UDC 130.1+316.4 DOI: https://doi.org/10.64076/iedc250724.01

Genes vs mind: possible consequences in the age of social media

Andriy Simchuk
Vasyl Stefanyk Precarpathian National University, Ivano-Frankivsk
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1762-144X

Abstract. *Human intellect, controlled by genes, is aimed at solving the problem of their multiplication, while the mind, based on self-awareness, acts in favor of the individual. Thus natural evolution concerns only intellect and does not affect the dynamics of mind, which can only develop as a result of individual efforts, and this is a problem for progress. Information links in social organisms (for example, ants) lead to the emergence of supra organismic intellect, superior to individual one and capable of solving more complex problems (Dreyer et al., 2024). At the same time, technical progress has provided effective means of communication (Internet, social networks). Will this not lead (if it has not already led) to a similar integration of intellects in the human community with unpredictable consequences?*
Keywords: *selfish gene, intellect, mind, human evolution, social media.*

It is obvious that human cognitive abilities contain two fundamentally different components: genetically determined intellect (as the ability to solve problems) and individual mind (as understanding) based on self-awareness. At first glance, it seems that there is no contradiction between them, and they work together, representing simply different levels of the same system. However, is this true? What is important here is that intellect is inherited in all living organisms, including humans, and the heritability of intellect increases with age (Bouchard Jr., 2013).

According to the concept of the selfish gene (Dawkins, 1976), genes are not "interested" in the goals of the organism in which they are located. The organism is only a tool that they use to achieve their main goal – to pass on as many copies of themselves as possible to subsequent generations. Thus, intellect controlled by genes and mind based on self-awareness may have different goals, and this may lead to contradictory, divergent developmental trends, especially with the growing influence of social networks, which are able to unite individual intellects into new systems.

Intellect developed in the process of evolution from primitive organisms to humans exactly in order to more effectively solve the problems of gene multiplication. Consequently, intellect serves precisely this purpose and is realized in the phenomenon of the organism's behavior in the form of various repertoires developed in the process of long-term evolution. These repertoires are made up of standard developed and tested procedures. Thus, genes, with the help of various biochemical and neurophysiological

mechanisms, “force” organisms to perform individual and joint actions aimed at gene spread. Hereditary variability in these mechanisms creates material for natural evolution. Sometimes this is considered the cause and evidence of the absence of free will (Sapolsky, 2023). However, the absence of free will also means the absence of mind. If a creature's behavior is determined by its set of genes and its environment, then there is simply no room for reasonable activity.

Indeed, the presence of a sufficiently strong influence of heredity on human intellect and behavior allows us to consider that in this case, too, genes have the ability to quite effectively use the same procedures developed in the process of evolution in “their own interests.” Although natural selection, responsible for the development of such adaptive mechanisms and connections, may weaken in humans due to advances in medicine, sexual selection is fully preserved and this probably allows genes to be successful in achieving their “goals,” including through human intellect (Miller, 2001).

Thus, human intellect is not subordinated by default to his personality, his Self. Genes are generally not “interested” in the prosperity of the organism itself. Genes “use” the organism as a mechanism that allows collecting energy from the environment and investing it in the transfer of genes to the next generation, and each gene “wants” to do this more effectively than others. Therefore, genotypes are only temporary associations, and this transience is manifested in genetically determined aging, illness (Casanova, Abel, 2013) and death (Böhm, Schild, 2003), which are necessary to free up a niche for the next evolving generations. The phenomenon of effective population size shows that about 10% of specimens on average participate in reproduction (Frankham, 1995), and the remaining individuals are actually sacrificed to the process of gene multiplication, senselessly dying from diseases, parasites, predators and natural death. It is clear that all of these are natural processes, and I am simply using anthropomorphisms, but the essence does not change. In this case, the “goals” of genes are directly aimed against organisms for which these things are evil. Natural death, contrary to popular belief, is not an attribute of life. This is evidenced by the fact that, on the one hand, there are special genetically determined mechanisms of death (Böhm, Schild, 2003), and on the other hand, exceptions to this rule (Piraino *et al*., 1996).

It may be a coincidence, but if we look at the characteristics attributed to Satan, they surprisingly correspond to the trends that genes bring to their carrier. The Bible characterizes Satan as: sending diseases (Job 2:7), bringing death into the world (Book of Wisdom II. 24), wicked and deceitful (Matt. 13:19, John 8:44), tempting (Matt. 4:3) and the prince of this world (John 12:31). All these characteristics in relation to humans and even other organisms have genetic determinants. I have already written above

about diseases, old age and death, we can also talk about the genetics of lies, unethical behavior (Loewen *et al*., 2013) and promiscuity (Garcia, 2010), it is difficult to argue about the power of genes over almost all aspects of biological life (Dawkins, 1976), including human behavior, as well as other species (Sapolsky, 2023). So, genes really do rule this world. All this is beneficial to the genes and that is why it was developed in the process of evolution, but all this is not beneficial to the individual, since in the end it always leads to bad consequences. Thus, the "enemy of man" may not be some mythological creature, but our own genes, or rather their property to strive for preferential multiplication in subsequent generations.

Mind presupposes understanding of the interrelations of objects and phenomena, the consequences of certain actions of an individual as a whole, abd the basis of reason (as understanding) is self-awareness. Therefore, the organism is a value for the mind, and in this, reason and intellect do not coincide, but rather have opposites. In this sense, there are contradictions and conflict between reason and the selfish gene. Sometimes the concept of the selfish gene is criticized for justifying human selfishness (Midgley, 2009), however, I think it does not justify it so much as it explains it. A weak mind is not able to resist genes that have honed their influence on an individual for hundreds of millions of years. Genes can try to use the ability of the Self to think for their own purposes - for example, by setting goals and developing procedures for crimes, wars of conquest, seizure of power, etc. This means that since the goals of genes (intellect) and mind do not coincide, the direction, purpose and result of the activity of mind must be included in its definition. In any case, modern ideas about the pinnacles of mind development, such as the Dyson Sphere, seem absurd. I'm absolutely certain that no civilization will ever do this. Because a Dyson Sphere is the ultimate dream of a population, not a civilization. It's exactly what ants would do if someone gave them the right technology (Simchuk, 2024). But of course, I don't put it all on genes and intellect - it's like a a lighthouse that brings the Light to illuminate the path from the first organisms to the beginnings of reason, but unfortunately, no further.

Thus, here we can conclude that only intellect is capable of evolving as a result of natural selection, but the mind itself (due to this selection) cannot evolve. Indeed, the mind can act contrary to genes, and then such individuals will fall out of natural evolution. And the individual nature of the mind says that only individual efforts are capable of developing it (As they say: The Kingdom of Heaven suffers violence (Matt. 11:12)). Again, an analogy: the mind can really provide technologies for controlling genes, and therefore remove diseases, old age and natural death from the lives of reasonable people, and without any mysticism. However, for some reason it is believed

that the evolution of the mind continues, although empirical data does not confirm this (OECD, 2024). Really, the existing society does not create conditions for the mass evolution of mind. They are not among the goals of the market system, are not included in the programs of political parties or other public organizations. This problem is not considered systematically at all because humans are considered rational a priori, and this may not be entirely true - the results of human average activity seem questionable from the point of view of their rationality. In any case, this is a serious problem.

In addition, there are still some pessimistic considerations regarding intellect. Recent experiments have shown that in social organisms, individual intellects can combine into a supra-organismic intellectual structure that is much superior to them (Dreyer *et al*., 2024). The fact that this was recorded in ants suggests that it was a spontaneous process that did not require self-awareness, but was based only on the informational connections that united individuals. Humans also belong to creatures with social connections, which initially developed for successful hunting, protection from predators and other tribes, etc. Therefore, a similar effect can also take place in human populations.

Game strategies that manifest themselves in the genetically determined behavior of many biological organisms have long been used in economics and politics (Axelrod, 1984; Brüne *et al*., 2013; Sapolsky, 2023). However, recently there have been major changes in communications. The powerful development of social networks is radically changing the political landscape, which has been formed for centuries and was based on the elites of societies. For a long time, most people were not interested in politics, and it was difficult and very expensive to attract them to it. Now this can be easily done using social networks. Considering that the mind, as I have already noted above, is not able to develop spontaneously, without the activity of the individual, the behavior of many is under greater influence of genetic factors, and social networks can contribute to a situation where we should expect the integration of their individual intellects into supra-individual structures that can exceed individual abilities. A sort of upgrade of the collective unconscious. This is a case where selfish genes can "use" technological advances created by the mind for their own purposes. Maybe everyone is now afraid of the wrong kind of intellect, which is what should really be feared? Artificial intellect does not have its own goals, but integrated human meta-intellect does have its own goals. One way or another, these will be the goals of selfish genes, and we are unlikely to like the methods of achieving them.

Can genes control such meta-intellect of human societies as effectively as they do on an individual level, or on a group level, as it happens in social animals, and how can

this be expressed? Obviously, the conditions and environment in this case are very different from what it encountered during millions of years of evolution, but perhaps the trends developing now in world politics are a consequence of the growing "power" of this collective unconscious, integrated due to the Internet and, most importantly, social networks. The growth of right-wing radical sentiments with a pronounced dominance of alpha leaders even in Europe (Aktas, 2024) on the one hand and very similar features and patterns (use of social networks for agitation and propaganda, preference for subordinate loyalty over competence, populism, etc.) of recent elections in countries as different as Ukraine (Doroshenko, 2022) and the United States (Sithole, 2025) on the other hand, may indicate certain strategies that were played out as a result of clashes and cooperations of interests, in which genetic behavioral determinants could also participate, since they are, in principle, characteristic of people. I do not doubt the legitimacy and democracy of the elections, but the problems can go beyond specific manifestations and have much more serious consequences and pose problems for the development of reason and the progress of civilization. In any case, as expected, humanity apparently did not show up for the final battle of good and evil or even took the wrong side for the most part, if we look at the already more than 11-year war in Ukraine, where the division of strategic directions of development is especially evident, and the punishment of Evil is not considered at all as an option for ending the war.

References

1. Aktas, M. (2024). The rise of populist radical right parties in Europe. *International Sociology, 39*(6), 591–605. https://doi.org/10.1177/02685809241297547.

2. Axelrod, R. (1984). *The evolution of cooperation*. Basic Books. https://websites.umich.edu/~axe/Axelrod_Evol_of_Coop_excerpts.pdf.

3. Böhm, I., & Schild, H. (2003). Apoptosis: The complex scenario for a silent cell death. *Molecular Imaging and Biology, 5*(1), 2–14. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1536-1632(03)00024-6.

4. Bouchard, T. J., Jr. (2013). The Wilson Effect: The increase in heritability of IQ with age. *Twin Research and Human Genetics, 16*, 923–930. https://doi.org/10.1017/thg.2013.54.

5. Brüne, M., Juckel, G., & Enzi, B. (2013). 'An eye for an eye'? Neural correlates of retribution and forgiveness. *PLoS ONE, 8*, e73519. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0073519.

6. Casanova, J.-L., & Abel, L. (2013). The genetic theory of infectious diseases: A brief history and selected illustrations. *Annual Review of Genomics and Human Genetics, 14*, 215–243. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-genom-091212-153448.

7. Dawkins, R. (1976). *The selfish gene*. Oxford University Press. https://books.google.com.ua/books?id=OirfBgAAQBAJ.

8. Doroshenko, L. (2022). Populists and social media campaigning in Ukraine: The election of Volodymyr Zelensky. In D. Taras & R. Davis (Eds.), *Electoral*

campaigns, media, and the new world of digital politics (pp. 221–243). https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.3998/mpub.12013603.14.

9. Dreyer, T., Haluts, A., Korman, A., Gov, N., Fonio, E., & Feinerman, O. (2025). Comparing cooperative geometric puzzle solving in ants versus humans. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 122*(1), Article e2414274121. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2414274121.

10. Frankham, R. (1995). Effective population size/adult population size ratios in wildlife: A review. *Genetical Research, 66*(2), 95–107. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0016672300034455.

11. Garcia, J. R., MacKillop, J., Aller, E. L., Merriwether, A. M., Wilson, D. S., & Lum, J. K. (2010). Associations between dopamine D4 receptor gene variation with both infidelity and sexual promiscuity. *PLoS ONE, 5*(11), e14162. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0014162.

12. Loewen, P. J., Dawes, C. T., Mazar, N., Johannesson, M., Koellinger, P., & Magnusson, P. K. (2013). The heritability of moral standards for everyday dishonesty. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization, 93*, 363–366. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jebo.2013.05.001.

13. Midgley, M. (2009, April 20). Hobbes's Leviathan, Part 3: What is selfishness? How Richard Dawkins went further than Hobbes and ended up ludicrously wrong. *The Guardian*. https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/belief/2009/apr/20/religion-philosophy-hobbes-dawkins-selfishness.

14. Miller, G. (2001). *The mating mind: How sexual choice shaped the evolution of human nature*. Anchor Books. https://ontherapyaspse.wordpress.com/wp-content/uploads/2012/04/geoffrey-miller-the-mating-mind.pdf.

15. OECD. (2024). *Do adults have the skills they need to thrive in a changing world?: Survey of Adult Skills 2023*. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/b263dc5d-en.

16. Pasteur, G. (1982). Classificatory review of mimicry systems. *Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics, 13*, 169–199. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.es.13.110182.001125.

17. Piraino, S., Boero, F., Aeschbach, B., & Schmid, V. (1996). Reversing the life cycle: Medusae transforming into polyps and cell transdifferentiation in *Turritopsis nutricula* (Cnidaria, Hydrozoa). *The Biological Bulletin, 190*(3), 302–312. https://doi.org/10.2307/1543022.

18. Sapolsky, R. M. (2023). *Determined: A science of life without free will*. Penguin Press. https://ndpr.nd.edu/reviews/determined-a-science-of-life-without-free-will.

19. Simchuk, A. (2024). Simulation hypothesis: Who launched the universe? *European Science, 5*(sge32-05), 80–92. https://doi.org/10.30890/2709-2313.2024-32-00-037.

20. Sithole, N. (2025, January 8). What do the US election results tell us about the global trajectory of populism? *European Center for Populism Studies (ECPS)*. https://doi.org/10.55271/rp0093.