

Justice, stewardship and altruism:



Could religion make a difference?

Dr. Valerie J. Grant

In this talk I will attempt an analysis of some contemporary problems concerning values and religion. I will start by sketching in relevant points from our evolutionary history, particularly the changing forms of altruism over time. I will query the extent to which altruism "should" trump justice, and reflect on what is meant by stewardship in local and global settings. I will outline the evolutionary advantages of having some form of religion and in the process make some rather unfashionable observations about the biological basis of individual differences. Finally I will question the idea that religion should be dispensed with altogether, and instead ask what would be the characteristics of a helpful contemporary religion.

Dr. Valerie Grant studied psychology at the University of Auckland, later specialising in evolutionary psychology. She taught at the Auckland School of Medicine for 34 years, first in Behavioural Science, later in Medical Ethics and the Humanities. She has published over 50 scientific papers and is still actively engaged in research on her maternal dominance hypothesis. In 1998 Routledge (London and New York) published her book "Maternal Personality, Evolution and the Sex Ratio: Do Mothers Control the Sex of the Infant?" Born into a Methodist parsonage in Dunedin, and later living at Trinity Methodist College Auckland where her father was the principal, she has a life-long interest in religion and the search for meaning.

Introduction

Evolutionary theory provides the bedrock of my deliberations. And as mentioned in a previous talk, it seems necessary to mention, right at the start, the difference between "ought" and "is". There are some indisputable givens that form the basis of evolutionary theory. Two of these are inequality and competition. These two underlie the characteristics and behaviour of all living things. Whether we speak of trees in the forest, or fish in the sea, spiders or humans, each and every one is unique and hence different. Each will have some advantageous characteristics and some disadvantageous characteristics. And it is the presence or absence of these in each individual that decides the results of the competition to survive and reproduce. If anything at all has been "ordained" it is inequality and competition, which means, basically, that life is not "fair". Today I want to address some of the issues this unfairness throws up for us humans, especially as they affect some of our core values.

Part 1. The changing forms of altruism

First we had Kin altruism – a form of nepotism, which worked well in small extended family groups. You will recall that "working well" means that those who practised it left more



surviving offspring than those who did not. In other words, those who behaved without regard for the welfare of their kin gradually died out. We are all descended from those who practised kin altruism.

It's also worth noting that the more sophisticated form of altruism didn't replace the earlier one, we simply built a more complex form onto it. We still practise kin altruism, as everyone here knows. We help support our own grandchildren, but not necessarily other people's grandchildren. We leave our worldly goods largely to our own extended family members, not to other people's family members.

Then came reciprocal altruism, which worked well all by itself provided humans lived in groups of 150 – 1,500. People who learned to share meat with others, including non-kin, and taught their children to share, left behind more surviving offspring than those who did not. But sharing with non-kin meant two things – first keeping some kind of calculation going on reciprocity and secondly finding a way to discourage or punish, cheaters and free-loaders (Boehm, Moral Origins). Reproductively successful groups got too big to keep up with the calculations; more was needed. And this seems to be the beginning of first, obligations, and then rules. In other words the arrival of the "ought".

All the major religions appear to have taken this evolutionarily adaptive strategy concerning altruism and co-operation and generalised or embedded it into a rule, the golden rule. It is basically a simple extension or refinement of reciprocal altruism. There are six versions on this slide, and I have written them out in the notes that accompany this talk.

Later, Christians were taught to go further than mere reciprocal altruism. "Give and do not count the cost" goes the old hymn. On the surface of it, I think most of us would agree with the rightness of this. We don't want to be too calculating and we do want to be generous. But later in my talk I want to offer a note of caution concerning what is now known as promiscuous altruism because it is clear that if applied as a general rule, it simply doesn't work.

Reciprocal altruism with rules however, provides the basis for a stable society. Where it is practised it ensures that when bad things happen, especially things that are out of our control, even strangers will rally round to help. For an obvious example, there's probably not a person here who didn't in some way give something towards helping strangers who suffered in the Christchurch earthquakes. And many people would say this is an example of compassionate giving, something that goes beyond reciprocal altruism.

But there are at least three important characteristics of this kind of compassionate giving which make me think it is still reciprocal altruism. There are probably not nearly as many people here who also gave money to help the victims of the Japanese earthquakes. This illustrates the importance of proximity (we don't give so readily to those in a far off country), and also of similarity (we do give more readily to people like us). A further factor is deservingness, based on concepts like responsibility or blame (no-one can be blamed for being an earthquake victim). And of course all these characteristics are directly linked to the concept of reciprocity. If we had an earthquake here in Auckland, it wouldn't be our fault and we'd hope the people of Christchurch would contribute generously to help us in our hour of need.

What happens when there is no potential for reciprocity? I invite you to try a little thought experiment. Imagine you have a crisp new \$50 note in your hand and it's your job to give it away, not to your favourite charity, but to an individual. You would have no problem giving it to

your grandchild. But suppose I said the individual must be a stranger – what then? What would happen if you just picked the next person on the street who looked as though they could do with it? Most people would not be able to accept it. Your gesture would immediately rouse suspicion. Many would assume not that you were being spontaneously generous, or seeking to right the world's inequalities, but rather there was more likelihood you were trying to get rid of an incriminating piece of evidence. Instead of seeing you as a good person, people would look askance at you. What's going on here? Perhaps it's because if you can't see what the benefit is to the donor, you feel very uncomfortable about taking the money. This in turn may be because reciprocal altruism is so deeply ingrained in us.

If lack of reciprocity distorts the relationship between unrelated individuals, can we solve the problems of reciprocity and inequality by giving to groups instead of individuals? If you want to give away some money it might be better to do it through official channels, in a specialist group context – and here there are many categories as everyone here knows from experience. It may be to the poor via the Sallies or the City Mission, or to the worthy via fund raisers for cancer research, the blind, or to one of many other channels for helping the luckless, disabled or ill. Or it may be to improve the environment – arts foundation, heritage society or forest and bird.

But in every case one can argue there is some reciprocal benefit for the donor. Perhaps the least return comes to the donor of funds to the Sallies, but even here we gain overall societal benefits. Where the donation (both time and money) is to a group whose task is openly described, everyone knows what the trade-off is and feels comfortable accepting it. It is an example of reciprocity – we give something and expect in return that something we care about will be improved - children from poor households will get breakfast, art will thrive, the kakapo will be saved, or cancer research will proceed apace. We derive both direct and indirect benefits from all these things.

What about giving internationally? Most people feel comfortable about giving emergency assistance, but what about the aid programmes that assist the starving in third world countries. Here the problems become more complex, partly because of widely-acknowledged corruption. No-one wants their hard-earned dollars going off to feed the privileged war-lords instead of the starving. But there may be more to it than that. The same kind of uneasiness that builds up between two individuals when the imbalance between giving and receiving grows too large, may be apparent at the international level too. When the giving is all one way, the recipient may begin to feel either patronised or suspicious. What kind of invisible debt are they building up? Not only does the recipient country begin to feel uneasy, but the on-looking countries do too, as everyone who has noticed the rise of Chinese generosity in the Pacific could testify.

So does altruism actually NEED to be reciprocal to work properly? As a matter of fact, yes. Mathematical models of the various forms of altruism show that only reciprocal altruism works. Evidence from our evolutionary past as well as our own contemporary experience, from the personal to the international, also suggest that only reciprocal altruism works. So where does that leave some of the old Christian western world's emphasis on unconditional loving and giving? "When a man asks for a loaf, give him two", and even "turn the other cheek" – not much reciprocity about that.

There are at least three aspects to all this that I suggest require further thought.

The first is to consider the extent to which the overwhelming growth in the world's human population has made it appropriate to take another look at the various forms of altruism and pay attention to their scientifically described outcomes - especially the mathematical models that indicate that so-called promiscuous altruism (that is altruism that offers no reciprocal benefit to the donor) does not work in the long run. ("Does not work" means that groups that practice promiscuous altruism die out; because cheaters and free-loaders take over and anarchy results.)

The second is to question whether the Christian message has been over-sold or misunderstood. Some writers (Robert Wright, *Evolution of God*) are arguing for example, that Jesus' recommendation to turn the other cheek was not an exercise in passivity or meekness, but rather a simple instruction about not taking on an unwinnable battle against a bully and thus living to fight another day. (See also Tan, 2010.)

The third is to observe the similarity in perspective that arises as human thinking develops. First we see reciprocal altruism arising very early in evolutionary time. Then we see a refinement of reciprocal altruism in the golden rule, and later still we see important similarities between these two and philosophy's utilitarianism. In developing Mill's utilitarian morality Robert Wright wrote in *The Moral Animal*, "You should, in short, go through life considering the welfare of everyone else as important as your own welfare" (p.336). Please note everyone else's welfare is not MORE important than your own welfare (as in the unworkable promiscuous altruism) but AS important.

Part 2. Justice

Underpinning the whole idea of reciprocity is the idea of fairness, or justice. As I mentioned at the beginning, one of the basic givens of life on earth is inequality, which leads almost inevitably to injustice, or at least perceived injustice. On the other hand, these two values, justice and reciprocity might be brought closer together, with advantages for both. It would be great to see an acknowledgement of them in a number of settings, beginning at home with the two-year-old. Then there's the on-going push for human rights. Reciprocity applies here too. Politically, I look forward to the day when rights are coupled with an equal emphasis on responsibilities.

Small children are quick to notice injustice. "It's not fair!" says one. "Why should he get a bigger piece than me?" At this point parents may attempt an explanation. But finally, when explanations fail to satisfy, they resort to "Well nothing's fair, and you'll just have to get on with it". In times gone by they used to say "Nothing's fair in this life ...". And of course this left the door open for a grand tally-up of justice in the next life, and thus had a calming effect on everyone.

Next, the children go to school where more injustices arise. Mary does no work and gets first prize. Jane works very hard and doesn't even pass. Here we are again confronted by the biological basis of individual differences, which is the bottom line. We can do our best to help by ensuring that everyone has good living conditions, and access to good teachers, but we can do nothing else about inequalities in potential. As I read recently, we should do all we can to provide equality of opportunity, but it is misguided to look for equality of results.

Bible stories illustrate the workings out of unequal distribution of talents. You will recall the parable of the talents (Matthew 25 14-30) – how the men given 5 talents and 2 talents respectively went off and used them efficiently, but the man with only one talent buried his in the ground. With this story, I often wish it was the man given 5 talents who buried his money in the ground while the man given one talent used his, because that is where today's problems lie. Children born with genetic advantages, encouraged by their equally fortunate parents, tend to flourish, whereas those with few genetic advantages find it much harder.

When it comes to justice at the community and political level, we here in New Zealand are among the most fortunate, with our internationally acknowledged reputation for being one of the least corrupt societies in the world. But even here the possibilities for cheating are all around us. Anyone who accepts the plumber's offer of a reduced price for cash, made to avoid both income tax and GST, can hardly criticise tax evaders in Greece, or even corrupt Wall Street traders. And what should happen to the cheaters and free-loaders who operate within the law – the people who take but don't give? The people who never reciprocate? Nothing? "Virtue is its own reward" we are told. This may ring true for some thoughtful, older people, who've reached transcendence, but I doubt it would provide sufficient motivation for many up-and-comers to refrain from finding ways to avoid tax.

And unfortunately, injustice goes deeper than that. It is good to point out that the environment can make a huge difference to whether or not a person is able to fulfil their potential, no matter what that potential is. But underneath this is the whole question of potential which is fundamentally biological or genetic luck, and in order to address contemporary questions of justice, should be recognised as such.

Recognition of the biological basis of individual differences could lead to subtle, but important changes. People who are born with few talents (now used in the contemporary sense) tend to be blamed for their lack of success, or even their inability to manage the demands of modern living. But this is simply not fair. They may be trying as hard as they can. So when they get blamed for something that is beyond their control they (understandably) go into grievance mode. It must be those other guys' fault; they must be ripping us off in some way.

In contrast to the genetically disadvantaged are the genetically advantaged, who make a similar but contrasting error. Because we are successful, they say, it must be because we work harder and are more conscientious. People who do not succeed are (therefore) just lazy. This in turn leads to an attitude of entitlement. We deserve to have more money and beautiful homes because we earned them. This line of thinking is equally false. They have these good things because they were born with, say, the equivalent of five talents (as in the parable) and because these talents are handed down from one generation to the other, they had parents who in their turn provided good environments, concentrating on the very things that were needed for their offspring to fulfil their potential.

So here we have the origins of two of today's great ills. On the one hand, there is the sense of grievance, in turn leading to anger and wrongly-attributed blame from those born with lesser-valued skills; and on the other, the deeply unattractive sense of entitlement, seen in those born with more highly-valued skills. What to do about this? Basically I believe this is a political question, but in the meantime I would remind everyone about that grand biblical admonition – "to whom much is given much will be required" (Luke 12:48). The first thing to do is to remind

the privileged that the basis of their success is genetic luck, and instead of being self-righteous about it they should a) acknowledge the origins of their good fortune, b) be grateful for it and c) seek to re-dress the unequal distribution of the good things of this world.

But on what grounds would they want to do this? Even if they acknowledged the biological basis of their good fortune, would they then automatically want to re-dress the balance by giving away some of their privilege? I'm not sure whether the mere concept of justice would be enough to ensure action of this kind. I would say, probably not. I think additional motivation would be required.

Part 3. Stewardship

My third contemporary value in need of re-balancing is stewardship. Stewardship does of course apply to our time, talents and money as much as to the planet, but here, I want only to talk briefly about the environment.

So far as individuals and communities are concerned, the messages have been around for a long time and for the most part are no longer controversial. Responsible modern parents and teachers encourage children to care about the environment. The messages are backed up by doing – everything from picking up and re-cycling rubbish, to planting trees, learning about endangered species and greenhouse gases.

I'm not sure at which point stewardship meets economics when it comes to buying more stuff ... but note that frugality and abstemiousness, long held in high regard by Protestants, are once again emerging as virtues, even in the writings of atheists (Charles Murray, *Coming Apart*).

So far as the planet is concerned, I think the biblical "man shall have dominion over all the earth" has been misinterpreted, or rather, interpreted to suit whatever world view was prominent at the time. These days we are inclined to interpret having dominion over all the earth as taking responsibility for it. We should indeed be doing all we can to ensure its wellbeing, and that means its natural beauty, the huge variety of habitats and species and so on. Most of you here know far more about this than I do, but I do want to say that allowing human population growth to completely swamp other forms of life seems particularly arrogant and far from the attitude of stewardship we should be adopting.

Last time I talked I mentioned ancient cave paintings and their interpretation as religious – recognition by the artist that humans were totally dependent on the animals for their own survival (food and clothes) and thus held them in respect, awe and reverence. Some of these paintings – for example this is Aurignacian cave art - date back 30,000 years and more, so the idea of respect, awe and reverence for the earth is not particularly new – we just seem to have lost sight of it in the last few hundred years.

I will not enlarge on any of this further except to draw your attention to a contemporary example. On 3 May 2012 Brian Fallow wrote in the NZ Herald (B2) "NZ's marine rights come with duties". (Terrific eh?) Not content with this extraordinary new approach, he elaborated on the nature of the contract between New Zealand and the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea. He quoted Professor Michael McGinnis (California), speaking about NZ's responsibility towards its huge marine zone and continental shelf. "Internationally you are obliged to act as stewards. It is not an issue of balancing use against biodiversity protection. The convention reflects a hierarchy of values and stewardship is the priority."

In looking more closely at altruism, justice and stewardship it has been interesting to me to notice how often all three are interwoven. In a manner similar to the ancient tragedy of the commons, I see some of today's problems similarly linked. To illustrate, I would like to refer to a story I read recently.

When the first refugee arrived in the village, everyone came out to welcome him. They invited him into their homes, they helped him find food, and asked about his family. But then more refugees came and more and more, so that the villagers gradually became more wary. Their homes could no longer contain the extra people and basic foods were running short. Still the refugees came, and since the villagers could no longer welcome them into their homes they began to camp on the outskirts of the village. (The picture shows Syrian refugees arriving at a small village near the border in Turkey in June this year.)

Knowledge can be shared infinitely, but matter and energy are finite (Hardin, 1982). At what point are advocates of altruism, justice and stewardship going to act? Is it before or after fights break out between the villagers and the refugees? At what point do those concerned for the welfare of everyone, begin to put limits on what must be shared? Is it ever right to put limits on what must be shared? If the answer to that is no, one must never put limits on the sharing of shelter and food, then is one correspondingly able to endorse the deaths of the habitat, the animals, the villagers and the refugees?

And please bear in mind, from an evolutionary point of view, the few who do survive will be the tough, the aggressive, the cheaters and free-loaders. The remnant group will be a far cry from the orderly, creative and generous villagers who welcomed the first refugees.

Here is a summary of the story so far ...

- Reciprocal altruism will only work well if reciprocity is maintained and we can find a way of controlling the level of cheaters and freeloaders.
- Justice will only be achieved if we can find a way of coping with inborn inequality and competition.
- Stewardship of the environment will only eventuate if we can agree on shared goals and find the motivation to look after the planet.

So now we come to the question of religion. Believing that religions overall had a negative impact on society, evolutionary anthropologists set out to trace their origins, mainly in order to find a way of getting rid of them. To everyone's surprise they found that no society had survived without a religion. If they had a religion they survived; if they did not have a religion, or if they had a religion and gave it up, they did not survive. The anthropologists have yet to find a surviving society, past or present, that is or was not controlled by some form of religious guidelines. This, they suggest, must mean that having a religion provided something that gave people an evolutionary advantage.

So my question today is, would any of the problems we have with contemporary values be helped by having a strong, plausible, contemporary religion?

As with so many other problems, I believe it is a matter of building onto existing models rather than throwing away the whole thing to start again.

On the other hand, what we had was clearly faulty and in need of some serious re-thinking. We need to recognise at least two major factors – first that some of the ancient religious admonitions and advice were designed for people living in small groups in primitive settings. While the rules worked well in those circumstances, they do not automatically translate to the very large populations we now have, nor to our current scientific world view.

But second, as humans we have not outgrown the same basic impulses and needs we've always had. When the chips are down, we still compete to survive and reproduce.

In this last part of my talk I want to make a few suggestions about this. Basically, these are original. That is to say, I'm not citing anyone else here, even Alain de Botton, who, as many of you know recently published a book spelling out his view of the good things that religion has provided in the past. My list is quite different and derives from my evolutionary perspective.

So what does a religion provide that society cannot do without? First, what most religions seem to provide at the most basic level is surveillance. This provides essential support for reciprocal altruism by giving everyone the feeling that they are being watched and evaluated by some all-powerful being that knows even their most private thoughts. Everyone behaves better if they think they're being watched, so this tends to damp down the frequency of cheaters and free-loaders. Where group size gets too large for individuals to be monitored, and where there is no ever-watchful god, there is, sooner or later, a rise in cheaters and free-loaders.

The second thing that religions tend to provide is some way of counteracting the inequalities of the natural order to make things fair, or just. Since it seems impossible to do so on earth, most religions suggest this occurs after death. Contemporary western humans with an education in science find this thinking implausible. They can find no evidence of an afterlife, and certainly not one in which everyone is brought to justice. Although some thinkers have suggested we should rise above issues of injustice, this tack is unlikely to succeed, especially in the young. So here too we would need to think of something new.

My third suggestion is that religion can provide sense that we are all part of something greater than ourselves (Newberg & Waldman, 2007, p.226). And perhaps even more important, that even the most powerful person is accountable to a higher authority. I think this is particularly relevant for leadership, in practically all settings. When a president, prime minister, or queen; a captain of industry, a judge, a headmaster, a teacher or a parent, acknowledges the authority of a higher power, this provides a very important safeguard for everyone. When such leaders and authority figures begin to think they themselves know it all, things can get dangerous.

No human being is all-knowing. No-one is infallible. Even the powerful should recognise their limitations by adopting a proper and reasonable humility that prevents humans going to extremes. I think this is one of the primary reasons for keeping some form of religion in public life. It is a reason why candidates for the American presidency are always asked about their religion. And it's one of the reasons why our own parliament and many of our schools begin their work with a prayer – God is the highest authority, not the prime minister nor the headmaster.

The fourth thing on my list of important things that religion can provide us with that nothing else can, is motivation, which in turn is directly related to goal-setting, purpose and hope. When

it comes to going beyond our biologically-based motivations to survive and reproduce, doing one's absolute best "for the glory of God" appears to have motivated people better than anything else.

We first encounter questions about motivation, goal-setting and purpose in our teens. At this time we begin to take far more notice of individual differences. Pre-teens hardly notice these differences at all, but from the age of 11 or 12 on, adolescents discern individual differences very clearly. They know some of their classmates are good at some kinds of activities and others are not.

In New Zealand, parents and teachers go out of their way to help young people discover where their talents lie so that most people gradually come to realise what it is they are good at, or in what way they are special. And here is something positive. In spite of the seeming injustice of the distribution of talents, the great thing is that if people have a religion which not only motivates, but teaches that using your particular talent or gift in the service of others is the right thing to do, and they do it, then they are likely to find fulfilment and happiness.

My fifth and last (for today anyway) is the idea incorporated into most of the world's great religions, that each and every one of us is unique, special, cared for, respected and loved by God. If all else fails, at least God still loves you. This idea has proved of inestimable value to lonely people everywhere, and to everyone who has ever felt a failure or brought disappointment to their loved ones. I cannot help but note in passing that the acknowledgement that each and every being is unique is central to both religion and to evolution.

So perhaps a secular society may not after all be the best possible model. Today I have suggested there are at least five attributes of religion, that little else can provide, and which contribute to our very survival in densely populated societies.

As it happens, these five attributes seem to be directly related to the re-valuing of those contemporary values mentioned earlier – altruism, justice and stewardship.

First, a religion can provide the kind of surveillance required to maintain reciprocal altruism so that it works well.

Second, a religion can provide a way of ensuring both comfort and ultimate justice in the face of otherwise insuperable inequalities.

Third, a religion can provide a higher power to whom everyone is accountable, not only for human relationships but for the care of all living things.

Fourth, a religion can provide a powerful motivating force that enables people to set satisfying goals, live their lives with purpose, and achieve fulfilment.

And finally, a religion can provide confirmation of a person's fundamental uniqueness and a sense that each and every individual is of worth.

Bibliography

BOOKS

Armstrong, Karen. *The Case for God: What religion really means*. Bodley Head: London, 2009.

Armstrong, Karen. *A History of God: From Abraham to the present: A 4,000- year quest for God*. Heinemann: London, 1993.

- Bishop, John. *Believing by Faith: An essay in the epistemology and ethics of religious belief*. Clarendon Press: Oxford, 2007.
- Boehm, Christopher. *Moral Origins: The evolution of virtue, altruism and shame*. Basic Books: New York, 2012.
- Collins, Frances S. *The Language of God: A scientist presents evidence for belief*. Free Press: New York, 2006.
- Cupitt, Don. *Taking Leave of God* SCM Press: London, 1980.
- Dawkins, Richard. *The God Delusion* Houghton Mifflin: Boston, 2006.
- De Botton, Alain. *Religion for Atheists: A non-believer's guide to the uses of religion*. Hamish Hamilton: London, 2012.
- Dennett, Daniel. *Darwin's Dangerous Idea: Evolution and the meanings of life*. Simon & Schuster: New York, 1995.
- Dennett, Daniel. *Breaking the Spell: Religion as a natural phenomenon*. Viking: New York, 2006.
- Geering, Lloyd. *Tomorrow's God: How we create our worlds*. Bridget Williams Books: Wellington, New Zealand, 1996.
- Haidt, Jonathan. *The Righteous Mind: Why good people are divided by religion and politics*. Pantheon Books: New York, 2012.
- Harris, Ian. *Creating God, Re-Creating Christ: Re-imagining the Christian way in a secular world*. St Andrew's Trust: Wellington, 1999.
- Harris, Sam. *The End of Faith: Religion, terror and the future of reason*. W.W.Norton: NY, 2004.
- Hitchens, Christopher. *God is Not Great: How religion poisons everything*. Twelve Books: New York, 2007.
- McGrath, Alister. *Why God Won't Go Away: Engaging with the new atheism*. SPCK: London, 2011.
- McNamara, Patrick. (ed.) *Where God and Science Meet: How brain and evolutionary studies alter our understanding of religion*. Praegar: Westport, Conn., 2006.
- Micklethwait, John & Woolridge, Adrian. *God is Back: How the global rise of faith is changing the world*. Penguin: London, 2010.
- Miles, Jack. *God: a Biography*. Knopf: New York, 1995.
- Murray, Charles. *Coming Apart: The state of white America 1960-2010*. Random House: New York, 2012.
- Newberg, Andrew & Waldman, Mark R. *Born to Believe: God, science and the origin of ordinary and extraordinary beliefs*. Free Press: New York, 2007.
- Tan, J. H. Religion as moral innovation. A review of John Teehan, *In the Name of God: The evolutionary origins of religious ethics and violence*. *Evolutionary Psychology*, 9: 61-63, 2010.
- Wilson, David Sloan. *Evolution for Everyone. How Darwin's theory can change the way we think about our lives*. Random House: New York, 2007.
- Wright, Robert. *The Moral Animal: Why we are the way we are: The new science of evolutionary psychology*. Random House: New York, 1994.
- Wright, Robert. *The Evolution of God*. Little, Brown and Co: New York, 2009.



SCIENTIFIC ARTICLE

Hardin, Garrett. 'Discriminating altruisms'. *Zygon*, 17: 163-186, 1982.

Abstract: Reliable Darwinism theory shows that pure altruism cannot persist and expand over time. All higher organisms show inheritable patterns of caring and discrimination. The principal forms of discriminating altruisms among human beings are individualism (different from egoism), familialism, cronyism, tribalism and patriotism. The promiscuous altruism called 'universalism' cannot endure in the face of inescapable competition. Information can be promiscuously shared, but not so matter and energy without evoking the tragedy of the commons. Universalism is not recommendable even as an ideal. Survival now requires the creation of an intellectual base for a new patriotism.

MAGAZINE ARTICLES

New Scientist cover story "God: Can't live with him, can't live without him." 17/3/12, pp 37-49.

Time cover story "Heaven can't wait: Why rethinking the hereafter could make the world a better place." Jon Meacham. 16 April 2012, pp 33-38.

THE UNIVERSALITY OF THE GOLDEN RULE IN THE WORLD RELIGIONS

| | |
|---------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Christianity | All things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye so to them; for this is the law and the prophets. Matthew 7:1 |
| Confucianism | Do not do to others what you would not like yourself. Then there will be no resentment against you, either in the family or in the state. Analects 12:2 |
| Buddhism | Hurt not others in ways that you yourself would find hurtful. Udana-Varga 5,1 |
| Hinduism | This is the sum of duty; do naught onto others what you would not have them do unto you. Mahabharata 5,1517 |
| Islam | No one of you is a believer until he desires for his brother that which he desires for himself. Sunnah |
| Judaism | What is hateful to you, do not do to your fellowman. This is the entire Law; all the rest is commentary. Talmud, Shabbat 3id |