuals' altruistic behavior as an independent cultural value.

IV. Conclusion

The provisions of modern biology on altruism and egoism enable to make the following conclusions. Human nature is determined by an internal conflict between oppositely directed urges – egoism and altruism. Human uniqueness is expressed in the ways to keep dynamic balance between different types of selection - individual and group and therefore between egoism and altruism.

In this case, there is an "iron rule": egoists defeat altruists within a group, while groups of altruists defeat the groups of egoists. The victory of various forces of selection, which encourage altruism and egoism, is never absolute, "The triumph of individual selection would lead to the disintegration of society. The triumph of group selection would cause human anthills." [32, P. 282] The history of human society development saw the examples of human anthills created by artificial ideological selection, which promoted group interests as a moral norm and ideal. Now, in the era of globalization, dominating moral norms and ideals are associated with the development of the interests of particular (egoistic) individuals.

However, a situation where individual selection that encourages egoism would "win" is *impossible*. Biologists fix the altruistic behavior of living creatures at all the levels of life substance organization, starting from the level of cells. Moreover, it occurred at the earliest stages of its evolutionary history. It did not disappear at any of its winds including the occurrence of a human with his complex "second nature" – culture. Evolution always "cared" for the preservation of altruists. Why? Obviously, they have "entelechial" biological meaning.

Interestingly, in some areas of biology, which lie outside sociobiology and are not directly associated with it, they discuss the ideas and results of research related to the philosophic interpretation of the nature of altruism and egoism.

DOI: 10.37200/IJPR/V24I5/PR2020162
Received: 10 Mar 2020 | Revised: 28 Mar 2020 | Accepted: 06 Apr 2020

This is the strategy of behavior of biological structures (substructures and super-cell structures) associated with so-called programmed death, which plays a substantial role in the maintenance of terrestrial life and evolution" [28]. These strategies were called autophagia (inside the cell), apoptosis (cell), organoptosis (organ), and phenoptosis (organism). The idea of self-liquidation mechanisms was first introduced more than a century ago; today, it is in the center of biological research[1], which is of great practical value for medicine and of great theoretical value for biology.

Biological reasonability of the self-liquidation programs of individualized structures can be explained in terms of altruistic sacrifice: they are activated to preserve more general collectivist structures – systems that have higher rank in the hierarchy of life". Academician V.P. Skulachev called this saving mechanism of nature "the samurai law of biology" [28].

If we look at it from the perspective of metaphysical biological scientism, we can see its analogues in human culture, for example, in the religious representations of a sacral victim and in secular representations of altruistic heroism and selfless devotion. "We are smart animals, though still animals", insists M. Ruse. He underlines that we have to take this fact into account even when "we think of our moral feeling - the most human of all human attributes" [21, P. 35].

Therefore, sociobiologists treat society and culture not as the results of the effort of a human estranged from nature, but as a transformed form of his biological nature. Human culture extracts cultural and ethical meaning from a biological meaning of cultural altruism and makes altruism a moral principle.

The American scientist and a Nobel Laureate in economics (1987) G. Simon who had been thinking how to combine altruism and sociobiology for many years calculated mathematically that altruism exists while its profit for the specie exceeds losses from the reduction of individual adjustment. The society which develops altruism in its members prospers while the losses of individual adjustment from altruism do not exceed the profits from obedience [25]. In nature, altruism performs species protection functions; just the same, in culture it performs culture protection functions. Today, many thinkers associate the crisis of modern culture with the deficit of altruism in it.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The work is supported by the RFBR project No 15-03-00710 "Categorical opposition 'altruism-egoism' in modern moral discourse".

REFERENCES

[1] Apresyan R.G. Egoism Electronic resource Electronic of the RAS Institute of Philosophy New Philosophic Encyclopedia // URL: http://iphras.ru/elib/3495.html (accessed date April 27, 2017).
[2] Grudinkin A. Za Muraveinikom – Cheloveinik, A Human Anthill. *Znanie – Sila.* 2014. No 6. Pp. 94-101.
[3] Gusseinov A.A. Ethics and Moral in Modern World. *Ethical Thought: Modern Research*. – Moscow. Progress-Traditsiya, 2009. P. 5-18.
[4] Denisov S.F. Scientism in Metaphysics: Monograph. *Omsk. Publishing house of Omsk State Pedagogical University.* 2011. 298 p.

[1] 2002 – Nobel Prize to S. Brener, J. E. Salston and H.R. Horwiz for discovering the mechanism of apoptosis.
2016 – Nobel Prize to E. Osumi for the discovery of autophagy – the processing of one's own cell structures (self-devouring).

DOI: 10.37200/IJPR/V24I5/PR2020162
Received: 10 Mar 2020 | Revised: 28 Mar 2020 | Accepted: 06 Apr 2020

[5] Dockins R. Electronic resource Ethology. Py. Access mode: URL: http://ethology.ru/library/?id=56 (access date December 23, 2016).
[6] Zinchenko V. Electronic resource Psychologies. Access mode: URL: http://www.psychologies.ru/self-knowledge/behavior/vladimir-zinchenko-dobrota-suschestvuet-radi-sebya-samoy/ (access date April 27,2017).
[7] Ilyin E.I. Psychology of Aid. Altruism. Empathy. *St. Petersburg. Piter,* 2013. 304 p.
[8] Kant I., Anthropology from the Pragmatic Viewpoint. *Kant I. Collected Works: in 6 v. V. 6. Moscow. Mysl,* 1966. Pp. 349-587.
[9] Karpinskaya R. S., Nikolskiy S.A. Sociobiology: a Critical Analysis. *Moscow. Mysl,* 1988. 203 p.
[10] Krasikov V.I. V Ekstrime. Interdisciplinary Philosophic Study of the Reasons, Forms and Patterns of Radical Consciousness. *Moscow,* 2006. 506 p.
[11] Krasikov V.I. Scientific and Filosophic Hybrids: Scientification of Philosophy in the XIX-XX Centuries. *Bulletin of Kuzbass State Technical University.* 2013. No1. P. 159-162.
[12] Kutyrev V.A. Apology of Human: Prerequisites and Contours of Conservative Philosophy. *Collection of articles. Moscow. Berlin. Direkt-Media,* 2015. 316 p. Pp. 64-93.
[13] Lamsden Ch. J., Wilson E.O. Prometheus's Fire a fragment from the book. Ethical Thought 1001. Moscow. Republik, 1992. 446 p. Pp. 325-341.
[14] Lorenz K. The Other Side of the Mirror. *Moscow. Respublika,* 1998. 493 p. Pp. 243-488.
[15] Markov A. Human Evolution. In 2 books. Book 2 Obeziyany, Neirony i Dusha [Monkeys, Neurons and Soul]. Moscow. AST: CORPUS, 2013. 512 p.
[16] Moiseev N.N. A Human and Noosphere. *Moscow. Molodaya Gvardiya,* 1990. 351 p.
[17] Nikolskiy S. A. Is Sociobiology a Biosociology of a Human?. Access mode URL: http://ethology.ru/library/?id=166 (accessed date April 27, 2017)
[18] Palmer J., Palmer L. Evolutionary Psychology. Secrets of Homo Sapiens Behavior. St. Petersburg, Praim-Evroznak. *Moscow, OLMA-PRESS,* 2003. 383 p.
[19] Petrenko V. F. Basic Metaphors of Psychological Theories. *Bulletin of Moscow University. Series* 14. Psychology. 2013. No 1. Pp. 4-23.;
[20] Petrenko V. F. Basic Metaphors of Psychological Theories. *Bulletin of Moscow University. Series* 14. Psychology. 2013. No 1. Pp. 4-23.
[21] Pecchei A. Human Qualities. *Moscow. Progress,* 1980. 302 p.
[22] Ruse M. Evolutionary Ethics: Healthy Perspective or Final Decrepitude? *Voprosy Filosofii.* 1992. No 3. Pp. 34-52.
[23] Ruse M., Wilson E. Darwinism and Ethics. *Voprosy Filosofii.* 1987. No 1. Pp. 94-108.
[24] Rand A. Добродетель эгоизма = The Virtue of Selfishness: A New Concept of Egoism. Alpina Publisher. Moscow, 2011. 185 p.
[25] Rand A. Answers: About Ethics, Art, Policy and Economy. Alpina Publisher. Moscow, 2012. 282 p.
[26] Simon G. What is Altruism? *V Mire Nauki.* 1991. No 5. P. 59.
[27] Satdinova N.Kh. Sociobiology - Pro and Contra. *Voprosy Filosofii.* 1982. No 3. Pp. 129-136.
[28] Sekatskaya M.A. Moral Responsibility without Freedom of Will. Argument for naturalist ethics. *Voprosy Filosofii.* 2014. No 10. Pp. 151-161.
[29] Skulachev V.P. Phenoptosis or Programmed Death of Organism. access mode: URL: http://elementy.ru/nauchno-populyarnaya_biblioteka/25551/Fenoptoz_ili_Zaprogrammirovannaya_smert_organizma
[30] Smith N. Modern systems of psychology. St. Petersburg. Prime-Euroznak. 2003. 384 p.
[31] Smith R. A Human between biology and culture. Chelovek. 2000. No 1. 25-36.
[32] Tischenko P.D., Yudin B.G. Heyday of Philosophy. *Voprosy Filosofii.* 2015. No 12. Pp. 198-203.
[33] Wilson E. Masters of the Earth. Social Conquest of the Planet by Humanity. St. Petersburg. Piter, 2014. 352 p.
[34] Wilson E.O. Sense of Human Existence [Electronic resource Postnauka.ru] – access mode: URL: https://postnauka.ru/longreads/48108 (access date December 23, 2016).
[35] Chernigovskaya T.G. Human in a Human: Consciousness and Neuron Network. Consciousness in Philosophy and Science. The RAS Institute of Philosophy, 2008. Pp. 325-360
[36] Egin D. Proschai, Farewell to the Egoistic Gene!. Electronic resource Этология. ру // access mode URL: http://ethology.ru/library/?id=301,%202007 (accessed date April 27, 2017)

DOI: 10.37200/IJPR/V24I5/PR2020162
Received: 10 Mar 2020 | Revised: 28 Mar 2020 | Accepted: 06 Apr 2020

[37] Yakimova E.V. Meloni M. Moralization of Biology: Pluses and Minuses of a Gracious Look on Nature. *Social and humanitarian sciences. Russian and foreign literature. Series 11: Sociology. Reference journal.* 2014. No 3. Pp. 100-109.

[38] Yakimova E. V. Phenomenon of Altruism: New Aspects and Modern Analytical Tendencies. *Sociological Annual: Collection of scientific works.* Moscow, 2013. 362 p. Pp.241-266.

DOI: 10.37200/IJPR/V24I5/PR2020162
Received: 10 Mar 2020 | Revised: 28 Mar 2020 | Accepted: 06 Apr 2020