

When genes and memes collide

Earlier we noted one of the most significant differences between *homo sapiens* and other animals: the thing that we experience as culture. We also noted that *homo sapiens* is a copying machine for the DNA which describes *homo sapiens* and a copying machine for complex behaviors - nature's first dual purpose copying machine.

We skipped a very interesting topic - What happens when the "selfish memplex" encounters the "selfish gene"?

As we have seen, Christianity, Islam, Judaism, and Mormonism are all examples of "selfish" memplexes.

The "selfish memplexes" act a selection force. This selection force manifests itself by selecting genes which describe a brain most easily controlled by religion.

A capacity for guilt would give a religion another "handle" on the brain. Therefore religion benefits from guilt. The reproductive success of a religion which can create and harness guilt is substantially improved. Thus religions that create and harness guilt to control resources will dominate the "meme pool" of religions. Religion must therefore logically be assumed to favor and select for sources of guilt - a brain which not only has an enhanced capacity to experience guilt, but also a brain which wants things inducing feelings of guilt.

Latent bisexuality induces guilt. In fact it could be considered as a "hyper-stimulus" much as modern food production has turned sugar into a hyper-stimulus for the sense of taste. Same-sex attraction induces guilt and therefore religion can be assumed to select for bisexuality - and by logical extension - homosexuality and all the other guilt-inducing "deviancy" observed in modern human culture.

Thus, in a sort of ultimate irony, the rise and spread of homosexuality is an entirely natural and predictable consequence of the rise and spread of religion. This is particularly true of the monotheistic religions such as Catholicism and Mormonism, the adherents of which are so vociferous in their condemnations of homosexuals.

It is important to note how culture has changed - especially since World War II.

Before World War II communities were much more able to enforce taboos. This changed after World War II. After that great sloshing of humanity many people

did not return to their small communities. These people instead collected in growing cities and created a critical mass which was able to resist the taboos of the larger culture. It is no coincidence that the gay rights movement began in cities where large numbers of men were discharged from military service after World War II. Many service men were discharged in New York City. This set the stage for the Stonewall Riots which are considered the beginning of the modern gay rights movement. On the west coast many service men were discharged in San Francisco. The resulting concentration of gay men has caused San Francisco to be considered a sort of capitol of the gay rights movement.

When considering religion as the agent causing widespread homosexuality, it is also important to recall that as human culture and especially religions sent human reproduction into overdrive they reduced or eliminated the need for well-modulated biologically driven reproductive urges. Where culturally driven reproduction replaced biologically driven reproduction there was no longer a natural selection pressure for well-modulated reproductive urges in that gene pool. That left biologically driven reproductive urges available for other purposes.

A considerable effort will also be made in this chapter to debunk Simon LeVay and others who wrongly equate homosexual behavior in *homo sapiens* with apparent homosexual behavior in other animals.

Homosexual behavior in other animals generally falls into one of two categories. Borrowing a term from “Dr. Laura” Schlessinger, the first category could be described as “biological errors.” Typical of this category is the sensationalized story of two male penguins in New York’s Central Park Zoo. The two “gay” penguins exhibited nesting behavior which would have been perfectly normal if one of the penguins were female. This happened back in 2004.

The other category is far more interesting. This category consists of widespread homosexual activity in a species. Interestingly enough, the best known examples are in other primates. The bonobo would be mistaken as a chimpanzee by most people and they are in fact closely related to one another. Female bonobos are regularly observed engaged in sexual pleasuring of one another. This has been interpreted as being Mother Nature’s stamp of approval on lesbianism among human females when in fact there exists no evidence the two phenomena are related.

To properly understand “lesbian” behavior among bonobos one should first understand a cruel reality in the animal world. Many males practice infanticide because it has been advantageous for genes which specified “kill all young which were here when I showed up.” A well-known example is seen in lions. A

“pride” of lions consists of many related females. A male or pair of cooperating males dominates. If a new male or cooperating pair of males takes over the pride, then they will kill all existing cubs. This behavior favors the genes for the killing instinct because females will come into estrus sooner once they are no longer nursing. This gives a slight but important advantage over generations.

Other animals (other gene pools) have developed ways to counter the infanticidal behavior. For example promiscuity of human females denies human males assurance of non-paternity. Thus the human male dare not kill infants - he could be killing his own entries in the next generation. The lion only kills when taking over a “pride.” Because this is when he has assurance of non-paternity - he is not killing his own cubs.

Now you are ready to understand those “lesbian” bonobos. Bonobos live in troops not unlike the pride of lions. The troop is composed largely of related females and is subject to violent takeovers by marauding males. The sexual pleasuring among the females is a bonding behavior. Females that have bonded in this way will come to one another’s aid when marauding males attack to eliminate preexisting infants. The primary difference between “lesbian” behavior as observed in bonobos and lesbian behavior as observed in human females is that in bonobos the behavior is clearly enhancing the reproductive success of the females. This is obviously different than lesbianism as observed among human females.

Homosexual behavior has also been observed among males of some species of baboons. Pairs of male baboons are sometimes observed to take turns at mounting and anally penetrating one another. People with an agenda may note this and then neglect to tell the “rest of the story.” To understand the “rest of the story”, one must understand that competition for fertile females is intense within a troop of baboons. If a male succeeds in mounting a female then other males are likely to attack to prevent him from completing the sex act and impregnating the female. This gives the attacking males a chance at the fertile female. It is obviously difficult for a male baboon to mount a female and simultaneously fend off attacking males. Things play out differently with the males which were observed to engage in homosexual sex play. When a baboon from such a pair would succeed in mounting a female his partner would not attack, but would instead defend against other males which tried to interfere with heterosexual coupling. The obvious conclusion is that the homosexual sex play creates a bond between the two males which increases their chances of passing along their genes. Thus as with the bonobos, this example of homosexual behavior clearly increases the “fitness” of the participants when considered from a Darwinian perspective. In both cases the participants get more entries into the evolutionary sweepstakes.

In contrast, homosexual behavior as observed in modern humans does not contribute to passing along the genetic code for the behavior to subsequent generations. In fact without culturally based and especially religiously based edicts to do so, the genes for homosexuality would not be transmitted in modern humans. However with the guilt driven reproduction induced by memplexes of religion we find that roughly six percent of the population identifies as exclusively homosexual. An even larger proportion should be presumed to be bisexual to some extent.

These bisexuals may be equally attracted to men and women or more attracted to one than the other. In any case the same sex attraction would act as a highly effective guilt generator. These people are very much in evidence - they are the ones that claim to be absolutely certain that homosexuality is a choice. They can be so certain based on their own experience - which is to wrestle with the guilt associated with their own homosexual desires.